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1. Apologies
   At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. Declarations of Interest
   Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

3. Public Participation
   3.1 Public Forum
   A period of up to 30 minutes is available for people to speak for up to five minutes on any issue that is not the subject of a separate hearings process.

   3.2 Deputations by Appointment
   Deputations may be heard on a matter or matters covered by a report on this agenda and approved by the Chairperson.
   
   There were no deputations by appointment at the time the agenda was prepared.

4. Presentation of Petitions
   There were no Presentation of Petitions at the time the agenda was prepared.
5. Council Minutes - 24 August 2017

Reference: 17/992547
Contact: Jo Daly jo.daly@ccc.govt.nz 941 8581

1. Purpose of Report
   For the Council to confirm the minutes from the Council meeting held 24 August 2017.

2. Recommendation to Council
   That the Council confirm the Minutes from the Council meeting held 24 August 2017.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Minutes Council - 24 August 2017</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. Apologies

Apologies
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00209
That the apologies from Councillor Templeton, Councillor Swiggs and Councillor Scandrett for temporary absence and Councillor Keown and Mayor Dalziel for early departure be accepted.
Councillor Davidson/Councillor Gough
Carried

2. Declarations of Interest
There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. Public Participation
3.1 Public Forum

3.1.1. Earth to Earth
Cameron Bassett and Fergus Dartnell from Westmount School presented to the Council on the creation of a biodegradable plant pot, as part of the Young Enterprise Scheme.

3.2 Deputations by Appointment

3.2.1. Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust
Jo Hooker from the Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust presented a deputation to the Council on item 42: Southshore Floodplain Management Short Term Options.
41. Resolution to Include Supplementary Reports

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00210

That the reports be received and considered at the Council meeting on Thursday, 24 August 2017.

Open Items

3.2.1. Deputations by Appointment
42. Southshore Floodplain Management Short Term Options
43. Cost Share Agreement Discussion
47. Canterbury Arena

Public Excluded Items

44. Cost Share Agreement Discussions
45. Communications Protocol
46. Development Christchurch Ltd – Update
47. Canterbury Arena

Mayor/Deputy Mayor

Carried

Councillor Johanson requested his vote against the resolution be recorded.

5. Council Minutes - 27 July 2017

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00211

That the Council confirm the Minutes from the Council meeting held 27 July 2017.

AND

That the Council confirm the Minutes from the Council meeting held 3 August 2017.

AND

That the Council confirm the Minutes from the Council meeting held 10 August 2017.

AND

That the Council receives the Minutes from the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting held 9 August 2017.

AND

That the Council receives the Minutes from the Finance and Performance Committee meeting held 2 August 2017.

AND

That the Council receives the Minutes from the Regulatory Performance Committee meeting held 26 July 2017.
AND

That the Council receives the Minutes from the Social and Community Development Committee meeting held 2 August 2017.

Mayor/Councillor Chen  

Carried

6. Council Minutes - 3 August 2017
   Council Decision
   Refer item 5.

7. Council Minutes - 10 August 2017
   Council Decision
   Refer item 5.

13. Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee Minutes - 9 August 2017
   Council Decision
   Refer item 5.

19. Finance and Performance Committee Minutes - 2 August 2017
   Council Decision
   Refer item 5.

21. Regulatory Performance Committee Minutes - 26 July 2017
   Council Decision
   Refer item 5.

25. Social and Community Development Committee Minutes - 2 August 2017
   Council Decision
   Refer item 5.
4. Presentation of Petitions

4.1 Mark Peters presented a petition of 1,366 signatures as below:

Please Save Denton Park in Hornby for Cricket, Rugby, and Outdoor Recreation purposes.
Please select an alternative site for the new Christchurch City Council Hornby Library, Customer Service, and South West Leisure Centre.

Hornby Rugby Football Club and Hornby Cricket Club are facing losing key sporting fields at Denton Park in Hornby, which they currently rely heavily on. These clubs both have long histories at Denton Park, and want to stay there for many years to come.

The Christchurch City Council need to respect the much-valued Denton Park, by moving their planned New Hornby Library, Customer Service, and South West Leisure Centre to another more appropriate site. Alternative sites are available and should be used at either Kyle Park, a great location for Hornby schools in that area, or Warren Park, which is accessible and free of traffic congestion problems and has space and less impact on existing users.

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00212

That the Council:

1. Receives the petition and thanks Mark Peters for the petition presentation. Mayor/Deputy Mayor

Carried

Councillor Swiggs left the meeting at 11.06am.

Mike Mora, Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Chairperson, Helen Broughton, Deputy Chairperson and Gary Watson, Community Governance Manager joined the table for items 8, 9 and 10.

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00213

That the Council:

1. Approve Denton Park (Option 1) as the preferred location for the new Hornby Library, Customer Services, and the South West Leisure Centre.
2. Approve a combined ‘co-located’ configuration for the facility.
3. Note the proposed use of Denton Park is inconsistent with the current reserve classification and the Denton Park Management Plan 1987; and in order to be implemented, will first require a partial change in reserve classification to (Local Purpose (Community Buildings) Reserve) and a change to the Management Plan.
4. That staff work closely with all sports clubs in the area particularly with Hornby Cricket Club in relation to the possibility of relocating from Denton Park.
5. That the concerns expressed over community safety and traffic management are noted and staff be asked to work to address these matters in particular.

Mayor/Deputy Mayor

Carried

Councillor Johanson requested his vote against resolution 1. be recorded.

Report from Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board - 8 August 2017

9. South Hornby School - Proposed School Speed Zone, Kea Crossing and P3 Parking Restrictions

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00214

That the Council:

1. Approve, in pursuance of the powers vested in it by Section 8.3(1) of the Land Transport Rule- Traffic Control Devices 2004 (Rule 54002), and pursuant to the powers vested in it by the Local Government Act 1974 and 2002, the Christchurch City Council hereby authorises the head teacher of the South Hornby School to appoint appropriately trained persons to act as school patrols at the Amyes Road school crossing point detailed in the staff report Attachment C, located at a point more or less 26 metres south east of its intersection with Branstion Street.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Galloway

Carried

The Council began consideration of item 10 at this point, then adjourned consideration of the item until later in the meeting.
47. Canterbury Arena

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00215

That the Council:

1. Receives the Multi-Use Arena Prefeasibility Report prepared by the Stadium Trust.
2. Notes that the preferred option is a full solid roof, a retractable pitch and proposed seating capacity of 25,000 permanent plus 5,000 temporary seating and a concert capacity, utilising the field of play, of 35,000-40,000.
3. Notes that Council in budgeting $253 million in its Long Term Plan has allocated sufficient funding to meet its 50% share of the proposed Multi-Use Arena under the Cost Share Agreement.
4. Notes that without additional funding the $253 million would only cover the cost of a modest provincial venue of 17,500 seats with 60% roof coverage of seating bowl.
5. Requests that officials work with the Crown to identify funding options for meeting the potential funding gap.
6. Notes that officials will report back on the ongoing work including development of a detailed business case in time for consideration for the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

Mayor/Councillor East  
Carried

Councillor Johanson requested his vote against the resolution be recorded.

Councillor Swiggs returned to the meeting at 11.47am after being absent for consideration of items 8, 9 and part of item 47.
27. Community Board Funding Allocation

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00216

That the Council:

1. Notes that the annual Strengthening Communities Grants Funding round is in progress and that all applications have been received and have been analysed. Recommendations for decision-making by elected members are subject to an agreement on the allocation of grant funding to Community Boards and for metropolitan groups;

2. Notes that the need to review the allocation of grants funding to Community Boards is driven by the change in Board boundaries and differing populations between Boards, and the request by Council in 2016 to review contestable grants processes;

3. Notes that the purposes of the Strengthening Communities Fund includes to support community focused organisations whose projects contribute to the strengthening of community wellbeing in the Christchurch City area;

4. Notes that objectives of the proposed funding allocation mechanism are to:
   a. Increase the opportunity and funding ability of Community Boards to allocate grants to community organisations based on each Board’s understanding of local needs and priorities, and
   b. Allocate grant funding to Community Boards based on population and relative social need to help achieve equitable citizen and community participation;

5. Agrees to a mechanism to allocate Strengthening Communities funding to Community Boards using a formula applying Census data based on 60% population and 40% equity;

6. Agree to a subsidy of $140,000 for the Banks Peninsula Board in addition to the formula based allocation;

7. Agrees that each Community Board will decide what proportion of the total funding it is allocated will be used for Strengthening Communities Fund annual grants and for Discretionary Response Fund grants respectively;

8. Notes that the proposed allocation mechanisms have been discussed with Community Boards all of whom support the proposed mixed allocation model and the majority of whom support the preferred option; and it has been discussed with the Social and Community Development Committee;

9. Notes that the efficacy and the outcomes of the recommended allocation formula will be reviewed and reported to Council prior to the recommendation of the allocation mechanism for the Strengthening Communities grants funding for 2018-19;

10. Notes that the total amount provided for contestable community grants in the 2017-18 Annual Plan is $7.203m, and of that to apply:
   a. $500K as its annual contribution to the Community Resilience Partnerships Fund which is match funded by the Ministry of Health;
   b. $1.2m will be used to fund major organisations; and
   c. $5.1m is available as contestable grant funding for community organisations through the annual Strengthening Communities grants and Discretionary Response Funds.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Cotter

Councillor Keown requested his vote against this resolution be recorded.

Carried
Councillor Gough was absent from the meeting between 11.53 and 11.55am.
Councillor Scandrett was absent from the meeting between 11.54 and 11.59am.
Councillor Templeton was absent from the meeting between 11.55am and 12.19pm for consideration of item 27.
Councillor East was absent from the meeting between 12.09pm and 12.15pm.
Councillor Keown left the meeting at 12.20pm.
Councillor Scandrett left the meeting at 12.20pm.

28. Resolution to Exclude the Public
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00217

That at 12.21pm the resolution to exclude the public as set out on pages 581 to 584 of the agenda and pages 126 to 127 of the supplementary agenda be adopted.

AND

That the following people be permitted to remain after the public have been excluded as they have knowledge that is relevant to those items and will assist the Council in consideration on the matters.

Rob Hall, Steve Clarke, Joel Lieschke, Cecilia Densham and Richard Wall from Development Christchurch Ltd for Item 34: Development Christchurch Ltd – Progress Report for June/July 2017

Steve Walsh and Brent King from Marsh Ltd for item 40: 2017/18 Insurance Renewal

Paul Munro from Christchurch City Holdings Limited and Hamish Foote from Chapman Tripp for item 45: Communications Protocol.

Rob Hall, Steve Clarke, Joel Lieschke, Cecilia Densham and Richard Wall from Development Christchurch Ltd and Paul Munro from Christchurch City Holdings Limited for item 46: Development Christchurch Ltd – Update.

Mayor/Deputy Mayor.  

Carried

The public were readmitted to the meeting at 12.55pm.

The meeting adjourned from 12.55pm to 1.40pm.

Councillor Manji was absent from the meeting from 1.40pm until 1.44pm.
43. Cost Share Agreement Discussion  
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00218

That the Council:

1. Notes that Council and Crown officials have discussed updated arrangements to the Cost Sharing Agreement which was originally signed in 2013, and have now proposed to Council a package that clarifies payments and ownership related to the Bus Interchange, central city public realm (Margaret Mahy Family Playground and Ōtākaro/Avon River Precinct), and residential red zoned land in the Port Hills, Brooklands, and Southshore.

2. Notes that the proposal is consistent with all capital expenditure forecast by the Council, but includes the transfer of additional assets, namely, all Port Hills red zoned land, plus Brooklands and Shoreside Red Zoned land purchased by the Crown, and full Council ownership of the Bus Interchange.

3. Notes that the Council has not previously budgeted for operating costs for the residential red zone assets and if this proposal is accepted this will need to be addressed.

4. Notes that the proposal would result in the Council ultimately owning the Bus Interchange, the Margaret Mahy Playground, the Ōtākaro/Avon River Precinct assets, and all of the residential red zoned land purchased by the Crown in the Port Hills, Brooklands, and Southshore – a total of 1,261 properties.

5. Approves the proposed update to the Cost Sharing Agreement with the Council paying up to a total of $75m for ownership of the Bus Interchange (land and buildings $23m), residential red zoned land in the Port Hills (land only $39m), Brooklands (nil), Southshore (nil), Margaret Mahy Playground (assets only $6.6m – land already in Council ownership) and Ōtākaro/Avon River Precinct (assets only excluding the Earthquake Memorial Wall remaining in Crown ownership - $6.4m).

   a. Approves pursuant to section 12 of the Local Government Act 2002 the purchase from the Crown of:

      i. The Bus Interchange land and buildings at the consideration referred to above, such land to be held for the purposes of a public bus interchange

      ii. All the Crown-owned residential red zone land in the Port Hills, Brooklands, and Southshore at the consideration referred to above, subject also to Resolution 8 below, such land to be held by the Council for the purpose of identifying future uses for the land.

      iii. The Margaret Mahy Playground and Ōtākaro/Avon River Precinct assets at the consideration referred to above.

   b. Approves the transfer to the Council of relevant contractual rights associated with the above land and buildings and assets (including warranties and guarantees relating to buildings and infrastructure).

   c. In order to implement these resolutions, delegates to the Property Consultancy Manager (in respect to land transfers) and the Head of Parks (in respect of assets) the authority to negotiate, enter into, implement and enforce such agreements with the Crown on such terms and conditions as he shall consider necessary or expedient to purchase the above land and assets and to transfer any contractual rights relating to such land and assets to the Council.

6. Approves that any technical changes to give effect to the above resolution be agreed by the Mayor as required, including the timing of any transfer and exact quantum of
payment, subject to the budgets and timing already determined through Council’s 2017 Annual Plan.

7. Approves that a project team will be established to undertake the necessary due diligence work with DPMC and LINZ to successfully transfer the agreed assets; finalise the operating and maintenance arrangements and costs; and that the ongoing maintenance costs associated with the residential red zone land will be incorporated in the 2018 LTP.

8. Approves pursuant to section 12 of the Local Government Act 2002 the sale by the Council of any of the properties identified in Appendix A (attached to this report excluding 1/20 and 2/20 Nayland Street) at no less than market value (with a tolerance of up to 10% on the downside) as determined by a registered valuer appointed by the Council, and

a. Delegates to the Property Consultancy Manager the authority to take such steps as he considers necessary or expedient to maximise value (where practical and possible including, in conjunction with LINZ removing the ‘red zone’ classification), to prepare and market those properties for sale, and to dispose of them (including the power to negotiate, enter into, implement and enforce agreements for sale and purchase with third party purchasers), and

b. Authorises the Property Consultancy Manager, for reasons of practicality, to depart from the Council’s policy of tendering all properties for sale (subject to resolution 8.c.) so long as the process adopted is open, transparent and public. The Council notes that there is no intention to amend the policy to accommodate this decision.

c. Requires that the properties referred to in Appendix A (attached to this report) shall be available as part of the disposal process to the following person(s) or parties in the following order:

   i. person(s) or parties who sold the particular property to the Crown as a consequence of the Crown’s Port Hills Residential Red Zoning following the earthquakes; and

   ii. person(s) or parties generally who sold properties to the Crown as a consequence of the Crown’s Port Hills Residential Red Zoning following the earthquakes;

   iii. current owner(s) of adjoining properties;

   iv. all other parties.

9. Notes that the project team will report back to Council as necessary to recommend decision making around future options, including options such as public works, roading corridors, hazard mitigation, amalgamation with parks or open public spaces, or other community uses (including those desired by the relevant Papatipu Rūnanga). The first report back is expected in approximately March 2018.

Mayor/Councillor Swiggs

Councillors Clearwater and Johanson requested their votes against the resolutions be recorded.

Councillor East request his vote against the purchase of Crown-owned residential land in Brooklands and Southshore be recorded.

Councillor Gough was absent from the meeting from 1.44pm to 1.52pm.

The Mayor left the meeting at 2.43pm, Deputy Mayor Turner assumed the Chair at that time.
26. Christchurch Housing Initiative - Agreement for Funding

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00219

That the Council:

1. Endorse the Agreement for Funding between the Crown and the Council for the Christchurch Housing Initiative.
2. Note that the Agreement for Funding’s requirement for matching funding from the Council will be subject to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.
3. Delegate to the Chief Executive Officer to confirm with the Ministry of Building Innovation and Employment the operational matters of the Agreement.
4. Request that staff report back to Council on an agreement for a third party to operate the Initiative.

Councillor Buck/Councillor Livingstone Carried

Report from Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board - 8 August 2017

10. Augustine Drive/Halswell Road Intersection Improvements - Scheme Design

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00220

That the Council:

1. Approve the scheme designs for the Augustine Drive/Halswell Road/Monsaraz Boulevard intersection, as detailed in the staff report Attachment A.
2. Approve the lane marking changes, kerb alignment changes, and islands in the general vicinity of the intersection of Augustine Drive, Halswell Road and Monsaraz Boulevard, as detailed in the staff report Attachment A.
3. Approve that the intersection of Augustine Drive, Halswell Road and Monsaraz Boulevard be controlled by traffic signals in accordance with the Land Transport Act – Traffic Control Devices Rule; 2004, as detailed in the staff report Attachment A.
4. Approve that the special vehicle lane for the use of south east bound cyclists only, be installed on the north east side of Augustine Drive commencing at its intersection with Halswell Road and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 65 metres.
5. Note that staff will provide for cyclists on all arms of the intersection through the detailed design and will report back to the Council on any required changes to the detailed traffic resolutions.

Councillor Cotter/Councillor Galloway Carried

Councillor Gough was absent from the meeting from 2.57pm to 3.05pm.
20. Easter Sunday Trading Hours

That the Council:

1. Request staff to investigate an Easter Sunday shop trading policy for the Christchurch City Council territory authority area, including consideration of exclusive areas, and report back to the Regulatory and Performance Committee.

The division was declared lost by 6 votes to 9 votes the voting being as follows:

For: Deputy Mayor Turner, Councillor Buck, Councillor East, Councillor Gough, Councillor Johanson and Councillor Manji

Against: Councillor Chen, Councillor Clearwater, Councillor Cotter, Councillor Davidson, Councillor Galloway, Councillor Livingstone, Councillor Scandrett, Councillor Swiggs and Councillor Templeton

Councillor Gough/Councillor East Lost by division

That the Council:

1. Request staff to investigate an Easter Sunday shop trading policy which allows for trading in the Banks Peninsula area only, option 2 in the staff report, and report back to the Regulatory and Performance Committee.

The division was declared lost by 7 votes to 8 votes the voting being as follows:

For: Deputy Mayor Turner, Councillor Buck, Councillor East, Councillor Galloway, Councillor Gough, Councillor Manji and Councillor Scandrett

Against: Councillor Chen, Councillor Clearwater, Councillor Cotter, Councillor Davidson, Councillor Johanson, Councillor Livingstone, Councillor Swiggs and Councillor Templeton

Deputy Mayor/Councillor Scandrett Lost by division

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00221

That the Council:

1. Agrees not to investigate an Easter Sunday Trading Hours policy, at this time.

2. Requests staff to maintain a watching brief for public expressions of interest in having a policy and, if support does emerge, to report back to the Council with further options.

The division was declared carried by 8 votes to 7 votes the voting being as follows:

For: Councillor Chen, Councillor Clearwater, Councillor Cotter, Councillor Davidson, Councillor Galloway, Councillor Livingstone, Councillor Swiggs and Councillor Templeton

Against: Deputy Mayor Turner, Councillor Buck, Councillor East, Councillor Gough, Councillor Johanson, Councillor Manji and Councillor Scandrett

Councillor Templeton/Councillor Davidson Carried
28. Resolution to Exclude the Public

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00222

That at 3.56pm the resolution to exclude the public as set out on pages 581 to 584 of the agenda and pages 126 to 127 of the supplementary agenda be adopted.

AND

That the required people resolved in the Council decision at 12.21pm be permitted to remain after the public have been excluded as they have knowledge that is relevant to those items and will assist the Council in consideration on the matters.

Deputy Mayor/Councillor Scandrett  Carried

The meeting adjourned from 3.56pm to 4.01pm.
The meeting returned to open meeting at 5.28pm.
Councillor Gough returned to the meeting at 5.30pm.
Councillors Johanson and Livingstone left the meeting at 5.30pm.
Councillor Chen left the meeting at 5.33pm.

Report from Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee - 9 August 2017

11. Proposed Lower Styx, Marshland and Hawkins Road Intersection Improvement and widening of Marshland Road Bridge.

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00223

That the Council:

1. Approve the staff proposal for the revised design and position for Marshlands Road, Lower Styx Road, Hawkins Road intersection improvement and widening of Marshland Road Bridge design (refer Appendix C & D).

2. Approve that the intersection of Marshland Road, Lower Styx Road, Hawkins Road be controlled by traffic signals (lights); Marshland Road Bridge be widened; and the project proceed to final design, tender and construction as detailed in Appendix C & D.

3. Request staff to investigate and if feasible to proceed with the construction of the bridge widening works ahead of the intersection upgrade.

4. Notes that the change request process is in place to adjust budgets in line with internal financial delegations.

5. Request staff to investigate whether the site can be identified as an ecological significant site.

Councillor Cotter/Councillor Davidson  Carried
12. Hereford Street Proposed Pedestrian Crossing (Zebra) and Parking Changes

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00224

That the Council approve the following:

1. That all parking and stopping restrictions currently located on the south side of Hereford Street between Cambridge Terrace and Montreal Street be revoked.
2. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at all times on the south side of Hereford Street commencing at its intersection with Cambridge Terrace and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 12 metres.
3. That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes Monday to Friday 9.00am to 5.00pm and designated to pay and display parking only on the south side of Hereford Street commencing at a point 12 metres west of its intersection with Cambridge Terrace and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 33 metres.
4. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at all times on the south side of Hereford Street commencing at a point 45 metres west of its intersection with Cambridge Terrace and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 25 metres.
5. That a loading Zone (Goods Vehicles only) be installed on the south side of Hereford Street commencing at a point 70 metres west of its intersection with Cambridge Terrace and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 7 metres.
6. That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 10 minutes on the south side of Hereford Street commencing at a point 77 metres west of its intersection with Cambridge Terrace and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 6 metres.
7. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at all times on the south side of Hereford Street commencing at a point 83 metres west of its intersection with Cambridge Terrace and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 33 metres.
8. That a Pedestrian Crossing (Zebra) be installed across Hereford Street commencing at a point 97 metres west of its intersection with Cambridge Terrace and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 5 metres.
9. That a bus stop be installed on the south side of Hereford Street commencing at a point 116 metres west of its intersection with Cambridge Terrace and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
10. That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at all times on the south side of Hereford Street commencing at a point 130 metres west of its intersection with Cambridge Terrace and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 32 metres to its intersection with Montreal Street.

Councillor Cotter/Councillor Davidson  Carried
28. Resolution to Exclude the Public

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00225

That at 5.37pm the resolution to exclude the public as set out on pages 581 to 584 of the agenda and pages 126 to 127 of the supplementary agenda be adopted.

AND

That the required people resolved in the Council decision at 12.21pm be permitted to remain after the public have been excluded as they have knowledge that is relevant to those items and will assist the Council in consideration on the matters.

Deputy Mayor/Councillor Templeton  
Carried

The meeting returned to open meeting at 5.42pm.

Adjournment of Meeting

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00226

It was resolved on the motion of Councillor Templeton, seconded by Councillor Davidson that the meeting be adjourned until 9am on Thursday 31 August in the Council Chamber.

Councillor Templeton/Councillor Davidson  
Carried

Councillor Swiggs requested his vote against the procedural motion be recorded.

The meeting adjourned at 5.42pm.
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Apologies

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00209

That the apologies from Councillor Keown and Councillor Gough for absence and for temporary absence from Councillor Manji be accepted.

Councillor Johanson/Councillor Scandrett

Carried

42. Southshore Floodplain Management Short Term Options

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00210

That the Council:

1. Receive the Southshore Floodplain and Management Short Term Options report with attachments
2. Approve option 2 to stabilise the emergency works to construction.
3. Refer the remainder of the report to the next Coastal-Burwood Community Board meeting for the Board’s comment and request staff report back to the Council meeting 28 September 2017.

Councillor Cotter/Councillor East

Carried

Councillor Manji left the meeting at 9.41am and returned at 11.52am and was absent for consideration and decision of item 42 and part of public excluded item 46.

The meeting adjourned at 10.37am and reconvened at 11.03am.

Report from Finance and Performance Committee - 2 August 2017


This report will be considered at the Council meeting on 7 September 2017.

Report from Finance and Performance Committee - 2 August 2017

15. Memorandum of Understanding - the Council, ChristchurchNZ, and Christchurch City Holdings

This report will be considered at the Council meeting on 7 September 2017.

Report from Finance and Performance Committee - 2 August 2017

16. Corporate Finance Report for the period ending 30 June 2017

This report will be considered at the Council meeting on 7 September 2017.

Report from Finance and Performance Committee - 2 August 2017

17. Final 2017/18 Statements of Intent

This report will be considered at the Council meeting on 7 September 2017.
Report from Finance and Performance Committee - 2 August 2017

   This report will be considered at the Council meeting on 7 September 2017.

Report from Social and Community Development Committee - 2 August 2017

22. Proposed Names for New Park and New Legal Road in East Frame
   This report will be considered at the Council meeting on 7 September 2017.

Report from Social and Community Development Committee - 2 August 2017

23. Review of the Terms of Reference for the Social and Community Development Committee and Housing Taskforce
   This report will be considered at the Council meeting on 7 September 2017.

Report from Social and Community Development Committee - 2 August 2017

24. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for the Former St Luke’s Vicarage, 185 Kilmore Street, Christchurch
   This report will be considered at the Council meeting on 7 September 2017.

28. Resolution to Exclude the Public
   Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00211

   That at 11.25am the resolution to exclude the public as set out on pages 581 to 584 of the agenda and pages 126 to 127 of the supplementary agenda be adopted.

   AND

   That the following people be permitted to remain after the public have been excluded as they have knowledge that is relevant to those items and will assist the Council in consideration on the matters.

   Rob Hall, Steve Clarke and Joel Lieschke from Development Christchurch Ltd from Christchurch City Holdings Limited for item 46: Development Christchurch Ltd – Update

   Mayor/Deputy Mayor

   Carried

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 12.40pm.

The Council acknowledged that items remaining on the agenda will be considered at the Council meeting on 7 September 2017.

Meeting concluded at 12.40pm.
CONFIRMED THIS 28th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2017

MAYOR LIANNE DALZIEL
CHAIRPERSON
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Watch Council meetings live on the web:
The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. Apologies

Apologies

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00231

That the apology from Councillor Keown and the apology from Councillor Johanson for early departure be accepted.

Councillor Johanson/Councillor Chen  Carried

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. Public Participation

3.1 Public Forum

3.1.1 Christchurch Symphony Orchestra

- Therese Arseneau, Chair and Gretchen La Roche, Chief Executive, Christchurch Symphony Orchestra presented to the Council.

3.1.2 Wayne Hawker

- Wayne Hawker presented to the Council.

3.2 Deputations by Appointment

There were no deputations by appointment.

4. Presentation of Petitions

There was no presentation of petitions.
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00232

That the Council:

1. Approve the following:
   a. The sale of two parcels of Council owned land at Redcliffs Park to the Crown at a current market value as assessed by an independent registered valuer appointed by the Council described as:
      i. 1,075 m² Lot 2 Deposited Plan 47479 CB27F/183
      ii. 7,692 m² Lot 3 Deposited Plan 47479 CB27F/184
   b. The cancellation of the vesting (in the Council) of the Crown owned land classified as Recreation Reserve at Redcliffs Park described as Reserve 4601 CB616/39 being 1.0304ha in area and to this land being set apart for a school.
   c. Appointment by the Crown to control and manage the Crown owned land at Redcliffs School described as follows as Recreation Reserve under Section 28 of the Reserves Act 1977 for a new park:
      i. 4,223m² Section 1 Survey Office Plan 334406 CFR156004
      ii. 4,047m² Part Lot 3 Deposited Plan 1228 CB190/67
      iii. 3,384m² Lot 1 Deposited Plan 7624 CB372/72
      iv. 4,957m² Part Lot 2 Deposited Plan 1228 CB495/17
      v. 1,821m² Part Lot 3 Deposited Plan 1228 Gazette 1924 p2596

2. Request and encourage the Ministry of Education to acknowledge and consider the project in the Main Road Master Plan relating to view shafts and access between Main Road near Moa Bone Cave and the Coastal Pathway and Estuary and to consider ways that this project can inform their planning for the new school site.

3. Note the Ministry of Education's commitment to remove the buildings and hardstand and then make good the demolition area to grass or similar, and to build a fence at the new park site. Council requests Council staff and the Community Board to consider which facilities and landscaping might usefully be retained as Council assets on the new park site, and to negotiate the retention of these items with the Ministry of Education.

4. Noting the level of service associated to the existing Redcliffs Park and the community's desire to retain this, request Council staff to negotiate a fair and reasonable contribution (accounting for the current condition and book value of the current assets) from the Ministry of Education in respect to retaining that level of service on the new park site.

5. Acknowledging the loss of waterfront amenity at the existing park site, allocate the proceeds from the sale of the fee simple land to improve recreational amenity on the new park site and surrounding area.

6. Require that all three elements of the transaction referred to in paragraph 1 above proceed.

7. Request Council staff to assess the new Redcliffs School site for inclusion in the priority list for a school speed zone.
8. Note the Ministry of Education’s willingness to contribute towards new traffic management and pedestrian safety systems that may be required.

9. Request that Council staff and the Ministry of Education work together to achieve continuity of service and minimal disruption to users of the park.

10. Delegate to the Chief Executive the authority to negotiate and enter into such documentation as she considers necessary to implement the above arrangements.

Deputy Mayor/Councillor Templeton  
Carried

Councillor Johanson abstained from voting on this item.

**Report from Social and Community Development Committee - 2 August 2017**

5. **Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for the Former St Luke’s Vicarage, 185 Kilmore Street, Christchurch**

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00233

That the Council:

1. Approves a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $204,892 for conservation, strengthening and repair work to the protected heritage building located at 185 Kilmore Street.

2. Notes that payment of this grant is subject to the applicant entering into a full conservation covenant, with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property title.

3. Request that the covenant will include a condition to preserve the visibility of the property from the street.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Swiggs  
Carried

Councillors Davidson and Johanson requested their votes against the resolutions be recorded.

**Report from Social and Community Development Committee - 2 August 2017**

6. **Proposed Names for New Park and New Legal Road in East Frame**

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00234

That the Council:

1. Approve Rauora Park as the reserve name in the East Frame development consisting of five parcels of land between Armagh Street and Lichfield Street (Lots 207, 304, 404, 504, 606 on RMA62031953 Approved Resource Consent Plan dated 14/07/2016)

2. Approve Huanui Lane as the name for the legal road to the west of Rauora Park between Armagh Street and Lichfield Street, a part of the East Frame Development (Lots 206, 303, 403, 503, 607 on RMA62031953 Approved Resource Consent Plan dated 14/07/2016).

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Templeton  
Carried

Councillors East and Johanson requested their votes against the resolutions be recorded.
7. **Review of the Terms of Reference for the Social and Community Development Committee and Housing Taskforce**

**Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00235**

That the Council:

1. Re-name the Committee to become the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee.
2. Adopt the amended terms of reference attached to this report for the Social, Community Development and Housing Committee.
3. Disestablish the Housing Taskforce.
4. Note that these decisions may have an impact on the terms of reference for other committees of Council, specifically around housing issues, consequently staff will report back to Council should those terms of reference need amending.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Livingstone  **Carried**

---

8. **Impact on Business from Council Works**

**Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00236**

That the Council:

1. Receive the information in the report.
2. Note that financial compensation for businesses or other ratepayers affected by the Council’s infrastructure works (whether through the rates system or a Grant) is not considered feasible.
3. Require that the managers of all Council infrastructure projects liaise with any businesses, property owners and tenants that front Council infrastructure projects to:
   a. provide best endeavours to minimise disruption.
   b. either enable access for pedestrians and vehicles onto the property or agree practical alternative measures to be implemented.
   c. ensure the needs of communities and businesses are identified within the procurement process, and that there is ongoing communication with affected parties.
4. Request management to report on the level of disruption and success of mitigation measures that have been undertaken on significant projects in the public realm in conjunction with the capital watchlist.

Deputy Mayor/Mayor  **Carried**

---

9. **Memorandum of Understanding - the Council, ChristchurchNZ, and Christchurch City Holdings**

This Item was duplicated in the agenda and considered as item 13.
Report from Finance and Performance Committee - 2 August 2017

10. Corporate Finance Report for the period ending 30 June 2017

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00237

That the Council:

1. Receives the information in the report
2. Notes the on-going but temporary Treasury Policy breach for interest rate re-pricing (hedging), last ratified at the Council meeting of 25 May 2017.

Deputy Mayor/Councillor Swiggs

Carried

Report from Finance and Performance Committee - 2 August 2017

11. Final 2017/18 Statements of Intent

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00238

That the Council:

1. Notes that the final Statements of Intent for 2017/18 have been received from the following groups of Council-controlled organisations:
   a. Christchurch City Holdings Ltd and its subsidiaries – Christchurch International Airport Ltd, Orion New Zealand Ltd, Lyttelton Port Company Ltd, Enable Services Ltd, City Care Ltd, EcoCentral Ltd, Red Bus Ltd and Development Christchurch Ltd;
   b. Council-owned organisations and charitable trusts – Vbase Ltd, Civic Building Ltd, ChristchurchNZ Ltd (formerly Transition Holdings Ltd) and Local Government New Zealand, Riccarton Bush Trust, Christchurch Agency for Energy Trust and Rod Donald Banks Peninsula Trust;
2. Notes that the final Statements of Intent for 2017/18 address the Council’s comments on the draft documents made at its meeting on 13 April 2017 (Council resolutions CNCL/2017/00109 and CNCL/2017/00110 refer);
3. Notes that the Statements of Intent meet the minimum statutory requirements for information to be provided as set out in clauses 9 and 10 of Schedule 8 of the Local Government Act 2002;
4. Notes that the Statements of Intent were made public by each of the Council-controlled organisations on or before 31 July 2017.

Deputy Mayor/Councillor Chen

Carried

Councillor Scandrett left the meeting at 11.21am

Report from Finance and Performance Committee - 2 August 2017


Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00239

That the Council:


Deputy Mayor/Councillor East

Carried
13. Memorandum of Understanding - the Council, ChristchurchNZ, and Christchurch City Holdings

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00240

That the Council:

1. Approves the draft Memorandum of Understanding as set out in Attachment A, and delegates to the Chief Executive authority to sign the Memorandum of Understanding on the Council’s behalf.

Councillor Manji/Councillor East  Carried

Report from Audit and Risk Management Committee - 23 August 2017


Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00241

That the Council:

1. Approve the content of the draft audit proposal letter received from Audit New Zealand.

2. Approve the Mayor signing the final audit proposal letter once received from Audit New Zealand.

Councillor Manji/Deputy Mayor  Carried

15. Audit and Risk Management Committee Minutes - 23 August 2017

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00242

That the Council receives the Minutes from the Audit and Risk Management Committee meeting held 23 August 2017.

Mayor/Councillor Manji  Carried

Report from Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee - 23 August 2017

16. Presentations Regarding Waste Minimisation

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00243

1. That the Council include provision for recyclable content in its environmental procurement policy when purchasing products.

2. That the Council receives the Minutes from the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee meeting held 23 August 2017.

Councillor Buck/Councillor Templeton  Carried
Report from Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee - 23 August 2017

17. Development Contributions - Small Residential Unit Rebate
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00244

That the Council:

1. Agree to the small residential unit development contributions rebate being extended to 31 December 2018 or until the fund is fully allocated, as detailed in the Small Residential Unit Rebate Scheme Criteria (Attachment A of the report).

Councillor Gough/Councillor Livingstone Carried

Report from Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee - 23 August 2017

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00245

That the Council:

1. Receive this status report.

2. Agree that the review of the Council’s Development Contributions Policy be completed in 2018.

Councillor Gough/Councillor Buck Carried
19. Master plan capital projects priorities

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00246

That the Council:

1. Receive the information;
2. Note that Council resolution CNC/2017/00086 applies to the matter of funding sought by Development Christchurch Limited for public realm projects in the New Brighton Centre Master Plan and, for that reason, this report excludes funding of New Brighton projects;
3. Confirm that $30.8 million will be included for consideration in the Draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan for the very high and high priority master plan capital projects; and
4. Not allocate an additional $16.4 million in the Draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan for the lower priority master plan capital projects, except as provided for in 5, below.
5. Include funding of approximately $709,000 for the following projects classed as Lower Priority Projects:
   a. N1 Colombo Street Public Spaces ($200k)
   b. NE2 Scott Park Enhancements ($159k)
   c. CCH2 Te Aja O Hineraki/Moa Bone Point Cave ($100k)
   d. FM5 Ferrymead Towpath Connection ($150k)
   e. C5 Local Landscape and Heritage Interpretations ($100k)
6. The remaining Lower Priority Projects are not to be considered for funding in the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan, but will be reconsidered for funding in future Long Term Plans.

Councillor Davidson/Councillor Swiggs

Carried

20. Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee Minutes - 23 August 2017

Council Decision

Refer to item 16.

21. Strategic Capability Committee Minutes - 15 August 2017

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00247

That the Council receives the Minutes from the Strategic Capability Committee meeting held 15 August 2017.

Councillor Buck/Councillor Swiggs

Carried

Councillor Scandrett returned to the meeting at 11.39am and was absent for items 12 to 21 and part of item 22.
22. Implementation Plan - Tsunami Report

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00248

That the Council:

2. Request a report back on progress by the end of 2017.
3. Request a further report on Tsunami Siren options and include information on Tsunami risks.

Mayor/Councillor Clearwater

Carried
24. Amendments to RMA Delegations and new RMA Fees

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00249

That the Council:

1. Relying on clause 32 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 and for the purposes of the efficiency and effectiveness in the conduct of the Council’s business, and relying on sections 34 and 34A of the Resource Management Act 1991, and any other applicable statutory authority,
   a. Delegate to the persons set out in Attachment A (as shown and highlighted) the responsibilities, duties, and powers as shown; and
   b. Amend the delegations set out in Attachment A (as so shown and highlighted).

2. Notes that the delegations shown in green in Attachment A come into force on 18 October 2017, and the rest of the delegations and amendments to delegations come into force on the date of this resolution.

3. In accordance with sections 36 and 36AA of the Resource Management Act 1991 commences the special consultative procedure in relation to the proposed charges/fees as follows:
   a. A deposit of $800 is proposed for permitted boundary activity applications:
   b. A deposit of $1,000 is proposed for processing permitted marginal or temporary non-compliances:
   c. That the processing of permitted boundary activity applications and processing permitted marginal or temporary non-compliances be charged at officer time assessed at the hourly rates in the existing Resource Management Fees Schedule set under the Annual Plan.

4. Adopts a ‘statement of proposal’ (as set out in Attachment B)

5. Notes that public consultation is planned for mid September to mid October, with public hearings (if required) around late October 2017.

6. That if submitters wish to make an oral submission a hearings panel is appointed to hear submissions on the new charges, deliberate on those submissions, and report back to the Council on the final form of the new charges; but that if no submitters request an oral hearing, the Council will deliberate on the submissions and consider the final form of the new charges.

Councillor East/Councillor Templeton

Carried
25. Annual Plan Contribution to Christchurch Yacht Club

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00250

That the Council:

1. Support the funding of $239,713 for the Christchurch Yacht Club construction of its replacement base, subject to the following conditions:
   a. There is enduring public access in perpetuity to the Coastal Pathway, and adjoining deck area and ramps providing access to the beach area below.
   b. The design and specifications of the replacement base are consistent with the developed design for the Coastal Pathway.

2. Authorise staff to negotiate with the Christchurch Yacht Club and develop terms and conditions of a funding agreement.

Councillor Templeton/Councillor Johanson Carried

Suspension of Standing Orders

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00251

That the Council resolve to suspend Standing Order 4.2 relating to the meeting duration to enable the meeting to sit continuously for longer than three hours without a ten minute break.

Mayor/Councillor Cotter Carried
26. Off-street free parking

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00252

That the Council:

1. Agrees:
   a. to provide one hour free parking in Council off-street sites for four months from the opening of the Lichfield Street car parking building.
   b. to fully review the initiative while it is operating.
   c. to consult on whether the initiative should be extended during the 2018 Long Term Plan process.

2. Undertakes a cost effective joint Central City marketing campaign between private sector central city business interests and the Council, and report back to the Council with details when they are available.

3. Converts all Council managed paid off-street parking to short stay.

4. Instruct Development Christchurch Limited and Council staff to develop a wider central city parking strategy, including:
   a. An investigation into extending this scheme to privately owned car parking buildings;
   b. options around validation and/or a targeted rate;

   and to report back to the Development Forum within three months.

5. Note that as part of the report back on fee setting for Lichfield Street carpark that it will include consideration for different options of calculating the charges.

Councillor Gough/Councillor Swiggs  Carried

Councillor Clearwater abstained from voting on this item.

Councillor Johanson requested his vote against the resolutions be recorded.

27. Resolution to Exclude the Public

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00253

That at 1.02pm the resolution to exclude the public set out on pages 371 to 374 of the agenda be adopted.

AND

That Rob Hall of Development Christchurch Limited remain after the public have been excluded for Item 30. Development Christchurch Ltd – Progress Report from June/July 2017 of the public excluded agenda as he has knowledge that is relevant to that item and will assist the Council.

Mayor/Deputy Mayor  Carried

The meeting adjourned at 1.02pm and reconvened at 2.05pm in public excluded session.
The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 3.20pm.

Meeting concluded at 3.20pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 28TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2017

MAYOR LIANNE DALZIEL
CHAIRPERSON
7. Council Minutes - 14 September 2017

Reference: 17/1017299
Contact: Chris Turner-Bullock
christopher.turner@ccc.govt.nz 941 8233

1. Purpose of Report
For the Council to confirm the minutes from the Council meeting held 14 September 2017.

2. Recommendation to Council
That the Council confirm the Minutes from the Council meeting held 14 September 2017.
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Watch Council meetings live on the web:
The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   
   There were no apologies.

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Public Participation**
   
   3.1 **Public Forum**
   
   There were no public forum presentations.

   3.2 **Deputations by Appointment**
   
   There were no deputations by appointment.

4. **Presentation of Petitions**
   
   There was no presentation of petitions.

   Bridget Williams, Community Board Member and Matt McIntock, Community Governance Manager joined the table for item 6.

5. **Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board Report to Council**
   
   **Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00255**

   That the Council:
   
   1. Receive the Community Board report.

   Councillor Gough/Councillor Keown **Carried**

   Darrell Latham, Community Board Member and Shupayi Mpunga, Community Governance Manager joined the table for item 5.

6. **Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Report to Council**
   
   **Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00256**

   That the Council:
   
   1. Receive the Community Board report.

   Councillor Johanson/Councillor Swiggs **Carried**
Christine Wilson, Community Board Chairperson and Penelope Goldstone, Community Governance Manager joined the table for item 7.

Councillor Gough left the meeting at 10.32am, during item 7. Councillor Cotter left the meeting at 10.34am and returned at 10.38am.

7. Banks Peninsula Community Board Report to Council
   Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00257

That the Council:
   1. Receive the Community Board report.

Deputy Mayor/Councillor Johanson Carried

Karolin Potter, Community Board Chairperson and Melanie Coker, Community Board Deputy Chairperson joined the table for item 8.

Councillor Gough returned to the meeting at 10.41am, during item 8.

8. Spreydon-Cashmere Community Board Report to Council
   Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00258

That the Council:
   1. Receives the Community Board report.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Scandrett Carried

Kim Money, Community Board Chairperson and Jo Wells, Community Governance Manager joined the table for item 9.

Councillor Clearwater left the meeting at 11.02am and returned at 11.04am.

9. Coastal-Burwood Community Board Report to Council
   Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00259

That the Council:
   1. Receive the Community Board report.

Councillor East/Councillor Livingstone Carried

Mike Mora, Community Board Chairperson and Gary Watson, Community Governance Manager joined the table for items 10 and 11.

10. Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Report to Council
    Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00260

That the Council:
   1. Receive the Community Board report.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Buck Carried
11. Waterloo Business Park - Proposed Night Time Restrictions

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00261

That the Council resolve to:

1. Approve that pursuant to the Christchurch City Council Cruising and Prohibited Times on Roads Bylaw 2014, Part 2, Clause 7, motor vehicles weighing less than 3,500 kilograms are prohibited from being operated from 10pm to 5am on the following roads:
   a) Doric Way (entire length)
   b) Commerce Crescent (entire length)
   c) Innovation Road (entire length)
   d) Enterprise Avenue (entire length)
   e) Islington Avenue (entire length)
   f) Industry Avenue (entire length)

Councillor Chen/Councillor Galloway

Councillor Swiggs requested that his vote against the resolution be recorded.

Ali Jones, Community Board Chairperson and Matt McLintock, Community Governance Manager joined the table for item 12.

Councillor Gough left the meeting at 11.32am and returned at 11.38am.

12. Papanui-Innes Community Board Report to Council

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00262

That the Council:

1. Receive the Community Board report.

Councillor Cotter/Councillor Davidson

Carried
Report from Papanui-Innes Community Board - 11 August 2017

13. Proposed Speed Limit Change Riverlea Estate Drive
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00263

That the Council:

1. Approve that pursuant to Section 5 of the Christchurch City Council Speed Limits Bylaw 2010, speed limits be revoked and set as listed below in clauses 1.a to 1.b and include the resulting changes in the Christchurch City Register of Speed Limits & Speed Limit Maps:
   a. Revoke the 50 kilometres per hour speed limit of Riverlea Estate Drive from a point 330 metres south of its intersection with Kainga Road to the end of Riverlea Estate Drive.
   b. Approve that the speed limit of Riverlea Estate Drive be set at 30 kilometres per hour from a point 330 metres south of its intersection with Kainga Road to the end of Riverlea Estate Drive, in accordance with Attachment A.

2. Approve that the speed limit changes listed above in clauses 1.a to 1.b come into force on 29 September 2017.

3. Request staff in future when private roads are brought into the network, that consideration is given to the operating speed at the time of the transfer.

Councillor Davidson/Councillor Cotter Carried

16. Insurance Committee Minutes - 4 September 2017
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00264

That the Council receives the Minutes from the Insurance Committee meeting held 4 September 2017.

Mayor/Deputy Mayor Carried

17. Policy for the Appointment and Remuneration of Directors to Council Organisations
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00265

That the report be left to lie on the table until the Council meeting on 28 September 2017.

Mayor/Deputy Mayor Carried
18. Appointment of Hearings Panel - Lyttelton Historical Museum Society -
Request for Gift of Land
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00266

That the Council:
1. Appoint a Hearings Panel to hear and consider the submissions received from the section
138 of Local Government Act 2002 consultation relating to the request for gift of land at
33-35 London Street, Lyttelton and request that the Hearings Panel report back to the
Council.

Deputy Mayor/Councillor Clearwater __________________________ Carried

Councillor Galloway left the meeting at 11.48am and returned at 11.54am.
Councillor Manji left the meeting at 11.55am and returned at 11.57am.

14. Chief Executive's Report August 2017
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00267

That the Council:
1. Receive the report.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Galloway __________________________ Carried

Councillor Gough left the meeting at 12.15pm and returned at 12.21am.

15. Mayor’s Monthly Report - August 2017
Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00268

That the Council:
1. Receive the information in this report.

Councillor Scandrett/Councillor Swiggs __________________________ Carried
19. Resolution to Exclude the Public

Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00269

That Rob Hall, Steve Clarke and Richard Wall of Development Christchurch Limited, remain after the public have been excluded for Item 20 of the public excluded agenda as they have knowledge that is relevant to that item and will assist the Council.

AND

That at 12.36pm the resolution to exclude the public set out on pages 116 to 117 of the agenda be adopted.

Mayor/Deputy Mayor Carried

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 1.19pm at which time the meeting concluded.

CONFIRMED THIS 28th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2017

MAYOR LIANNE DALZIEL
CHAIRPERSON
1. **Purpose of Report**
   For the Council to confirm the minutes from the Council meeting held 4 September 2017.

2. **Recommendation to Council**
   That the Council confirm the Minutes from the Council meeting held 4 September 2017.
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Watch Council meetings live on the web:
1. **Apologies**
   
   Council Resolved METC/2017/00006
   
   That the apologies for absence from the Mayor, Councillor Gough and Councillor Keown be accepted.
   
   Deputy Mayor/Councillor Templeton  
   
   **Carried**

2. **Declarations of Interest**

   Councillors declared the following interests relating to applications received to the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund from specific organisations and took no part in the discussion and decision making of those applications.

   - Deputy Mayor Turner – Okains Bay Maori and Colonial Museum Trust (page 180)
   - Councillor Davidson – Canterbury Neighbourhood Support Inc (page 50)
   - Councillor Templeton - Woolston Brass Inc. (page 209)
   - Councillor Livingstone - Nga Maata Waka Enterprises - Nga Hau E Wha National Maara (page 89)
   - Councillor East - Canterbury Neighbourhood Support Inc (page 50)

3. **2017 / 18 - Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund**

   Council Resolved METC/2017/00007
   
   That the Council:
   
   1. Has considered all of the applications and recommendations for the 2017/18 Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund.
   2. Approve the allocations from the 2017/18 Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund as per the attached document.
   3. Approve the transfer of any remaining unallocated monies from the 2017/18 Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund to the 2017/18 Metropolitan Discretionary Response Fund.
   4. Note that the following applications are already being considered by the Community Resilience and Partnership Fund:
      a. Canterbury Neighbourhood Support Inc (Page 50)
      b. Otautahi Creative Spaces Trust (Page 91)
      c. Pacific Youth Leadership And Transformation Council (Page 92)
      d. Project Lyttelton Incorporated (Page 233)
   5. Note that the following applications will be referred to the Community Resilience and Partnership Fund as they have been deemed to meet the criteria of this fund:
      a. Q-topia (Page 98)
      b. The Canterbury Mental Health Education and Resource Centre Trust (Page 108)
      c. Conservation Volunteers New Zealand (Page 225)
   6. Approve that $25,000 of the funds transferred to the 2017/18 Metropolitan Discretionary Response Fund be ring-fenced for Q-topia Incorporated.
7. Approve that $45,000 of the funds transferred to the 2017/18 Metropolitan Discretionary Response Fund be ring-fenced for The Canterbury Mental Health Education and Resource Centre Trust.

8. Should they be successful in being funded, the funds transferred to the 2017/18 Metropolitan Discretionary Response Fund will be released for other applicants.

9. Request that staff report to the Council by the end of September 2017 on the terms of reference of a comprehensive strategic funding review of all of the funds and the support that the Council provides to sustain and support organisations in the city, including the relationship of the Council with other funders.

10. Establish a Funding Review Working Group comprising of the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Social and Community Development Committee and the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee. The Working Group will provide feedback to staff on the comprehensive funding review detailed in 9.

11. Note that further work is required regarding Early Learning Centre funding, which will be undertaken in the second part of the current funding review, and approve that implementation of the Council decision of 11 February 2016 to no longer ring-fence money for Early Learning Centre rent subsidy will be further delayed until 30 June 2018.

12. Note that there will not be any multiyear funding allocations made from the 2017/18 Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund due to the comprehensive strategic funding review and request staff to communicate with the organisations that had requested multiyear funding the reasons it was not granted this year.

13. Support in principle raising the total amount of Community funding available for grant allocations by 10 percent in the Long Term Plan for financial year 18/19 and then inflation adjusted each year after that.

14. Request that staff have further discussions with the Christchurch City Mission and other relevant agencies relating to sheltered and emergency housing projects being aligned with Christchurch’s Housing First programme.

15. Meet with the Canterbury District Health Board to discuss the issue of grants funding towards health related organisations.

Deputy Mayor/Councillor Clearwater

Carried
## Council - Metropolitan Funding
#### 04 September 2017

### 2017/18 METROPOLITAN SCF APPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Name/Subject</th>
<th>Project Total Cost</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hornsby Community Preschool</td>
<td>Hornsby Community Preschool Rent</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Killara Early Learning Centre Avanu</td>
<td>Killara Early Learning Centre Avanu Rent</td>
<td>$31,360</td>
<td>$31,360</td>
<td>$31,360</td>
<td>$31,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mona Vale Early Childhood Centre</td>
<td>Mona Vale Early Childhood Centre Rent</td>
<td>$32,888</td>
<td>$32,888</td>
<td>$32,888</td>
<td>$32,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>New Beginnings Preschool</td>
<td>New Beginnings Preschool Rent</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>New Brighton Community Preschool and Nursery Inc</td>
<td>New Brighton Community Preschool and Nursery Rent</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Redwood Early Childhood Centre Incorporated</td>
<td>Redwood Early Learning Centre Rent</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Springwood Early Learning Centre Inc</td>
<td>Springwood Community Early Learning Centre Rent</td>
<td>$42,750</td>
<td>$42,750</td>
<td>$42,750</td>
<td>$42,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>St Alban’s Community Preschool Incorporated</td>
<td>St Alban’s Community Preschool and Nursery Rent</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Woodford Park Kindergarten</td>
<td>Woodford Park Kindergarten Rent</td>
<td>$42,900</td>
<td>$42,900</td>
<td>$42,900</td>
<td>$42,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $291,689

### Major Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Name/Subject</th>
<th>Project Total Cost</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Christchurch Community House Te Wakaunui</td>
<td>Shared Resources and Facilities for Community Groups</td>
<td>$806,485</td>
<td>$535,000</td>
<td>$535,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Christchurch Operatic Inc &amp; Tiki Showtime Club</td>
<td>Salaries, Wages and Operational Costs</td>
<td>$519,000</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Christchurch Symphony Orchestra</td>
<td>Concerts and Community Engagement Programmes</td>
<td>$746,135</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ferrymond Park Limited</td>
<td>Ferrymond Park Annual Salaries Assistance</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mayor's Welfare Trust</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Welfare Fund</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>New Zealand Opera Limited</td>
<td>Delivery of Professional Opera</td>
<td>$377,600</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Chinese Welfare Trust</td>
<td>Chinese Welfare Park Staff Salaries</td>
<td>$3,184,180</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Science Alive Centres (Science Alive)</td>
<td>Science Alive Community Outreach</td>
<td>$152,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>The Court Theatre Trust</td>
<td>Court Theatre Operations</td>
<td>$4,675,863</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $13,411,385

### GENERAL APPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Name/Subject</th>
<th>Project Total Cost</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Age Concern Canterbury</td>
<td>Social Connection Coordinator</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Pool Budget: $3,364,789

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$291,689</td>
<td>$291,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,977,956</td>
<td>$1,977,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,364,789</td>
<td>$3,364,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Balance for Allocation:**

- **Increase: $516**
- **Decrease: $70,116**

---

**Note:**

- The table above shows the breakdown of funding applications and recommendations made by the Council. The funding is allocated based on priority and recommended amounts.

---

**Page 4**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment A</th>
<th>Item 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council - Metropolitan Funding</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>04 September 2017</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Item No.: 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Christchurch City Council</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>28 September 2017</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Page 58</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 41</td>
<td>180 Degrees Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 42</td>
<td>Alkermes Canterbury Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 43</td>
<td>Ask group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 44</td>
<td>Baird Women’s Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 45</td>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters of Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 46</td>
<td>Canterbury Basketball Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 47</td>
<td>Canterbury Communications Trust TIA Planning Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 48</td>
<td>Canterbury Hockey Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 49</td>
<td>Canterbury Men’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 50</td>
<td>Canterbury Neighbourhood Support Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 51</td>
<td>Canterbury Refugee Resettlement and Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 52</td>
<td>Canterbury Rugby Football League Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 53</td>
<td>Canterbury Society of Arts &amp; GICA Centre of Contemporary Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 54</td>
<td>Canterbury Tennis Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 55</td>
<td>Canterbury West Coast Sports Trust (Sport Canterbury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 56</td>
<td>Canterbury Youth Workers Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 57</td>
<td>Cashmere Technical Football Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 58</td>
<td>Catholic Employment Services Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 59</td>
<td>CHART Christchurch Music Industry Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 60</td>
<td>Chomneyside Children’s Centre Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 61</td>
<td>Christchurch Salsa Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 62</td>
<td>Christchurch City Choir Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 63</td>
<td>Christchurch City Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 64</td>
<td>Christchurch Civic Music Council National Concert Competition Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 65</td>
<td>Christchurch Community Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 66</td>
<td>Christchurch Men’s Health Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 67</td>
<td>Christchurch Metropolitan Cricket Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 68</td>
<td>Christchurch Primary Schools Cultural Festival Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Christchurch Reintegration Services Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Christchurch School of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Christchurch Youth Council Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Christchurch Wellington Chinese Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>City Harvest Food Rescue Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Community Law Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Deaf Society of Canterbury Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Disabled Persons Assembly (NZ) Inc - Christchurch Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Earthquake Disability Leadership Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>First Theatre Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Hagley Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Handmade Studio Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>JU2J Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Kingdom Resources Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Korean Society of Christchurch Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Little Foundation Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Male Survivors of Sexual Abuse Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Netball Manawatū Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>New Zealand Council of Victim Support Groups Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>New Zealand Snail Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Ngā Māori Waka Enterprises - Ngā Hau E Wha National Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>No. 6 Manawatū Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Ohakune Creative Spaces Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Pacific Youth Leadership and Transformation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Papatoetoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>People First Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Peterborough Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Presbyterian Support (Upper South Island)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Presidents Aid and Rehabilitation Society of Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Southcare Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Retail Alley Chinese School Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Royal New Zealand Foundation of the Blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian Cultural Centre Trust (Christchurch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Social Equity and Wellbeing Network Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>SPAN Charitable Trust (operating as Skillwise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>START Inc (Sexual Assault Support &amp; Rehabilitation Teams)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Stepping Stone Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Taylors Mistake Surf Life Saving Club INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Tenants Protection Association (CPA) inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>The Canterbury Mental Health Education and Resource Centre Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>The Green Beech Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>The Man Community Music Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Physics Room Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>The Plains Centre for Music and the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>The Youth and Cultural Development Society Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Volunteering Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watch This Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>West Christchurch Women's Refuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Whiteaways Carving Centre Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Women's Centre Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>YMCA Arts Trust Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Youthline Central South Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>50th Up Broke Boat Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addington Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Adult Condominium Education Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Adventure Specials Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Arapawa Society of Carterton/Wanaka Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Anglican Care Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Apatches New Zealand (AphasianZ) Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Art for Life Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Arthritis Foundation of New Zealand Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Awak New Zealand Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Avon Hockey Club Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Avon-Otahuhu Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Bithertong Canterbury Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>BUS 45 Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Cereal Charities Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Canterbury Boxing Association Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Canterbury Community Cycling Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Canterbury Cystic Fibrosis Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Canterbury Hindi Language Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Canterbury Judo Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Canterbury Nepalese Society Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Canterbury Repartory Theatre Society Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Canterbury Water Polo Board Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Caring for Carers Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Garnet Radio Broadcasting Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>CCS Disability Action Canterbury West Coast Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Chinese Culture Association (NZ) Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Christchurch Budget Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Christchurch Early Intervention Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Christchurch Football Squads Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Christchurch Peoples Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Christchurch School of Gymnastics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Citizens Advice Bureau Christchurch Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Coastguard Christchurch Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Dante Afghan Italian Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Delta Community Support Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Depression Support Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Disabled People Centre Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Drug ARM Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Dyspraxia Support Group of NZ Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Early Childhood Resource Centre (Creative Kids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Edgeware Croquet Club Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>English Language Partners NZ Trust - Christchurch Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Family Action of New Zealand Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Family Support Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Food Resilience Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Get Fit I •</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Gymnastics in Canterbury Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Hagley Golf Club Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Hagley Park Tennis Club Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Kicks For Kids Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Kerbit Canterbury Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Library Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Organisation Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moutohora Canterbury Community Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multiple Sclerosis and Parkinsons Society of Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO Productions Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Avon Christchurch BMX Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>O.S.C.A.R. Network in Christchurch Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Odyssey House Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Omano Bay Moari and Colonial Museum Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Olympic Gymnastics Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Paparoa Youth Development Trust (Te Ku Ki Pau Trust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Parent to Parent Greater Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pathway Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Philippine Culture and Sports Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pilots Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Princeton Volleyball Club Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Polish Association in Christchurch Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RAD times Christchurch Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rata Justice Services Otago Region Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Riccarton Dance Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Royal New Zealand Red Cross Society Canterbury Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Set Your Ram Yu (society) (Canterbury Ram Club)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>South City Youth Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Southern Seed Exchange Foundation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SPIDER NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sports Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Spreddy Youth Community Trust (SYCT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Squash Canterbury Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>St John Central Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>St Paul's Trinity Pacific Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Te Awa Pouau/Cutlers Cancer Club Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The Home and Family Society Christchurch Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The New Zealand Vegetarian Society Inc Christchurch Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Toitū's Association New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Treasure Trove Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ultimate Martial Art Fighting Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>White Elephant Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Woolston Brass Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>YMCA Young Mums Christian Association of Christchurch (Inc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>YMCA Christchurch Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Blue Light Ventures Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Canterbury Caversham Society Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Canterbury Combined Leisure Marching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Canterbury Home Educators Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Canterbury Horticultural Society Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Christchurch Cat Bells Bazaar Rescue Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Christchurch Catholic Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Christchurch Children's Holiday Camps Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Christchurch Coastal Pathways Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Christchurch Fellowship of Song, Dance and Drama Inc. Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Christchurch Football Club Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Community Energy Action-Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Conductive Education Canterbury Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Conservation Volunteers New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Dress for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Good Night, Sleep Tight Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Impact Performance Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Living Springs Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Mental Health Advocacy and Peer Support Trust (t/a MHAPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>New Zealand Latin Dance Cup Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Pregnancy Help Inc. Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Project Lyttleton Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Road Traffic Accident Victims Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Seabrook Mohotika Trust for Specific Learning Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>St Ives Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>The Arts Centre of Christchurch Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>The Aspie Trust (Inc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>The Clown Doctors New Zealand Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>The Commencing Book Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>The Parenting Place Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Train the Brain Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Water and Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Burwood Academy Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Canterbury African Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Canterbury and New Zealand Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Canterbury Asthma Society (Inc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Canterbury Charity Hospice Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Christchurch United Social and Cultural Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Empowern Christchurch Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Endometriosis NZ (Christchurch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Evolocity Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Knox Youth Well-being Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>New Migrant Health Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Re:Start Painit Group Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Rangiora Community Centre Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>The World Business Festival Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Wildlife Veterinary Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   | $25,420,312 | $5,084,416 | $1,947,384 | $1,617,084 |
Meeting concluded at 11.24am.

CONFIRMED THIS 28TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2017

MAYOR LIANNE DALZIEL
CHAIRPERSON
9. Proposed Lease to Christchurch School of Gymnastics - 193 Travis Road - Part of Queen Elizabeth II Park

| Reference: | 17/1031774 |
| Contact: | Tom Lennon | tom.lennon@ccc.govt.nz |

1. **Board Comment**

At the Board’s request, staff provided comment on the matters of concern raised in the deputations. Deputations were made in opposition to the granting of the lease by Craig MacKay, Lynda Hunt and Dan O'Sullivan.

Other potential sites were discussed at an onsite meeting with residents and community groups. However, after further investigations into these alternative sites, all of them were either unsuitable or unfeasible. A letter and information leaflet summarising the options that were investigated was developed and subsequently sent to residents however it was acknowledged that this went out some time after the site meetings and should have been sent earlier to inform residents and meeting attendees of this outcome.

The Board noted that when the Council approved the land sale to the Ministry of Education, they also resolved to allocate the proceeds from the sale of land towards the development and implementation of a Masterplan for the rest of QEII Park. This Masterplan will include community input and consider things such as:

- What principles will define the nature and character of the park to meet the community’s needs.
- What the community wants to see on the park (e.g. walking paths, a golf course, etc.)

The Board said that they would like to work with the Christchurch School of Gymnastics regarding the building and landscaping surrounding the building as well as the replacement of any trees that are removed as a result of the development.

2. **Staff Recommendations**

That the Coastal-Burwood Community Board:

1. Recommend that the Council grant a lease to the Christchurch School of Gymnastics Incorporated over an area of 3,151 square metres approximately being part of QEII Park also known as 193 Travis Road as shown in Attachment A to this report.

2. Authorise the Property Consultancy Manager to conclude and administer the terms and conditions of the lease including landscaping and tree replacement in accordance with the consultation and agreement by the Coastal-Burwood Community Board as detailed in item 5.21 of this report.
3. Coastal-Burwood Community Board Decisions Under Delegation

Community Board Resolved CBCB/2017/00001

Part C

That the Coastal-Burwood Community Board:

1. Authorise the Property Consultancy Manager to conclude and administer the terms and conditions of the lease including landscaping and tree replacement in accordance with the consultation and agreement by the Coastal-Burwood Community Board as detailed in item 5.23 of this report – ‘The Community Board has expressed their desire, should the lease be approved, to enter into an agreement to work with CSG regarding the building, landscaping surrounding the building including a potential bund and other mitigating landscaping as well as the replacement of any trees that are removed as a result of the development.’

2. Request that staff engage with the Community Board and Community to develop a landscape plan in conjunction with the QEII Park masterplan process. Noting that approximately 20 trees will need to be removed, to enable the lease to occur.

4. Coastal-Burwood Community Board Recommendation to Council

That the Council:

1. Grant a lease to the Christchurch School of Gymnastics Incorporated over an area of 3,151 square metres approximately being part of QEII Park also known as 193 Travis Road as shown in Attachment B to this report.
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1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Coastal-Burwood Community Board to recommend to the Council that a new lease to Christchurch School of Gymnastics Incorporated (“CSG”) be granted at Queen Elizabeth II Park (“QEII”).

Origin of Report
1.2 This report is staff generated at the request of Christchurch School of Gymnastics Incorporated.

2. Significance

2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the low number of people interested or directly affected, low impact on the environment and Mana Whenua and low risk to Council.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Coastal-Burwood Community Board:

1. Recommend that the Council grant a lease to the Christchurch School of Gymnastics Incorporated over an area of 3,151 square metres approximately being part of QEII Park also known as 193 Travis Road as shown in Attachment A to this report.

2. Authorise the Property Consultancy Manager to conclude and administer the terms and conditions of the lease including landscaping and tree replacement in accordance with the consultation and agreement by the Coastal-Burwood Community Board as detailed in item 5.21 of this report.

4. Key Points

4.1 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2015 - 2025):

4.1.1 Activity: Recreation and Sports Facilities

- Level of Service: 7.0.1 Provide residents access to fit-for-purpose recreation and sporting facilities

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 – Grant a new lease (preferred option)
- Option 2 – Decline the lease request
4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
- Enable the provision of a modern gymnastics sporting facility
- Continued provision of community facilities and services by a third party.
- People are actively involved in their communities and local issues
- Services are available locally within the urban areas
- People have a sense of connection and participate in their community.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
- An area of QEII Park occupied by a building
- Loss of vegetation as a result of the construction of the new building

5. Context/Background

History

5.1 CSG have been based at their current location at QEII for 21 years. A term renewal was exercised in 2016 for 12 years and the lease has a final expiry date of 25 March 2041.

5.2 CSG's facility was badly damaged in the 2011 earthquakes and is no longer “fit for purpose”. The cost of repairing the building is high and the Club are looking at options to relocate closer to the new Eastern Recreation & Sport Centre at QEII Park, which is planned for completion in 2018.

5.3 CSG owns the purpose built stadium; it has a footprint of 2,373m² and is a dedicated gymnastics facility on land leased from the CCC at an annual rental of $1174.30. The stadium was built in 1996 as the regional training, high performance and competition gymnastics venue. The stadium was extended in 2007. Substantial funding of $350,000 was received from the Lion Foundation for this extension and in recognition of this donation the Stadium was named The Lion Foundation Gymnastics Stadium.

5.4 The stadium was badly damaged in the 2011 earthquakes. This has resulted in a significant increase to the operational heating costs for the facility which cannot be easily mitigated.

5.5 Detailed geotechnical and engineering investigations have been completed by CSG which identify that rebuilding on the current site is not a viable or sensible option. The preference is to relocate to a site in QEII Park where more favourable land conditions exist. Rebuilding on the current site also posed a significant operational challenge for CSG with the need to vacate the building for the period of the rebuild.

5.6 Repairs were undertaken in early 2013 to give the school an opportunity to continue their programmes while decisions on the future site of the new facility could be made. Approximately $196,000 was spent to bring the stadium up to 63% of the current building code.

5.7 CSG's decision to remain within QEII Park was substantiated and supported by a detailed Needs Analysis and Business Case which is Attachment C to this report. The Needs Analysis and Business Case findings were supported by Council’s Recreation and Sports Unit who have been closely working with CSG over a significant period of time in the identification of a new site for the relocation of CSG operations.

5.8 CSG would like to remain close to the new recreation and sport facilities so that members could potentially use both facilities in one visit.

5.9 The club has approximately 2,000 members and employs 60 staff.
5.10 On 7 March 2016 CSG made a deputation to the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board with a general update on the CSG operations. The possibility of the CSG relocating its current facility alongside the Eastern Recreation and Sport Centre was also discussed. CSG undertook to inform the Board of progress with its business case and costing.

5.11 On 20 February 2017 CSG made a deputation to the Coastal-Burwood Community Board. The deputation noted their intent to seek Council funding and a lease agreement which would include shared car parking.

5.12 CSG have made significant progress seeking third party funding to enable a new building to occur. This funding is dependent upon the project to occur in a timely manner.

The Land

5.13 The lease area is contained within the land known as QEII Park described as Part Lot 1 and Part Lot 6 Deposited Plan 1064 contained in Certificate of Title CB36C/1272. It is a “park” in accordance with the definition given in section 138(2) of the Local Government Act 2002.

Delegations

5.14 Community Boards have the delegation to grant leases of “non-reserve” land for a maximum term of 20 years (less 1 day) to voluntary organisations for the purposes described in this report.

5.15 Staff recommend that a lease of 35 years less 1 day be granted which is the maximum term in accordance with provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 section 218 subdivision requirements.

5.16 The Coastal-Burwood Community Board does not have the delegated authority to grant the lease for this longer term however they may recommend to the Council that a lease be granted.

Advertising and Public Consultation

5.17 Public advertising of the intention to grant a lease has been carried out in accordance with section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002. 300 leaflets were delivered to those living on the streets surrounding the park and displayed in Council service centres and libraries, city-wide. 450 key stakeholders and submitters on the Ministry of Education land sale, were emailed directly, and a notice was placed in the QEII Eastern Recreation and Sports Centre E-newsletter, which has 600 subscribers.

5.18 In accordance with Section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002 the granting of a lease for more than 6 months that has the effect of excluding or substantially interfering with the public’s access to the park constitutes a disposal therefore consultation was required.

5.19 Submissions closed on Monday 3 July 2017 and the Community Board has been briefed on the results of such consultation.

5.20 As a result of the consultation process, 108 submission were received. Of these:

- 89 supported the proposal (10)*
- 5 supported the proposal but had some concerns (1)*
- 11 did not support the proposal (8)
- 3 did not state a preference

*brackets () denotes those living within one block of QEII Park

5.21 As part of the consultation process members of the Community Board, local residents association, CSG representatives and Council staff met on the proposed site to identify where the proposed new facilities would be built if the lease was to be granted.

5.22 Concerns were raised by the Community Board and local residents at the site meeting regarding the proposed site. At that meeting further consultation was discussed. Since this meeting,
further investigation has found all other proposed sites on the park to be unsuitable or unfeasible. Therefore because of this, no further consultation proceeded and it was determined that a hearing panel was not necessary in this particular situation.

5.23 The Community Board has expressed their desire, should the lease be approved, to enter into an agreement to work with CSG regarding the building, landscaping surrounding the building including a potential bund and other mitigating landscaping as well as the replacement of any trees that are removed as a result of the development.

5.24 A summary of the Consultation may be found in Attachment B.

The Proposed Lease

5.25 The proposed leased area, as shown in Attachment A, comprises of 3,151 square metres of green space area and the land under the proposed building. The proposed leased area is subject to an annual rental in accordance with the Councils policy for setting rent for sports groups and organisations occupying parks and reserves. Based on current assessments the annual rental charged will be $2,307 + GST.

5.26 In the eventuality of the proposed new lease to CSG being approved, the current lease will need to be terminated to coincide with the relocation of the CSG operation to the newly built facility. In this case there will most likely be an overlap between the new and existing leases until the new facility is completed. CSG will not be charged rent for the new lease during construction until such time the new building is completed and fully operational.

5.27 Artistic impressions of the building plan together with a landscaping plan including replacement trees will be presented to the Community Board for discussion and agreement.

5.28 In relation to the existing building, CSG is currently investigating the possibility of selling or transferring ownership of the building to a community group. In the eventuality of this not going ahead CSG will be responsible for the demolition, site clearance and reinstatement of the current lease area.

5.29 Any transfer of the current building improvements to a new owner or the surrender of the lease for the current premises will be subject to approval by the Community Board and Council.

5.30
6. Option 1 – Grant a New Lease (preferred)

Option Description
6.1 To grant a new lease to Christchurch School of Gymnastics Incorporated for 35 years less one day over that part of QE II park as shown in Attachment A.

Significance
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.
6.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are meet by the consultation already undertaken.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
6.5 The neighbouring Community and participants involved in gymnastics are specifically affected by this option due to high usage of the facility by different groups and accessibility for members of the public to hire. Their views generally support this request.

6.6 Those who opposed this option did so on the grounds of:
- perceived parking issues (5)
- a desire for the gymnasium to stay where it is (4)
- a desire not to increase the number of buildings in the park (3)
- a concern that use of the park is becoming constrained (3)
- a concern that the aesthetic of the park will be compromised by a minimalist building (3)
- did not want trees removed (2)
- Unhappy about previous process around buildings in QEII (1)

6.7 Those who supported the proposal but had some concerns were concerned about:
- parking (3)
- wanted room maintained for a 50m pool (1) and
- were interested in the existing building (1)

6.8 Those who supported this option did so on the grounds of:
- The importance of the club (23)
- The proximity to the recreation centre (16)
- The desire to keep the club in the east (12)
- The opportunities in a new build (5)
- The maintenance of the only senior gym in the city (3)
- The desire to stay on QEII Park (3)

6.9 Other reasons (8)

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.10 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies
Financial Implications
6.11 Cost of Implementation - there are no costs to the Council other than staff time which is budgeted for. An annual ground rental will be charged in accordance with Council’s charging policy for ground leases on parks.

6.12 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – not applicable

6.13 Funding source – not applicable

Legal Implications
6.14 A Deed of Lease will be prepared to document the lease arrangement. CSG will be responsible for the costs of preparing the new deed which is $250 plus GST and the cost of advertising which is approximately $450 plus GST.

Risks and Mitigations
6.15 The risk in granting a lease is that some members of the community may oppose the decision.

6.16 Risk: There will be a risk to reputation of the Community Board and Council with broader media coverage to regional and national audiences.

6.16.1 Treatment: Public consultation and communication undertaken by stakeholders to inform members of the public of the new development and decision.

6.16.2 Residual risk rating: the rating of the risk is low

Implementation
6.17 Implementation dependencies - Resolution by Council

6.18 Implementation timeframe – 4 – 6 weeks to finalise lease documentation following Council resolution.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
6.19 The advantages of this option include:

- Enable the provision of a modern gymnastics and sporting facility
- Continued provision of community facilities by a third party.
- People are actively involved in their communities and local issues
- Services are available locally within the urban areas
- People have a sense of connection and participate in their community.

6.20 The disadvantages of this option include:

- An area of park occupied by a building.
- Loss of vegetation as a result of the construction of the new building.

7. Option 2 – Decline the Request for a New Lease

Option Description
7.1 Not approve a new lease and maintain the current lease arrangement with CSG.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low, consistent with section 2 of this report.

7.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are not required.
Impact on Mana Whenua
7.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
7.5 The CSG and community alike are specifically affected by this option due to the need to provide a space for the community to gather and interact. Their views would not support this option.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
7.6 This option is inconsistent with Council’s Plans and Policies
7.6.1 Inconsistency - Does not support Annual Plan level of service which sets out to identify and promote community facilities provided by a third party.
7.6.2 Reason for inconsistency – contrary to Level of Service
7.6.3 Amendment necessary – change to Level of Service

Financial Implications
7.7 Cost of Implementation - not quantified, however costs would include staff time and resources to facilitate the transfer of the current ground lease to a third party yet to be identified.
7.8 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Council would continue being responsible for ongoing maintenance on part of the QEII Park that is not affected by the lease to CSG.
7.9 Funding source - Council budget for ongoing maintenance.

Legal Implications
7.10 There are no legal implications in not approving a new lease.

Risks and Mitigations
7.11 By not approving the lease there would be risk to the Community Board and Council from not achieving levels of service set out by the Council.
7.12 Risk - Reputational/image caused by Council caused by not approving a new lease. This will (may) result in minor negative short term coverage to the Community Board and Council.
7.12.1 Treatment: The Community Board and Council would be required to tolerate the risk and impact to CSG in not approving the lease.
7.12.2 Residual risk rating: the rating of the risk is medium.

Implementation
7.13 Implementation dependencies - Council resolution
7.14 Implementation timeframe – Adequate time to notify CSG to remove their improvements.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.15 The advantages of this option include:
- A portion of QEII Park not being exclusively used by CSG.

7.16 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Loss of support and confidence in the local Community Board and Council.
- Many groups and the community missing out on the opportunity to have a brand new sporting facility funded by a third party.
Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tom Lennon - Property Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Kathy Jarden - Team Leader Leasing Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angus Smith - Manager Property Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce Rendall - Head of Facilities, Property and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Filsell - Head of Recreation and Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Richardson - General Manager Citizen and Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed lease at QEII Park to Christchurch School of Gymnastics - consultation outcomes

Consultation

Consultation on leasing land to the Christchurch School of Gymnastics (CSG) ran from 6 June to 3 July, 2017. A public notice was placed in the local paper. 300 leaflets were delivered to those living on the streets surrounding QEII Park and displayed in Council service centres and libraries, city-wide. 450 key stakeholders and submitters on the Ministry of Education land sale, were emailed directly and a notice was placed in the QEII Eastern Recreation and Sports Centre (ERSC) e-newsletter, which has 600 subscribers. 108 submission were received. Of these:

- 89 supported the proposal (10)
- 5 supported the proposal but had some concerns (1)
- 11 did not support the proposal (8)
- 3 did not state a preference

*brackets () denotes number of submitters living within one block of QEII Park*

Those who opposed the lease had the following concerns:

- a perception of parking issues;
- a desire for the gymnasium to stay where it is;
- a desire not to increase the number of buildings in the park;
- that use of the park is becoming constrained;
- that the aesthetic of the park will be compromised by a minimalist building.

A site meeting was held with concerned residents and community groups. At the meeting consultation on other potential sites was discussed. However, since this meeting further investigation has found all other proposed sites on the park to be unsuitable or unfeasible.

Building options that were reviewed

**Repair / rebuild current facility:** The earthquake distorted the gymnasium up to a meter at the south end, due to lateral spreading towards Travis Wetlands. Most of the gymnasium would need to be rebuilt, the repairable parts relieved and the ground under the whole site would need to be remediated to a depth of 10 meters. Ground remediation alone would cost $4million, which the CSG cannot afford. There would also be 18 months where the gymnasium was unusable for its members.

**Build on the western side of QEII Park:** The entire western section of the park suffered extensive land damage and has a high water table, making land remediation costs unfeasible for the CSG to build a facility.

**Build at the western end of the car park, near the sports fields (blue box):** This site is still too close to the poor land on the west side of the park, making this option unaffordable for CSG to both remediate the land and build a new facility.

ccc.govt.nz/haveyoursay
On Ascot Avenue (blue box): While this is an option for the CSG it does impact on the future use of the park as well as some of the underground services. There is also a bigger impact on the immediate neighbours.

Next to Eastern Recreation and Sports Centre (ERSC): It was also suggested that the gymnasium could be included next to the ERSC, which is currently under construction. This development is surrounded by car parking on the west, service entry and outbuildings on the north and east, and is reserved for potential future expansion of the building on the south side.

Preferred site - between sports fields (blue box): This is the option was consulted on. Four playing fields can be accommodated with about five meters spare in either direction. Some of the row of trees would need to be removed for the building, although several of these are nearing the end of their life. This option makes use of the existing car park. There was also the option of turning the gymnasium so it ran west to east, but this makes the foundations more expensive and impacts more on the surrounding fields and future options for the park.

Other issues:

Parking: During consultation, parking availability for the new gymnasium was the greatest concern for submitters. It was felt that the car park for the new ERSC would not be sufficient for the users of both buildings. The recommended location between the sports fields (image immediately above) allows the gymnasium to use the existing car park, which at 160 parks, more than covers the 55 required for the facility.

Trees: The row of trees between the sports fields would need to be partially removed to accommodate the new gymnasium. These trees are nearing the end of their life and already require some attention. All trees removed to make way for the building will be replaced near to the site.

QEII Park Plan: A plan for the whole park will be developed in the coming years. This will outline the purpose of the park as well as looking at the specific components with the park area such as the golf course, walking tracks and any future developments.

New building: The new gymnasium will be subject to all planning regulations, in accordance with the Resource Management Act.

Old building: It is hoped that a new lease can be sought for a suitable (low use) tenant, which will eliminate the cost of demolition.
CHRISTCHURCH SCHOOL OF GYMNASTICS
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND BUSINESS CASE
SEPTEMBER 2016

VISITOR SOLUTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign off</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Version</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclaimer:
©VSL 2016
Information, data and general assumptions used in the compilation of this report have been obtained from sources believed to be reliable. Visitor Solutions Ltd has used this information in good faith and makes no warranties or representations, express or implied, concerning the accuracy or completeness of this information. Interested parties should perform their own investigations, analysis and projections on all issues prior to acting in any way with regard to this project.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Visitor Solutions was commissioned by the Christchurch School of Gymnastics (CSG) to undertake a “Business Case and Needs Analysis” on the future of the club’s QEII facility. The facility was damaged in the 2010-2011 earthquake series. The CSG is a not-for-profit organisation operating as an Incorporated Society. It was established to provide gymnastics opportunities at both participation and competition level. The entity’s QEII venue has been in use for around 20 years.

This report will be utilised by the Christchurch School of Gymnastics (CSG) to inform decisions on the club’s future facility requirements. In particular it is to enable CSG to select an option which will then be explored in greater detail as the planning, analysis and design process proceeds.

This Business Case has concluded that demand exists for a new replacement QEII facility. Based on available data it is concluded that this facility should be located adjacent to the QEII Recreation and Sport centre on QEII Park. Given the information available CSG is in a strong position to develop a new facility, provided it can gain the required funding support.

The Business Case has identified a small operational deficit. However, it is considered likely that with further refinement the project should be able to operate at a surplus. These refinements can be made as additional new data become available following partner discussions.

The success of this proposed facility is inextricably linked to the partnership with CCC. There are several critical areas that rely on a transparent partnership with Council. All efforts should be made to foster this relationship.

Recommendations

1. Proceed with discussions with CCC to confirm a land lease at QEII Park for a new, purpose built Gymnastics Facility.
2. Undertake funding analysis that fairly reflects the most likely funding mix for the capital costs of the project.
3. Seek further clarity from CCC on the willingness to contribute to various portions of the total project cost.
4. Seek confirmation from CCC on the timing of the process and probability of CSG to gain a lease at Jellic Park HPSNZ facility as the second CSG venue.
5. Consider a broadening of community programmes and / or hirers of the facility during quieter times to increase operating revenue.
6. Undertake an organisational optimisation review that would cover existing and proposed programme delivery, operational revenue and expenditure, along with a review of the most appropriate governance and management model moving forward.

- 3 -
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Introduction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Existing Club Sites &amp; Context</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Demographic Analysis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Club Membership &amp; Proximity</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Network of Facilities</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Strategic Context</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Options Assessment</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Options Analysis</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Preferred Option</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 Preliminary Estimate Of Cost</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 Governance &amp; Management</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 Preliminary Operational Business Model</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0 Risk Analysis</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0 Conclusions and Recommendations</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1: Other Demographic Features</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2: Localised Playing-Age Projections</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3: Capital Cost Estimate</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4 – Comparison of Spaces Old Venue vs Proposed</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 5 – Proposed Road Map</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 6 – Commercial Property Search</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 7 - Sensitivity Analysis</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of study

Visitor Solutions was commissioned by the Christchurch School of Gymnastics to undertake a “Business Case and Needs Analysis” on the future of the club’s QEII facility. The facility was damaged in the 2010-2011 earthquake series.

The Christchurch School of Gymnastics is a not-for-profit organisation operating as an incorporated society. It was established to provide gymnastics opportunities at both participation and competition level. The entity’s QEII venue has been in use for around 20 years.

This report will be utilised by the Christchurch School of Gymnastics (CSG) to inform decision making on the club’s future facility requirements. In particular it is to enable CSG to select an option which will then be explored in greater detail as the planning, analysis and design process proceeds.

This report should not be seen as an end point in itself but rather one step in a process. The report is based on data available at this point in time.

1.2 Project Scope

The study scope encompassed the following:

- An assessment of a series of options for a replacement to the existing QEII CSG facility
- Analysis of the preferred option and the development of a preliminary Business Case based on information available at the time

What was out of scope was the development of a Capital Revenue strategy or confirmation of a second venue for the CSG club. Budget constraints precluded the development of more than one concept plan for consideration or any testing of key operational assumptions with stakeholders and potential users.1

1.3 Process and Methodology

The key methodology tasks undertaken during the study can be broadly described as involving:

- Data gathering and analysis,
- Demographic analysis - Collection and review of existing Council, Statistics NZ, and membership data,
- Reviewing current and proposed Council policies,
- Reviewing the network of comparable facilities with the area,
- Undertaking an options assessment,

1 These areas were offered in the project methodology but declined.
• Undertaking consultation interviews and workshops with CSG and other stakeholders to identify the key issues and potential priorities,
• Completing a site, context and facilities assessment,
• Developing building concepts for a preferred site option (including descriptions of the development option, capex implications, pros and cons, project risks, and governance and management considerations),
• Development of a Business Case based on available data and assumptions.

1.4 Terminology

This report frequently uses the following terminology:

CSG: The Christchurch School of Gymnastics, sometimes also referred to as the Club. The Club has a Board of Directors that oversees a two venue club (QE II and Impact Alpha).

Existing QE II Building/Site: The facility where the CSG is presently based on QE II Park.

QE II Recreation and Sport Centre: The planned new centre at QE II Park that will be developed by Council for a 2018 opening.

Impact Alpha: CSG’s second venue, currently a commercially leased building on Watts Road.
2.0 EXISTING CLUB SITES & CONTEXT

2.1 Sites and Context

The Christchurch School of Gymnastics (CSG) is a two venue club operating in the North-East and West of Christchurch. Map 2.1 shows the locations of the current two sites. There are a few other gym clubs in Christchurch with only two other clubs in Christchurch City offering an artistic programme.

The CSG is the largest provider of recreation and competitive gymnastics in Christchurch (and is the second largest in the country). Competitive gymnastics disciplines offered include Women’s Artistic, Men’s Gymnastics, Trampolining, and Aerobics. The club does not offer a Rhythmic programme.

Map 2.1 – Existing GymSport Club Sites

The Christchurch School of Gymnastics operates out of two venues. The main venue is located on Travers Road at the Christchurch City Council operated QEII grounds. The secondary venue (known as Impact Alpha) is based in a commercially leased building on Watts Road, Stockburn. The Watts Road property lease is due to expire in November 2017.

Legend

- CSG Clubs
- Other Gym Clubs
- Proposed Club

CSG - QEII

CSG - Watts Road

Proposed Site for Impact Alpha
3.0 DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

3.1. Introduction

The shape of Christchurch is changing. The following section outlines the demographic trends that may impact on the facility decisions of the CSG.

The current site for the CSG is located on Travis Road in the North-East quarter of Christchurch City. Assessment of the current membership shows a residence pattern across Christchurch City, with a large proportion of members in the North-East quarter. On this basis the main catchment populations are viewed as: (1) the ‘Christchurch North-East’ area7, and (2) the Christchurch City area7. The demographic features of these areas are therefore focused on.

Key Points

Information on changes in population and age-group composition are presented in this section, along with other particularly notable demographic features8. The main summary points below note any distinctions of the Christchurch North-East population, particularly relative to the wider Christchurch City population:

- At the 2013 Census there were around 90,000 residents in the Christchurch North-East area, and around 340,000 in Christchurch City overall.
- The Christchurch North-East area has been experiencing population decline post-earthquake, and future growth is projected to be only very slight overall.
- Projections of typical playing-age populations for Gymsports (aged 0-14 years) highlight some localised growth areas around Prestons and Highfield Park, although with very much lower growth throughout the rest of Christchurch North-East (see Appendix 2). By 2043 only 1,400 more 0-14 year olds are projected to be in Christchurch City overall, so overall numeric growth appears likely to be small under current projections. Other very notable projected-growth hotspots in Christchurch City were in the South and South-West, around the Halswell area in particular (see Appendix 2).
- The main age-group feature is a progressively aging population across all areas, with the greatest rate of population increase in the older age groups, particularly over 60, and relative proportional decline among the younger age-groups.
- For most other socio-demographic characteristics the population of Christchurch North-East was not notably different from that of Christchurch City overall (see Appendix 1).

Taken overall there appears to be only weak evidence that Gymsport participation sustainability could be based on population growth alone. To maintain sustainability, and particularly to achieve any significant participation growth, a focus on ways to attract

---

7 Based on Statistics NZ Area Units – see Appendix 1. These exclude some greenfield areas further out to the North such as around Belfast and Prestons, although projected growth there is noted separately (see Appendix 2).
8 The full ‘Christchurch City’ area provides the larger population setting for comparison with this more localised population catchment – to better define any unique features. Note that few were identified so most tables are presented in Appendix 1.

---
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significantly higher proportions of the younger age-groups (than are currently achieved) will be required. To support sustainability, more options for involving participation by older people (or partner groups) in the use of Gynsport facilities and related activities may also need to be considered.

Demographics are an important (but not the only) factor that CSG needs to consider when looking at options for a replacement for the current QEI site.

### 3.2 Overall population numbers and trends

At the most recent 2013 census the populations of key catchment areas for the proposed centre were as follows:

- 89,046 residents in the Christchurch North-East area.
- 341,459 residents in the greater Christchurch City area.

The population trends for the local catchment areas between the 2001 and 2013 Censuses have shown local decline in Christchurch North-East and only a slight increase in the overall city population (Table 3.1) and households (Table 3.2). These are a reflection of earthquake-driven setbacks within what were previously general patterns of increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 Population number change: 2001-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch North-East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2 Household number change: 2001-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch North-East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected future population growth for the main population catchment areas is summarised below in Table 3.3. Overall these projections indicate that the local catchment population will not grow substantially. This suggests that any significant future growth in sport and recreation participation will depend more on capturing a greater market share of the overall population than on any simple population growth. This implies that ‘new user’ opportunities and interests will need to be generated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3: Projected population numbers and growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch North-East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ. Population projections (2013 base)
While future population growth may not be a strong feature of the local Christchurch North-East area, and only moderate across Christchurch City as a whole, some changes in population composition, most specifically around age-group may be significant. Some key population characteristics are summarised below as a background to understanding where participation growth opportunities may lie.

3.3 Age Groups and Projections

Overall Age Groups

The age-profiles of Christchurch North-East and Christchurch City were virtually the same (Table 3.4, Figure 3.1). Both feature a relatively even spread distribution of age-groups, with only slightly more in the 60+ age-group (which clustered all other ages).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.4: Age group distribution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9 10-19 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60+ Total Median Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch North-East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2013

Age Group Projections

Looking forward, there are similar patterns projected for the Christchurch North-East and Christchurch City. Only the older age-groups are projected to increase significantly in numbers over the next 30 years (2013-2043). Tables 3.5-3.6 and Figures 3.3-3.4 below illustrate the broad pattern projected for the key local catchment areas. The main feature is the large increase in the older 65+ age-group by 2043 - by around 100% in both the Christchurch North-East area and...
Christchurch City overall. With this growth the relative proportion of people aged 65+ in the Christchurch North-East would increase from around 13% of the overall population to around 24%. This is virtually the same for Christchurch City. By contrast the 0-14 year age-group in Christchurch North-East is projected to decrease slightly from around 19% to 16%. This is also virtually the same for Christchurch City. Together this indicates that the main catchment populations are aging, with the numbers in the younger age-groups tending towards a slight growth in Christchurch City overall, but a slight decline in Christchurch North-East.

Given that the older population will increase in numbers overall, increased provision of facility capacity and new activity opportunities for older age-groups will be required to sustain facilities. However, for Gymports there is most significance in the only slight projected growth in younger age group numbers. Here the focus should be more on generating new demand and increased market share, as any natural population growth in the catchment population age-groups will only be minimal.

Figure 3.3: Projected population growth by age-group – Christchurch North-East area

Table 3.5: Projected population growth by age-group – Christchurch North-East area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>2018-2043</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14 years</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>17,440</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>16,530</td>
<td>16,280</td>
<td>15,990</td>
<td>15,790</td>
<td>-1,910</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-39 years</td>
<td>32,740</td>
<td>33,770</td>
<td>33,740</td>
<td>34,050</td>
<td>32,940</td>
<td>32,420</td>
<td>32,180</td>
<td>-560</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-64 years</td>
<td>30,460</td>
<td>30,690</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>28,860</td>
<td>29,170</td>
<td>28,630</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>-1,750</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>14,060</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>18,960</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>23,180</td>
<td>23,850</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92,850</td>
<td>95,960</td>
<td>96,810</td>
<td>98,490</td>
<td>99,490</td>
<td>100,220</td>
<td>100,550</td>
<td>7,660</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Subnational population projections (2013 base, medium series)
Figure 3.4: Projected population growth by age-group – Christchurch City

Table 3.6: Projected population growth by age-group – Christchurch City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>Change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14 years</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>65,600</td>
<td>66,200</td>
<td>65,100</td>
<td>65,300</td>
<td>65,200</td>
<td>65,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-39 years</td>
<td>123,300</td>
<td>133,200</td>
<td>136,700</td>
<td>139,300</td>
<td>137,400</td>
<td>137,300</td>
<td>138,100</td>
<td>14,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-64 years</td>
<td>117,400</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>119,700</td>
<td>119,500</td>
<td>123,400</td>
<td>125,500</td>
<td>129,700</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>52,100</td>
<td>60,700</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td>91,700</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>103,700</td>
<td>51,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>356,700</td>
<td>379,400</td>
<td>393,100</td>
<td>406,100</td>
<td>417,800</td>
<td>428,000</td>
<td>436,800</td>
<td>80,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Subnational population projections (2013 base, medium series)

Here it should also be noted that a separate analysis of projections for the typical playing-age population catchment for Gymsports (0-14yrs) found no significant growth areas within the ‘Christchurch North-East’ area as defined here, although notable projected growth was apparent just further to the North around Preston and Highfield Park (refer Appendix 2). This suggests that while overall growth in the Christchurch North-East may be at best minimal, there are potentially some localised hotspots within it, or nearby, to where numbers in the playing-age range (0-14yrs) will be increasing.

While over Christchurch City as a whole there are projected to be only 1,400 more 0-14 year olds in 2043 than there were in 2013, there are some notable localised hotspots of projected growth – particularly to the North and South-West (see Appendix 2 for details).
3.4 Other Population Characteristics

A number of other selected socio-demographic features of the catchment populations were investigated. From these the following points were noted; the full tables concerned are presented in Appendix 1.

Compared with Christchurch City, the population of Christchurch North-East had:

- Similar levels of median personal, family and household income; labour force participation; education levels; ethnic diversity profiles; proportions of overseas-born residents; types of households; family types; access to telecommunications and the internet; and access to motor vehicles in households.
- A generally higher degree of relative social deprivation in East Christchurch (north of the Estuary), with relatively less deprivation in the more Northern and Western areas.
- Overall none of these features were considered to represent any specific constraining issue for Gmysports participation, unless focus was on the population of some parts of East Christchurch where some localised areas have more socio-economic challenges.
4.0 CLUB MEMBERSHIP & PROXIMITY

This section provides a high level overview of the membership of CSG, together with some indication of trends and changing use features.

4.1 Membership

The membership\(^1\) of CSG from the 2016 year is identified below (Table 4.1), with note made of reported membership trends over the last six years.

Table 4.1: Membership – CSG Venues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Trend 2016-2017</th>
<th>Trend notes from survey comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Alpha</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Parents want more classes for all children in the family at the same time - maybe in different codes. More Asian children are attending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE1</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>White preschool numbers have dropped due to the increase in free childcare. Recreational numbers have increased 20% and advanced recreation 75% over the last 6 years. Junior competitive participants have also almost doubled in that time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking forward, the lack of consistent past data records on membership levels precludes estimation of direct membership projections. However, the wider population projections across Christchurch City (and areas within) - as summarised in Appendix 2, does suggest that growth is likely. This assumes that the same proportion of the population ‘captured’ (the capture rate) by GYmsports now remains at a consistent level in the future. However, any growth based on current status quo conditions would currently be slight at best – estimated at only around 2% over the next 20 years or so for Christchurch overall.

If higher growth is desired then specific initiatives that foster an increased ‘capture-rate’ for participants across the population would be required. Higher playing-age population growth are projected for more localised ‘hotspot’ areas within Christchurch City (refer Appendix 2), so that facilities located strategically relative to those hotspots, or targeted on drawing members from those areas, may offer more growth potential.

\(^1\) Numbers of members enrolled in the CSG venues over a year as provided by CSG.
4.2 Club Catchment Areas

Membership for both CSG sites, both competitive and recreational, has been analysed to understand the primary catchment for each facility. Maps 4.1 and 4.2 outline membership and indicates a strong North and East contingent of members for the QEII site and a strong West catchment for the Impact Alpha site.

Map 4.1 – CSG - Impact Alpha Site Membership
Maps 4.1 and 4.2 demonstrate clear areas of the city gravitate to the “local” gymnastics facility. This is particularly evident in the North and East for the QEII facility and the West and South-West for Impact Alpha. Members in the South are more evenly split across the two venues.
4.3 Drive Time Analysis

The time it takes to get to and from a venue does play a significant part in a participant developing an ongoing association with a club or organisation. For the purposes of this report the following map has been developed to understand the membership that resides within an approximate eight to ten minute drive time (Map 4.3). During the Options Assessment component of this report consideration and preference was given to locations that were within proximity of main transport routes, allowing an ease of access, particularly through the main arterial routes in Christchurch.

Map 4.3 – Drive Time Catchments (8-10 minutes) for each venue

Note: The blue shading indicates an eight to ten minute drive time to the CSG venues.

An 8-10 minute off-peak drive time has been used to illustrate how much of the city can access a venue. Map 4.3 shows that people will generally gravitate toward a venue that is within a reasonable distance (if possible). Generally speaking, this can be illustrated by the lower number of CSG QEI members in the west and less Impact Alphas members in the East.
5.0 NETWORK OF FACILITIES

A facility inventory assessment of the existing GymSport facilities in the wider Christchurch area was undertaken. This was done in order to determine what effect various site options would have on both CSG and other gym club memberships. This section (Tables 5.1) provides a brief snapshot of the current GymSport landscape in the area. It demonstrates that CSG – QEI is some distance from other similar clubs, while CSG – Impact Alpha is in close proximity of the other large club (Olympia GymSport Club). Any opportunity to re-shape the network of GymSport clubs should be considered.

Some of these venues do not necessarily offer GymSports NZ accredited Gymnastics courses.

There is only one smaller club within relative proximity to the QEI facility. Any future network planning done by either GymSports NZ or the Christchurch School of Gymnastics should take care to ensure a spread of facilities and clubs is developed that reflects the future shape and demographics of the wider Christchurch area.

Table 5.1: Other GymSport Facilities/Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from QEI site (km)</th>
<th>Distance from Impact Alpha site (km)</th>
<th>Venue/Facility Name</th>
<th>Venue/Facility Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clubs Offering Similar Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Te Wero Club</td>
<td>81 Bickerton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>Pioneer Stadium Gym Club</td>
<td>75 Lyttelton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Olympia Gymnastics Sports</td>
<td>29 Springs Road, Hornby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Rangiora Gymnastics Club</td>
<td>18 Edward Street, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>Ice Trampolining</td>
<td>18 Edwards Street, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>West Melton Gymnastics Club</td>
<td>1138 West Coast Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Clubs offering other GSNZ Disciplines                                |                                       | Diva Rhythmic Club              | 668 Wharepuhi Road           |
| 12.5                       | 2.6                                  | Delta Rhythmic Gymnastics Club      | 85 Breeks Road                |
| 11.3                       | 7.1                                  |                                       |                              |

It is important to note there are other venues in Christchurch that offer gymnastics activities that are not affiliated with GSNZ. For example, the YMCA Bishopdale centre offers a form of early childhood movement classes that competes for participants. Equally there is a rise in NZ of the development of commercial trampoline venues, with Christchurch seeing the opening of new venues in Carmen Road and Maces Road.

---

6 See Map 2.1 for a spatial layout of the various clubs
6.0 STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The proposed development aligns with a number of high-level strategies and plans in the local and central government sectors. Key areas of alignment are summarised below.

6.1 Christchurch School of Gymnastics - Strategic Plan (2016)

The current strategic plan for CSG\(^2\) identifies its vision as “to be New Zealand’s leading GymSport provider, where all athletes are empowered to strive for excellence”. The strategic plan has five key priorities:

- Sustainable,
- Communication,
- Transparency,
- Performance,
- Culture.

Within the “Culture” priority CSG has identified “Maintaining excellent training equipment and facilities” as a “measure/initiatives”.

6.2 Sport New Zealand – National Facilities Framework

Sport New Zealand is the government entity responsible for providing leadership and promoting sport and recreation within New Zealand. Operating under the Sport and Recreation Act (2002) Sport New Zealand has developed a National Facilities Framework to promote getting “Better Value from New Zealand’s Sporting Facilities”. This framework was used as a filter in helping determine the preferred option for the CSG and to help set out the Business Case.

6.2.1 Sport New Zealand - Community Sport Strategy

Sport New Zealand released the Community Sport Strategy in 2015 aimed at re-shaping and galvanising the sector into providing quality opportunities for New Zealanders to participate in community sport. Of particular note for this Business Case are the focus areas that Sport NZ will be driving which include:

1. School aged children (5-18 years),
2. Local delivery (particularly in low-participation communities),
3. Competitive Sport (including talent identification).

CSG provide the majority of their services to young people and focus on talent identification into competitive sport for those participants who choose this path.

6.3 Spaces and Places Plan for Sport and Recreation in Greater Christchurch (2013)

\(^2\) Christchurch School of Gymnastics Strategic Plan 2016-2020

\(^3\) Sport NZ re-prioritised investment to align to this strategy and as a result reduced its investment to GSNZ. CSG will need to continue to work with GSNZ in advocating for the value of GymSports to Sport NZ (and other third party funders).
The Spaces and Places Plan was developed after the 2011 earthquake series and identified, at a high level, the short, medium and long term priorities for the recovery of sport and recreation in greater Christchurch. This covered most sporting codes (and recreational activities), including Gym Sports.

The Plan recommended three key areas for Gym Sports as a code:\n1. Christchurch School of Gymnastics GymSports Centre be replaced with a venue in the North West of Christchurch,
2. Develop a third centre in the South East,
3. Develop the existing Olympia Centre.

It is important to note that these three recommendations were made at a time when it was thought QEII would be a go-go area for facility builds. This has subsequently changed with the development of the new QEII Recreation and Sport Centre and the re-location of both Shirley Boys’ High School and Avonside Girls’ High School to the QEII park area.

The Plan went on to state opportunities existed to develop similar “precincts” as the one that existed at QEII prior to the quakes, where a cluster of facilities operate in close proximity, but independently.

6.4  **NZ GymSports Facilities Strategy (Draft - 2016)**

GymSport New Zealand is currently developing a national facilities strategy with an aim to provide a high level strategic framework for national facilities planning. It is designed to provide direction on what should be done and crucially, what should not be done.

The objectives of the strategy are identified below:

1. Deliver a hierarchical network of GymSports facilities which are financially sustainable.
2. Provide a network of accessible facilities that offer gymnastics clear progression pathways.
3. Enable GymSports organisations to work collaboratively to access facility opportunities.

As part of developing the national facilities strategy, a hierarchy approach to the GymSports future network has been adopted to utilise the best use of available capital and operational resources. A key component of the facility hierarchy is the regional hub facility; these facilities are capable of accommodating year round training at a more advanced level and hosting regional events. The evolving national facilities strategy has identified that Christchurch has a gap at the regional facility level due to earthquake damage.

The draft strategy is recommending the need to develop a regional hub in Christchurch.

---

*SEEL (2013) Spaces, Place and People Plan for Sport and Recreation in Greater Christchurch - Updated February 2013 Page 3*
7.0 OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

As discussed earlier the Christchurch School of Gymnastics (Inc.) currently operates from two venues. One of these venues, located at Queen Elizabeth the Second (QEI) Park was significantly damaged in the February 2011 earthquake. The client’s brief was to assess the current development options and provide a recommendation on a preferred option. This preferred option will then form the basis for the business case.

7.1 Initial Options and Principles

The five options highlighted were defined as:

1. **Option One** – Remain on the existing QEI site and remediate the current facility in its entirety.

2. **Option Two** – Relocate and rebuild close to the Eastern Recreation and Sports Centre (ERSC) site on QEI Park.

3. **Option Three** – Purchase a commercial building and renovate to the required specifications.

4. **Option Four** – Purchase land elsewhere in Christchurch and rebuild.

5. **Option Five** – Enter a long term lease for a suitable building.

At the same time preliminary investigation into some other alternatives options outside of the five outlined above were considered to ensure all available options were considered.

Nationally, there are guiding principles for sports facilities. The National Sports Facility Framework looks to provide guidance around the development of sporting facilities in New Zealand. The framework acknowledges the challenges that sporting facility owners and users have had over the years and proposes six key principles that should be considered when developing a facility\(^{10}\). These are:

1. **Meeting an Identified Need** – Is the facility required? Is there a need for a new or re-developed facility?

2. **Future Proofing** – is the facility able to cater for change; increased participation, or the changing face of sport?

3. **Sustainability** – Can the facility operate sustainably now and into the future, financially and environmentally? Often investment up front for capital costs is relatively

\(^{10}\) Sport NZ (2013) Better Value from New Zealand Sporting Facilities - The New Zealand Sporting Facilities Framework (page 5)
straightforward to find from third party sources, while ongoing operating costs are more difficult to fund.

4. **Partnering and Collaboration** – what opportunities exist for joint ventures with other sectors (e.g. education)?

5. **Integration** – What opportunities exist for a facility to be multi-use?

6. **Accessibility** – How can the facility be developed to encourage participation by all?

These principles need to be considered by CSG when determining what type of facility they are wanting, now and into the future. They are factored into the criteria used in this section. Each option has been assessed against an agreed set of criteria while at the same time identifying any unique advantages of challenges with a proposed option. The analysis draws on information presented by CSG, supplemented by independent investigations. There are a series of assumptions that are also considered and discussed.

### 7.2 CSG Criteria for Preferred Option Selection

The CSG developed several criteria for assessing potential sites for a new gymnasium. These criteria are at a high level and have helped CSG narrow down a very long list of potential building sites and/or existing buildings. The criteria used can be summarised below as:

- **Part of a wider Sports hub**
  There are advantages of being located along side other sporting activities. Shared costs of parking, services and the increased volume of people pre-disposed to recreation and sport being in one location all help a venue. Being part of a wider hub also offers CSG the ability to be used as an over-flow space, be it for meeting space, or larger events.

- **Available space**
  CSG has stated the preferred site needs an area of at least 2,500m² to function as the existing facility does now. This allows the development of two gymnasiums (or combined space), along with the ancillary rooms to service participants, spectators, staff and volunteers. Another important component to consider is cost of the land. Ideally CSG is seeking use of land via either Ecan or CCC.

- **Transport routes and services**
  For any reasonably scaled sport and recreation facility the proximity to key transport routes is a critical element. Ease of access to a venue is another important transport factor, as is the ability of a site to be serviced by regular public transport, allowing participants, staff and volunteers to easily move to and from the venue. The existing site at QEI is well serviced by the ring road, as well as being a significant stop for buses.

- **Proximity to schools**
  Programmes offered to schools during the week are a key element of a successful business model for many sport and recreation centres. Proximity to a number of schools helps the

---

11 CSG Internal Document (undated); Super Facility Requirements

---
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schools to easily connect with the centre and avoids significant transport costs. A venue situated within close proximity with a number of schools can usually expect to benefit from increased use during the off-peak, school day. Decile levels of schools can be used as a proxy for a community’s ability to pay for extra-curricular and in-curriculum activities.

- **Catchment Area fits Preferred Profile for Gymnastics**
  
  CSG has indicated a preference to locate in an area that reflects the user profile of its members. As such, a socio-demographic profile of a preferred community would include an area that has higher than average numbers of families with children under 15 years old and household incomes that can sustain membership fees.

- **Strategic fit within the Gymnastics facility network**
  
  There is little advantage to the activity of gymnastics to be located closely alongside other gymnastics venues. A network that is spread will help draw from a wider catchment of participants and help grow the sport, rather than cannibalise members from existing venues.

### 7.3 Additional Criteria for Consideration

There are a number of other factors that should be considered when determining the preferred option. These can be summarised as follows:

- Whole of Life cost of option, including:
  - Capital cost of option,
  - Ongoing operating costs,
  - Any additional revenue or reduced savings directly attributable to an option.

- Geo-technical status of land and cost of any required re-mediation.\(^\text{12}\).

- Aesthetics of site – Ensuring it characterises sport and recreation.

- Customer expectations: Ensuring the venue will meet the expectations of users.

### 7.4 Other Emerging Factors

The Board of CSG has held workshops to assess the various options and several other factors emerged that warrant consideration when determining a preferred option.

- **Building Leases**
  
  The CSG Board has ruled out the long term option of commercially leasing both their gym facilities. The Board want to control an appropriate portion of their facilities. The 2010-2011 earthquake series impact on a leased venue, compared to an owned venue, would have

\(^{12}\) Note: The scope of this report does not include detailed geo-technical assessments or detailed costs of remediating land. The authors have used available estimates where possible.
more than likely seen the CSG club without a venue at all. The CSG Board also indicated during the Business Case development process that it had a responsibility to build and maintain an asset for the membership.

- **Impact Alpha – Watts Road**
  
The other CSG venue is a leased warehouse on Watts Road. There are several key drivers for CSG to seek an alternative venue to Watts Road. Firstly, the venue is at capacity during peak times and secondly, the current lease costs of this facility are very high. The ceiling height currently inhibits the development of a full Trampolining programme. The current lease expires in November 2017.

  These factors have forced CSG to look for an alternative venue in the West or North West of the city to complement the QEI site. CSG has had discussions with Council around another building that could potentially be used in the North-West.

---

37 In interviews CSG has noted that other facility owners closed venues quickly, and often did not re-open, whereas CSG were able to control their destiny.
8.0 OPTIONS ANALYSIS

When considering the options a "paired comparison evaluation" methodology was used to quantify the importance of each criterion and then evaluate the options.

Visitor Solutions consolidated the assessment criteria discussed in Section 7.0 into two levels. Each of the five options (Section 7.1) was assessed against the first level of criteria. Those that reached a threshold of acceptability were then progressed to the second phase.

8.1 First Level Criteria

There was a two level assessment process to assess the viability of each option. The first level of assessment used the following critical criteria:

1. **Financial Sustainability** – The impact the option would most likely have on the long term financial sustainability of the CSG.

2. **Level of Alignment with Catchment** – The primary catchment area has a population base that supports and has an affinity for gymnastics as a sport.

3. **Security of tenure** – the option provides a reasonable security of tenure for the club so there is a lower chance of future disruption.

4. **Likely quality of facilities** – A fit for purpose gymnastics facility can be achieved through the option.

5. **Optimal Gymnastics Network** – the preferred option assists the wider Gymsports collective through a venue that enhances the network and coverage of gymnastics venues in Canterbury.

- Assessment of Options

There were two parts of the process in the level one assessment of options. Firstly independent investigations and enquiries were made about alternative sites, both Council (and Crown) and private land and buildings that could potentially be suitable. Secondly the information gathered was analysed using the first level criteria to determine which options should proceed to the second level assessment.

At this point in time two options were dismissed. They were:

a. **Option Three** - Purchase a commercial building and renovate to required specifications.

This option was dismissed for several reasons. Primarily, the search by Visitor Solutions failed to identify suitable venues that were in locations that aligned to the gymnastics

---

14 This methodological approach is used to compare criteria to understand relative importance and then ranks each criteria, using a weighting effect. Each option is assessed to determine a raw and weighted score and then ranked accordingly.
catchment and/or failed to add value to the gymnasties network. Several examples of possible venues were presented to the CSG Board and are summarised in Appendix Six.

b. Option Five - Enter a long term lease for a suitable building. This option was dismissed primarily because CSG has indicated it did not have the appetite to have both venues as commercially leased venues, therefore affecting security of tenure and potential financial sustainability.

8.2 Second Level Criteria

The second level assessment criteria for the three remaining options were:

1. Operating Costs - Likely ongoing operating costs that can be expected with the option.

2. Location - The option is close to transport hubs, on a main arterial for ease of access and is ideally located within close proximity of schools, with the priority being primary schools.

3. Site Quality - The land is of a suitable nature to construct on and/or the site is remediated, therefore reducing the risk of further environmental disruptions.

4. Capital Costs - The cost of creating a new venue is not prohibitive and can be achieved through a mix of CSG and third party support.

5. Strategic Alignment and Partnerships - The option provides a location that is part of a wider sports hub, generating the synergies and collaboration expected.

• Assessment of Options

During the assessment of these options through the second-level criteria it became increasingly apparent that the future site for CSG’s second venue, and its size, plays an important role in determining the preferred option for a replacement of the QEII venue. For the purposes of this report and with the approval of the CSG Board it is assumed that the CSG may secure a long term lease for the use of Jellie Park 2020 (see Section 8.3 for further explanation).

The preferred option was assessed as being Option Two – Lease of Council land and build new facility. For the purposes of this Business Case the site is assumed to be adjacent to the planned QEII Recreation and Sport Centre (QEII R&SC).

• Ongoing operating costs (in particular the lower cost of lease) are more favourable than those for Option Four (cost of purchasing land). It is also highly unlikely that Option Four would be able to deliver the desired location or strategic alignment criteria, given the available sites in the current climate.

• Option One was ranked lower than the preferred option as the estimates of a full remediation and re-build made this a less favourable choice. The disruption of a large scale
repair project (through vacating parts of the existing site) was also seen as an important factor in favouring a new build.

A summary of the assessment process is outlined in Figure 8.1 below.

Figure 8.1 Outline of Options Assessment Outcome

No one site will deliver every criterion that the Christchurch School of Gymnastics is seeking. A key factor in this is that, generally speaking, land in the east of Christchurch is not ideal as it would likely require remediation. The east is also the preferred strategic location of CSG given the preferred shape of the network of gymnastics facilities in Canterbury and the membership profile.

8.3 A Christchurch School of Gymnastics Network Approach

Other key dependencies for a preferred option are the long term location and size of any other new CSG facility. Locating an alternative new venue close to where Impact Alpha is currently located does not meet the need for a network of facilities in Christchurch. It is in close proximity to Olympia Gymnastics and a dispersed network has advantages for all. Therefore it is recommended that the Impact Alpha venue operation should seek an alternative site with a lower lease cost in a location that fits the network approach.
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Should an alternative venue from the current Watts Road venue be secured, then the size of this venue also informs the required footprint of the preferred Qell replacement option. During investigations the High Performance Sport New Zealand (HPSNZ) facility at Jellie Park was raised as a possible medium to long term alternate venue for the Impact Alpha campus.

The HPSNZ centre at Jellie Park was constructed in 2012 following the 2010 and 2011 earthquake series to serve as the home of high performance sport in Canterbury. The building has a large open area which includes a netball court, 40 metre (indoor) running track and an area for strength and conditioning. Smaller spaces within the building include a function room (approx. 100 m²), changing facilities, office areas, staff kitchen and athlete lounge, along with several smaller consultation rooms. It is estimated there is approximately 1,450m² available as usable gymnastics area without any alterations. Appealingly for the CSG the ceiling height is approximately 12m, making it an ideal venue for Trampolining.

Potential challenges to this site are access and car parking. The venue currently has approximately 30 car parks. It is likely CSG would require more than this and it is unlikely CCC would allow overflow to park in the general Jellie Park Recreation and Sport Centre car park, which is already at capacity during peak times. Access is currently off Ilam Road. This would need to be reviewed in conjunction with CCC. There is another access off Green’s Road that could be used provided this did not create a thoroughfare for vehicles between Greers Road and Ilam Road.

Should HPSNZ move to the planned Metropolitan Sports Centre then their current premises will potentially be available for other recreation and sport use. Further investigations with CCC have indicated that they would prefer a single-use recreation and sport provider to lease this space from CCC. Council staff have indicated an expression of interest process will be run to select a preferred leasee. The likely start date for any lease is the second quarter of 2020 once HPSNZ has moved to the Metropolitan Sports Centre.

---

35 A recent update of the Jellie Park Management Plan (June 2016) reference the challenges faced at Jellie Park surrounding parking and specifically mentions access in the Plan (clause 3.13.3)  “prohibits vehicular use of the roadway between Greers Road and the recreation and sport centre, other than for use by maintenance and service vehicles for supporting special events, and in emergencies. Council staff have indicated the lack of parking at Jellie Park will be a challenge to manage.
9.0 PREFERRED OPTION

The Options Assessment has identified that CSG should pursue the option of developing a stand-alone facility adjacent to the QEIl RSC. Ideally an integrated facility with the QEIl RSC should be pursued, however the timing of the two projects do not align enough to warrant this being discussed further.

It is worthwhile noting that two secondary schools will be co-locating on QEIl Park, adjacent to the proposed QEIl Recreation and Sport Centre.

The preferred option should also factor in the potential size of the long term site for the CSG Impact Alpha facility. This facility has a footprint of approximately 2,100m² of which 1,450m² are available with little or no costs for refurbishment. More space could be created within the footprint by re-configuring the spaces available. The roof height of the Jellie Park site is also approximately 12.0 metres, allowing all gymnastics disciplines (but particularly Trampoline) to operate up to international requirements. This potentially also allows the ceiling height of the proposed QEIl venue to be specified at a lower 7.2m as competitive Trampolining could be solely based at Jellie Park.

The current “active gymnastics areas” across the two existing CSG facilities equates to approximately 2,850m² of usable area. The following preliminary schedule of spaces (Table 9.1) is based on an active gymnastics area of 3,300m² across the two venues. This allows for several factors:

1. A ten percent increase in usable area for growth in peak times (which are currently at or near capacity).
2. Reflection from key staff is that some space can be used more efficiently in the future.
3. A need to increase occupancy and use in the traditional down time through increased diversity of programming.
4. A reflection of the demographic data showing a minimal increase in the number of 0-14 year olds in the Christchurch area over the next 30 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Size (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics Area</td>
<td>Large space/s with apparatus permanently set up Ceiling height required to be a minimum of 7.2m. Would include a pit area (either in-ground or in a built up area) that would be capable of being used from several directions.</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently Impact Alpha has circa 1,000m² while QEIl venue has 1,850m².

A comparison of spaces with the existing QEIl facility can be found in Appendix Four.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 9</th>
<th>Attachment C</th>
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</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foyer</strong></td>
<td>Lobby/entrance area where participants and spectators enter and either move to the performance or spectator areas. This includes an area for a temporary food counter and a space for merchandise to be sold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reception</strong></td>
<td>Space for bookings, welcoming and directing participants, spectators and visitors. Sale of merchandise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offices</strong></td>
<td>Open plan office. Space for up to eight desks (includes two hot desks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Store area</strong></td>
<td>Needs to be a minimum of 5m long for beam storage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleaner Cupboard</strong></td>
<td>Small area with tub/hot water and storage space for facility cleaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff room</strong></td>
<td>Small area for staff to retreat to (current staff area is too large at 33m²).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Areas</strong></td>
<td>Min. As required by building code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toilets</strong></td>
<td>As per building code (include a staff only WC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-use room</strong></td>
<td>A room developed as a function area of the club that can also be utilised as meeting space and a location for birthday parties and holiday programmes. A retractable wall would allow the space to be divided into two areas and give greater programming flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1MF: allows for 0.76 people classroom style; 1.20 people standing or theatre seating style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kitchen</strong></td>
<td>A space for cooking and re-heating food and serving beverages. A space where catering can be received and stored. Would include dishwasher, fridge, microwave, oven, instant hot water tap, waste disposal and recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewing gallery (spectator space)</strong></td>
<td>Parents and caregivers space to view classes and competitions. Retractable seating for approximately 200-250 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td>Approximate circulation allowance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GFA</strong></td>
<td>Approximate total gross floor area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed facility has a mezzanine area that would accommodate a viewing area for spectators and a function room that would be available to hire along with other ancillary areas. The main gymnastics area would have a divider (net/curtain) to allow the large area to be divided into two smaller areas for programming purposes.

The preliminary design allows a space for a lift, but this has not been included at this point in time.
The look and feel of the venue is something that may need further consideration. It is recommended that CSG discuss their Urban Design requirements with CCC before commencing any further design to ensure the proposed gymnastics venue meets any guidelines set by CCC. For the purposes of this Business Case the following exterior design has been proposed (Figure 9.3).

While the venue is still a metal clad “box” there is a façade that gives it more of an up-market look and feel. This area will give the venue a really clear entry area and will most likely meet CPIED18 guidelines. The following sketches provide an artist’s impression of what the facility could potentially look like (ensuring the building is not just seen as a box).

Figure 9.3 Render of Exterior of Christchurch School of Gymnastics

Note: Artist’s Impression only.

18 Crime Prevention through Environmental Design is an important strategy in preventing design through the development of places and spaces that allow natural surveillance.
10.0 PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF COST

Based on the preliminary concept plan an estimate of cost has been calculated (see Appendix 3 for details).

Table 10.1: Preliminary cost estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFA estimate is based on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,370 Ground Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498 Mezzanine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,868 total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Infrastructure</td>
<td>$0.30M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Works</td>
<td>$7.09M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Building Works</td>
<td>$7.39M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping / Paving</td>
<td>$0.10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking</td>
<td>$0.41M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>$0.51M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$7.90M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees &amp; Consents (15%)</td>
<td>$1.185M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$0.91M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>$2.095M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation</td>
<td>$0.895M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$0.500M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$1.395M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimate</td>
<td>$11.390M13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is understood that CSG has held preliminary discussions with the Christchurch City Council to understand the opportunity to partner in some of the costs associated with re-building at QEII Park. Some of these costs are specific to the current environment and a possibility exists for CCC and CSG to agree a strategy to ensure CSG can remain in the East of the city and serve the surrounding communities. For the purposes of this Business Case all main project costs have been identified (see Appendix 3 for full breakdown and inclusions and exclusions).

10.1 Reduced Cost Options

The Christchurch School of Gymnastics has options for reducing the cost of this building as the project progresses. The first available option is to reduce the size of the facility, thereby reducing capital costs. As an example reducing the gross floor area by 10% could save in the order of

13 Significant remediation costs to land are a relatively new phenomenon in the construction of community facilities in Christchurch, placing an extra burden on organisations attempting to serve the East of Christchurch.

14 Price Estimate excludes the following: Loose fit-out and sports equipment, development contributions, land, finance and legal costs and escalation costs from September 2016.
10% in capital costs. A value management process can be used to refine costs at key project stages.
11.0 GOVERNANCE & MANAGEMENT

The Christchurch School of Gymnastics has a fully functioning Board that delegates day to day operating of the Club to a Chief Executive. The CSG also has sub-committees set up for the CSG Classic Competition, a Funding Committee, and a General Committee.

As the CSG progress their plans for a new facility it would be sensible to formally establish a Facilities Sub-Committee to oversee the new development. This would speed up the process through the sensible delegation of duties.

The CSG Board will still remain responsible for the two venues. The Club, through the Board, will be required to commit to a long term lease at the venue at Jellie Park (assuming this option is pursued and is successful). This will require the Board to have confidence in the medium and long term sustainability of the entire Club.

The development of a new large scale capital project is often an opportunity for an operational review of an organisation as it marks a natural period of change. We would recommend that all organisations consider such a review prior to commencing the project design stages. The review should examine amongst other things governance and management. In essence this review amounts to an organisational warrant of fitness. Any areas identified as needing fine tuning can then be attended to prior to intensive project development starting.
12.0 PRELIMINARY OPERATIONAL BUSINESS MODEL

The development of the preliminary business model has been based on the existing financial accounts of the Christchurch School of Gymnastics (the asset owning entity); and a series of reviews and benchmarking exercises of similar facilities to that being proposed.

The model’s estimates are also based on high level assumptions. Further detailed business planning and consultation with potential user groups will be required during the next phase of the facility development planning to establish a final business plan.

As the facility is likely to hold the position of a Regional GymSports facility it will be used by more than just one club. The financial implications of this will need to be more fully explored with the project partners.

Important Background Assumptions

Although this business model is specifically focused on Christchurch School of Gymnastics proposed QEI facility, it is important to be aware of the entity’s second facility. The following assumptions underpin the rationale behind this Business Case.

1. Jelle Park (the proposed new secondary site) will be leased from the 1st of April 2020.
   a. A lease will be gained for considerably less than the commercial/lease currently paid at Watts Road ($106k).
2. Christchurch City Council will make a contribution toward the remediation of land on the QEI site to accommodate CSG.
3. Usable floor area at CSG QEI will be 1,850 m²
4. Usable floor area could therefore increase from the current 2,850m² to 3,300m² without any significant facility conversion.
5. The Trampoline programme will be based from Jelle Park from 2020 given the 12 metre ceiling height. Recreational trampolining could still be run from the QEI site.
6. Opportunity exists for more programmes targeting other age ranges to increase usage during traditionally slower times. It is assumed a large database exists that can be used to promote these activities.
7. To ensure continued sustainability CSG should work with CCC and other agencies to encourage usage by other age groups. For example aligning programmes to fall prevention strategies and other health promotion activities for older adults.
The following assumptions have been developed to underpin the preliminary model and are generally based on existing budgeting practices within CSG. This model is based on the preliminary concept plan (see Section 10).

12.1 General Base Assumptions

1. Christchurch School of Gymnastics (CSG) will develop, own and operate the QEI facility.
2. The entity will be able to sublease and rent areas of the facility to other clubs, organisations and the public.
3. Depreciation of the facility will be covered by the entity in the form of a depreciation contribution only.
4. Facility maintenance will be covered by CSG.
5. Day to day operational costs for the facility will be covered by CSG.
6. CSG will run the facility on a professional basis.
7. The preliminary model covers the facility only and not the satellite facilities run by CSG.
8. The model assumes other clubs will (hire and) have access to the new facility as they currently do at the existing site.
9. Existing 2015/16 club membership numbers have been assumed to reflect year one membership. Over time these numbers are anticipated to increase as utilisation increases.
10. All facilities will be proactively marketed.
11. The project will be fully funded through existing funds and third party grants. No allowance has been made for servicing loans.

12.2 Revenue Assumptions21 – Year One

12. The QEI facility will generate revenue through the following membership programmes:
   a. Trampoline - 72 members with average fees of $486 per annum generating $35,000,
   b. Pre School - per annum 200 members with average fees of $365 generating $73,000,
   c. Recreation - 575 (plus 82 Gmysports) members with average fees of $557 per annum generating fees of $366,000,
   d. Competitive WAG and MAG - per annum 150 members with average fees of $1,653 per annum generating fees of $248,000,
   e. An additional $12,000 in GSSNZ competitive affiliation fees are collected.

Combined membership revenue will total $734,000.

13. A comprehensive schools and holiday programmes will generate the following
   a. Schools programme will generate $60,000 income – noting that there is currently a two year cycle of school visits which sees every second year achieve slightly higher figures (circa $65,000),
   b. Holiday programmes will attract income totalling $27,000 in income per annum.

14. The facility will be used for a series of OSCAR programmes after school. These are anticipated to generate $15,500 per annum based on past trading.

15. An MED grant of $3,500 is also received annually for the OSCAR programme.

21 Both revenue and expenditure are based on a number of factors including previous and budgeted revenue and expenditure for QEI site along with specific requirements for a new purpose built facility.
16. A series of general community programmes will be run each year generating $10,000 per annum in the first year. Note this area of programming requires additional planning, promotion and administration to attract new target markets to the facility.

17. The facility will host a series of competitions given its proposed sub regional hub status. These competitions will generate $55,000 per annum in fees.

18. Charitable grants will generate $60,000 per annum for the QEI facility (assumes the grant income is split at a rate of 80% to QEI and 20% to Impact Alpha venue).

19. The facility (or specific parts of it) will be available to hire. Users will pay a hire charge for the use of spaces. Revenue from these charges is estimated at $23,000 pa.

20. The facility will have a small food kiosk and vending machines and sell Gym related merchandise. Based on past trading and an improved layout of items this secondary spend area should increase from the current $12,500 per annum to $20,000 per annum.

21. Facility sponsorship will generate $12,000, pa. This assumes sponsorship is divided into a series of smaller sponsorship packages for various rooms, areas and purposes.

22. Fundraising through members a budgeted at $9,000 per annum.

Summary of Preliminary Revenue Stream Estimates

The main revenue sources for the facility are outlined in Table 12.1 and Figures 12.1 and 12.2.

Table 12.1: Summary of Preliminary Revenue Stream Estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Stream</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Programmes</td>
<td>$734,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, Holiday &amp; OSCAR Programmes</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Programmes</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitions</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym Hire</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise and Food and Beverage</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUE</td>
<td>$1,029,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12.1: Summary of Preliminary Revenue Estimates by Percentage
Revenue for the new venue will continue to rely heavily on membership fees.

![Summary of Revenue for QE11 Campus](image1)

Figure 12.2: Summary of Membership Programme Revenue
Recreational membership fees generate over half of membership revenue.

![Membership Programmes Revenue by Type](image2)
12.3 Optical Cost Assumptions – Year One

Direct Costs

12. The facility will have the following paid staff and contractors (note many of these are split across the two venues):
   - CSG Chief Executive (FT role - oversees both facilities) 0.67 FTE at QFII site.
   - Operations Manager (contributing to Health and Safety etc.) 0.33 FTE,
   - Administration Manager 0.84 FTE,
   - Finance Administrator 0.25 FTE,
   - Reception 1.0 FTE,
   - Coaches,
   - Part-time Coaches,

Total Salaries and Wages for CSG QFII will be $770,000.

Gymnastics – National Affiliation Fee22 - is estimated to be $40,000 per annum and linked to membership numbers.

Overheads

13. Communications expenses will equate to $11,000 per annum. This is made up of:
   - Telephone (land and mobile) $3,000
   - Internet $1,000
   - Postage, stationary etc. $4,000
   - Computer software $3,000

14. Marketing expenses:
   - Promotions and Advertising $10,000 – this is to help develop and promote new activity areas and revenue sources in to the venue.

15. Other Administrative / Facility Service Costs will equate to $62,000 per annum:
   - Bank charges $1,000
   - ACC levy and Kiwi Saver will equate to $39,000 per annum.
   - Professional Development allowance $8,000
   - Security services $4,000
   - Accounting fees $6,000
   - Legal fees $2,000
   - Advisory fees $2,000

22 CSG pay a ternity fee to GNZ for the following member types:
   - Recreation members - $1.00 / term
   - Pre/School members - $2.30 / term
   - Elementary & Junior Member $16.50/term
   - Technical Membership $87/year
   - Senior Competitive members - $27/term

A Competition Levy of 10% is charged by GNZ for all sanctioned competitions.
16. Utilities & Lease costs will be $34,000 per annum.
   - Electricity and gas $22,000 – assuming a connection to the Energy Centre on site
     leads to a price reduction of “normal” electricity costs.
   - Waste Management $2,000,
   - Rates – assume exempt,
   - Lease - $10,000 – Provisional sum: This is to be confirmed with Council.

17. Cleaning, Repairs and Maintenance will equate to $30,000 per annum:
   - Cleaning contracts $18,000,
   - Repairs and maintenance building interior $4,000 pa,
   - Repairs and maintenance building exterior $4,000 pa,
   - Repairs and maintenance to equipment $4,000 pa,

Note: R&M will increase over time as the building ages and wears.

18. Insurance will be $31,000 per annum.
   - Insurance – contents $6,000 (provisional sum only),
   - Insurance – building $25,000 (provisional sum only).

19. Depreciation Contribution towards the building $30,000.

20. Depreciation contribution to equipment $15,000.

Summary of Preliminary Operational Costs

The main costs for the facility are projected to be salaries (accounting for 3/4 of operating costs) (Table 12.2 and Figure 12.4).

Table 12.2: Summary of Preliminary Operational Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Categories</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary and Wages</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSNZ Affiliation Fees</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions and Advertising</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrative Costs</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Lease</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning, Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance (Building and Contents)</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Contribution</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>$1,033,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12.2: Projected Facility Cost estimates by Percentage

Summary of Expenditure
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12.4 The Preliminary Model – Profit and Loss Forecast

The preliminary model forecasts a deficit based on the assumptions outlined earlier in this section. However, it is considered likely that as the project is progressed and additional details are clarified this position can be returned to a break even or small surplus (as adjustments in revenue and expenditure are made and additional revenue generating activity occurs within the facility and wider club).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12.1: Preliminary Operational / Business Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trampolene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive WAG &amp; MAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, Holiday and OSCAR Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools' Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCAR Programmes (after school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED Grant (for OSCAR Programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym Hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise, Food and Beverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INCOME</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Year One $</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSNZ Affiliation Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone (land and mobile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, Stationary, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Expenses (Promotions and Advertising)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrative / Facility Service Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC Levy and Kiwi Saver</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Allowance</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Services</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Fees</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Fees</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Lease Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity and Gas</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates - assume exempt</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease (provisional sum to be confirmed with Council)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning, Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning Contracts</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance Interior</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance Exterior</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance to Equipment</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance - Contents</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance - Building</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td><strong>988,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING SURPLUS</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Contribution</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Result (Profit)</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A sensitivity analysis indicates that if revenue increased by 10% and costs declined by 15% approximately $247,000 would be generated annually. If revenue was to increase by 15% and costs decreased by 15% the surplus would be greater (approximately $298,000). The impact of a 15% increase in revenue and 10% increase in costs would create a $51,000 surplus. A full range of analysis is provided in Appendix 7. This analysis demonstrates that small percentage shifts in revenue or expenditure alter the bottom line considerably.
13.0 RISK ANALYSIS

There are inherent risks associated with any facility development that need to be acknowledged and managed appropriately through a thorough risk management process. This Business Case has identified certain project risks that will need to be mitigated. These are:

Financial Risks

13.1 A funding analysis for this project was outside of this project’s scope. The CSG needs to consider the funding mix that is potentially available and the likelihood that exists for this funding to be realised. A regional facility status is likely to assist funding.

13.2 The project costs identified are for this point in time. Escalation costs in the Canterbury construction industry are currently running at approximately 5% per annum. Further delays will see these costs continue to rise.

13.3 The costs for remediation are an area that requires further discussion with CCC to determine what level of funding (if any) they will contribute to the remediation of CCC land. For the purposes of the financial model in this Business Case, a Council contribution has been assumed, however this needs to be confirmed.

Location Risks

13.4 This business case is predicated on CSG gaining access to the gymnasium at Jellie Park. While there is a risk in this assumption the financial model for the proposed QEII venue (the subject of this study) is stand-alone. Securing Jellie Park is not a project risk, but rather a wider organisational risk/challenge for CSG. Should CSG not secure a lease at Jellie Park, then a new site will need to be found with favourable terms, preferably in the North-West of Christchurch. The specification of the QEII venue may also need to adjust (for example, have a higher stud height).

13.5 Timeframe expectations between CCC and CSG differ. The CCC has recently raised the development of a Master Plan at QEII Park as a project that will occur in the next 9-15 months. There is a risk that CCC may not decide to support CSG’s re-location before the Master Planning exercise is complete. These delays will add additional cost to any construction project over this time.

13.6 At the same time as CSG is attempting to gain formal Council support for the new facility, Local Body Elections will occur in October, making it unlikely for any decisions to be made in the short term.
### Business Case Risk Management Table - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Risk Consequences</th>
<th>Mitigations/ Controls</th>
<th>Sources of Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Insufficient Funding to Progress Project.                  | CSG does nothing and continues to operate in a facility that is sub-standard.           | 1. Reduce footprint, therefore capital cost reduces.  
2. Develop fundraising plan and understand probability of external support. | 1. Qualified Quantity Surveyor estimates included in Business Case.  
2. Value management exercises undertaken with partner organisations. |
| Delays in Project – internally                             | Escalation Costs Missed opportunities      | 1. Timely Board decision to pursue recommended option.  
2. Ongoing analysis and professional advice at each project stage provided to board. | 1. Business Case to inform decision making.  
2. Ongoing analysis and professional advice at each project stage.  
3. Project partner advice. |
| Delays in Project – external planning processes\(^{13}\)    | Escalation Costs Missed opportunities      | 1. Continue to engage with Council as landowner on a regular basis  
2. Develop a formalised engagement plan between CSG and CCC for continued, meaningful engagement. | 1. CCC Officers / Board / Councils working closely.  
2. Engagement Plan. |
| CCC does not commit to the level anticipated by CSG        | Higher than anticipated costs to be borne by CSG or found elsewhere.                   | 1. Look to secure commitment from CCC as soon as practical.  
2. Reduce project scope. | 1. Business Case to inform CSG & CCC discussions.  
2. Ongoing discussions with Council and CSG. |
| Unconfirmed future location of Impact Alpha                 | Inability to confirm the future overall club spaces may delay this project            | 1. Start discussions with all parties as soon as possible.  
2. Gain a full understanding of the process being followed. | 1. Ongoing discussions with all potential partners. |
| Change in direction of CCC due to local body elections.    | Changing priorities and interests lead to other projects being supported before, or instead of CSG. | 1. Engage with politicians / staff as early as practical after local body elections. | Engagement Plan. |

\(^{13}\) E.g. CCC has signified the desire to develop a Master Plan for the QEII Park area. This has the potential to delay the project by up to a further 12 months.
14.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This Business Case has concluded that demand exists for a new replacement QEII facility. Based on available data it is concluded that this facility should be located adjacent to the QEII Recreation and Sport centre on QEII Park. Given the information available CSG is in a strong position to develop a new facility, provided it can gain the required funding support.

The Business Case has identified a small operational deficit. However, it is considered likely that with further refinement the project should be able to operate at a surplus. These refinements can be made as additional new data become available following partner discussions.

The success of this proposed facility is inextricably linked to the partnership with CCC. There are several critical areas that rely on a transparent partnership with Council. All efforts should be made to foster this relationship.

Recommendations

1. Proceed with discussions with CCC to confirm a land lease at QEII Park for a new, purpose built Gymnastics Facility.

2. Undertake funding analysis that fairly reflects the most likely funding mix for the capital costs of the project.

3. Seek further clarity from CCC on the willingness to contribute to various portions of the total project cost.

4. Seek confirmation from CCC on the timing of the process and probability of CSG to gain a lease at Jellic Park HPSNZ facility as the second CSG venue.

5. Consider a broadening of community programmes and/or hires of the facility during quieter times to increase operating revenue.

6. Undertake an organisational optimisation review that would cover existing and proposed programme delivery, operational revenue and expenditure, along with a review of the most appropriate governance and management model moving forward.24

24 In essence this review amounts to an organisational warrant of fitness. Any areas identified as needing fine tuning can then be attended to prior to intensive project development starting.
APPENDIX 1: OTHER DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURES

Catchment Area Definition
The ‘Christchurch North-East’ catchment area used here comprised residents from the following Statistics NZ Area Units25.

Individual and Household Income
Residents of Christchurch North-East had similar Median Personal income to residents of greater Christchurch City, but slightly lower Median Household and Family incomes (Table 1). These might suggest slightly lower financial capacity to engage in sport and recreation activities among more local residents, but this difference is small.

Table 1: Median personal and household income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median personal income</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Median Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch NorthEast</td>
<td>$29,363</td>
<td>$61,170</td>
<td>$70,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>$29,800</td>
<td>$65,300</td>
<td>$76,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2013

Employment Status
There were only very minor differences in employment status (Table 2).

Table 2: Employment status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed Full-time</th>
<th>Employed Part-time</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Not in the Labour Force</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch NorthEast</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>268,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2013

Education Level
There were only very minor differences in education level (Table 3).

Table 3: Highest level of educational qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Quals</th>
<th>Level 1-3 Cert</th>
<th>Level 4-6 Cert</th>
<th>Degree level</th>
<th>Postgrad level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch NorthEast</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>238,557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2013

Ethnic Diversity
There were only minor variations in the proportions of different ethnicities (Table 4). The ‘European’ group was highly predominant among residents overall.

Table 4: Ethnic Composition of the Population26

25 Statistics NZ Area Units - 588102 Redwood South; 592401 St Albans West; 592402 St Albans East; 592701 Shirley West; 592702 Shirley East; 592812 Dalington; 593200 Richmond North; 593300 Richmond South; 581010 Redwood North; 590501 Jarvis Wetland; 590504 Marischal North; 590505 Waltham; 590506 Highfield Park; 590502 Parklands; 590601 Wainui Beach; 592500 Marischal; 592600 Edgecumbe; 592811 Bartwood; 592820 Jarvis; 593000 Avondale; 593000 Wainui; 593100 Azurit; 593400 Avondale; 593501 Linwood; 593502 Phillipstown; 593600 Linwood North; 593800 Ilam; 593900 Bromley; 595600 North Berich; 595800 New Brighton.

26 Note that total % will exceed 100% as more than one ethnicity can be specified in the Census.
The main feature of ethnicity change over recent years has been a relative decline of European residents, and a growing proportion of Asian residents in particular (Table 5). While their base numbers are currently low the growth is strong, which may increasingly represent an area of opportunity in sport and recreation participation. However on the basis of current numbers the clearly dominant market remains ‘European’ and is likely to stay that way unless there is any specific preference for Gymsports among particular ethnicities.

Table 5: Percentage Change in Population Ethnicities (2001-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Christchurch NorthEast</th>
<th>Christchurch City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnicity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83,925</td>
<td>325,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2013

Reflecting the similarities in ethnicity across all areas, the proportions of residents born in New Zealand were also largely the same, with around 20% of residents in most areas born in New Zealand (Table 6).

Table 6: Proportion of NZ vs Overseas-Born residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NZ Born</th>
<th>Overseas Born</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch NorthEast</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>325,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household types
There were only very minor differences in household types (Table 7).

Table 7: Household types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One-family</th>
<th>Two-family</th>
<th>Three or more families</th>
<th>Other Multi-Person</th>
<th>One Person</th>
<th>Total households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch NorthEast</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>120,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2013

Family types in households
There were only very minor differences in family-types in households (Table 8).

Table 8: Family types in households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Couple without children</th>
<th>Couple with children</th>
<th>One parent with children</th>
<th>Total families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch NorthEast</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2013
Household Access to Telecommunications
There were only very minor differences in household access to telecommunications (Table 9).

Table 9: Percentage of households with telecommunications access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Access</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Landline</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Total households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Northeast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>123,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics NZ Census 2013

Household Access to Motor Vehicles
Most households (around 90%) had access to at least one motor vehicle, suggesting most would have reasonably good mobility to access work, community and recreational facilities.

Table 10: Percentage of households with telecommunication access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Vehicle</th>
<th>1 Vehicle</th>
<th>2 Vehicles</th>
<th>3+ Vehicles</th>
<th>Total households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch NorthEast</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>123,609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deprivation Index
Another key indicator of overall socio-economic conditions in an area is provided by the Deprivation Index, created by the University of Otago using data from Statistics New Zealand Census (2013). The index combines census data relating to income, home ownership, employment, qualifications, family structure, housing, access to transport and communications. Figure 1 below summarises the deprivation index scores for Statistic NZ Area Units around the QE2 site. The key feature is the lower levels of relative deprivation generally to the North of the site, particularly compared with areas to the South and East.

Figure 1: Deprivation index levels across Christchurch North-East (by Statistics NZ Area Units)

Source: NZ Deprivation Index – University of Otago and Statistics NZ (interactive map NZ Herald)
APPENDIX 2: LOCALISED PLAYING-AGE PROJECTIONS

These tables summarise the top-10 growth hotspots for growth in the population of the 0-14 year age-group and of the whole population respectively (based on Statistics NZ Area Units).

- **TOP-10 Projected growth hotspots for Christchurch City - ‘Playing-Age’ group (0-14 years)**
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>pop change</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>587842 Halswell West</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587847 Henderson's Basin</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590507 Prestons</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>2,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590506 Highfield Park</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587702 Wigama</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588402 Sawyers Arms</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590400 Belfast</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591700 Avon Loop</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591300 Cathedral Square</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587812 Broomfield</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Christchurch</strong></td>
<td><strong>64,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This highlighted the most significant growth hotspots being in the **Halswell area** (Halswell West and Henderson's Basin) to the far south and to the north in the **Prestons** and **Highfield Park** areas. Each of these areas were projected to have over 1000 more 0-14 year olds in 2043 that they had on 2013.

- **TOP-10 Projected growth hotspots for Christchurch City – whole population**
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>pop change</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>587842 Halswell West</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>7,610</td>
<td>9,190</td>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>10,210</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587847 Henderson's Basin</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>4,280</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>8,330</td>
<td>10,350</td>
<td>9,670</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590507 Prestons</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,140</td>
<td>6,290</td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>8,610</td>
<td>8,310</td>
<td>2,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587702 Wigama</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>7,390</td>
<td>8,220</td>
<td>8,970</td>
<td>9,670</td>
<td>10,350</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588402 Sawyers Arms</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>5,710</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>7,530</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590506 Highfield Park</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>5,270</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590400 Belfast</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>6,070</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>6,960</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>8,120</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591700 Avon Loop</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>6,730</td>
<td>7,740</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>6,640</td>
<td>6,790</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591300 Cathedral Square</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587812 Broomfield</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Christchurch</strong></td>
<td><strong>356,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>579,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>593,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>406,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>417,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>428,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>436,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3: CAPITAL COST ESTIMATE
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Order of Cost Estimate
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Christchurch Gymnasium Club

6 September 2016
Christchurch Gymnasium Club
Order of Cost Estimate - September 2016

Clarifications & Exclusions

General
These estimates have been based on the scope & assumptions stated in the estimate

Clarifications
Estimates are based on the following:
- Pacific Environments plan sketches dated 5th September 2016
- Estimates assume a traditional procurement process
- Provisional Allowances have been made where noted for items where scopes have been assumed.

Exclusions
The following are excluded from these estimates:
- Loose fitout & sports equipment
- Site specific geotech issues & topographical level changes
- Development Contributions
- Land, Finance & Legal costs
- Escalation costs from September 2016
- GST
### Christchurch Gymnasium Club

**Order of Cost Estimate - September 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gymnasium Building</th>
<th>1,850 m²</th>
<th>1,850</th>
<th>3,422,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foyer</td>
<td>50 m²</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>10 m²</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>23 m²</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>31 m²</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>111,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC change</td>
<td>69 m²</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>246,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change rooms</td>
<td>104 m²</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>374,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>86 m²</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>264,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>35 m²</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>104 m²</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>374,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| First Floor        |          |       |           |
| Audience viewing   | 101 m²   | 3,600 | 365,600   |
| Circulation        | 10 m²    | 3,600 | 36,000    |
| Circulation        | 52 m²    | 3,600 | 193,200   |
| Circulation        | 33 m²    | 3,600 | 123,800   |
| Function/Meeting   | 143 m²   | 3,600 | 514,800   |
| kitchen            | 21 m²    | 3,000 | 63,000    |
| WCs                | 44 m²    | 3,000 | 132,400   |
| Circulation        | 23 m²    | 3,000 | 62,000    |
| Circulation        | 31 m²    | 3,000 | 111,600   |

| Site Works         |          |       |           |
| Provisional allowance for services infrastructure | Sum | 300,000 |
| External paving around building | 400 m² | 140 | 50,000 |
| Landscaping around building | Sum | 50,000 |
| Tarmac carparking assumed | 2,700 m² | 150 | 405,000 | 811,000 |

| Loose Fitout & sports equipment excluded | Sum | - | - |
| Sub-Total | 7,898,300 |

| Professional Fees & Consents | 15% | 1,184,745 |
| Contingency | 10% | 908,305 |
| Total | 9,911,350 |

**Total order of Cost Estimate**

| Say | $10,000,000 |
## APPENDIX 4 – COMPARISON OF SPACES OLD VENUE VERSUS PROPOSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Proposed Venue</th>
<th>Old Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size (m²)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics Area</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>1,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foyer</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store area</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner Cupboard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff room</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Areas</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use room</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewing gallery (spectator space)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Included above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GFA</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td>2,596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5 – PROPOSED ROAD MAP
APPENDIX 6 – COMMERCIAL PROPERTY SEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of Property</th>
<th>Agent/contact</th>
<th>Property details</th>
<th>Evaluation fit for purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POTENTIAL PROPERTIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 Breezes Road, Aranui</td>
<td>Hamish Finnie Glass Miles Agency 03 343 9486</td>
<td>7,061sqm (approx) land area with old Aranui New World building. 2580sqm floor area, 11m roof height (currently there is a false ceiling in at the moment). I know you’ve already looked at this previously, however now for sale and vendors realistic. Currently no insurance cover, sold on an as is where is basis. There is an engineers’ report which states building is only at 13% of national building standards, and a brief report into what development would be necessary to get it up to the 34% required level. Very basic reports but would need to do own research at own cost. Great development opportunity with the subject properties rezoned Commercial Core (under the Christchurch Replacement District Plan) via Decision 11 of the Independent Hearing Panel dated 18th December 2015. Operative June 2016.</td>
<td>Deadline sale 1pm 15 June 2016. This property is worth considering as the base warehousing structure is of the appropriate floor area and ceiling height required. Clearly significant work needs to be done to bring it up to building standards, however that could be reflected in the price.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Crosby St (with Hills Rd entrance too), Mairehau</td>
<td>Garry Ottman, Bayleys 03 375 4700</td>
<td>1.2ha land area; 2920sqm buildings. Approx 150 carparks. The St Albans Shirley Working Men’s Club is strategically located with entrances off Hills Road and Crosby Street and is close to the Shirley Road/Hills Road shopping precinct and the Palms Mall. Variety of</td>
<td>This property had a deadline sale date of Wednesday 18th May, however it did not sell, and as of Thursday 19th May the agents are confident a figure in the region of $2million would secure the site. This site satisfies many...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
buildings dating from 1958-1984. Some areas leased to the dance groups and Tai
kwan do clubs. It features a
main bar with associated
kitchen, chiller, gaming area,
pool tables and facilities for
band entertainment. A
staircase and lift lead to an
open plan upstairs area with
its own bar/serving facility
ideal for meetings,
presentations or office
accommodation. The large
hall features a stage, its own
bar and reception area with
adjoining billiard area housing
three full size tables. Sliding
doors provide access to the
garden and barbecue area.
The separate recreation room
is currently used for martial
arts and has its own storage
facility and amenities. A
second standalone
recreation room has its own
amenities and kitchen and is
used by the pigeon club and
slot car club. The large
commercial kitchen, food
preparation area and offices
currently leased to catering
company. Currently L1 zoning,
but proposed changes will
mean it will be RS
(Residential/Suburban) when
changes come into effect.
Would need redevelopment
in order to make it fit for
purpose for gymnastics – roof
height etc.

323 Lincoln Road
Addington

FOR SALE OR LEASE

The property has frontage to
Lincoln Road and also access
off Bernard Street and Walsall
Street.

8,348sqm over three titles

Significant potential to
utilise current office
and amenities area,
whilst developing
workshop and
warehouse area into

FOR SALE

Stewart White,
Bayleys 03 365
1842 or 027
4788944

Christchurch School of Gymnastics
Needs Analysis and Business Case – September 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council 28 September 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council 28 September 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55 Lums Road Middleton</th>
<th>Craig Edwards Knight Frank 0274344245</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>386sqm workshop/warehouse and 353sqm offices and amenities Seaed yard with a wash-bay area Fuel storage if required The improvements to the property comprise that of a 1970s built warehouse/workshop facility that includes substantial offices.</td>
<td>appropriate gym facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Located at 55 Lums Road, the premises sit between two of Christchurch’s major arterial routes Blenheim Road and the Christchurch Southern Motorway. Ample yard space and access ways allow for easy vehicle movements and container storage. Both warehouses have drive-through capability. Features:  - Air Conditioned office space  - Ample off street parking  - Multiple roller door access to warehouse  - Large power supply  - Gantry crane rails  - Office Building - 492.64sqm ground floor office - 64.44sqm first floor office - 88.38sqm cafe/amenities  - Front Warehouse - 3726.86sqm high stud warehouse (7.5m to the knee) - 240.44sqm lean-to - 5845sqm sealed yard Multiple purchase options available with a proposed subdivision plan available on request. Available 1 September 2016 |

Front warehouse on this site is available for sale at approximately $4,900,000 or leasing for $440,000pa. It is approx. 30 years old with some asphalt on the floor and a few piers for roof support dividing the otherwise open space. This could be worth a look by the Club – the FRONT WAREHOUSE only is the potential option. Significant development of the warehouse would be required, however it has the required height, size and outside areas. The other warehouses on the site can be leased or other income derived from arrangements in place.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Agent/Agent details</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>456 Ferry Road, Woolston</td>
<td>Harry van Tongeren, Bayleys Canterbury Commercial 03 375 4805</td>
<td>Owned by the Indian Association currently looking to sell. Land approx. 3016sqm... current buildings to be removed and new build undertaken. Two road frontages (accessways), two freehold titles. Currently retail/business zoned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dalziel Place, Woolston</td>
<td>Sam State Colliers International Commercial 03 385 7887</td>
<td>Site Area: 3,815 sqm Building floor area: 2,352 sqm. Constructed in 2010, warehouse and tidy offices and amenities. The building is currently split into two separate tenancies with a removable dividing wall. The United Movers tenancy (which comes vacant in August 2016) features the offices and amenities over two levels at the front of the premises. The western tenancy features a very small office, office and toilet and has a rear roller door for access. The building is of very conventional design and will suit a wide range of businesses. The high power supply will appeal to manufacturers while the high stud (8m) warehouse and devan area will appeal to exporters, importers and distribution companies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Osborne St, Waitham</td>
<td>Christian Kellar (027) 3334057 Sam State (021) 738245 Colliers International Christchurch, Licensed Agent (REA)</td>
<td>Land area: 10,325m² Building area: 6,836m² The large corner site has two street frontages and contains significant land and buildings. All buildings have been strengthened to a minimum 33% NBS, and as such are ready for immediate use. This property is under offer, however there are issues with one of the proposed purchasers and the current situation could change and the property may become available again.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.: 9</td>
<td>Attachment C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2008 | (03) 3657887 | BARE LAND | occupation. This is a rare opportunity to secure a large city fringe site with multiple buildings and potential for a mix of tenancies and holding income. |
| Barnes/Cavendish Rd, Redwood | Bob Davison MB Cook Commercial Ltd 021 940 915 03 341 4094 03 343 0600 | 11.6m2 stud clear span warehouse of some 1,177m2 with potential to add significant value. Currently leased, the property will be vacant shortly. Situated within a 1.5407ha (15,407m2) Business 4 zoned section, immediate neighbour of Cavendish Business Park. |
| 5/47 Anchorage Road, Hornby | Robert Williams 027 434 4723 D 03 375 6617 W 03 375 6600 Jones Lang La Salle Christchurch | 4,416 of freehold vacant land. Development potential. No building costs. Excellent ground conditions. |
| Harewood Land | Bryan Ashworth 021 212 9308 W 03 379 4120 Ray White Commercial | 7000sqm bare land – near Christchurch Airport Location makes this property unlikely to appeal to the Club. |
| 250 Port Hills Road Hillborough | Simon 0274323345 Simon | Bare land, development site 3500m2 Business zoned land in two blocks with two access ways. |
| MAYBE BUT UNLIKELY PROPERTIES | | | |
| 11 Braeburn Drive Hornby | Agent: Garry Ottman, Bayleys 03 375 4700 | Located on Braeburn Drive this property has five roller doors and two points of access. This property is available for lease at a rental to be negotiated. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Owner/Contact</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 96 Marshall St, Woolston | Greg Mann, Bayleys Commercial 027 225 6456 | Land area 6,695sqm  
Zoned B4  
Building footprint 2,698sqm (approx.)  
Building area 4,400sqm (estimated)  
Bought by the Vendor in the last several years ‘As is’ with the existing building deemed uneconomic to repair the vendor had intended to develop the site to provide 17 warehouse and apartment units. Plans, Resource Consent, Geotech Report, and Building Consents have all been approved. | Significant work needed to bring this into a usable option. This is essentially a “bare land” purchase and therefore price would need to reflect the level of work to be done to achieve a usable site for the Club.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 65 Foremans Road, Hornby | Tony from CBRE Realty 03 374 9889  
- Warehouse - 2,136sqm  
- Office - 835sqm  
- Canopy - 160sqm  
8-9m stud.  
Brand new build that starts in July with completion expected by early next year. Ability to have input into the building. Roller doors on the west and south of the building to allowing easy access to the 2,000sqm car parking, two story office and canopy to the south. | Only available for lease – but the opportunity to have input into the building specs.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
<p>| 112 Hayton Road, | Sam Cowdy | Property features - dual street | Available for Sale or                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Wigram**  
021 365 605  
03 355 6555  
access - concrete yard - drive through canopy with 4 roller doors, - 9m stud and clear span.  
Warehouse 1,885sqm Canopy 540sqm Ground floor office / showroom 242sqm First floor office 206sqm Mezzanine 38sqm  
Lease. Probably too small for the Club’s requirements however, couldn’t get hold of the agent for this property therefore very little more information gathered.

| 11 Moneur Place  
Addington | Harry van Tongeren  
Bayleys  
0274332912 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International tenant - Schneider Electric (NZ) Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3,625sqm warehouse/workshop space, 1,735sqm offices and amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 95 car parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current rental $644,143pa net</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Moneur Place is located in Christchurch’s premium industrial area Middleton. This large property comprises a substantial industrial building tenanted by one of the world’s leading electrical component manufacturers. Schneider Electric (NZ) Limited manufactures short-run components for the export market and has been a tenant since 2005. Take the opportunity to become a partner in the ownership of this exceptional property with $2,500,000 of shareholding available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYNDICATE SHAREHOLDING IN THIS PROPERTY MAKES IT UNSUITABLE FOR IMMEDIATE USE BY THE CLUB.**  
This property is not suitable as the current owners are only looking to free up some capital and are inviting syndicate-type shareholdings in this building. The tenants are on a long term lease and the buildings wouldn’t be available for conversion to a GymSport facility for some years.

| 66 Carmen Road  
Hornby | Mark Macealey  
or Sam State Colliers  
International  
021650460 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings: 8,073m2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land: 21,281m2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant industrial investment occupied by international tenant Amcor. Two street frontages. Multiple titles... again not likely prospect as investor syndicates are being sought.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be sold by deadline private treaty (by 24 May). **THIS PROPERTY IS BEING SOLD TO SYNDICATE INVESTORS.**
APPENDIX 7 – SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Provided as a separate document
10. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for the Former Pumphouse, 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch

Reference: 17/994767
Contact: Fiona Wykes fiona.wykes@ccc.govt.nz 941 8052

1. **Staff Recommendations**

That the Social and Community Development Committee recommend to Council that it:

1. Approves a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $200,000 for conservation, strengthening and repair work to the protected heritage building located at 544 Tuam Street.
2. Notes that payment of this grant is subject to the applicant entering into a full conservation covenant, with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property title.

2. **Social and Community Development Committee Recommendation to Council**

That the Council:

1. Approves a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $200,000 for conservation, strengthening and repair work to the protected heritage building located at 544 Tuam Street.
2. Approves a further second Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $200,000 for conservation, strengthening and repair work to the protected heritage building located at 544 Tuam Street in the 2018/2019 financial year, subject to funding being allocated to the Heritage Incentive Grant Fund through the 2018-2028 Long-term Plan process.
3. Notes that payment of this grant is subject to the applicant entering into a full conservation covenant, with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property title.

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for the Former Pumphouse, 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Statement of Significance - Former Pumphouse - 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for the Former Pumphouse, 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch

Reference: 17/789843
Contact: Fiona Wykes Fiona.wykes@ccc.govt.nz 941 8052

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

   Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social and Community Development Committee to recommend that Council approve a Heritage Incentive Grant for the former Pumphouse at 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch.

   Origin of Report
   1.2 This report is staff generated in response to an application for a Heritage Incentive Grant from the building’s owner.

2. Significance

   2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the dwelling, the amount of funding requested being less than $500,000.

3. Staff Recommendations

   That the Social and Community Development Committee recommend to Council that it:

   1. Approves a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $200,000 for conservation, strengthening and repair work to the protected heritage building located at 544 Tuam Street.

   2. Notes that payment of this grant is subject to the applicant entering into a full conservation covenant, with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property title.

4. Key Points

   4.1 This report supports the Council's Long Term Plan (2015 - 2025):

   4.1.1 Activity: Heritage Protection

   - Level of Service: 1.4 All grants meet Heritage Incentives Grants policy and guidelines

   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

   - Option 1 – A nominated amount of $200,000
   - Option 2 – A nominated amount of $150,000

   4.3 Options Summary – Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

   4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

   - The work will help to ensure the repair, ongoing use and future protection of this highly significant heritage building. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines.
• The building has recognised local and national architectural, social, historical and cultural significance.

• With the completion of the works outlined, the former Pumphouse will be repaired and upgraded, and the owners are committed to the continuing use and maintenance of the building.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

• This is a significant grant for a single building; however it is an investment in an important local landmark and nationally recognised heritage building that might otherwise have been lost.

• The proposal to assist the owners in their works on the building does not provide the full amount requested by the applicant, even though this was less than the percentage amounts generally awarded for comparable projects.

5. Context/Background

Building Status

5.1 The former Pumphouse is scheduled as a Highly Significant (Group 1) building in the Christchurch District Plan. The building is listed Category 2 by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) List Number 3736. The building has high historical and social significance for its association with the formation of the Christchurch Drainage Board, and the individuals responsible for the sewerage system’s design and construction. It has high cultural significance as it represents the birth of an effective and technologically advanced sewerage system that improved the quality of peoples’ lives, as well as their way of life. The building has high architectural significance, for its utilitarian design and classical detailing, and technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate period construction and engineering techniques and practices. There is contextual significance in that the building is a city landmark, and through the relationship with other buildings on the site and with surviving underground sewerage infrastructure. The building is one of the few visible, above ground components of the city’s 19th century sewerage system.

5.2 The former Pumphouse is a complex of individual buildings, the earliest of which were designed by English civil engineer William Clark. Clark had previously worked for the York and North Midland railway system in England, and the East Indian Railway Company, along with designing drainage schemes for Kingston-upon-Hull, Calcutta, and Madras. He also worked on water supply and drainage schemes for many places in Australia, along with Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch.

5.3 The building complex is a utilitarian structure with multiple gabled roofs and restrained classical detailing. It is constructed of brick with Oamaru stone details, distinctive multi-paned steel arched windows, arched doors, and round windows in some of the gables. The roofs are a mixture of slate and corrugated iron. Over time the furnace stack and the pump machinery have been removed from the site.

5.4 The current owners of the building are Paddy and Jackie Snowdon. In relation to the Operational Guidelines ‘Potential Conflict of Interest’ disclosure, the Committee should note there is no conflict of interest with this application.

5.5 The buildings suffered moderate damage in the 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquakes, although considering their age and construction they performed well. The complex has continued to be occupied, but the owners need to repair and strengthen the buildings to ensure ongoing use of the site. Due to the age and condition of the buildings the owners had been unable to get
insurance cover in recent years meaning that there was no cover in place at the time of the Canterbury earthquakes. The cost to repair and strengthen the buildings is considerable and so the owners are seeking help from external funders for the project.

5.6 The owners have decided to strengthen the buildings to 67% of New Building Standard (NBS), rather than the minimum required 34%, to ensure the security of the buildings’ future. The owners have obtained both a resource consent, and a building consent for the proposed works.

5.7 The proposed works comprise structural upgrades and repairs, to the complex of buildings. The roofs are to be repaired, the brickwork walls are to be repaired and strengthened with metal ties, windows, doors and Stonework are also to be repaired. Items such as the gantry crane are to be retained, and electrics and fire protection upgraded. All the works are in line with the Heritage Incentive Grant Policy – Operational Guidelines, and will contribute towards strengthening and retaining these important Christchurch heritage buildings for ongoing use.

5.8 The total cost for the proposed repair and upgrade of the building (including heritage and non-heritage related costs) is estimated at $1,529,986.70, excluding GST. There is no insurance payment associated with these works. The owners have secured a $200,000 grant from the Heritage EQUIP fund, run by the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, for strengthening the building to 34% NBS. No other grants have been secured to assist with these works. The owners are proposing to fund the rest of the works through insurance payments from other properties they own, business earnings and a proposed bank loan. They initially requested $400,000 from the Council’s HIG fund, paid over two years. This would equate to 26% of the overall heritage related costs, and would generally have been considered to be a reasonable proposal which could be supported by heritage staff. The request to split it over two years is seen as pragmatic, and also shows an awareness of the limits of the HIG funding, and suggests a way to limit the impact on the HIG fund in any given financial year.

5.9 However, Council staff have noted that they are unable to recommend a grant to be awarded over two years, given that the Council will be considering the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan and funding for 2018/19 and beyond cannot be guaranteed.

5.10 Council staff have assessed the grant based on the usual funding percentages awarded through the Heritage Incentive Grant Policy – Operational Guidelines. These are normally 50% and 30% of eligible heritage related works. The eligible heritage works for this proposal equate to $1,514,487. Both of these options resulted in grant amounts that are greater than the amount potentially remaining in the fund - $757,244 and $454,346 respectively.
6. **Option 1 – Nominated grant sum of $200,000 (preferred)**

**Option Description**

6.1 The proposed works are to structurally upgrade and repair the building. They involve structurally upgrading the interior of the building and carrying out repairs and reinstatement works to the interior and exterior fabric, including repairs to the stonework.

6.2 Overall the total heritage and non-heritage works being proposed are priced at $1,529,986.70, excluding GST. All relevant costs of the heritage related works ($1,514,487) are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and strengthening</td>
<td>$1,016,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifting and reinstating gantry crane</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonework repairs</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees/consents</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$128,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of conservation and restoration related work requiring assistance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,514,487</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. This has already been determined to equate to more money than the grant fund could support. The building has high historical, and social significance to Canterbury, as well as high cultural and architectural significance. The building
also has technological and craftsmanship, and contextual significance. Its ongoing repair, retention and upgrade to ensure its continuing use is worthy of support. Given the high cost of the works, and the current limitations of this grant fund, a grant of $200,000 is suggested as being appropriate for this project. This is 13% of the total works. This seeks to balance the value of both the building and the eligible works being undertaken with the limited funds available this year.

| Overall proposed Heritage Incentive Grant | $200,000 |

Significance
6.4 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with Section 2 of this report. There are no engagement requirements in the Operational Guidelines or Policy for this grant scheme.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.5 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
6.6 The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes ‘The city’s heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations’ and ‘The central city has a distinctive character and identity’. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.7 The recommendations of this report align with the relevant strategies, plans and policies as listed below:
- Recovery Strategy for Greater Christchurch – Mahere Haumanutanga o Waitaha
- The Christchurch District Plan
- Heritage Conservation Policy
- Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
- New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
- International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter 1993

Financial Implications
Cost of implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$719,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from 2016/2017</td>
<td>$76,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 129 Cambridge Terrace</td>
<td>$24,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 28 Dublin Street, Lyttelton</td>
<td>$44,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 26 Godley Quay, Lyttelton</td>
<td>$28,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 185 Kilmore Street, Christchurch</td>
<td>$204,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Funds 2017/2018</td>
<td>$139,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.8 The Heritage Protection activity includes the provision of advice, the heritage grants schemes, heritage recovery policy, and heritage education and advocacy. The Council aims to maintain and protect built, cultural and natural heritage items, areas and values which contribute to a unique city, community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past. The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the tourism industry and provides an economic benefit to the city.

6.9 Heritage Incentive Grants and conservation covenants provide financial assistance for the maintenance and enhancement of heritage areas and buildings.

6.10 The Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2015-25 Long Term Plan.

Legal Implications

6.11 Limited conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Conservation Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of $15,000 to $149,999. A full conservation covenant is required for grants of $150,000 or more.

6.12 Covenants are a comprehensive form of protection of the buildings because they are registered against the property title, ensuring that the Council’s investment is protected. A full conservation covenant will be required in association with this grant.

Risks and Mitigations

6.13 The grant scheme only allows funds to be paid out upon completion of the works, certification by Council Heritage staff and upon presentation of receipts. This ensures that the grant scheme is effective and that funds are not diverted or lost. Covenants also act as a protective mechanism, ensuring the building is retained once the work is undertaken.

Implementation

6.14 The grant recipient is expected to acquire all resource, building and other consents required for the works. Resource consent and building consent have been obtained for these works.

6.15 The grant recipient has an eighteen month time period to undertake the works and to claim the grant. An application to extend this timeframe can be made to the Council.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

6.16 The advantages of this option include:

- The work will help to ensure the repair, re-use and future protection of this highly significant heritage building. The application meets all the criteria for a grant as provided in the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy – Operational Guidelines.

- The building has recognised local and national architectural, social, historical and cultural significance.

- With the completion of the works outlined, the former Pumphouse will be repaired and upgraded, and the owners are committed to the continuing use and maintenance of the building.

- Fixing the grant ensures that some funds remain available to enable further awards to be made to projects which also achieve positive heritage outcomes should they come forward for funding.

6.17 The disadvantages of this option include:

- This is a significant grant for a single building; however it is an investment in an important local landmark and nationally recognised heritage building that might otherwise have been lost.
The proposal to assist the owners in their works on the building does not provide the full amount requested by the applicant, even though this was less than the percentage amounts generally awarded for comparable projects.

7. Option 2 – A lower level of funding – a nominated grant sum of $150,000

Option Description

7.1 As for Option 1 but with a lower level of financial support to the project. Previous HIG Grant support to other projects in the city has varied but has been generally between thirty and fifty percent of the cost of eligible works. A grant of $150,000 is proposed in the table below. A lower grant has been considered as a second option, and not the preferred option, due to the overall eligible heritage works for the item equating to more than $1,500,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund</th>
<th>$719,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from 2016/2017</td>
<td>$76,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 129 Cambridge Terrace</td>
<td>$24,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 28 Dublin Street, Lyttelton</td>
<td>$44,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 26 Godley Quay, Lyttelton</td>
<td>$28,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 185 Kilmore Street, Christchurch</td>
<td>$204,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Funds 2016/2017</td>
<td>$189,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 The Operational Guidelines for the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs. The building has historical, and social significance to Canterbury, as well as architectural, aesthetic and technological significance. Its ongoing repair and upgrade to enable its retention is worthy of support. Given the high cost of the works, but the extremely limited funds left in the Heritage Incentive Grant Fund, a nominated sum for the grant is suggested as being appropriate for this project.

| Proposed Heritage Incentive Grant | $150,000 |

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages

7.3 The advantages of this option include:

- It would leave a greater amount of money in the Heritage Incentive Grant Fund to enable further awards to be made to projects which also achieve positive heritage outcomes should they come forward for funding.

7.4 The disadvantages of this option include:

- It would provide a lower level of support from that typically granted by Council for this important heritage building repair project, at a time of significance loss and damage to heritage buildings in Christchurch and Banks Peninsula.
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(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.
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DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 520

FORMER WATERWORKS PUMPING STATION AND
SETTING, NO. 1 PUMPHOUSE – 544, 544B, 544E
TUAM STREET, CHRISTCHURCH

PHOTOGRAPH: M.VAIR-PIOVA, 06/01/2015

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE
Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

The former No. 1 Pumphouse is of high historical and social significance as it is associated with the establishment of the Christchurch Drainage Board in 1875/76, and the development of an engineering solution to address Christchurch’s inadequate 19th century sewage and drainage problems. Further, it is one of the few visible above ground components of the city’s 19th century sewerage system.

By the mid 1870s the absence of an organised sewerage and rubbish disposal system, coupled with an inadequate drainage had become a city-wide problem and the City’s high death rates from water borne diseases was a direct consequence of this unhygienic situation. In an effort to address the drainage and sewage issues on a city-wide basis an Act of Parliament passed special legislation bringing the Drainage Board into existence. The Board was tasked with planning and constructing a systematic drainage and sewerage network for both the City and the suburbs.
At Christchurch ratepayer's suggestion, following a negatively-received scheme prepared by the Drainage Board's first engineer, John Carruthers, an English civil Engineer William Clark was engaged as consulting engineer by the Board. Clark revised Carruthers plans and in April 1878 presented the board with a comprehensive drainage scheme for Christchurch and the suburbs. The key point of Clark's scheme, which was approved by the Drainage Board in May 1878, was that wastewater flows were to be admitted into the sewers, but was to be kept separate from stormwater at all costs and discharged into rivers or direct to the Estuary.

A sewage pumping station and sewage tank beneath it was to be built on land the Board owned on Matheson's Road. This would pump the city's sewerage along a rising main eastwards out of town, where a sewage farm was to be established on the sandhills. Here the sewage would be irrigated over the paddocks, fertilising the soil.

Clark provided the Drainage Board with detailed plans for the pumping station and sewage tank in April 1879 and under the management of the Drainage Boards replacement engineer C. Napier Bell, construction works began in March the following year. This involved the construction of 3.5 miles of brick and concrete sewers, the construction of the sewage tank and pumping station and the erection of English-sourced machinery. This work was carried out by Thomas H. Parsons under contract for £33,675, 1 shilling and 4 pence.

Construction of the sewage tank underneath the pumping station progressed slowly, on account of the unstable, quicksand-like subsoil, and the many baby eels that continually clogged the fans of the groundwater pumping apparatus (Star, 16 July 1879) and it wasn't until September 1882 that No. 1 Pumphouse became fully operational.

Enlarged over time, the No. 1 Pumphouse complex continued to play a key role in the disposal of city sewage until 1957, when the Drainage Board opened a new pumping station in Pages Road. The buildings were used as a maintenance depot until the 1980s when the Board vacated the site. The building and surrounds are currently used as a sewage yard.

**Cultural and Spiritual Significance**

Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

The former No. 1 Pumphouse is of high cultural significance. The sewerage system, of which the pumphouse was the cornerstone, transformed 19th century Christchurch resulting in significant improvement in residents quality and way of life and the overall amenity of the City.

This building is the subject of two paintings by Christchurch artist Doris Lusk - Pump Station (1956) and 1970.

**Architectural and Aesthetic Significance**

Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

The building has high architectural significance for its brick construction, utilitarian design and classical detailing, and technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate period construction and engineering techniques and practices. The former No. 1 Pumphouse is a complex of individual buildings, the earliest of which are of architectural and aesthetic significance for their design by English civil engineer William Clark (1821-
1880). Clark's training and work history were diverse and involved engineering roles with the York, and North Midland railway system and the East Indian Railway Company. He designed drainage systems for Kingston-upon-Hull, Calcutta, Madras and helped to prepare water supply and drainage schemes for Port Adelaide, Newcastle, Bathurst, Goulburn, Orange, Maitland (the Walla Water Works), and Brisbane, and afterwards for Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch.

The Pumphouse building is a utilitarian structure with multiple gabled roofs and restrained classical detailing. Constructed of brick with Oamaru stone detailing the building has distinctive arched windows and doors, multipaned steel windows and round windows in some of the gables. These small round windows are associated with the French Baroque style and revived by English Victorian architects in the mid-nineteenth century are also used in some of the former Dean's Estate Farm Buildings (1883) in Kahurangi Road, Riccarton. The roofs are variously slate and corrugated iron.

Alterations to the building have included the removal of the furnace stack and removal of pump machinery.

**TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE**

Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with: the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

The former No. 1 Pumphouse is of technological and craftsmanship significance for its construction methods, materials and detailing. The construction of the building, in particular sewage tank and below ground pump chamber, on an extensive area of quicksand involved considerable innovation and skill and was described at the time as a remarkable undertaking (Star,16/6/1881, p 3).

It is possible that some of the pump and drainage technology remains in the sub floor area of the building and within the setting, in which case this would also be of technological significance, as evidence of innovative pumping and drainage technology and the work of William Clark who designed the equipment.

**CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE**

Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

The former No. 1 Pumphouse and setting is of contextual significance for its City landmark status, the result of its visibility and distinctive brick gabbed roof forms. The building, is part of a group of Pumping Station and underground archaeology (decommissioned portions and working, relined portions of the sewerage system) which evidence Christchurch's 19th century sewerage infrastructure. These above ground structures share a degree of consistency in scale, form, materials and detailing. The setting of the Pumphouse consists of the immediate parcel of land with some boundary plantings of shrubs and native and exotic trees.
ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with the potential to provide physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or people.

The building and setting are of archaeological significance because they have potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, drainage and sewage technology and other human activity, including that which pre-dates 1900.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

The former No. 1 Pumphouse and setting have overall high significance to the Christchurch District, including Banks Peninsula as one of the few visible above ground components of the city’s 19th century sewerage system and for the buildings role in effecting significant improvement in the overall amenity of the City and in the lives of Christchurch residents.

The building and setting has high historical and social significance for its association with the formation of the Christchurch Drainage Board, and the individuals responsible for the sewerage systems design and construction. It has high cultural significance as the building represents the birth of an effective and technologically advanced sewerage system that brought cultural change to the City by improving people’s quality and way of life. The building has high architectural significance for its brick construction, utilitarian design and classical detailing, and technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate period construction and engineering techniques and practices. It has contextual significance as a city landmark and through its relationship with the other buildings on the site and also with surviving underground sewerage infrastructure. The building and setting have archaeological significance for their potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site including that which pre-dates 1900.

REFERENCES:


‘No poo in the sewers, please...’ Christchurch uncovered blog dated 17 October 2014
http://blog.undercoverchristchurch.co.nz/2014/10/no-poo-in-the-sewers-please/


Description of Pumphouse construction. Star., 16 June 1881, p.3

REPORT DATED: 4 MARCH 2015
Please note this assessment is based on information available at the time of writing. Due to the ongoing nature of heritage research, future reassessment of this heritage item may be necessary to reflect any changes in knowledge and understanding of its heritage significance.

Please use in conjunction with the CCC Heritage files.
11. Heritage Incentive Grant Application for St Peter's Church, 24 Main South Road, Christchurch

Reference: 17/994856
Contact: Amanda Ohs amanda.ohs@ccc.govt.nz 941 8292

1. Social and Community Development Committee Consideration

The Committee considered the report on a Heritage Incentive Grant Application for St Peter’s Church, 24 Main South Road, Christchurch. The Committee requested a report on the Summary Assessment Against Heritage Incentive Grant Criteria be included in every Heritage Incentive Grant application placed before the Committee in future.

2. Social and Community Development Committee Recommendation to Council

Staff and Committee Recommendations

That the Council:

1. Notes that Council heritage staff have considered the application for a Heritage Incentive Grant for strengthening of St Peter’s Church against the relevant policy and operational guidelines criteria and have concluded that the application does not meet the policy and operational guidelines criteria.

2. Declines a Heritage Incentive Grant for the strengthening component of the proposed work to St Peter’s Church located at 24 Main South Road, Upper Riccarton.
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1. **Purpose and Origin of Report**

   **Purpose of Report**
   
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social and Community Development Committee to consider a Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) application for strengthening works to St Peter’s Church in Upper Riccarton.

   **Origin of Report**
   
   1.2 This report is staff generated in response to an application for a Heritage Incentive Grant from the building’s owner.

2. **Significance**

   2.1 The decision in this report is of medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the heritage classification of the building and the amount of funding requested being less than $500,000.

   2.1.2 It was also noted that there were significance factors around community interest, possibly environmental, social and cultural impact, potential reputational risks to Council, and the reversibility of the effects of the decision.

3. **Staff Recommendations**

   That the Social and Community Development Committee:

   1. Notes that Council heritage staff have considered the application for a Heritage Incentive Grant for strengthening of St Peter’s Church against the relevant policy and operational guidelines criteria and have concluded that the application does not meet the policy and operational guidelines criteria.

   2. Recommends that the Council therefore declines a Heritage Incentive Grant for the strengthening component of the proposed work to St Peter’s Church located at 24 Main South Road, Upper Riccarton.

4. **Key Points**

   4.1 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2015 - 2025):

   4.1.1 Activity: Heritage Protection

   - Level of Service: 1.4.2 All grants meet Heritage Incentives Grants policy and guidelines

   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

   - Option 1 – No grant support of eligible items (preferred option)

   4.3 Options Summary – Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)
4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- The Council would be acting in accordance with the Heritage Incentive Grant Operational Guidelines and Policy.
- Heritage Incentive Grant funding will not be awarded to assist a project which arguably detracts from a positive heritage outcome for the building.
- By not supporting this grant, the Heritage Incentive Grant funds remain available to provide support for other projects which achieve more positive heritage outcomes.
- There would be no potential for Council to be perceived by some parts of the community as supporting works to a heritage building which will result in the reduction of its heritage value and significance.
- Level of Service 1.4.2 in Council’s Long Term Plan would be met.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- The Council could be perceived as not supporting an owner in the retention of their heritage building.
- The Council could be perceived as inconsistent because the works have been approved by Resource Consent.
- The owners may consider that they are not being supported in the retention of their heritage building.
- Limited covenant protection would not be achieved with this option.

5. Context/Background

Introduction

5.1 St Peter’s Church have applied for grant assistance from the Heritage Incentive Grants scheme for strengthening works which total $905,000. The strengthening work is part of a project which includes repairs, removal of the damaged transepts, alterations and substantial extensions which extend across part of the graveyard.

Heritage Status of St Peter’s Church

5.2 St Peter’s Church, graveyard and setting is currently scheduled as a Highly Significant (Group 1) building in the Christchurch District Plan. The building is listed Category 2 by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) List Number 1792.

5.3 The building is highly significant as western Christchurch’s original Anglican Church. It has been a centre of Anglican worship and parish life in Riccarton for over 150 years. It is the sole remaining example of Benjamin Mountfort’s masonry Anglican Church designs in Christchurch.

5.4 This large masonry Gothic Revival church, was built in a number of stages over several decades, by different architects and it has high architectural and aesthetic significance.

5.5 The church is built in a traditional Victorian cruciform (cross shaped) style with a square castellated (regularly spaced squared openings) tower and gabled roof forms that define the chancel, nave and transepts, and organ chamber.

5.6 The church has a high degree of integrity (the wholeness or intactness of the place) and authenticity (credibility or truthfulness of surviving evidence and knowledge of the place).
5.7 The oldest part of the present church is the Early English style stone chancel (Benjamin Mountfort, 1875). Cyril Mountfort added an Early English style nave and transepts (1901). In 1929 noted Arts and Crafts architect Cecil Wood extended the nave and added a tower and vestries to the western end. The different architectural styles blend together to create a harmonious composition of stone, slate and stained glass. In 1977 the church was reordered internally by Christchurch architect Don Donnithorne.

5.8 The graveyard dates from the 1850s and contains a large number of notable burials. The random arrangement of graves within the graveyard was reordered on the surface in the 1960s which included the existing headstones being placed in rows on new concrete strips. The result of this is that surface headstones are not actually related to the location of the graves below the surface.

5.9 For further information refer to Attachment A of this report – the Statement of Significance for St Peter’s Church. See also Figures 1, 4 and 7 below.

Earthquake damage

5.10 The building was damaged in the Canterbury earthquakes, and although the roof and gable forms remain, the transepts have been deconstructed to window sill level. The 1920s portion of the church remains structurally intact – see Figures 2 and 5 below.

Insurance

5.11 St Peter’s received an insurance settlement of $2,057,957 of which $1,421,198 remained at end of 2016 after payments for consents and professional costs, as well as temporary stabilisation and repair work on the church. Strengthening upgrade works are not covered by the insurance pay out.

Other funding

5.12 St Peter’s have received $200,000 funding from the Canterbury Earthquake Heritage Buildings Trust (CEHBT) for “Work to restore the church to its original condition” with reference to the work relating to the heritage fabric. This is discussed further in para 5.65.

5.13 St Peter’s have also been granted $30,000 ($15,000 from 2016-17 and $15,000 2017-18) by the Halswell – Hornby - Riccarton Community Board from the Discretionary Response Fund. Finance staff have advised that there is no formal financial policy that addresses the issue of organisations being granted financial assistance from different parts of Council for the same project. There is precedent for situations where one organisation has been the recipient of multiple sources of funding and this has been deemed appropriate. The guiding principle would be that the funding is not for the same activity/purpose. In this instance, the Community Board funding was specifically requested as a contribution towards compliance costs which would not appear to duplicate funding requested under the Heritage Incentive Grants fund. The applicant also adopted a very transparent approach in that they did disclose the pending Heritage Incentive Grant application.

5.14 Heritage Incentive Grant Operational Guidelines, Terms and Conditions on Eligibility allow:

“Owners of heritage buildings, places or objects who apply for heritage grants from the Christchurch Community Trust, the Lotteries Commission, the Heritage New Zealand Trust or other heritage funding sources are not precluded from applying for Council Heritage Incentive Grant funding.”

Grant Policy

5.15 The application is seeking funding only for structural strengthening elements of the work, priced at $905,000 excluding GST of which $636,208 is potentially eligible for funding (Refer 5.46).
5.16 In terms of the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy - Operational Guidelines, the owner would be eligible to apply for a HIG for the strengthening, conservation, repair and maintenance works to the original church. The construction of the alterations and additions and the removal of heritage fabric to accommodate these would not be eligible.

5.17 Provided the grant assessment criteria are met, the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy - Operational Guidelines provide for a grant of up to fifty percent of the total heritage related costs.

5.18 The Heritage Incentive Grants Policy and Operational Guidelines are intended to support the ‘conservation, protection and maintenance of...heritage forms and fabric’.

Strengthening Scheme

5.19 The strengthening scheme in the approved Resource Consent application is conceptual only and is subject to change under a more detailed assessment. In general the scheme targets a seismic strength of sixty-seven per cent of New Build Standard (NBS). This is because achieving one hundred per cent NBS would significantly increase the scope of work required to the existing structure. The new additions form part of the seismic system. The proposed steel frames provide lateral support to the nave and the chancel walls via the exposed steel trusses at eaves level and the new foundations across the transept provide the required base fixing platform for the new steel braced frames.

5.20 Foundations will be kept as shallow as possible (600-700mm) to try and avoid significant disturbance to the existing ground outside the original church. The shallowness of the graves identified in the Ground Penetrating Radar survey will be responded to in the developed design by localised foundation design to ‘hover’ or span the shallow remains to avoid any disruption or need to disinter the remains (RMA92030134, S 95a/956b report). It is likely that some of the original burials will occur in those areas of the site required for the church extensions or for the new access routes to the building. This may be a sensitive issue for the descendants of those people buried in this church yard.

5.21 The church considered several options for repair and strengthening following the earthquakes. These included reinstating what had been lost and strengthening it to thirty-three per cent of NBS (New Build Standard), which was estimated to cost a total of $4.14 million. This did not resolve parish issues around the capacity of the existing church to meet current needs.

Wider project – Repair, Alterations and Extensions

5.22 The structural strengthening works for which grant assistance is being sought form part of a larger plan to repair, upgrade, alter and extend St Peter’s Church.

5.23 Rather than retain the Church in its original form, St Peter’s Church have made the decision to remove the damaged transepts, strengthen the central area of the church, build new additions to extend the north and south transepts, alter the internal form and spaces (nave, sanctuary and new chapel), and alter the graveyard and setting, in addition to undertaking maintenance and repairs.

5.24 The aim of the proposed changes is to increase the amenity and flexibility of the church to meet contemporary needs.
5.25 The works will raise the overall building compliance to over sixty-seven per cent of NBS. The total cost for the proposed extension to repair and upgrade the building in this option (including heritage and non-heritage related costs) is estimated at $3.93 million.

5.26 Given the nature and extent of changes proposed and the impact of the project as a whole on the heritage values of the church, the strengthening work subject to this funding application should be considered as part of the full scope of works and not as an isolated element when considering potential grant assistance for St Peter’s.

5.27 The broader project impact is illustrated in the figures below:

**Figure 1**

![Photograph: St Peter’s Church, North facade prior to the earthquakes, December 2009](image)

**Figure 2**

![Photograph: St Peter’s Church, North façade, December 2014, M.Vairpiova](image)
Figure 3

Architect’s impression showing North façade with consented vestibule addition (RMA92030134)

Figure 4

Photograph: St Peter’s Church, South façade prior to the earthquakes, December 2009
Figure 5

Photograph: St Peter’s Church, South façade, December 2014, M. Vairpiova

Figure 6

Architect’s impression of consented South Side Transept Extension (RMA92030134)
Figure 7

Simplified floor plan showing consented additions

Figure 8
Detailed Floor Plan of consented works

Resource Consent

5.28 The strengthening, repair, additions and alterations have been consented through the resource consent process (RMA92030134), using external heritage professionals to provide the Council’s heritage advice.

5.29 Heritage staff provided advice on the design early on in the process, in February 2014, stating that the initial design would not be supported, due to the juxtaposed contemporary elements being at odds with and dominating the aesthetic of the historic church. Heritage staff involvement continued until it became clear their concerns were not being addressed, and they could not therefore support the proposed works. At that point, an external, independent heritage professional was appointed to provide Resource Consent staff with heritage advice on the consent to ensure that there was no perceived conflict of interest.

5.30 While a resource consent has been approved for the proposed works, this approval does not assure a positive heritage protection outcome. The resource consenting process can result in outcomes that would not necessarily be considered suitable for a Heritage Incentive Grant, even if they can be given consent through the District Plan. Resource Consent is a separate, legislative process with different, broader considerations (such as use and economic effects) to the Heritage Incentive Grants process, which is solely focused on positive heritage outcomes. The provisions of the District Plan can therefore enable works to be undertaken which result in a negative impact on heritage fabric and values. While a resource consent ensures the District Plan provisions have been adhered to,
Heritage Incentive Grant funding is assessed against best practice heritage conservation outcomes and supports the retention or enhancement of heritage values.

5.31 There is an additional factor at play in regards to the difference in approval through resource consent and assessment through the Heritage Incentive Grants criteria for this proposed work to St Peter’s Church. The St Peter’s Church resource consent was processed under the previous Christchurch City Plan which was in effect at the time the consent was lodged. That plan pre dated the current 2010 version of the ICOMOS NZ Charter (Attachment B) which was revised to remove reference to ‘clearly distinguishable’ alterations and additions being acceptable conservation practice. The 2010 ICOMOS NZ Charter conservation principle for alterations and additions (Article 21) states ‘Any alterations or additions should be compatible with the original form and fabric of the place, and should avoid inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass, colour, and material’ (emphasis added). Heritage staff’s assessment of the St Peter’s Church Heritage Incentive Grant Application below reflects this shift in conservation approach for additions and alterations to heritage buildings.

Assessment of Grant Application

5.32 The strengthening works for the Church are fully integrated with the new additions and cannot therefore be considered as an isolated element when considering potential grant assistance for St Peter’s.

5.33 Staff have considered the full scope of works (including those works within and outside of the scope of the application and HIG eligibility) against the policy and have identified that the project as a whole will result in a reduction of the heritage significance of the Church, due to the incompatibility of the alterations and additions and the loss of heritage fabric.

5.34 Heritage staff consider the proposed works to the Church are not in accordance with the Operational Guidelines as they do not conserve, maintain and protect the heritage form and fabric of the church, and do not meet the ‘Criteria for Assessing Heritage Incentive Grant Applications’, which are to be used to assess grant applications and determine the amount of the grant. The works as a whole do not meet three criteria and only meet part of two other criteria out of the seven criteria.

5.35 This full assessment is included as Attachment C and is summarised below:
## Summary assessment against HIG Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIG Operational Guidelines Criterion</th>
<th>Assessment – project as a whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage impact related criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The heritage values of the building, place or object in the post-earthquake environment of Christchurch and Banks Peninsula</td>
<td>Criterion not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The contribution the proposed work will make to the retention of the building, place or object</td>
<td>Criterion met in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The contribution that the proposed work will make to the wider heritage values of the area</td>
<td>Criterion not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The degree to which the proposed works are consistent with the conservation principles and practice of the ICOMOS (NZ) Charter and other relevant international ICOMOS Charters</td>
<td>Criterion not met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4 criteria not met</td>
<td>1 Criterion met in part</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other criteria</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 The urgency of the work required relating to the risk of damage if the work is not done in a timely manner</td>
<td>Criterion met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The availability of grant funds</td>
<td>Criterion met in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 The amount of any previous Grants for the property</td>
<td>Criterion met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 criteria met and 1 met in part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Totals</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 criteria met</td>
<td>2 criterion met in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 criteria not met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.36 The extent of the negative heritage impact of the proposed works is such that the alterations and additions will result in the building’s overall heritage value being reduced from a ‘Highly Significant’ (Group 1) heritage building for the Christchurch District to a
‘Significant’ (Group 2) heritage building, when assessed against Christchurch District Plan Policy 9.3.2.2. This is the result of the loss of original fabric and the loss of the key element of the original cruciform shape where the transepts (the two parts forming the arms of the cross shape, projecting at right angles from the nave – refer Figure 7) cross the nave, due to the transepts not being reconstructed and the manner in which the extensions are fully integrated into the original structure. This reduces the architectural and aesthetic value of the church from ‘Highly significant’ to ‘Significant’, and the integrity and authenticity of the Church from ‘High’ to ‘Moderate’.

5.37 As a ‘Significant (Group 2) Heritage Item, the Church would still be a scheduled heritage item in the District Plan, however it would have less protection in terms of the rules. The number of Highly Significant buildings would reduce from 242 to 241 of a total of 680 schedules heritage items. In terms of the definitions and policy in the District Plan, the Church will no longer make a ‘strong’ contribution to the district’s sense of place and identity or be of ‘high’ overall significance to the District.

5.38 The overall works will detract from the heritage values of the area for the wider community in terms of the prominent visual impact on the landmark church within its setting.

5.39 In addition to being one of the Heritage Incentive Grant criteria, the Council has adopted the ICOMOS NZ Charter as part of its Heritage Conservation Policy. The proposed works meet the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) NZ Charter in some respects but on balance, the works are not in alignment with the Charter.

5.40 The alterations are focused on the areas of damage where heritage fabric has been lost or partially deconstructed and the works will result in continued use for ecclesiastical purposes, which is an important aspect of the church’s heritage value – these aspects align with some of the ICOMOS Charter principles.

5.41 The proposal does not align with the ICOMOS NZ Charter in a number of key areas. The Charter advocates conservation projects to be led by conservation plans and for extant plans to be followed as good conservation practice. A conservation plan is in place for St Peter’s Church and was included as part of the Heritage Incentive Grant application. This Conservation Plan includes a conservation policy which requires the north and south transepts to be reconstructed – this conservation policy will not be met with the proposal to remove the transepts and replace them with new designs.

5.42 The manner in which the new additions and proposed structural system are fully integrated into the original church renders this work irreversible and results in a negative impact on the heritage values of the church. This does not align with the Charter which requires ‘Any change should be the minimum necessary, should be substantially reversible, and should have little or no adverse effect on the cultural heritage value of the place.’

5.43 The scale, form and materials of the new additions create a strong contrast with the original church. This renders them incompatible with the original form and fabric of the church and there will be a resultant significant adverse impact on the heritage values of the Church. This is out of alignment with the Charter which states ‘Any alterations or additions should be compatible with the original form and fabric of the place, and should avoid inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass, colour, and material. Adaptation should not dominate or substantially obscure the original form and fabric, and should not adversely affect the setting of a place of cultural heritage value. New work should complement the original form and fabric’.
Option 1 – No grant support of eligible items (preferred)

Option Description

5.44 The proposed works included in the grant application are to structurally upgrade the building. The strengthening works form part of a wider scope of work involving repairs, and the extension of the north and south transept areas with new building additions. The works have resource consent under RMA92030134. The key aspects of the consent are: strengthening the existing church; new extensions to the north and south transepts; changes to the internal spaces (nave, sanctuary and new chapel); repairs and maintenance; changes to graveyard and setting.

5.45 Overall the strengthening works being proposed are priced at $905,000 excluding GST, which include sums relating to Preliminary & General, Contract Works Insurance and Contingency, not all of which are eligible for grant funding. Heritage staff have determined $636,208 would potentially be eligible for funding.

5.46 All relevant costs of the heritage related works are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Costs (GST exclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site preparation</td>
<td>$8,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substructure</td>
<td>$161,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>$215,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor, wall and ceiling</td>
<td>$64,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal for works</strong></td>
<td><strong>$471,265</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees (15% of heritage related works above)</td>
<td>$70,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary and General, margin + contingency (20% of heritage related works above)</td>
<td>$94,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of conservation and restoration related work requiring assistance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$636,208</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

5.47 On balance, the application does not meet the requirements of the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy Operational Guidelines criteria. It is a Level of Service requirement that all grants meet Heritage Incentives Grants Policy and guidelines.

5.48 In principle, Heritage staff support strengthening, repair and maintenance works to the Church and its adaptation to meet the present needs of the congregation.

5.49 While the proposed strengthening of the church will make it more resilient in the event of future earthquakes, and the additions are intended to provide a greater space for large church gatherings and refreshments, to the benefit of the parish and community users, the design of the scheme as a whole will not achieve a positive heritage outcome. The removal rather than repair of the damaged transepts and the new, enlarged transepts to the proposed design will have adverse heritage impacts.

5.50 The Heritage Incentive grants are directed to supporting good heritage outcomes and heritage staff are limited in their assessment of this grant to heritage matters. Heritage Staff consider that the community outcomes desired of the project as a whole could have been achieved with a design that was more compatible with the heritage values of the church, and in a way which retained its level of heritage significance.

5.51 Given the loss of heritage value which will result from the project as a whole, and the Heritage Incentive Grants Operational Guidelines criteria and the related Level of Service not being met, staff cannot support a grant.
5.52 It is recommended that the application for a Heritage Incentive Grant for this project is declined.

| Proposed Heritage Incentive Grant | NIL |

**Significance**

5.53 The level of significance of this option is medium consistent with Section 2 of this report. There are no engagement requirements in the Operational Guidelines or Policy for this grant scheme.

5.54 The level of significance was determined by consideration of the localised numbers of the congregation and building users, their ongoing lack of access to the Church for funerals, worship and activities, and the community benefits if the proposal is carried out. It also considered the high public awareness of the Church’s project and fundraising drive and the potential risk to Council of media attention. Heritage staff assessed negative heritage impacts, and the member numbers of the City’s two principal heritage interest groups who have expressed concerns on the negative heritage impacts of the project were also taken into account. The alignment with the Heritage Incentive Fund guidelines and the lack of financial impact on the Heritage Incentive Grants fund were also considered.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

5.55 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, and therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**

5.56 The Heritage Incentive Grants Scheme is aligned to the Community Outcomes ‘The city’s heritage and taonga are conserved for future generations’ and ‘The central city has a distinctive character and identity’. Heritage Incentive Grants contribute towards the number of protected heritage buildings, sites and objects, which is a measure for these outcomes.

5.57 Staff have discussed the community uses and values associated with the Church site and buildings with the local Community Development Advisor. They advised that there is likely to be interest in this matter from the local community for the following reasons: the Church and its setting is a familiar landmark at a key intersection in the city; Church Corner is a defining feature in the community, for its physical location and for the historical meaning of the site; the use of the Church by an active congregation as well as the wider community.

5.58 St Peter’s Church have advised that the site and buildings provide a local community gathering place for weekly church and community activities by around 260 users each week, including Women’s Fitness Group (30); Mainly Music (32); Anglican Women’s Group (40); English Language Classes (40); Choir (35); Band (12); Youth Group (12); Good News Club (12); St John’s Cadets (30); Zumba (12); Christchurch Pops Choir (80); The A Team (handy helpers) (10); Bishop Julius Choir (10); Care Bears (12); Coffee and Chat (25). In addition the Church hosts the Horticultural Society’s annual event (60-80 people), and two local schools visit their graveyard twice a year which equates to around 600 students per annum.

5.59 The Church have indicated that 80% of these activities will be undertaken in the rebuilt church space, with the remainder occurring in the Parish Hall. The ‘Petersgate Counselling Service’ has its own building from which it provides its services for 6,000 people per annum.
5.60 The Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board are aware of the St Peter’s Church proposal. At a meeting on 28th March 2017, the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board heard a deputation from the Church and passed a resolutions (HHRB/2017/00170) to Approve the making of a grant of $15,000 from its 2016-17 Discretionary Response Fund to the Anglican Parish of Upper Riccarton-Yaldhurst as a contribution to the compliance costs for the renovation of St Peter’s Church and Approve the making of a grant of $15,000 from its 2017-18 Discretionary Response Fund to the Anglican Parish of Upper Riccarton-Yaldhurst as a contribution to the compliance costs for the renovation of St Peter’s Church.

5.61 The other group in the community which may take an interest in the Heritage Incentive grant and the St Peter’s Church project are the wider community and individuals who take an interest in heritage as well as heritage interest groups. To gauge views on the matter, heritage staff sent details of the approved Resource Consent for the Church to Architectural Historian Dr Ian Lochhead, the foremost expert on Benjamin Mountfort, Historic Places Canterbury (Chair, Mark Gerrard) and the Christchurch Civic Trust (Chair, Tim Hogan), and invited comment. These groups share similar concerns with the design of the additions and alterations as the Council’s Heritage staff.

5.62 Historic Places Canterbury believe the proposed changes are inconsistent with the ICOMOS Charter, in particular Article 21, and considered that the extra space desired by the Church could have been achieved with forms and materials which would be consistent with the style of the building (Email, 3.8.2017). Refer Attachment C.

5.63 Dr Ian Lochhead also considers the proposed design fails to meet the standards for adaptation of heritage buildings as set out in Section 21 of the ICOMOS Charter, and that ‘The proposed design makes extensive use of contrasting materials and flat-roofed forms that are incompatible with the original Gothic Revival character of the church’. Dr Lochhead also considers that the landmark status and prominent location of the Church, along with its increased importance since the earthquakes (as the sole remaining example of Benjamin Mountfort’s masonry Anglican church designs in Christchurch) mean ‘it is critically important that changes to the building are carried out in a manner that can be fully justified in terms of best practice heritage conservation’ (Letter, 31 July 2017). Refer Attachment D.

5.64 The Christchurch Civic Trust stated that the additions to the north and south transepts are very unsympathetic and incongruous in terms of scale, form and materials, and that ‘the design solution chosen is very unsympathetic to the heritage values of this very important “gateway” church, which embodies the sensitive and enduring work of several highly important Christchurch Architects.’ (Correspondence, 10. 8.2017) Refer Attachment E.

5.65 Heritage New Zealand have shown support of ‘work to restore the church to its original condition’ through the granting of funding from the Canterbury Earthquake Heritage Buildings Trust, which Heritage New Zealand manages. It is noted that community benefit and public ability to access are part of the assessment criteria for this draft, along with level of heritage significance, conservation standards and cost effectiveness.

5.66 There appears to be local community interest and support for the Church project as a whole, while on the other hand there is concern expressed on the negative heritage impacts by heritage interest groups. Therefore the recommendation to decline a Heritage Incentive Grant may be unexpected and seen as inconsistent by some and supported by others. This is further discussed under Risks and Mitigations below.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

5.67 The recommendations of this report align with the relevant strategies, plans and policies as listed below:
Council  
28 September 2017

- Recovery Strategy for Greater Christchurch – Mahere Haumanutanga o Waitaha
- The Christchurch District Plan
- Heritage Conservation Policy
- Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
- New Zealand Urban Design Protocol
- International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New Zealand Charter 2010

Financial Implications

Cost of implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Budget for the Heritage Incentive Grant (HIG) fund 2017/18</th>
<th>$719,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from 2016/2017</td>
<td>$76,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 129 Cambridge Terrace</td>
<td>$24,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 28 Dublin Street, Lyttelton</td>
<td>$44,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved grant to 26 Godley Quay</td>
<td>$28,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to 185 Kilmore Street, Christchurch</td>
<td>$204,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to the former Pumphouse, 544 Tuam Street</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed grant to St Peter’s Church, 24 Main South Road</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds 2017/2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>$139,669</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.68 By not supporting this grant, the Heritage Incentive Grants fund remains at $139,669 to provide funding for other projects which achieve more positive heritage outcomes.

5.69 The Heritage Protection activity includes the provision of advice, the heritage grants schemes, and heritage education and advocacy. The Council aims to maintain and protect built, cultural and natural heritage items, areas and values which contribute to a unique city, community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past. The Council promotes heritage as a valuable educational and interpretation resource which also contributes to the tourism industry and provides an economic benefit to the city.

5.70 Heritage Incentive Grants, with their associated conservation covenants, provide financial assistance for the maintenance and enhancement of heritage areas and buildings.

5.71 The Heritage Incentive Grant budget is an annual fund provided for in the 2015-25 Long Term Plan.

Legal Implications

5.72 This approach has been supported by the Council’s Legal Services Unit, who have advised ‘the legal risks in assessing the whole project against the funding criteria rather than treating the application for a contribution to strengthening costs in isolation are low.’ (Memorandum, Ian Thomson to Carolyn Ingles, 16 August 2017).

5.73 The Social and Community Development Committee has delegated authority to approve Heritage Incentive Grant applications up to a value of $150,000, therefore any decision to decline the grant as per the staff recommendation would need to be made by Council.

5.74 Limited conservation covenants are required under the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy - Operational Guidelines for properties receiving Heritage Incentive Grants of $15,000 to $149,999. A full covenant is required for grants of $150,000 or more.
5.75 Covenants are a comprehensive form of protection of the buildings because they are registered against the property title, ensuring that the Council’s investment is protected. Covenant protection would not be achieved with this option to not support the project.

**Risks and Mitigations**

5.76 Due to the community interest there is likely to be potential media attention regarding a decision to decline a heritage grant.

5.77 The applicant may have a strong expectation of funding support through this fund, and therefore could disagree with the decision and question the decision making process, potentially through some form of legal review.

5.78 This report has been reviewed by a representative of the Council’s Policy Centre of Excellence, and a member of Council’s legal staff, to ensure the interpretation and application of the policy and operational Guidelines criteria are correct.

**Implementation**

5.79 The grant recipient is expected to acquire all resource, building and other consents required for the works. A resource consent has already been gained for these works. The grant recipient has an eighteen month time period to undertake the works and to claim and grant that is awarded. An application to extend this timeframe can be made to the Council.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

5.80 The advantages of this option include:

- Heritage Incentive Grant funding will not be awarded to assist a project which does not result overall in a positive heritage outcome for the building.
- By not supporting this grant, the Heritage Incentive Grants funds remain available to provide support for other projects which achieve more positive heritage outcomes.
- There would be no potential for Council to be perceived as supporting works to a heritage building which will result in the reduction of its heritage value and significance to the community.
- The Council would be acting in accordance with the Heritage Incentive Grant Operational Guidelines and Policy.
- Level of Service 1.4.2 in Council’s Long Term Plan would be met.

5.81 The disadvantages of this option include:

- The Council could be perceived as not supporting an owner in the retention of their heritage building.
- The Council could be perceived as inconsistent because the works have been granted a Resource Consent.
- The owners may consider that they are not being supported in the retention of their heritage building.
- Limited covenant protection would not be achieved with this option.
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DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

ST PETER’S CHURCH,
24 MAIN SOUTH ROAD; PART OF 25, 25A YALDHURST
ROAD, CHRISTCHURCH

St Peter's Church is western Christchurch's original Anglican Church. Consecrated in 1858 it was the second church to be consecrated by Bishop Harper; after he arrived in Canterbury in 1857. In 1852 the then vicar of St Michael's, Archdeacon Mathias, gifted twenty acres for the establishment of a church. It was not until 1857 however that the Parish of Riccarton was defined, a first vicar appointed, and a church building begun. The first vicar, Rev. Crosdale Bowen, was ordained by Bishop Harper in 1857 in his first ordination for the new diocese of Canterbury. Bowen's new parish initially covered the entire western part of Christchurch and its hinterland, and was later enlarged to include Governors Bay and Little River.

As the main Anglican Church west of the city, St Peter's attracted a large congregation including many well-known early colonists and public figures. The original church proved inadequate for the needs of the growing congregation and was enlarged in 1860 and 1861. The oldest surviving portion of the present church is the Early English style chancel, added in 1875.
DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 1285

ST PETER’S CHURCH AND SETTING
24 MAIN SOUTH ROAD; PART OF 25, 25A YALDHURST ROAD, CHRISTCHURCH

PHOTOGRAPH: M. VAIR-PIOVA, 23/12/2014

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE
Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

St Peter’s Church has high historical and social significance as western Christchurch’s original Anglican Church, for the congregation that has been associated with it since the 1850s, and for the connection of the church with clergyman Crosdaile Bowen. In 1852 the vicar of St Michael’s, Archdeacon Mathias, gifted twenty acres for the establishment of a church. It was not until 1857 however that the Parish of Riccarton was defined, a first vicar appointed, and a church building begun. The first vicar, Crosdaile Bowen, was ordained by Bishop Harper in 1857 in his first ordination for the new diocese of Canterbury. Bowen’s new parish initially covered the entire western part of Christchurch and its hinterland, and was later enlarged to include Governors Bay and Little River. He was to serve the Riccarton
parish until his death in 1890, and is buried under the chancel. The new St Peter's, consecrated in 1858, was the second church to be consecrated by Harper. As the main Anglican Church west of the city, it attracted a large congregation including many well-known early colonists and public figures, a number of whom are interred in the graveyard, which was consecrated with the church. The original church proved inadequate for the needs of the growing congregation and was enlarged in 1860 and 1861. The oldest surviving portion of the present church is the Early English style chancel, added in 1875. Noted architects Benjamin Mountfort, his son Cyril Mountfort and Cecil Wood were involved in the design of the current church.

Following the Canterbury earthquakes the church was severely damaged, and though the roof and gable forms remain the transepts have been deconstructed to window sill level. The 1920s portion of the church remains structurally intact.

**Cultural and Spiritual Significance**

Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

St Peter’s Church has high cultural and spiritual significance as a centre of Anglican worship and parish life in Riccarton for over 150 years. The additions and alterations to the church over nearly eighty years indicate the centrality of the church building to the life of its community. The final addition to the church in 1929 was dedicated to Archdeacon Bowen. The church contains a number of stained glass windows, furniture and fittings which were presented as memorials to parishioners. The church, its graveyard and setting are of cultural spiritual value and tell of worship and burial practices over a period of 150 years.

**Architectural and Aesthetic Significance**

Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

St Peter’s has high architectural and aesthetic significance as a large, masonry, Gothic Revival church, built in a number of stages over several decades by different architects. These indicate the changing needs of the parish and the development of the Gothic Revival style. The original church was timber and was designed by Benjamin Mountfort and Isaac Luck, opening in 1858. This building proved inadequate for the needs of the growing congregation however, and was enlarged by Mountfort and Luck in 1860 and 1861. The oldest surviving portion of the present church is the Early English style stone chancel, added by Benjamin Mountfort in 1875. The current church is built in a typical Victorian cruciform style with a square castellated tower and gabled roof forms that define the chancel, nave and transepts and organ chamber.

A talented and individual practitioner of Neo-Gothic, Mountfort established a forty year career as one of New Zealand’s leading architects from the late 1850s. As both Provincial Architect and architect to the Anglican Diocese, he executed a large number of both secular and ecclesiastical commissions, including the Canterbury Provincial Government Buildings and Canterbury Museum. Mountfort’s many Neo-Gothic churches range widely in size and design, but are always accomplished ecclesiologically-correct compositions. After Mountfort’s death, his son and successor Cyril added an Early English style nave and transepts to St Peter’s in 1901. Cyril Mountfort’s architecture is regarded as similar but less effective than that of his father. His two most successful ecclesiastical designs are considered to be St
Luke's in Kilmore Street, now demolished, and St John's Hororata. In 1929 architect Cecil Wood extended the nave and added a tower and vestries to the western end.

Unlike the Early English Gothic of the Mountfort's sections of the church, Wood designed his additions in the late or Perpendicular Gothic. This served to not only differentiate his portion from the earlier parts, which accorded with the honesty of treatment required by the principles of the Arts and Crafts movement to which Wood subscribed, but also suggests a process of stylistic evolution common to many British parish churches, which were frequently added to over many centuries. Wood set up practice in Christchurch in 1908, and emerged as the city's leading architect between the wars. He was most well known for his domestic designs, but also executed a number of prominent educational, public and ecclesiastical commissions. Other Wood churches include St Barnabas Fendalton and St Paul's Tai Tapu. St Peter's was reordered internally in 1977 by Christchurch architect Don Domithorne. This included the choir stalls being removed from the chancel and a new altar being installed along with a semi-circular communion rail.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE

Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with: the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

St Peter's has high technological and craftsmanship significance as a large stone Gothic Revival church demonstrating three types of masonry, and for its stained glass windows. The three surviving sections of the church each show the hand of different masons working in different periods, with various types and sizes of masonry laid in different fashions. Benjamin Mountfort's chancel is constructed of large tooled blocks of brown basalt. Cyril Mountfort's nave and transepts utilise flat slabs of rock-faced grey Halswell basalt laid in courses, but is lined on the interior with red brick with Oamaru Stone banding. Wood's also used rock-faced Halswell Basalt, but larger blocks, and not in courses. Wood's section also exhibits the finest exterior carving, including in spandrel panels and the gargoyles on the tower. The facings of all these sections are Oamaru stone. St Peter's also exhibits the work of a number of leading English stained glass firms, from the late 19th and early 20th centuries, including Clayton and Bell, Heaton, Butler and Bayne, Lavers and Barraud, James Powell and Son and Lowndes and Drury, with a number of notable windows.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

The church has contextual significance as part of an ecclesiastical precinct contributed to by many of the city's most prominent architects and as a landmark building in a very traditional churchyard setting. The setting of St Peter's Church consists of the triangle of land that is the immediate land parcel and part of the neighbouring land parcel containing the old hall and new hall. Surrounding the church is the graveyard, which contains a number of mature trees. Beyond the lychgate are the verger's cottage (1901), the old hall (Clarkson and Ballantyne, 1910) and the new hall (Heathcote Helmore, c1950). These are also set in parkland type setting with many mature trees. Beyond these is part of the former glebe. Together these buildings form an important ecclesiastical, historical and architectural precinct contributed to by many of the city's most prominent architects. St Peter's Church is located on a large v-
shaped site at the intersection of the Main South and Yaldhurst Roads. Situated between these two busy arterials, but located in a very traditional, peaceful churchyard setting, St Peter’s is one of the city’s landmark buildings. The site post-earthquake now contains temporary prefabricated accommodation for the Anglican Parish and includes the offices of the Diocese and Bishop.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE
Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with: the potential to provide information through physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or objects.

St Peter’s and its setting are of archaeological significance because they have the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, burial practices and human activity on the site, including pre-1900.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT
St Peter’s Church and its setting are of high overall significance to the Christchurch District, including Banks Peninsula as western Christchurch’s original Anglican Church and for the parish and congregation that has been associated with it since the 1850s. St Peter’s Church has high historical and social significance for the connection of the church with Archdeacon Mathias who gifted twenty acres for the establishment of a church and clergyman Crossdale Bowen who was ordained by Bishop Harper in 1857 in his first ordination for the new diocese of Canterbury. It has high historical and social significance for its role within the Anglican Diocese and Riccarton community since the 1850s. St Peter’s Church has high cultural and spiritual significance as a centre of Anglican worship and for the memorials commemorating past parishioners contained within it. St Peter’s has high architectural and aesthetic significance as a large, masonry, Gothic Revival church, built in a number of stages over several decades by noted architects B W Mountfort, Cyril Mountfort and Cecil Wood. St Peter’s has high technological and craftsmanship significance as a large stone Gothic Revival church demonstrating different types of masonry construction, and for its stained glass windows. The church has contextual significance as part of an ecclesiastical precinct contributed to by many of the city’s most prominent architects as a landmark building in a very traditional churchyard setting. It has high archaeological significance because of its potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, burial practices and human activity on the site, including pre-1900.

REFERENCES:
Christchurch City Council, Heritage File, St Peter’s Church Riccarton – Main South Road/25 Yaldhurst Road
Christchurch City Council, Christchurch City Plan – Listed Heritage Item and Setting Heritage Assessment – Statement of Significance. St Peter’s Anglican Church, Graveyard and Setting – 24 Main South Road - 2011

REPORT DATED: 07/11/2014, 22 MARCH 2017
PLEASE NOTE THIS ASSESSMENT IS BASED ON INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF WRITING. DUE TO THE ONGOING NATURE OF HERITAGE RESEARCH, FUTURE REASSESSMENT OF THIS HERITAGE ITEM MAY BE NECESSARY TO REFLECT ANY CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF ITS HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE.
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DISTRICT PLAN – LISTED HERITAGE PLACE
HERITAGE ASSESSMENT – STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
HERITAGE ITEM NUMBER 355

ST PETER’S CHURCH GRAVEYARD AND SETTING -
24 MAIN SOUTH ROAD; PART OF 25, 25A YALDHURST
ROAD, CHRISTCHURCH

PHOTOGRAPH : M. VAIRO-PIOVA, 23/12/2014

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

The graveyard at St Peter’s Church has high historical and social significance for its association with the church, its use a graveyard since the 1850s and for the large number of notable Cantabrians that are buried in it. As the main Anglican Church west of the city, St Peter's Church attracted a large congregation including many well-known early colonists and public figures. A number of these people are interred in the graveyard, which was consecrated with the church in 1858. Among the many well-known figures interred there are:
province. Provincial Superintendent William Moorhouse; early settler George Moore and his daughter Anne Townsend; deaf educator Gerrit van Asch; Edward Seager who was instrumental in establishing Sunnyside Hospital and his nephew prominent architect Samuel Hurst Seager; Sir Henry Wigram and his wife; district nursing founder Sibylia Maude; John Ballantyne founder of Christchurch's well-known department store and horticulturist Edgar Stead.

CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE
Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

St Peter's graveyard has cultural and spiritual significance as part of a centre of Anglican worship and parish life for over 150 years and as the burial place for many prominent Cantabrians. It has high cultural and spiritual value as an expression of European burial practices for over 150 years.

ARCHITECTURAL AND AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE
Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

The graveyard has aesthetic significance for its spacious, well-maintained grounds containing gravestones, lawns and mature trees, surrounding St Peter's Church. The trees are mainly oaks, silver birch and yews, many of which were planted by the first vicar of the original church, the Rev. Crossdale Bown. The yews previously formed an avenue from the lychgate towards the church entrance, but many of these trees have been lost over the years. The graveyard was redeveloped in lawn cemetery fashion in 1960, with the removal of iron railings surrounding family plots and headstones placed in rows on concrete strips. To this end there has been a loss of the tangible evidence of earlier burial practices and the monumental masonry associated with this.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE
Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with: the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

The gravestones in the churchyard have technological and craftsmanship significance for the degree of craftsmanship they demonstrate in their design and execution.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE
Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

The graveyard has contextual significance as a very traditional churchyard setting and as part of an ecclesiastical precinct contributed to by many of the city's most prominent architects. The setting of St Peter's graveyard consists of the triangle of land that is the immediate land parcel and part of the neighbouring land parcel containing the old hall and...
new hall. The graveyard contains a number of mature trees and consists of a large V-shaped site at the intersection of the Main South and Yaldhurst Roads. Although situated between these two busy arteries it still presents a very traditional, peaceful churchyard setting. The graveyard was re-ordered in lawn cemetery style in 1960.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE

Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with: the potential to provide information through physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social, historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or people.

St Peter’s graveyard and its setting are of archaeological significance because they have the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past burial practices and human activity on the site, including pre-1900.

ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

The graveyard and its setting at St Peter’s Church are of high overall significance to the Christchurch District, including Banks Peninsula for its association with the church and its use a graveyard since the 1850s. The graveyard, which was consecrated with the church in 1858, has high historical and social significance for the number of notable Cantabrians that are buried in it and the role it has had in the community as part of Anglican worship and burial practices. St Peter’s graveyard has cultural and spiritual significance as part of a parish life for over 150 years and as an expression of European burial practices for over 150 years. The graveyard has aesthetic significance for its spacious, well-maintained grounds containing grave stones, lawn and mature trees, surrounding St Peter’s Church. The graveyard has contextual significance as a very traditional churchyard setting and as part of an ecclesiastical precinct contributed to by many of the city’s most prominent architects. St Peter’s graveyard and its setting are of archaeological significance because they have the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past burial practices and human activity on the site, including pre-1900.

REFERENCES:

Christchurch City Council, Heritage File, St Peter’s Church Riccarton – Main South Road/25 Yaldhurst Road
Christchurch City Council, Christchurch City Plan – Listed Heritage Item and Setting Heritage Assessment – Statement of Significance. St Peter’s Anglican Church, Graveyard and Setting – 24 Main South Road - 2011
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ST PETER’S CHURCH LYCHGATE AND SETTING
24 MAIN SOUTH ROAD; PART OF 25, 25A YALDHURST ROAD, CHRISTCHURCH

PHOTOGRAPH: M. VAIR-PIOVA, 23/12/2014

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

Historical and social values that demonstrate or are associated with: a particular person, group, organisation, institution, event, phase or activity; the continuity and/or change of a phase or activity; social, historical, traditional, economic, political or other patterns.

The lychgate at St Peter’s Church has historical and social significance for its association with the church site and formerly as the original porch for the 1858 church. It was designed by Benjamin Mountfort and Isaac Luck as part of the first timber church on the site. It was removed and erected as the lychgate following the 1929 additions made to the church by Cecil Wood.

CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Cultural and spiritual values that demonstrate or are associated with the distinctive characteristics of a way of life, philosophy, tradition, religion, or other belief, including: the
symbolic or commemorative value of the place; significance to Tangata Whenua; and/or associations with an identifiable group and esteemed by this group for its cultural values.

The lychgate and setting at St Peter’s Church have cultural and spiritual significance as part of a site that has been a centre of Anglican worship and parish life for over 150 years. The site is held in high regard by the parishioners.

ARCHITECTURAL AND AESTHETIC SIGNIFICANCE
Architectural and aesthetic values that demonstrate or are associated with a particular style, period or designer, design values, form, scale, colour, texture and material of the place.

The lychgate has architectural and aesthetic significance as the only surviving remnant of the original 1658 church, being the former porch. It is of a deep gabled roof form with an exposed rafter roof, low side walls and gothic detail in the inset decorative barge boards. The original church was designed by Benjamin Mountfort and his business partner at the time Isaac Luck. Luck arrived in New Zealand in 1851, advertising himself as a builder, architect and surveyor. Luck went into partnership with Mountfort in 1857, having previously married his sister in 1853. He and Mountfort worked on several projects together over the 8 year partnership with current research suggesting this was the first of them. The original timber church was designed to suggest successive periods of construction through differing styles, as is found with mediaeval churches. The porch also reflected this reference to mediaeval examples, such as the famous 15th century timber porch of Margetting Church in Essex. In 1929 when Cecil Wood extended the nave and added a tower and vestries to the stone church, the porch was recycled to become the lychgate.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND CRAFTSMANSHIP SIGNIFICANCE
Technological and craftsmanship values that demonstrate or are associated with the nature and use of materials, finishes and/or technological or constructional methods which were innovative, or of notable quality for the period.

The lychgate at St Peter’s Church has technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate timber construction techniques from the 19th century and for the detailed craftsmanship employed in the decorative elements.

CONTEXTUAL SIGNIFICANCE
Contextual values that demonstrate or are associated with a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognized landmarks and landscape which are recognized and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.

The lychgate has contextual significance as part of the churchyard with its established trees and graves. The setting for the lychgate is within the churchyard and consists of the triangle of land that is the immediate land parcel and part of the neighbouring land parcel containing the old hall and new hall. It sits on the western edge of the graveyard, providing access to the parcel of land leading to the other buildings in the ecclesiastical precinct. The remains of an avenue of yew trees leads from the lychgate to the church entrance.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE
Archaeological or scientific values that demonstrate or are associated with the potential to provide information through physical or scientific evidence an understanding about social
historical, cultural, spiritual, technological or other values of past events, activities, structures or people.

Although a relocated remnant of the original church, the St Peter’s Church lychgate and its setting are of archaeological significance because they have the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site, including pre-1900.

**Assessment Statement**

The lychgate at St Peter’s Church and its setting are of overall significance to the Christchurch District, including Banks Peninsula for its association with the church site and formerly as the original porch for the 1858 church. The lychgate at St Peter’s Church has historical and social significance for its association with the church site and formerly as the original porch for the 1858 church. The lychgate and setting at St Peter’s Church have cultural and spiritual significance as part of a site that has been a centre of Anglican worship and parish life for over 150 years. It has architectural and aesthetic significance for its design by Benjamin Mountfort and Isaac Lick and as the only surviving remnant of the original 1858 church, being the former porch. The lychgate at St Peter’s Church has technological and craftsmanship significance for its ability to demonstrate timber construction techniques from the 19th century. The lychgate has contextual significance as part of the churchyard with its established trees and graves and although a relocated remnant of the original church, the St Peter’s Church lychgate and its setting are of archaeological significance because they have the potential to provide archaeological evidence relating to past building construction methods and materials, and human activity on the site, including pre-1900.

**References:**

Christchurch City Council, Heritage File, St Peter’s Church Riccarton – Main South Road/25 Yaldhurst Road
Christchurch City Council, Christchurch City Plan – Listed Heritage Item and Setting Heritage Assessment – Statement of Significance. St Peter’s Anglican Church, Graveyard and Setting – 24 Main South Road - 2011

**Report Dated:** 07/11/2014, 22 March 2017

---

**Please note this assessment is based on information available at the time of writing. Due to the ongoing nature of heritage research, future reassessment of this heritage item may be necessary to reflect any changes in knowledge and understanding of its heritage significance.**

**Please use in conjunction with the CCC heritage files.**
ICOMOS New Zealand Charter
for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value
Revised 2010

Preamble

New Zealand retains a unique assemblage of places of cultural heritage value relating to its Indigenous and more recent peoples. These areas, cultural landscapes and features, buildings and structures, gardens, archaeological sites, traditional sites, monuments, and sacred places are treasures of distinctive value that have accrued meanings over time. New Zealand shares a general responsibility with the rest of humanity to safeguard its cultural heritage places for present and future generations. More specifically, the people of New Zealand have particular ways of perceiving, relating to, and conserving their cultural heritage places.

Following the spirit of the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter - 1964), this charter sets out principles to guide the conservation of places of cultural heritage value in New Zealand. It is a statement of professional principles for members of ICOMOS New Zealand.

This charter is also intended to guide all those involved in the various aspects of conservation work, including owners, guardians, managers, developers, planners, architects, engineers, craftspeople and those in the construction trades, heritage practitioners and advisors, and local and central government authorities. It offers guidance for communities, organisations, and individuals involved with the conservation and management of cultural heritage places.

This charter should be made an integral part of statutory or regulatory heritage management policies or plans, and should provide support for decision makers in statutory or regulatory processes.

Each article of this charter must be read in the light of all the others. Words in bold in the text are defined in the definitions section of this charter.

This revised charter was adopted by the New Zealand National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites at its meeting on 4 September 2010.

Purpose of conservation

1. The purpose of conservation

The purpose of conservation is to care for places of cultural heritage value.

In general, such places:
(i) have lasting values and can be appreciated in their own right;
(ii) inform us about the past and the cultures of those who came before us;
(iii) provide tangible evidence of the continuity between past, present, and future;
(iv) underpin and reinforce community identity and relationships to ancestors and the land; and
(v) provide a measure against which the achievements of the present can be compared.

It is the purpose of conservation to retain and reveal such values, and to support the ongoing meanings and functions of places of cultural heritage value, in the interests of present and future generations.
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Conservation principles

2. Understanding cultural heritage value

Conservation of a place should be based on an understanding and appreciation of all aspects of its cultural heritage value, both tangible and intangible. All available forms of knowledge and evidence provide the means of understanding a place and its cultural heritage value and cultural heritage significance. Cultural heritage value should be understood through consultation with connected people, systematic documentary and oral research, physical investigation and recording of the place, and other relevant methods.

All relevant cultural heritage values should be recognised, respected, and, where appropriate, revealed, including values which differ, conflict, or compete.

The policy for managing all aspects of a place, including its conservation and its use, is the implementation of the policy, must be based on an understanding of its cultural heritage value.

3. Indigenous cultural heritage

The indigenous cultural heritage of tangata whenua relates to whenau, hapu, and iwi groups. It shapes identity and enhances wellbeing, and it has particular cultural meanings and values for the present, and associations with those who have gone before. Indigenous cultural heritage brings with it responsibilities of guardianship and the practical application and passing on of associated knowledge, traditional skills, and practices.

The Treaty of Waitangi is the founding document of our nation. Article 2 of the Treaty recognises and guarantees the protection of tino rangatiratanga, and so empowers kaitiakitanga as customary trusteeship to be exercised by tangata whenua. This customary trusteeship is exercised over their taonga, such as sacred and traditional places, built heritage, traditional practices, and other cultural heritage resources. This obligation extends beyond current legal ownership wherever such cultural heritage exists.

Particular motuarongare, or knowledge of cultural heritage meaning, value, and practice, is associated with places. Motuaronga is sustained and transmitted through oral, written, and physical forms determined by tangata whenua. The conservation of such places is therefore conditional on decisions made in associated tangata whenua communities, and should proceed only in this context. In particular, protocols of access, authority, ritual, and practice are determined at a local level and should be respected.

4. Planning for conservation

Conservation should be subject to prior documented assessment and planning.

All conservation work should be based on a conservation plan which identifies the cultural heritage value and cultural heritage significance of the place, the conservation policies, and the extent of the recommended works.

The conservation plan should give the highest priority to the authenticity and integrity of the place.

Other guiding documents such as, but not limited to, management plans, cyclical maintenance plans, specifications for conservation work, interpretation plans, risk mitigation plans, or emergency plans should be guided by a conservation plan.
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5. Respect for surviving evidence and knowledge

Conservation maintains and reveals the authenticity and integrity of a place, and involves the least possible loss of fabric or evidence of cultural heritage value. Respect for all forms of knowledge and existing evidence, of both tangible and intangible values, is essential to the authenticity and integrity of the place.

Conservation recognises the evidence of time and the contributions of all periods. The conservation of a place should identify and respect all aspects of its cultural heritage value without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others.

The removal or obscuring of any physical evidence of any period or activity should be minimised, and should be explicitly justified where it does occur. The fabric of a particular period or activity may be obscured or removed if assessment shows that its removal would not diminish the cultural heritage value of the place.

In conservation, evidence of the functions and intangible meanings of places of cultural heritage value should be respected.

6. Minimum intervention

Work undertaken at a place of cultural heritage value should involve the least degree of intervention consistent with conservation and the principles of this charter.

Intervention should be the minimum necessary to ensure the retention of tangible and intangible values and the continuation of uses integral to those values. The removal of fabric or the alteration of features and spaces that have cultural heritage value should be avoided.

7. Physical investigation

Physical investigation of a place provides primary evidence that cannot be gained from any other source. Physical investigation should be carried out according to currently accepted professional standards, and should be documented through systematic recording.

Invasive investigation of fabric of any period should be carried out only where knowledge may be significantly extended, or where it is necessary to establish the existence of fabric of cultural heritage value, or where it is necessary for conservation works, or where such fabric is about to be damaged or destroyed or made inaccessible. The extent of invasive investigation should minimise the disturbance of significant fabric.

8. Use

The conservation of a place of cultural heritage value is usually facilitated by the place serving a useful purpose.

Where the use of a place is integral to its cultural heritage value, that use should be retained.

Where a change of use is proposed, the new use should be compatible with the cultural heritage value of the place, and should have little or no adverse effect on the cultural heritage value.
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9. Setting

Where the setting of a place is integral to its cultural heritage value, that setting should be conserved with the place itself. If the setting no longer contributes to the cultural heritage value of the place, and if reconstruction of the setting can be justified, any reconstruction of the setting should be based on an understanding of all aspects of the cultural heritage value of the place.

10. Relocation

The on-going association of a structure or feature of cultural heritage value with its location, site, context, and setting is essential to its authenticity and integrity. Therefore, a structure or feature of cultural heritage value should remain on its original site.

Relocation of a structure or feature of cultural heritage value, where its removal is required in order to clear its site for a different purpose or construction, or where its removal is required to enable its use on a different site, is not a desirable outcome and is not a conservation process.

In exceptional circumstances, a structure of cultural heritage value may be relocated if its current site is in imminent danger, and if all other means of sustaining the structure in its current location have been exhausted. In this event, the new location should provide a setting compatible with the cultural heritage value of the structure.

11. Documentation and archiving

The cultural heritage value and cultural heritage significance of a place and all aspects of its conservation should be fully documented to ensure that this information is available to present and future generations.

Documentation includes information about all changes to the place and any decisions made during the conservation process.

Documentation should be entered into archival standards to maximise the longevity of the record, and should be placed in an appropriate archival repository.

Documentation should be made available to connected people and other interested parties. Where reasons for confidentiality exist, such as security, privacy, or cultural appropriateness, some information may not always be publicly accessible.

12. Recording

Evidence provided by the fabric of a place should be identified and understood through systematic research, recording, and analysis.

Recording is an essential part of the physical investigation of a place. It informs and guides the conservation process and its planning. Systematic recording should occur prior to, during, and following any intervention. If it should include the recording of new evidence revealed, and any fabric obscured or removed.

Recording of the changes to a place should continue throughout its life.
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13. Fixtures, fittings, and contents

Fixtures, fittings, and contents that are integral to the cultural heritage value of a place should be retained and conserved with the place. Such fixtures, fittings, and contents may include carving, painting, weaving, stained glass, wallpaper, surface decoration, works of art, equipment and machinery, furniture, and personal belongings.

Conservation of any such material should involve specialist conservation expertise appropriate to the material. Where it is necessary to remove any such material, it should be recorded, retained, and protected, until such time as it can be reinstated.

Conservation processes and practice

14. Conservation plans

A conservation plan, based on the principles of this charter, should:

(i) be based on a comprehensive understanding of the cultural heritage value of the place and assessment of its cultural heritage significance;
(ii) include an assessment of the fabric of the place, and its condition;
(iii) give the highest priority to the authenticity and integrity of the place;
(iv) include the entirety of the place, including the setting;
(v) be prepared by objective professionals in appropriate disciplines;
(vi) consider the needs, abilities, and resources of connected people;
(vii) not be influenced by prior expectations of change or development;
(viii) specify conservation policies to guide decision making and to guide any work to be undertaken;
(ix) make recommendations for the conservation of the place; and
(x) be regularly revised and kept up to date.

15. Conservation projects

Conservation projects should include the following:

(i) consultation with interested parties and connected people, continuing throughout the project;
(ii) opportunities for interested parties and connected people to contribute to and participate in the project;
(iii) research into documentary and oral history, using all relevant sources and repositories of knowledge;
(iv) physical investigation of the place as appropriate;
(v) use of all appropriate methods of recording, such as written, drawn, and photographic;
(vi) the preparation of a conservation plan which meets the principles of this charter;
(vii) guidance on appropriate use of the place;
(viii) the implementation of any planned conservation work;
(ix) the documentation of the conservation work as it proceeds; and
(x) where appropriate, the deposit of all records in an archival repository.

A conservation project must not be commenced until any required statutory authorisation has been granted.

ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010  Page 5
16. Professional, trade, and craft skills

All aspects of conservation work should be planned, directed, supervised, and undertaken by people with appropriate conservation training and experience directly relevant to the project.

All conservation disciplines, arts, crafts, trades, and traditional skills and practices that are relevant to the project should be applied and promoted.

17. Degrees of intervention for conservation purposes

Following research, recording, assessment, and planning, intervention for conservation purposes may include, in increasing degrees of intervention:

(i) preservation, through stabilisation, maintenance, or repair;
(ii) restoration, through reassembly, reinstatement, or removal;
(iii) reconstruction; and
(iv) adaptation.

In many conservation projects a range of processes may be utilised. Where appropriate, conservation processes may be applied to individual parts or components of a place of cultural heritage value.

The extent of any intervention for conservation purposes should be guided by the cultural heritage value of a place and the policies for its management as identified in a conservation plan. Any intervention which would reduce or compromise cultural heritage value is undesirable and should not occur.

Preference should be given to the least degree of intervention, consistent with this charter.

Re-creation, meaning the conjectural reconstruction of a structure or place; replication, meaning to make a copy of an existing or former structure or place; or the construction of generalised representations of typical features or structures, are not conservation processes and are outside the scope of this charter.

18. Preservation

Preservation of a place involves as little intervention as possible, to ensure its long-term survival and the continuation of its cultural heritage value.

Preservation processes should not obscure or remove the patina of age, particularly where it contributes to the authenticity and integrity of the place, or where it contributes to the structural stability of materials.

i. Stabilisation

Processes of decay should be slowed by providing treatment or support.

ii. Maintenance

A place of cultural heritage value should be maintained regularly. Maintenance should be carried out according to a plan or work programme.

iii. Repair

Repair of a place of cultural heritage value should utilise matching or similar materials. Where it is necessary to employ new materials, they should be distinguishable by experts, and should be documented.
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Traditional methods and materials should be given preference in conservation work.

Repair of a technically higher standard than that achieved with the existing material or construction practices may be justified only where the stability or life expectancy of the site or material is increased, where the new material is compatible with the old, and where the cultural heritage value is not diminished.

19. Restoration

The process of restoration typically involves reassembly and reinstatement, and may involve the removal of accretions that detract from the cultural heritage value of a place.

Restoration is based on respect for existing fabric, and on the identification and analysis of all available evidence, so that the cultural heritage value of a place is recovered or revealed. Restoration should be carried out only if the cultural heritage value of the place is recovered or revealed by the process.

Restoration does not involve conjecture.

i. Reassembly and reinstatement

Reassembly uses existing material and, through the process of reinstatement, returns it to its former position. Reassembly is more likely to involve work on part of a place rather than the whole place.

ii. Removal

Occasionally, existing fabric may need to be permanently removed from a place. This may be for reasons of advanced decay, or loss of structural integrity, or because particular fabric has been identified in a conservation plan as detracting from the cultural heritage value of the place.

The fabric removed should be systematically recorded before and during its removal. In some cases it may be appropriate to store, on a long-term basis, material of evidential value that has been removed.

20. Reconstruction

Reconstruction is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material to replace material that has been lost.

Reconstruction is appropriate if it is essential to the function, integrity, intangible value, or understanding of a place, if sufficient physical and documentary evidence exists to minimise conjecture, and if surviving cultural heritage value is preserved.

Reconstructed elements should not usually constitute the majority of a place or structure.

21. Adaptation

The conservation of a place of cultural heritage value is usually facilitated by the place serving a useful purpose. Proposals for adaptation of a place may arise from maintaining its continuing use, or from a proposed change of use.
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Alterations and additions may be acceptable where they are necessary for a compatible use of the place. Any change should be the minimum necessary, should be substantially reversible, and should have little or no adverse effect on the cultural heritage value of the place.

Any alterations or additions should be compatible with the original form and fabric of the place, and should avoid inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass, colour, and material. Adaptation should not dominate or substantially obscure the original form and fabric, and should not adversely affect the setting of a place of cultural heritage value. New work should complement the original form and fabric.

22. Non-intervention

In some circumstances, assessment of the cultural heritage value of a place may show that it is not desirable to undertake any conservation intervention at that time. This approach may be appropriate where undisturbed constancy of intangible values, such as the spiritual associations of a sacred place, may be more important than its physical attributes.

23. Interpretation

Interpretation actively enhances public understanding of all aspects of places of cultural heritage value and their conservation. Relevant cultural protocols are integral to that understanding, and should be identified and observed.

Where appropriate, interpretation should assist the understanding of tangible and intangible values of a place which may not be readily perceived, such as the sequence of construction and change, and the meanings and associations of the place for connected people.

Any interpretation should respect the cultural heritage value of a place. Interpretation methods should be appropriate to the place. Physical interventions for interpretation purposes should not detract from the experience of the place, and should not have an adverse effect on its tangible or intangible values.

24. Risk mitigation

Places of cultural heritage value may be vulnerable to natural disasters such as flood, storm, or earthquake; or to humanly induced threats and risks such as those arising from earthworks, subdivision and development, buildings works, or willful damage or neglect. In order to safeguard cultural heritage value, planning for risk mitigation and emergency management is necessary.

Potential risks to any place of cultural heritage value should be assessed. Where appropriate, a risk mitigation plan, an emergency plan, and/or a protection plan should be prepared, and implemented as far as possible, with reference to a conservation plan.
Definitions

For the purposes of this charter:

Adaptation means the process(es) of modifying a place for a compatible use while retaining its cultural heritage value. Adaptation processes include alteration and addition.

Authenticity means the credibility or truthfulness of the surviving evidence and knowledge of the cultural heritage value of a place. Relevant evidence includes form and design, substance and fabric, technology and craftsmanship, location and surroundings, context and setting, use and function, traditions, spiritual essence, and sense of place, and includes tangible and intangible values. Assessment of authenticity is based on identification and analysis of relevant evidence and knowledge, and respect for its cultural context.

Compatible use means a use which is consistent with the cultural heritage value of a place, and which has little or no adverse impact on its authenticity and integrity.

Connected people means any groups, organisations, or individuals having a sense of association with or responsibility for a place of cultural heritage value.

Conservation means all the processes of understanding and caring for a place so as to safeguard its cultural heritage value. Conservation is based on respect for the existing fabric, associations, meanings, and use of the place. It requires a cautious approach of doing as much work as necessary but as little as possible, and retaining authenticity and integrity, to ensure that the place and its values are passed on to future generations.

Conservation plan means an objective report which documents the history, fabric, and cultural heritage value of a place, assesses its cultural heritage significance, describes the condition of the place, outlines conservation policies for managing the place, and makes recommendations for the conservation of the place.

Contents means movable objects, collections, chattels, documents, works of art, and ephemera that are not fixed or fitted to a place, and which have been assessed as being integral to its cultural heritage value.

Cultural heritage significance means the cultural heritage value of a place relative to other similar or comparable places, recognising the particular cultural context of the place.

Cultural heritage value(s) means possessing aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, commemorative, functional, historical, landscape, monumental, scientific, social, spiritual, symbolic, technological, traditional, or other tangible or intangible values, associated with human activity.

Cultural landscapes means an area possessing cultural heritage value arising from the relationships between people and the environment. Cultural landscapes may have been designed, such as gardens, or may have evolved from human settlement and land use over time, resulting in a diversity of distinctive landscapes in different areas. Associative cultural landscapes, such as sacred mountains, may lack tangible cultural elements but may have strong intangible cultural or spiritual associations.

Documentation means collecting, recording, keeping, and managing information about a place and its cultural heritage value, including information about its history, fabric, and meaning; information about decisions taken; and information about physical changes and interventions made to the place.
Fabric means all the physical material of a place, including subsurface material, structures, and interior and exterior surfaces including the patina of age; and including fixtures and fittings, and gardens and plantings.

Hapu means a section of a large tribe of the tangata whenua.

Intangible value means the abstract cultural heritage value of the meanings or associations of a place, including commemorative, historical, social, spiritual, symbolic, or traditional values.

Integrity means the wholeness or intactness of a place, including its meaning and sense of place, and all the tangible and intangible attributes and elements necessary to express its cultural heritage value.

Intervention means any activity that causes disturbance of or alteration to a place or its fabric. Intervention includes archaeological excavation, invasive investigation of built structures, and any intervention for conservation purposes.

Iwi means a tribe of the tangata whenua.

Kaitiakitanga means the duty of customary trusteeship, stewardship, guardianship, and protection of land, resources, or toanga.

Maintenance means regular and on-going protective care of a place to prevent deterioration and to retain its cultural heritage value.

Motavanga means traditional or cultural knowledge of the tangata whenua.

Non-intervention means to choose not to undertake any activity that causes disturbance of or alteration to a place or its fabric.

Place means any land having cultural heritage value in New Zealand, including areas, cultural landscapes, buildings, structures, and monuments; groups of buildings, structures, or monuments; gardens and plantings; archaeological sites and features; traditional sites; sacred places; townscape and streetscape; and settlements. Place may also include land covered by water, and any body of water. Place includes the setting of any such place.

Preservation means to maintain a place with as little change as possible.

Reassembly means to put existing but disarticulated parts of a structure back together.

Reconstruction means to build again as closely as possible to a documented earlier form, using new materials.

Recording means the process of capturing information and creating an archival record of the fabric and setting of a place, including its configuration, condition, use, and change over time.

Reinstatement means to put material components of a place, including the products of reassembly, back in position.

Repair means to make good decayed or damaged fabric using identical, closely similar, or otherwise appropriate material.

Restoration means to return a place to a known earlier form, by reassembly and reinstatement, and/or by removal of elements that detract from its cultural heritage value.

Setting means the area around and/or adjacent to a place of cultural heritage value that is integral to its function, meaning, and relationships. Setting includes the structures, outbuildings, features, gardens, curtilage, dispersal, and accessways forming the spatial context of the place or used...
In association with the place, *setting* also includes *cultural landscapes*, townscapes, and streetscapes; perspectives, views, and viewpoints to and from a place; and relationships with other places which contribute to the *cultural heritage value* of the place. *Setting* may extend beyond the area defined by legal title, and may include a buffer zone necessary for the long-term protection of the *cultural heritage value* of the place.

*Stabilisation* means the arrest or slowing of the processes of decay.

*Structure* means any building, standing remains, equipment, device, or other facility made by people and which is fixed to the land.

*Tangata whenua* means generally the original indigenous inhabitants of the land, and means specifically the people exercising *kaitiakitanga* over particular land, resources, or *taonga*.

*Tangible value* means the physically observable *cultural heritage value* of a place, including archaeological, architectural, landscape, monumental, scientific, or technological values.

*Taonga* means anything highly prized for its cultural, economic, historical, spiritual, or traditional value, including land and natural and cultural resources.

*Tino rangatiratanga* means the exercise of full citizenship, authority, and responsibility.

*Use* means the functions of a place, and the activities and practices that may occur at the place. The functions, activities, and practices may in themselves be of *cultural heritage value*.

*Whanau* means an extended family which is part of a *hapu* or *iwi*.

---
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Assessment of St Peter’s Church Heritage Incentive Grant Application against the Operational Guidelines ‘Criteria for Assessing Heritage Incentive Grant Applications’.

1. The heritage values of the building, place or object in the post-earthquake environment of Christchurch and Banks Peninsula.

The building has high historical and social, cultural and spiritual, architectural and aesthetic, technological and craftsmanship value. In addition it is also of contextual and archaeological significance to Canterbury. St Peter’s Church remains an important landmark. It has become a rare example of Cecil Wood’s architecture (much has been lost in the Earthquakes). St Peter’s Church is a rare surviving example of a stone church, particularly one in an English Style churchyard. Architectural Historian Dr Ian Lochhead, foremost expert on the work of Benjamin Mountfort, has stated that the Church is of its increased importance since the earthquakes as the sole remaining example of Benjamin Mountfort’s masonry Anglican church designs in Christchurch. The church currently has a high degree of integrity and authenticity even considering the earthquake damage it sustained with the collapse of some stonework, and necessary stabilisation and make safe works.

Following the completion of the consented alterations and extension works this “high level” would be reduced to a moderate degree of authenticity and integrity. This loss of heritage value results from the loss of original fabric and the eradication of the key element of the ecclesiastical architectural form – the original cruciform shape where the transepts cross the nave. The manner in which these extensions are fully integrated into the original structure entirely obscures the original cruciform plan and permanently alters the original design. The Church will have a significantly reduced level of cultural heritage value with the loss of this original and traditional cruciform plan. Although the approved works repair and strengthen the church, they do not reintegrate the integrity of the transepts. The associated alterations to the exterior form and features, including the visibility, design and materials of the new additions and their physical and visual integration within the original church building, will permanently and adversely alter the original overall form, appearance and sense of place. This significantly reduces St Peters high level of authenticity and integrity.

Assessment of the significance of the church taking into account the consented repair, strengthening and additions has been undertaken by the Heritage Team. This has indicated that the additions and alterations which are beyond the scope of the grant eligible works will result in a reduction in the architectural and aesthetic value of the church and a reduction of its integrity and authenticity. This results in a consequential reduction in the overall heritage significance of St Peters from a Highly Significant (Group 1) to a Significant (Group 2) Heritage Item. This assessment was undertaken using the process and criteria for identification and assessment of historic heritage for scheduling in the District Plan (Christchurch District Plan Policy 9.3.2.2).

Upon completion of the consented works St Peters would meet 3 of the District Plan heritage assessment criteria at a highly significant level, and 3 at a significant level. This is a change from its current assessment with 4 of the criteria met at the highly significant level and 2 at a significant level. Considering the importance of the architectural value to the overall significance of the church, the reduction of this value from highly significant to significant does have an impact on its overall heritage value.

Assessment – criterion met in part

2. The contribution the proposed work will make to the retention of the building, place or object.
The repairs and strengthening will enable the church to be retained and remain in use. Although the alterations and additions form part of the strengthening solution chosen, repair and strengthening of the church could be achieved without the additions. The Church considers the additions necessary to accommodate a new way of worship and increase the size of the venue. However, the Heritage Team considers that the design and the way in which the additions have been incorporated into the heritage building have a negative impact on its heritage significance. In addition – the whole building is not being retained with the proposed works – the remaining fabric of the damaged transepts and the form of the transepts which create the cruciform shape will be lost. With these changes carried out, the Church would still meet the threshold for listing as a Heritage Item in the District Plan, however as outlined above, this would be at a lower level of significance and protection.

Assessment – Criterion met

3. The contribution that the proposed work will make to the wider heritage values of the area.

The strengthening will ensure the building is resilient in future events, and that the church will be able to continue its use as a place of worship for the local parishioners. The additions are intended to provide a greater space for large church gatherings and refreshments, to the benefit of the parish. However, the proposal as a whole will detract from the wider heritage values of the area in terms of the effect of its size, design and location. The additions are very visually prominent for this landmark building and setting on a busy corner site. St Peters and its setting give the name to the area – Church Corner. The form and materials of the church will be significantly altered following the proposed works, and these changes will be fully visible to the community. The works will have an adverse effect on the landmark importance of the site.

Assessment – Criterion not met

4. The degree to which the proposed works are consistent with the conservation principles and practice of the ICOMOS (NZ) Charter and other relevant international ICOMOS Charters.

The proposed works as a whole meet the ICOMOS Charter in some respects but not in others. The full scope of works proposed for St Peter’s Church are considered against the relevant sections of the ICOMOS NZ Charter, 2010 below:

Article 4. Planning for Conservation - ‘The extent of any intervention for conservation purposes should be guided by the cultural heritage value of a place and the policies for its management as identified in a conservation plan.’ The Conservation Plan (CP) for St Peter’s Church has been used to inform the project. However not all the works are in alignment with the CP policies. Specifically, the CP states that the church should be restored to its original form with the north and south transepts and the organ loft being reconstructed (CP Part 6. Implementation of policies). This will not be achieved with the alterations and additions.

Article 5. Respect for surviving evidence and knowledge - ‘Conservation maintains and reveals the authenticity and integrity of a place, and involves the least possible loss of fabric or evidence of cultural heritage value;’ ‘Any intervention which would reduce or compromise cultural heritage value is undesirable and should not occur.’ The alterations are focused on the areas of damage where heritage fabric has been lost or partially deconstructed. Reconstruction and strengthening without the additions would require further deconstruction of fabric, but the materials could be reused to minimise the loss of heritage fabric. As discussed above, the alterations and additions will reduce the level of integrity and authenticity and heritage value of the church.
Article 6. Minimum Intervention - "Intervention should be the minimum necessary to ensure the retention of tangible and intangible values and the continuation of uses integral to those values. The removal of fabric or the alteration of features and spaces that have cultural heritage value should be avoided." Overall, the majority of the church's heritage fabric remains intact and is not greatly affected by the proposed works. However, the impact on the overall heritage value of the church is significant. The new additions are visually prominent and will result in the permanent loss of heritage fabric. They will permanently alter the form, features and spaces of the church, and result in the reduction of the listed building's architectural and aesthetic value. The impact of the alterations is increased by the visibility of the church within its setting and its landmark prominence. The works as a whole will reduce the church's heritage value from 'Highly Significant' to 'Significant' in the Christchurch District Plan.

Article 8. Use - "The conservation of a place of cultural heritage value is usually facilitated by the place serving a useful purpose". The works will result in continued use for ecclesiastical purposes, which is an important aspect of the church's heritage value.

Article 9. Setting - "Where the setting of a place is integral to its cultural heritage value, that setting should be conserved with the place itself." The alterations will reduce the setting area. The works will also build over burials and necessitate the moving of headstones. Although the headstones have been relocated in the past to obscure the reading of the burial locations there will be some further adverse effect on the setting.

Article 17. Degrees of intervention for conservation purposes - "The extent of any intervention for conservation purposes should be guided by the cultural heritage value of a place and the policies for its management as identified in a conservation plan. Any intervention which would reduce or compromise cultural heritage value is undesirable and should not occur." See discussion of Articles 4 and 5 above.

Article 21. Adaptation - "The conservation of a place of cultural heritage value is usually facilitated by the place serving a useful purpose." Proposals for adaptation of a place may arise from maintaining its continuing use, or from a proposed change of use. Alterations and additions may be acceptable where they are necessary for a compatible use of the place. Any change should be the minimum necessary, should be substantially reversible, and should have little or no adverse effect on the cultural heritage value of the place. The manner in which the new additions and proposed structural system are fully integrated into the original church renders this work irreversible and results in a negative impact on the heritage values of the church. See discussion above regarding the adverse effects of the additions on the heritage value of St Peter's Church.

Article 21 continued. Adaptation - "Any alterations or additions should be compatible with the original form and fabric of the place, and should avoid inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass, colour, and material. Adaptation should not dominate or substantially obscure the original form and fabric, and should not adversely affect the setting of a place of cultural heritage value. New work should complement the original form and fabric." The alterations are one design response to the planning, proportions and architectural idiom of St Peter's Church. The additions will obscure the original form of the transepts, and to some extent will also obscure the remaining heritage fabric of the areas where they connect to the listed building. They are not visible or physically separate from the heritage church. Rather, they are designed to visually extend the building's transepts in width and length, with flat roofed forms which introduce a contrasting bulkiness and heaviness to the narrow and soaring Gothic Revival forms of the original architecture. The height of the proposed flat roofed sections, aligning with the eaves line of the original building, creates an uncomfortable juncture with the roof forms of the church.
additions are to be constructed in glass, metal and concrete which will distinguish them from the original stone walls, but does not necessarily complement the craftsmanship and detailing of the heritage fabric resulting in an inappropriate contrast. The new flat roofed extension to the south will be a dominant feature on this elevation as it is the full height of the wall, a scale too large relative to the adjoining transept. They will introduce a prominent feature in the overall design aesthetic of the church, unlike Wood’s earlier flat roofed vestry addition which was designed to be a clearly subservient form in the reading of the original church architecture. Overall the scale, form and materials of the new additions results in an inappropriate and incompatible contrast.

Assessment – Criterion not met

5. The urgency of the work required relating to the risk of damage if the work is not done in a timely manner.

The church is temporarily secured. However, it has been in this stabilised state since 2011 and deterioration is inevitable. Until it is repaired and upgraded it remains vulnerable to further seismic events.

Assessment – Criterion met

6. The availability of grant funds.

The Heritage Incentive Grant fund has seen a high uptake since the start of the financial year. If grant applications for St Luke’s Vicarage and the former Pumphouse are approved, this will result in only $119,669 being left in the budget. Therefore available funding is very limited. If this remaining amount is expended, there will be no available grant monies for projects with positive heritage outcomes until 1 July 2018.

Assessment – Criterion met in part

7. The amount of any previous Grants for the property.

St Peter’s Church has not received any funding from the Heritage Incentive Grants scheme to date.

Assessment – Criterion met
From: Mark Gerrard [mailto:markgerrard@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Thursday, 3 August 2017 6:43 p.m.
To: Wykes, Fiona
Subject: St Peter’s Church, Riccarton - restoration and alteration

Dear Fiona

The committee of Historic Places Canterbury met today to consider the proposed alterations to St Peter’s at Church Corner.

We are unanimous in the view that the proposed changes are entirely unsatisfactory and have an adverse impact on the heritage of the building and the landmark importance of the site.

We are astonished that resource consent for the proposed changes to this significant building has been granted (and apparently signed off by Heritage New Zealand) without any opportunity for public input. It is obviously too late to do anything about the process except to note our concern but we expect that the Church will be seeking heritage funding from the Council to assist with its restoration and alterations. We would be disturbed if the Church were to be granted heritage funding to assist in this proposal. We believe that where public money is to be put into assisting to retain heritage buildings (something which we clearly support) it should only be done where any changes to the heritage character of the building adhere to best practice. In our view the changes proposed here clearly to not do so.

We believe that the proposed changes are inconsistent with the ICOMOS Charter.

21. Adaptation
The conservation of a place of cultural heritage value is usually facilitated by the place serving a useful purpose. Proposals for adaptation of a place may arise from maintaining its continuing use, or from a proposed change of use.
Alterations and additions may be acceptable where they are necessary for a compatible use of the place. Any change should be the minimum necessary, should be substantially reversible, and should have little or no adverse effect on the cultural heritage value of the place.
Any alterations or additions should be compatible with the original form and fabric of the place, and should avoid inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass, colour, and material. Adaptation should not dominate or substantially obscure the original form and fabric, and should not adversely affect the setting of a place of cultural heritage value. New work should complement the original form and fabric.

We consider that the proposed changes are inappropriate in form, scale, mass, colour and material. The alterations have a significantly adverse impact upon the setting as well as upon the interior spaces of the building. The forms chosen are unsympathetic with the style of the building. Though it may be argued that the the flat sections of the proposed additions reflect the flat roofed section of the original building, the scale and materials are on the south elevation in particular, are entirely out of keeping. The height and the cladding are incongruous and the large plate glass windows are a travesty. The flat section of the south transept gains 14 seats which could easily be fitted into the nave. The additional seating within the gabled portion of this alteration could have been gained more sympathetically by extending the depth of the gable while retaining existing windows and stone cladding. The need for a new vestry on the south side seems questionable. The obvious space for this is the area labelled as office. The church owns a number of buildings on the site including a very large church hall so it is difficult to understand why it is necessary to fit an office within the church when this creates the need for an intrusive vestry on the south elevation.
The proposed vestibule on the north elevation substantially obscures and in places destroys the original form and fabric of that elevation. Replacement of the stone gable and its arched window by the intrusive flat roofed addition with complete glazing of the remaining visible portion of the gable completely transforms the mass of this elevation. Although the retention of the stained glass windows within the gable pays lip service to the heritage of the building their impact will be completely lost. Given the existence of a large church hall, this proposed vestibule seems to us to require an unjustified impact on the heritage form and fabric of the building. According to s. 21 of the charter, any changes should be the minimum necessary. Historic Places Canterbury accepts that liturgical changes may dictate the bringing forward of the altar and the reuse of the chancel as a chapel though we consider the orientation rather strange. However we are concerned that there is an apparent intention to cover the brick walls with some form of cladding. The polychromatic brickwork is a distinctive feature of the interior.

In summary, we believe that the changes proposed are ill-conceived and that the extra space desired by the church could have been achieved with forms and materials which would be consistent with the style of the building.

We hope these comments are of some assistance and we would be happy to discuss the matter in person if you desire.

Kind regards

Mark Gerrard
Chair
Historic Places Canterbury.
31 July 2017

Fiona Wykes
Senior Heritage Advisor
Heritage Team
Urban Regeneration, Urban Design & Heritage Unit Strategy & Transformation Group
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73012, Christchurch, 8154

Dear Fiona

St Peter’s Anglican Church, Upper Riccarton

Thank you for your email of 27 July concerning St Peter’s, Upper Riccarton. I am familiar with St Peter’s and its history as one of Christchurch’s earliest churches and there is extensive discussion of the original church in my book, A Dream of Spires: Benjamin Mountfort and the Gothic Revival (Canterbury University Press, 1999). I think the first observation to be made is that in many jurisdictions it would be considered normal to involve the “foremost expert” on an architect in the discussion about significant alterations of a heritage listed building at the start of the process, rather than at the very end. This is a failure of process that seems to me to have become the norm in recent times, rather than the exception. There seems to be comparatively little value in being asked to comment at a point where plans have already been consented and signed off by Heritage New Zealand. Nevertheless, there are some comments that I think can usefully be made even at this late stage.

1. General principles
The proposed design fails, in my view, to meet the standards for adaptation of heritage buildings as set out in section 21 of the New Zealand ICOMOS Charter 2010. This should be the guiding document for considering proposals of this kind. Section 21 paragraphs 2 and 3 state:

Alterations and additions may be acceptable where they are necessary for a compatible use of the place. Any change should be the minimum necessary, should be substantially reversible, and should have little or no adverse effect on the cultural heritage value of the place.

Any alterations or additions should be compatible with the original form and fabric of the place, and should avoid inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass, colour, and material. Adaptation should not dominate or substantially obscure the original form and fabric, and should not adversely affect the setting of a place of cultural heritage value. New work should complement the original form and fabric.

(my emphasis)

The proposed design makes extensive use of contrasting materials and flat-roofed forms that are incompatible with the original Gothic Revival character of the church. The
proposed materials include exterior zinc cladding, aluminium mullions and cappings and extensive use of unmodulated plate glass.

2. South Transept
The use of large, unmodulated areas of glass in the extension to the south transept offends against Section 21 in a particularly egregious manner and is both incompatible and unnecessarily dominant. The benefits achieved by this addition seem to be relatively minor in terms of seating capacity, while the impact on the heritage fabric and form is extremely damaging. The extensions to the east and west sides of the south transept rise above the upper level of the nave walls, making them inappropriately dominant while the glazing of the south ends of these extensions is out of scale with the fenestration of the rest of the building and in its use of a large planes of glass is incompatible with the treatment of the existing wall surfaces. The original proportions of the transept will be lost and its relationship to the nave completely altered. The junction between the west side of the south transept and the nave wall is also discordant as it abuts the east side of easternmost nave buttress, thereby altering the proportions of the south nave elevation as well. The form of the chancel, currently fully legible from the south, will also be compromised.

It is difficult to see sufficient gains from these extensions to offset the damage to the heritage values of the building as a whole. A simple extension of the south transept that maintained its existing form and fenestration pattern would provide additional space without compromising heritage values.

The proposed changes to the south transept involve a significant loss of heritage fabric that could be restored using widely available repair strategies. Original fabric should, as a matter of principle, be retained where ever possible. Furthermore, the construction of light weight gables using timber frames with a veneer of stone has been successfully achieved at the Arts Centre and could also be used at St Peter’s in order to preserve the visual integrity of the original form of the church while reducing seismic loads.

3. North Transept
The extension here also presupposes destruction of a significant amount of heritage fabric and its replacement with modern materials that are incompatible with the original. The proposed flat ceiling in the space between the demolished west transept wall and the new exterior wall introduces a further form that has no relationship to the pitched, open timber roofs elsewhere in the church. This box like element is also present on the west side of the south transept extension.

The treatment of the north gable anticipates the loss of not only the original heritage fabric but also of the original fenestration pattern within which the paired lancet windows are situated beneath a larger arch incorporating stone tracery. The proposal to place the two stained glass windows from the north transept within a new gable that is fully glazed is fundamentally misconceived. The effectiveness of stained glass results from it being placed within a setting of solid wall, so that the light is concentrated in the area of the stained glass, resulting in the characteristic effect of glowing colours. By surrounding the stained glass panels with transparent glass this effect will be totally lost. In addition, except on the dullest of overcast days it will be almost impossible to read the areas of stained glass because the amount of light entering through this north facing window will be too dazzling.
4. Chancel

It is not clear from the documentation supplied what treatment is proposed for the interior walls of the chancel in its conversion to a chapel. The interior perspective looking east (page 7) suggests that the existing wall surfaces are to be clad with some unspecified material arranged in vertical panels. This is also shown in the ground plan but no explanation is provided. It is hard to see what the justification is for this resurfacing of the chancel walls and the concomitant loss of heritage fabric. My strong recollection is that the chancel walls are of polychromatic brick with bands of white limestone, i.e., similar to the walls of the nave. As the only surviving masonry chancel designed by Mountfort it would seem to be a serious heritage loss for this now unique example of his work to be hidden behind a modern wall surface. The orientation of the chapel in a north-south arrangement seems odd in terms of liturgical precedent. St Michael and All Angels, for example, has a forward, free standing altar but a Lady Chapel in the chancel that retains the traditional east-west orientation. However, in the context of other changes proposed this is a matter of relatively minor significance.

5. Vestibule

Without having seen the brief for the proposed additions it is not clear to me what the justification is for the vestibule extension. Given the existence of the single storey addition at the west end of the church and the generous amount of unoccupied space shown within the west end the nave this seems like a costly extension that is largely unnecessary. To achieve this addition a significant amount of heritage fabric is being lost or obscured. If additional, non-liturgical space is required this would be better accommodated through an addition at the west end rather than in front of the prominent north transept, one of the dominant heritage aspects of the church.

6. Sittings

The extension of the north and south transept allows for the addition of 33 seats. Of these 18 are located in the western extensions to the north and south transepts. By adding a single seat to each row of seats in the nave these 18 people could be accommodated without the need to destroy a significant amount of heritage fabric. The remaining 15 seats could still be accommodated within the south transept if it was extended southwards in the manner discussed in section 2 above. The provision of sittings in the transepts involves significant loss of heritage fabric, major changes to the form of the building and the introduction of new and incompatible forms and materials. This gain in sittings seems a poor return for the proposed level of intervention into the heritage fabric.

7. Conclusion

It is regrettable that this proposal has been consented without the opportunity for public input and, in particular, from the wider heritage community. Given that the church has a large task of fundraising ahead of it, there could be no grounds for rushing the consent for reasons of urgency. Where public funds are being committed to heritage projects there should also be a concomitant willingness to subject these projects to public scrutiny. In the event that the Church Property Trustees apply to the Christchurch City Council for funding for this proposal in its present form there are substantial grounds for questioning the wisdom of supporting the project. It is appropriate for Council to support well conceived heritage restoration projects that follow the principles set out in the 2010 New Zealand ICOMOS Charter, and it should be seen to support best practice in heritage conservation. Where proposals fall short of these standards funding should be withheld until such time as they are met.
I do not know if a conservation plan was prepared for St Peter’s prior to the development of the current proposal. This is a normal requirement for any heritage project that is seeking public funding. Has the proposal been assessed against heritage criteria identified in a conservation plan?

St Peter’s is a landmark building on a very prominent site at the intersection of two major roads. It is seen by thousands of people on a daily basis. This makes it critically important that changes to the building are carried out in a manner that can be fully justified in terms of best practice heritage conservation.

Finally, it should be recognised that St Peter’s Upper Riccarton is now the sole remaining example of Benjamin Mountfort’s masonry Anglican church designs in Christchurch. With contributions to the overall design by Mountfort’s son, Cyril, the architect of the nave, and by Cecil Wood for the west end and tower, the heritage significance of St Peter’s is now much greater than it was before the earthquakes of 2010 and 2011. This increased significance should be reflected in the level of scrutiny given to any proposal to significantly compromise the heritage values of the church.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]
Amanda

A sub-committee of the Christchurch Civic Trust (David Thornley, Anne Dingwall, Trevor Lord, Ross Gray and I) has looked at the St Peter’s proposal you sent us for comment. We are very concerned that the Tennent Brown design seriously compromises the existing heritage form and materiality of this landmark building.

We understand that the Christchurch City Council has adopted the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 2010 and uses it as a standard reference document. If the Architects had adhered to the requirements of the Charter, which calls (Adaptation 21) for the avoidance of inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass (colour) and material, these design flaws could have been avoided.

In seeking to fulfill a brief to gain considerably more space within the building, the Architects have created very unsympathetic and indeed incongruous additions to the north and south transepts. This is in terms of scale with the north transept and in terms of form, particularly with the extremely clumsy box-like accretions on each side of the extended south transept. We find that the use of new materials compounds the issue with the incongruous forms referred to.

We consider it most unfortunate that the tower has now been relegated to an entrance of secondary importance, thereby reducing its presence and adversely impacting on its key structure’s heritage values. Similarly, the prominence of the chancel has been compromised by the intrusive south transept vestry addition as the box-like form referred to earlier.

The loss of the existing heritage setting of some of the graves is regrettable; again, a consequence of the decision to enlarge the church in the manner chosen.

While we appreciate that the parish has its own reasons for wishing to enlarge the church, we do wonder if it would not have been possible to accommodate new requirements in the existing adjacent church halls, thus obviating the need to compromise the heritage form and fabric of the church. We feel strongly that the design solution chosen is very unsympathetic to the heritage values of this very important “gateway” church, which embodies the sensitive and enduring work of several highly important Christchurch Architects.

We consider that the Resource Consent process has been seriously deficient. At very least, Christchurch’s world authority on Benjamin Mountfort, Dr Ian Lochhead, should have been consulted at the beginning of the planning process.

In view of our discussion, this group would not support CCC heritage funding being granted for this project.

Thank you for giving the Christchurch Civic Trust the opportunity to comment on this important heritage matter.

Tim Hogan
12. Mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei
For us and our children after us: a new direction for heritage

Reference: 17/994974
Contact: Victoria Bliss victoria.bliss@ccc.govt.nz 027 222 2782

1. Social and Community Development Committee Consideration

1. The Committee acknowledged the hard work by staff on the new direction for heritage, along with contributions by building owners and others to saving heritage.

2. Staff Recommendations

That the Social and Community Development Committee recommend to Council that:

1. It instruct staff to prepare a Heritage Strategy with an implementation plan outlining a new direction for heritage.

2. The Strategy is based on the following principles:
   - our inheritance and legacy;
   - the recognition of both tangible and intangible heritage;
   - a story-based approach that acknowledges all our cultures;
   - under-pinning our local and community sense of place and city identity.

3. The Strategy is developed in partnership with Ngāi Tahu.

4. Implementation of the Strategy is developed in partnership with key stakeholders, owners and the community to include, but not limited to:
   a. A charter or shared values agreement developed through further engagement to implement the new strategic direction collaboratively.
   b. Regular workshops to facilitate a collaborative approach to achieving positive heritage outcomes.
   c. Establishment of regular hui with the ngā Rūnanga.

3. Social and Community Development Committee Decisions Under Delegation

Part C

That the Social and Community Development Committee seek staff advice on the process and feasibility of a Heritage Regeneration Plan in response to the deputation by Historic Places Canterbury and the feedback on the new direction for heritage.
4. Social and Community Development Committee Recommendation to Council

That the Council:

1. Instruct staff to prepare a Heritage Strategy with an implementation plan outlining a new direction for heritage.

2. Note that the Strategy is based on the following principles:
   - our inheritance and legacy;
   - the recognition of both tangible and intangible heritage;
   - a story-based approach that acknowledges all our cultures;
   - under-pinning our local and community sense of place and city identity.

3. Note that the Strategy is developed in partnership with Ngāi Tahu.

4. Note that implementation of the Strategy is developed in partnership with key stakeholders, owners and the community to include, but not limited to:
   a. A charter or shared values agreement developed through further engagement to implement the new strategic direction collaboratively.
   b. Regular workshops and/or forums to facilitate a collaborative approach to achieving positive heritage outcomes.
   c. Establishment of regular hui with the ngā Rūnanga.

5. Facilitate a workshop with relevant organisations and agencies to consider an overarching strategic approach to moveable cultural property in Christchurch city.
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Reference: 17/884576
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1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social and Community Development Committee to recommend to Council that the findings of the “Future of Heritage” public engagement are used to inform a new strategic direction for heritage and supporting implementation measures.

Origin of Report
1.2 This report is staff generated and reflects an earlier request from Council for staff to consider the development a heritage strategy.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of medium/high significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the significance matrix and in particular factors including the district-wide impact of the decisions, potential positive social and cultural impacts, and potential opportunities for Council and the wider community.

2.1.2 Community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social and Community Development Committee recommend to Council that it:

1. Instruct staff to prepare a Heritage Strategy with an implementation plan outlining a new direction for heritage.

2. That the Strategy is based on the following principles:
   - our inheritance and legacy;
   - the recognition of both tangible and intangible heritage;
   - a story-based approach that acknowledges all our cultures;
   - under-pinning our local and community sense of place and city identity.

3. That the Strategy is developed in partnership with Ngāi Tahu.

4. Implementation of the Strategy is developed in partnership with key stakeholders, owners and the community to include, but not limited to:
   a. A charter or shared values agreement developed through further engagement to implement the new strategic direction collaboratively.
   b. Regular workshops to facilitate a collaborative approach to achieving positive heritage outcomes.
   c. Establishment of regular hui with the ngā Rūnanga.
4. Key Points

4.1 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2015 - 2025):

4.1.1 Activity: Heritage Protection

- Level of Service: 1.4.1 Implement a programme to ensure a consistent and broadened level of historic heritage protection within Banks Peninsula and Christchurch City.
- 1.4.3 Provide advice and advocacy on heritage conservation principles and priorities for the district’s historic heritage, both internally and externally.
- 1.4.6 Maintain proactive relationships with listed heritage building owners.

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 - Council reflects the engagement findings with internal and external measures. This requires the development of a Heritage Strategy and necessary supporting processes and measures. Council continues to engage with the community to implement the strategic direction for heritage through a collaborative charter or shared values agreement (Preferred Option).
- Option 2 – maintain the status quo.

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- The Council is responding to the engagement findings by using this information to establish a shared vision for heritage across the district and working in partnership to deliver this vision.
- There is a clear message around guardianship, inheritance and intergenerational equity - Mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei (for us and our children after us) - coming through the engagement process. To have a long-term strategic direction for heritage is the most effective means to ensure Council responds to the need to promote and implement guardianship across all its decisions relating to heritage in the short and long term.
- A Strategy would formally endorse our partnership with Ngāi Tahu by including an agreed shared vision and values which would identify, promote and celebrate mana whenua and tangata whenua history inclusively.
- A clearly articulated strategic direction with identified values would facilitate and direct community engagement in heritage and underpin Council’s relationships and partnerships with key stakeholders.
- A clearly defined strategic direction for heritage would enable Council to make informed decisions around heritage, and assist them to be able to measure and prioritise outcomes with greater clarity.
- Where heritage relates to or connects with other areas in Council, there would be strategic guidance to inform the decisions being made thereby ensuring greater efficiency and consistency.
- The strategic direction would guide other necessary processes and protocols to ensure heritage is considered at the appropriate stage with other units on Council-wide initiatives.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
• Decision making: This option could result in Council handing over some decisions and priorities around heritage to communities and stakeholders, thereby reducing its control.

• The focus would move from regulatory to non-regulatory heritage protection: this would require pro-active education and advocacy initiatives resulting in less certain and less easily management outcomes.

• Community expectations: these would need to be carefully managed.

5. Context/Background

The need for a strategic direction for heritage.

5.1 Council requested staff consider preparing a Heritage Strategy, originally in 2014, to provide strategic guidance for the protection and promotion of heritage across the district. At the same time, Council commenced the District Plan review and staff resources were prioritised to that work until earlier this year.

5.2 Council’s involvement in heritage is diverse, and includes a range of regulatory and non-regulatory roles and mechanisms. These have never been set out comprehensively in a strategic document.

5.3 Council is an owner of heritage, responsible for a large number of listed and non-listed heritage items, some of which have national or international significance. The listed heritage buildings owned by Council are a strategic asset under the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

5.4 The community has in the past requested that Council purchase additional heritage buildings under threat, however there is no strategic guidance for Council regarding such requests. Nor is there any current, comprehensive strategic direction to inform Council in the decisions it takes and priorities it places around heritage.

5.5 Heritage is a key resource and asset to the district, contributing to our community and local identity, culture, belonging and sense of place. The retention and promotion of our heritage is vital to creating a vibrant, dynamic and sustainable twenty first century city, which celebrates its past and the stories of all the people who have lived, are living and will live here. There are social, cultural, community and economic benefits to be derived from the retention of heritage.

5.6 The district’s heritage has undergone major changes in recent years. The Canterbury earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 have resulted in the loss of a substantial number of both listed and unlisted heritage buildings. The loss of so much of our built heritage provides an opportunity to broaden the definition of heritage to embrace the intangible elements which remain: the stories of people and places, including sites, traditions, knowledge, landscapes, areas and archaeology. This will bring us closer to Ngāi Tahu’s vision of cultural heritage.

5.7 The new Christchurch District Plan has significantly reduced the regulatory protection for the district’s heritage, for example through changes to what are permitted or restricted discretionary activities and many interiors of buildings not being included in heritage listings. As a result, Council needs to review its role in heritage protection and its way of working with Ngāi Tahu, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZ), stakeholders, owners and the community to retain and promote our heritage through non-regulatory measures.

5.8 There is an increased public and community awareness of heritage following the earthquakes. This offers Council the opportunity to develop a new approach to the protection and celebration of heritage which is founded on a collective vision and developed through engagement and partnership. This new direction will establish the importance and role of heritage to the district, and identify what legacy we should be leaving for future generations. It also offers the
opportunity for Council to engage with the community and stakeholders to develop ways to implement and achieve the vision in a more collaborative manner.

5.9 The principles identified through engagement which will underpin the Heritage Strategy align with Council’s wider strategic direction.

- Council has already identified in its Multicultural Strategy: “Our Future Together” the importance of celebrating our cultural diversity.
- Te Hononga Pāpātipu Rūnanga Committee has identified in its Terms of Reference the intrinsic value of “safeguarding the interests of future generations”.
- Council’s Proposed Strategic Framework has an overarching principle of “partnership”, where Council is committed to listening to and empowering the people of Christchurch; also the value of ‘stewardship’ and our responsibility to act together as custodians of our heritage.

Engagement

5.10 Given the context described above and the heightened community awareness of heritage issues, staff requested that the Social and Community Development Committee endorse a public engagement process on a new direction for heritage before any decisions around the development of a Heritage Strategy.

5.11 The purpose of the engagement was to develop a clearer understanding of what the community values, why they value it, and how they wish to see it protected, promoted and celebrated. This understanding was deemed necessary to enable staff to identify a collective vision for heritage for the future. It was also required to identify issues and opportunities and inform the mechanisms required to deliver a new approach.

5.12 This information-gathering exercise took the form of a survey attracting 160 responses, two workshops for key stakeholders, three community drop-in sessions, feedback from students, an internal staff workshop and discussions with ngā Rūnanga leaders (See engagement timeline - Attachment 1).

5.13 The feedback from all this engagement informs this report. A summary is shown in Attachment 2 and the full report is available at https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/consultations-and-submissions/haveyoursay/show/15. The wide-ranging suggestions will also assist in the development of an implementation plan. Through the engagement process relationships have begun to be developed and these can be built on to establish a collaborative approach to the implementation of the Strategy.

5.14 There will be a requirement for ongoing engagement to support the development of the Heritage Strategy, and the supporting implementation measures.

5.15 The engagement has identified some key areas which establish the principles of the new direction for heritage the community are seeking. These are:

- Heritage is an inheritance and a legacy: we are guardians of our heritage, and have a duty and a responsibility both individually and collectively to ensure that we protect and preserve it for future generations.

- We need to value intangible as well as tangible heritage: our current definition of ‘heritage’ needs to be broadened to include buildings, places, traditional pa sites, landscapes, traditions and oral histories, streetscapes, heritage areas, archaeology, trails and walks, mahinga kai, natural heritage, urupā and local history. (See Attachment 2 for graphs recording survey results.)
Heritage needs to be inclusive: it should honour and celebrate the stories of all who have lived, are living and will live here. It must respect all the layers and stories which collectively form Christchurch’s unique and diverse development.

Heritage is fundamental to our community identity, sense of place, character and unique local distinctiveness: we need to reposition heritage so that it underpins our cultural and community identity and local character.

5.16 Five key themes and values emerged clearly from the engagement process to support these principles and guide the new direction for heritage which the community is seeking. These define heritage as providing:

- Sense of place and local distinctiveness: we are a city of villages, and this is what makes us unique and anchors us to where we live.
- Cultural identity: this city has a rich and diverse history. We need to respect and acknowledge this past to preserve our cultural identity for the future and to celebrate where we came from and why we are here.
- Connectedness: we are all connected through our stories and our intangible as well as tangible heritage. This connectedness links us to our ancestors and our descendants across time, and connects our communities across the district.
- Engagement and empowerment: heritage with a community focus will enable us to find new ways of working collaboratively to protect and celebrate our history. It can offer the opportunity to use education and advocacy to engage the next generation with the legacy they will inherit.
- Sustainability: heritage can support sustainable communities by anchoring and connecting them to each other and to the place where they live. It can also offer local economic sustainability through tourism, both locally and internationally.

5.17 The engagement has identified six specific areas of public concern or issues, which the community feels need to be addressed in order to deliver positive heritage outcomes through a new direction for heritage. These present opportunities for Council to work in partnership with stakeholders and the community to address concerns and seek solutions. The engagement has demonstrated that the community believes successful protection and promotion of heritage requires:

- More support for communities, groups, owners and developers. There was a widespread message throughout the engagement responses that communities, owners and groups felt a lack of support. This included lack of support from Council. There were perceptions of the interface with Council being challenging; a lack of appreciation for and acknowledgement of efforts made to protect and celebrate heritage; no identified point of contact within Council for heritage groups, owners and communities to liaise with; isolation from other groups; and a lack of consistent messages from Council around heritage. There were also concerns around communities and groups feeling powerless and unheard. The engagement to date has already begun to address some of these concerns, with the workshops held and staff beginning to build and support networks. Recommendation 2 would further address these issues.

- More collaboration and partnership between all stakeholders. The workshops in particular identified opportunities for stakeholders to work more collaboratively. The desire for such a forum to continue regularly to bring together communities, groups, owners and developers with other stakeholders was clearly articulated, along with the possibilities of greater efficiency and effectiveness through collaboration. Recommendation 2 is included to address this.
• **More funding for heritage (both tangible and intangible).** The success and positive impact of the existing grant funding for heritage was acknowledged through the engagement (Heritage Incentive Grants and Central City Landmark Heritage Grants). However, it was noted that there is no funding available to support either non-listed heritage or intangible heritage outcomes. Many trusts and groups have specifically identified issues around funding shortfalls to support their projects. There is no specific funding available to support places of Ngāi Tahu cultural significance, which are mostly unlisted and intangible. A lack of funding was a recurrent theme as limiting heritage protection and promotion, as well as being recognised as reducing opportunities to incentivise and support better heritage outcomes.

• **More promotion to build awareness and appreciation.** This is required to attain a culture change which will recognise the value of heritage both in terms of its social and public good outcomes and economic and tourist potential. The engagement identified ‘education to increase understanding and appreciation’ and ‘greater acknowledgement and recognition of the benefits of heritage’ as being important tools for protection and retention; it also cited ‘lack of public awareness and appreciation’ and ‘lack of acknowledgement of the community value of heritage’ as being the second biggest barriers to heritage retention after lack of funding and high cost.

• **More protection.** The reduction of regulatory protection under the new Christchurch District Plan, in addition to the current moratorium on plan changes, has raised concern about the ongoing regulatory protection available for listed heritage places. There were widespread responses stating that the loss of heritage as a result of the earthquakes has made what has survived more precious and in greater need of retention and protection. Although there was a clear indication that the definition of ‘heritage’ needs to be broadened to include intangible values, there remains a strong focus on tangible, built heritage. Regulatory protection was the third highest tool to protect our heritage (after funding and education), and the question ‘what types of heritage are most important for your community, family or business’ identified “Buildings” as the key item of value. A number of respondents suggested the use of non-regulatory protection measures to support regulatory protection.

• **More recognition of local identity and distinctness.** As discussed above, the engagement findings clearly demonstrate a community desire for heritage to be valued as underpinning our community and city identity, character, culture, belonging and sense of place. There were very strong messages around the need for Council to acknowledge and celebrate local character and distinctiveness, and for communities to be involved in identifying the heritage values of their neighbourhood and the stories which made them special. The unique qualities and distinct characteristics of different communities was not felt to be especially recognised, enhanced or celebrated for their diversity.

5.18 The Committee should note that at a meeting attended by the Mayor and Deputy Mayor the matter of moveable cultural property – museum objects, and archives - was raised. It was noted that archive, manuscript and document collections need to be managed in a more integrated, accessible way. This matter did not come up as part of the engagement process.

6. **Option 1 – Prepare a Heritage Strategy with an implementation plan outlining a new direction for heritage (preferred option).**

**Option Description**

6.1 Council reflects the engagement findings with internal and external measures. This requires the development of a Heritage Strategy and necessary supporting processes and measures.

6.2 Council continues to engage with the community to implement the strategic direction for heritage through a collaborative charter or shared values agreement.
Significance

6.3 The level of significance of this option is medium/high consistent with Section 2 of this report.

6.4 Engagement carried out reflects this level of significance.

Impact on Mana Whenua

6.5 This option potentially involves a decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

6.6 The two engagements at the ngā Rūnanga hui have achieved awareness of, and support in principle by key mana whenua kaitiaki for the collaborative development of a Heritage Strategy. This is a positive opportunity to increase the recognition, celebration and protection of mana whenua and tangata whenua history and places of Ngāi Tahu cultural significance. It also offers the opportunity for a more inclusive approach to heritage which aligns with the policies of the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan and is in keeping with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Community Views and Preferences

6.7 Following the Social and Community Development Committee briefing on 6 April 2017, Council staff distributed the Future of Heritage Survey on 12 April 2017. One hundred and sixty responses were received during the consultation which closed on 22 May 2017. This feedback came from a range of geographical areas and age groups: three were under 18; 12 were 18-24. 58 were 25-49; 44 were 50-64 and 41 were 65 and over.

6.8 The Future of Heritage survey respondents revealed that many different elements have heritage value including local history, specific buildings, archaeological sites, traditional pa sites, traditional stories and oral history, trees, landscapes and streetscapes. Comments emphasised the importance of retaining and restoring buildings, and education and awareness.

6.9 The survey results indicated that the key tools to protect and retain heritage were funding, financial incentives and education to increase understanding in order to achieve greater acknowledgement of the benefits of heritage. Conversely, the biggest barriers to heritage retention were lack of funding, lack of public awareness and appreciation.

6.10 Community views were also obtained during three drop-in sessions attended by a total of 51 people in Christchurch, Akaroa and Lyttelton. These reinforced the importance of character areas and how these contribute to a sense of place and identity.

6.11 Emerging themes identified by key stakeholders at workshops on 26 April and 6 May included a culturally diverse heritage, storytelling and promotion, sense of place, communities, innovation, economic issues/opportunities, collaboration, collective responsibility (guardianship and legacy) and education. Future forums were requested to discuss these issues.

6.12 In response to the community discussions and survey findings, an internal Council workshop was organised to look at ways the Council could better address these issues. Key actions included being pro-active within and outside the Council, partnership with the community, greater involvement of libraries and storytelling, increased heritage funding, and advocacy to Central Government.

6.13 Views expressed during engagement support the need for a Heritage Strategy with a focus on guardianship and community identity, and a new way of delivering heritage outcomes in partnership with the community.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

6.14 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.
Financial Implications
6.15 Cost of Implementation – costs are estimated to be $25,000 for the development of the implementation plan in partnership with key stakeholders, owners and the community. This is in addition to staff time. Existing budgets can be prioritised to support this.

6.16 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – unknown at this stage.

6.17 Funding source – funding from existing budgets can be prioritised for developing the strategy and the engagement required for that process.

Legal Implications
6.18 None at this point in time. Legal advice will be sought as part of the development of any charter or shared values agreement.

Risks and Mitigations
6.19 None at this point in time.

Implementation
6.20 Implementation dependencies - staff availability and funding.

6.21 Implementation timeframe – dependant on engagement process.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
6.22 The advantages of this option include:

• See 4.3.1

6.23 The disadvantages of this option include:

• See 4.3.2

7. Option 2 – Maintain the status quo

Option Description
7.1 This option does not reflect the engagement findings with the development of a Heritage Strategy and necessary supporting processes and measures. It does not require further engagement with the community to implement the strategic direction for heritage through a collaborative charter or shared values agreement.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low which differs from section 2 of this report due to continuation of the status quo. This option carries some risk as many of those who have participated in the Future of Heritage engagement have asked for ongoing and increased dialogue between the Council, stakeholders, owners and community.

7.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are theoretically low, but this would likely not be acceptable to the heritage community.

Impact on Mana Whenua
7.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions. However, engagement at the ngā Rūnanga hui have achieved awareness of, and support in principle by key mana whenua kaitiaki for the collaborative development of a Heritage Strategy. To maintain the status quo would not achieve the increased recognition, celebration and protection of mana whenua and tangata whenua history and places of Ngāi Tahu cultural significance. It would also lose the opportunity for a more inclusive approach to heritage which aligns with the policies of the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan.
Community Views and Preferences
7.5 This option was not consulted on as it does not deliver a Heritage Strategy as requested by the Council.

7.6 It could be implied from the engagement that has been undertaken that the community viewed the engagement to date very positively and were enthusiastic to be involved in developing a strategic direction for heritage. It could be inferred not to do so would be counter to the views expressed.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
7.7 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies as it continues the status quo. However, it does not deliver a Heritage Strategy as requested by the Council.

Financial Implications
7.8 Cost of Implementation – no additional cost as it continues the status quo.

Legal Implications
7.9 None as it continues the status quo.

Risks and Mitigations
7.10 There is a risk that those who have participated in the Future of Heritage engagement and have asked for ongoing and increased dialogue between the Council and the community will feel unheard. The heritage community would feel this is unacceptable.

7.11 Residual risk rating: the rating of the risk is medium.

Implementation
7.12 Implementation dependencies - none
7.13 Implementation timeframe - none

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.14 The advantages of this option include:

- There are no additional costs to Council.
- Decisions and priorities around heritage remain within Council control rather than being agreed in partnership with communities and stakeholders.
- The focus will remain on regulatory heritage protection and tangible heritage reducing the need for Council to provide pro-active education and advocacy initiatives.

7.15 The disadvantages of this option include:

- The Council request to develop a Heritage Strategy is not delivered.
- The Council is not responding to the engagement findings and the community expectations, and desired outcomes identified in the engagement would not be met.
- Partnership over an agreed shared vision and values for heritage with Ngāi Tahu would not be achieved. As a result an inclusive approach to identify, promote and celebrate mana whenua and tangata whenua history and places of Ngāi Tahu cultural significance would not be developed.
- With no strategic direction for heritage, Council has no framework to inform its decisions or to guide them to measured, prioritised or consistent outcomes.
- There would be no opportunity to engage or involve the community in decisions relating to their heritage, character or local identity.
The current, narrow definition of heritage would not be expanded to include intangible heritage or a story based approach which would include all cultures.
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Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.
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Attachment 1: Future of Heritage engagement timeline - April to August 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 April 2017</td>
<td>Briefing to Social and Community Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April to 22 May</td>
<td>Future of Heritage Survey – 160 respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 26 April</td>
<td>First of stakeholders facilitated workshops: North New Brighton Community Centre CCC, Ngai Tahu, Heritage NZ, DOC, ECAN, Christchurch Civic Trust, Historic Places Canterbury, Akaroa Civic Trust, ICOMOS, Museums, Archaeology, Antarctic Trust, Youth Council, heritage building owners, developers, general heritage supporters, representatives of Community Boards. Ngai Tahu stakeholders - 42 including staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 29 April</td>
<td>First drop-in session at the Gailey Hall, Akaroa - 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 3 May</td>
<td>Second drop-in session at Civic Offices - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 6 May</td>
<td>Second stakeholder workshop, Function Room, CCC – 42 including staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 9 May</td>
<td>Presentation to University of Canterbury students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 13 May</td>
<td>Third drop-in session at Grubb Cottage Lyttelton – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 23 June</td>
<td>Internal workshop – 55 including Heritage Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 2 June</td>
<td>Community Development Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 13 June</td>
<td>Workshop with Heritage New Zealand and Department of Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 2 August</td>
<td>Presentation to ngā Rūnanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 2 August</td>
<td>Presentation to Social and Community Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 7 August</td>
<td>ngā Rūnanga hui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 14 August</td>
<td>Presentation to those who have participated in Future of Heritage engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 16 August</td>
<td>Meeting with Mahaanui Kurataio Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 6 September 1pm</td>
<td>Social and Community Development Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 2: The Future of Heritage engagement survey graphs

The following graphs from the Future of Heritage Survey highlight key issues and opportunities. The full report and other engagement feedback can be viewed at https://crgovtnz.cwp.gov.nz/the-council/consultations-and-submissions/haveyoursay/show/15

1. Which of the following do you consider to be of heritage value?
2. What types of heritage are most important for your community, family or business?
3. What do you think are the main benefits of heritage?
4. What things would you like to see more of to celebrate and promote heritage in your community?
5. What do you feel are the most important tools to protect and retain heritage?
6. What do you see as the biggest barriers to heritage retention?
13. Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan Community Engagement and Feedback

Reference: 17/995348
Contact: John Clemens  john.clemens@ccc.govt.nz  941 7589

1. Social and Community Development Committee Recommendation to Council

That the Council:

1. Endorse the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan in its current form.
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1. **Purpose and Origin of Report**

   **Purpose of Report**
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social and Community Development Committee to consider information in relation to community engagement and feedback on the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan, and to recommend Council endorse the Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan.

   **Origin of Report**
   1.2 This report is provided to fulfil Council resolution CNCL/2017/00085 from 6 April 2017.

   **Council Resolved CNCL/2017/00085**

   That the Council:

   1. Approve the Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan for community engagement and feedback, to be reported back to the Social and Community Development Committee within three months.

   Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Johanson

   **Carried**

2. **Significance**

   2.1 The decision(s) in this report are of medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the number of people with an interest in the Botanic Gardens and potential for increased interest to be generated. The Botanic Gardens also have cultural importance in Christchurch.

   2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. **Staff Recommendations**

   That the Social and Community Development Committee recommend to Council that it:

   1. Endorse the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan in its current form.

4. **Feedback from Linwood – Central – Heathcote Community Board**

   4.1 The Linwood – Central – Heathcote Community Board considered community engagement and feedback on the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan at its meeting of 31 July 2017.

   4.2 From minutes of this Community Board meeting [unconfirmed as of 16 August 2017]

   **Staff Recommendations**

   That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

   1. Support the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan in its current form.

   2. Support the Spatial Plan as a planning tool for staff to accommodate the impact of future design plans.
Community Board Recommendations LCHB/2017/00108

Part A

That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board recommends that the Social and Community Development Committee:

1. Support the purpose of the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan.
2. Support the value of sensory gardens including a fragrance component.
3. Request that hidden spaces be kept and new ones be created.

Tim Lindley/Darrell Latham

Carried

5. Key Points

5.1 Written feedback from the public in response to the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan was received from 44 people and organisations (Attachment A).

5.2 Written feedback was collated by staff and cross-referenced summaries of the most frequently raised issues and commentaries provided for each of these (Attachment B).

5.3 Thirty people also joined one of the six guided walks in the Botanic Gardens scheduled during the engagement period, several of these indicating that they would also complete a feedback form. Their verbal feedback has also been summarised (Attachment B).

5.4 Of the 44 written responses, 19 commented on the Spatial Plan itself. The relevant feedback from respondents is categorised as follows:

- Supportive and appreciative comments about the Spatial Plan and how it illustrates the ways in which the projects in the Master Plan are accommodated in the existing framework.
  Specific comments: “excellent”, “in support”, “generally supportive”, “support proposals”, “Overall I support the plan”, “We applaud the Council’s initiative”, “…welcome the development of a spatial plan”, “very good”.

- Less supportive comments suggesting that there should be no change to the Botanic Gardens and that the Master Plan projects illustrated in the Spatial Plan were unnecessary or unwanted.
  Specific comments: “…a place of solitude and beauty now so why change?”, “…plan is truly changing the character of the garden”, “we don’t need to make huge changes”, “…not tinker with [the Gardens] apart from a gentle tidy-up”, “the gardens are well set out and perfectly functional as they stand”.

- Comments from a few respondents suggesting that the Spatial Plan was vague or difficult to decipher although these people, along with most other respondents, went on to comment on specific aspects of Master Plan projects in the Spatial Plan.

5.5 Master Plan projects, such as a bridge across the Avon River to the Visitor Centre, the new conservatory complex, and the play landscape, attracted more favourable comment than adverse comment. The most commented on and supported project was a bridge to the Botanic Gardens Visitor Centre.

5.6 Most other comments (10 or more) related to the potential loss of trees or existing plant collections, new plant collections, and the potential for the development of Master Plan projects to adversely affect a sense of open space.

5.7 Informal feedback provided verbally during guided walks indicated support for a Visitor Centre bridge, the Children’s Play Landscape, the Magnetic Observatory project, the new Conservatory Complex, the Robert McDougall Art Gallery Interface project, and path changes.
5.8 Respondents appreciated the opportunity to be consulted and expressed a desire to have the opportunity to provide further feedback during the development of future projects.

5.9 Overall the feedback supports the Spatial Plan in its current form as a representation of the projects in the Master Plan.

6. Context/Background

6.1 Purpose and preparation of the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan

- The Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan was prepared for Council by Isthmus Landscape Architects during 2016.

- The Spatial Plan illustrates how the existing components of the Botanic Gardens and the capital projects defined in the Hagley Park and Botanic Gardens Master Plan and the Botanic Gardens Management Plan can be woven together to enrich visitor experience and engagement, and improve the operation and management of the Botanic Gardens.

- Preparation of the Spatial Plan during 2016 involved a process of consultation and engagement. Consultation and engagement was managed by Mene Associates and took place with staff; with partners the Christchurch Botanic Gardens Charitable Trust and Ngāi Tūāhuriri Matapopore Charitable Trust; and with other stakeholders (CCC Heritage Advisors, Heritage New Zealand Advisor, Canterbury District Health Board, Canterbury Museum, Christ's College, Friends of the Christchurch Botanic Gardens, Hagley - Ferrymead Community Board, Inner City West Neighbourhood Association, Gardens and Victoria Neighbourhood Association). Input from additional interested parties was also sought from the Christchurch Youth Council and Cycling/Active Transport groups (ViaStrada), CCC Recreation Planners, the CCC visitor experience team, and Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) advisors.

6.2 Previous reports to Council on the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan

- The Social and Community Development Committee of Council considered a report on the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan on 1 March 2017.

- The Social and Community Development Committee endorsed the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan, and recommended to Council that it approve the Spatial Plan.

- Council approved the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan for community engagement and feedback at its meeting of 6 April 2017 under resolution number CNCL/2017/00085 to be reported back to the Social and Community Development Committee.

- Community engagement and feedback was considered by the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board at its meeting of 31 July 2017.

6.3 Community engagement and feedback process

- Staff sought feedback on the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan between 29 April and 27 May 2017.

- Engagement took place through: Have Your Say (refer attachment C), Newsline articles, social media posts, direct correspondence with neighbours and stakeholders, guided tours in the Botanic Gardens, prominent displays (refer Attachment D) in the Botanic Gardens Visitor Centre and city libraries, and at the Autumn Show held in the Botanic Gardens 29-30 April.

  Feedback was received online or using a hard copy form. Verbal feedback was also provided and noted during guided tours.
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## Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan Attachment A: Formal Community Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission ID #</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Community Feedback Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>This is unnecessary, the gardens are well set out and perfectly functional as they stand and do not require an upgrade. A waste of rate payer money.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1264            | A. I do not support the removal of the three trees intended to be felled - they have a magnificent presence, and do not prevent view paths in any significant way. The trees should be retained.  
B. Work on connection with the Gallery building (toilets, etc) should only be carried out insofar that they support the revision of the Gallery to art gallery use. (see attached) | 5 |
| 1354            | I would like to give my comments and feedback on the spatial plan and botanic gardens in general.  
The gardens are one of the "Garden City" highlights and I think the spatial plan is excellent. However there is only so much "space". Thanks to our forefathers insight we get to enjoy this wonderful facility. With so much "space" available in the red zone should we not be planning for botanic garden Mark 2… For the next generation. It could take some of the pressure off the existing facility which with increased population and tourism will become a commercial hub leaving BG2 (botanic gardens 2) a new retool Haven.  
Part of the Avon loop between bardsacres and Fitzgerald Ave could be an ideal place for BG2.  
Back to the existing plan... are there any plans to improve the access road to the carparks it has stood the test of time but as a first impression it is looking unkept an tired.  
Thanks for the opportunity to have my say. | 1, 13 |
| 1358            | As an inner city resident I visit the gardens regularly - at least once a fortnight. While I am generally supportive of plans for the gardens, I think the council needs to concentrate on the basics first. This jewel in the city crown is looking distinctly tarnished. My grandmother Gladys Reading worked in the greenhouses in the 1920s and features in the display about gardens' staff in the visitors’ centre. Gladys would turn in her grave if she could see the poor maintenance in the gardens today. Weeds are a common in both planted areas and lawns. It looks as if the council has either cut back on maintenance to save money or simply doesn’t have sufficient staff to do the job properly. This should be addressed before any other upgrading is undertaken. I support the need for decent toilet facilities - even the newer ones in the visitor centre are inadequate at busy times and others are well overdue for replacement. I support the need for a bridge to the visitor centre. The provision of wheelchair accessible access to the centre is an excellent service, but it presupposes users can walk from the car park to the centre to access them. | 1, 3, 9, 10 |
| 1389            | I've had a good look at the plans for the botanic gardens and would just like to raise a couple of concerns.  
1) what sort of time frame are we looking at - the Gardens & play area are incredibly well used throughout the year. To make them inaccessible for long periods of time would be extremely inconsiderate especially when you consider how unique the gardens are to all ages & cultures. It took months for the bridge along side Chivs College leading to the Gardens to be repaired & my concern is we will be facing the same scenario.  
2) Has car parking been addressed? The car park is already grossly inadequate for the amount of people coming to Hagley Park in peak season and, once upgraded, one can only presume that numbers will increase.  
3) Please please please don’t cut down too many of those gorgeous huge trees - they add such uniqueness to Hagley and many overseas people comment on how amazing they are. Thanks | 5, 13 |
I have over my lifetime visited the botanic gardens on a regular basis and have always found it of value. There is something of of interest for everyone no matter what age. I am particularly interested in the children’s garden development, as myself as a child, and later my children have found the Botanic Gardens a magical place, full of places to discover and things to see. Indeed for many generations the botanic gardens have been central to family gatherings and hold fond memories. I commend the staff of the gardens and our council for keeping it running so well and so open for the enjoyment of the public and visitors alike.

I feel that part of our cities healing has been that, with so many of our known icons gone, that the Botanic Gardens has been there... the real heart of our Garden City. I also love that the many paths are well tended and mostly wheelchair accessible (great for when moving an elderly relative around).

There are some things I would like to see into the future... if and when time and money allows.
- A walk-through temperate edible food forest & garden
- More use of organic methods (and I do know this increases cost and can take a bit more time and you may already be using some... but I hate the "scorched earth" around the trees and would much rather see dense mulch or plantings.

The Botanic Gardens are a source of contentment & interest to us. We enjoy almost weekly visits to
- the park-like areas of lawns & large trees (particularly deciduous trees that show colour in autumn)
- the perennial border area
- the old rose garden by the hospital
- the wooded paths along the Avon River on the Riccarton Av side & Nth corner
- the seasonal changes in the flower gardens, shrubs & trees
- the small groups of people visiting - (not large tour parties) (love the kids)

We would like:
- more parking (numerous times we have gone away because of lack of parks)
- more labelling of trees, shrubs & flowers
- we don’t want
- parking used by Christ College students
- more vehicles in the garden so support the new Visitor Centre Bridge as long as it does not increase vehicle numbers

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft spatial plan.

I have read the plan in full and am in support of it. It is as strategic plan for the future and I was particularly pleased to see the following within the plan
- the new bridges from the hospital grounds and the Hagley Park carpark area
- the conservatory developments
- the recognition of complementing the wider Avon River plantings that are underway.

What was what?? Please tell me I’m reading this map all wrong. Part of the charm of the existing conservatories is that they are separate ... and have their own special history & wonderful benefactors.

Why after we have lost so much already would we want to demolish? the alpine, cacti, fernery & begonia (Not now!) buildings. The plants are looking good, the people are enjoying strolling about so why fix what’s not broken.

The new shop/cafe/education building is quite enough new construction for this decade ... if not century. Could it be that whatever the public say ... the decisions have already been made & I guess this development provides jobs. Trump would be impressed. Not me.
1545 | I volunteer as a guide and also with simple gardening tasks in CBG. As a volunteer and regular visitor my concern is the failure of CCC to invest in ongoing maintenance. The heart of a garden is the plants and how well those are cared for...big capital developments are secondary.  
I have visited many Botanic Gardens in Europe and Australia. Christchurch has a fantastic legacy left by previous generations in a superb location (try getting to Auckland Bot. Gdns!)  
It is obvious though, that vital staff have been cut over time and the Gardens are showing the signs of this. If it continues positive feedback will decline and there will be fewer visitors as people become aware of the decline in maintenance and will go elsewhere...no matter what money is spent on capital developments. | 9 |
1680 | I would like to comment on the proposal to build a new conservatory. The most treasured and enjoyed features in the Botanic Gardens are the plants: the trees and shrubs, the gardens, and the lawns. There are already numerous built structures in the gardens and care should be taken not to encroach on to open spaces and garden vistas with new buildings. As a general principle new buildings should not exceed the size of buildings they replace. On the spatial plan three indicative ‘envelopes’ are shown for the new conservatory. Two of these spaces would encroach on lawns and trees and add an intrusive and major built structure into what is presently a place where trees, birds, flowers, and open space can be enjoyed adjacent to the ever popular rose garden. My submission is that there is only one place that the new conservatory can go, and that is to the north and adjacent to the Cuningham conservatory so that the intrusion of built structures into the gardens landscape is kept to a minimum. | 4, 8 |
1689 | I leave the Botanic Gardens alone!!  
Obviously someone with lots of time on their hands planned this. Leave the Gardens alone...they are a place of solitude and beauty now so why change? | 1 |
1708 | Please do not remove the Fernery! Such a kitsch style building! Don’t want a new complex, enough buildings in the garden.  
Too much natives plants on river banks will block the view  
We want to keep the heritage rose garden!  
Keep the plants around the Fernery Lake, bulbs, shrubs, ferns, Cypress, Palms, so beautiful in summer-autumn! Too much natives, we want something different than the rest of the city  
Playground sounds great  
New water bodies sounds great  
More toilets is good  
Should be more artwork | 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 |
1709 | I think this plan is truly changing the character of the garden. Not enough open lawns, too many pathways (and straight!!) too much native plants | 1, 7, 8, 12 |
1756 | See Attachment 1 below  
5. There needs to be more carparking.  
2. Prefer B location to a location for this. | 1, 13 |
1822 | GENERAL OBSERVATION:  
(i) There appear to be too many proposed shelters - 6 in total is excessively intrusive;  
(ii) Why is it proposed to remove the macroura - such a popular and much-loved climbing tree?  
(iii) Is there evidence that new conservatory buildings are justified east of the Rose Garden?  
SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS / QUERIES:  
(i) Is the proposed water body west of the playground due to the area being subject to flooding?  
(ii) What facilities are envisaged within the proposed shelters?  
(iii) Is there a building envelope restriction on the size of new structures so that buildings do not ‘overpower’ Botanic Gardens?  
(iv) Is it proposed to create a new water body on the western side of the river gateway in the woodland / CBG area?  
(v) What are the river gateway areas intended to display and / or are there more detailed plans yet to be exhibited?  
COMMENTS:  
(i) My concern is that the Botanic Gardens do not become too pre-occupied with introducing active or structured activities which demand increasing numbers of buildings  
(ii) What is planned for enhancing the Jurassic area in the BG’s northwest sector? | 4, 5, 7, 8, 14 |
1833
Thank you for the opportunity to “walk through” the proposals with the curator
Suggestions for children’s play area:
- Varied coloured plastic equipment looks scruffy
- What about a maze? plants or semi “see-through” elements e.g. metal stakes spaced apart but not able to be penetrated but children can be seen
- Plantings that children can run through/round

RETAIn historic elements - buildings and garden areas such as rose garden, maple hydrangea grove, rhododendron walk, herbaceous border, lime walk, the large trees near the entrance that children play “inside” and the large multi-branched trees nearer the visitor centre - they are wondrous and fun

1831
This is in no particular order.
Creating a Gonzawa area & having a special space for Canterbury plants is excellent.
Replacing the conservatories except Cunningham what about a special sensory garden possibly do two or more levels - smaller footprint & have a bigger area for displaying specialist plants also more space for offices/workplaces etc...
Upgrading the children’s playground & having a pavilion/classroom a needed space.
Toilets (both) are outdated & need replacing sometime.
New bridge for vehicle access for deliveries & a walking path especially those people using wheelchairs & pushchairs is another improvement.
Realising the path from the bridge re Peace Bell to path parallel to Information Shop and the Cafe is good.
Please keep Heritage Rose collection usually more resistant to pests & diseases plus often have scents too.
Rare & endangered plants keep them scattered throughout the gardens hopefully unlabelled less likely to get stolen.
I like the idea of the Canterbury river margin section.
Magnetic Observatory/Wather station i think the idea of rehoming historic features for a particular display boards with lots of information would be more user friendly bring it all more together.
Evelyn Coutts memorial gate - is it in the wrong place could it be moved or altered to reuse the seating nearby or put where even? if not that what about the plaque?
I like keeping the old Terazoma/Cafe an really excellent idea to be reused for an extra venue for hire? Or something else?

1852
1. Make sure all notable trees have a PROPER PLaque before them setting out the tree’s history, who and when planted etc as well as information about the tree type etc plus a index map showing their locations.
2. Ensure the “woodlands” character of the area south of the Avon and adjoining the hospital, is further enhanced by “shritt” planting and replacement where necessary of large deciduous trees with under tree flowers. PATHS need attention.
3. Needs a clear hierarchy of paths i.e. main, sealed, secondary metalled?
4. Support proposals - get on with it!!!

1867
I think that having the conservatory complex on the lawn next to the rose garden would be too intrusive on that lovely open area. Having it near the lakes behind Cunningham House would be much better. I’m concerned about the removal of Fawwak House. Is it to be acceptable to the public with its unique collection of plants.

1868
I have mixed feelings about the plan concerning the Botanic Gardens. Some of the facilities should be retained e.g. The Cafe Restaurant, The Hotting on the River Avon. Over all I support the plan. Examples are New Conservatories, Pavilions, changing rooms and the proposed shelter. The proposed Conservancy complex will attract visitors and the Central Lawn setting same thing which will interest you as the proposed Bridges could get more visitors and tourists to the Gardens.

Would you note I have read the Spital report in the Central Library, made available for those who have an interest in the Botanical Gardens.

1869
Take care with what so to be done. All these grand plans sound very expensive. Would it not be better to spend more money on employing more gardeners - the gardens used to be beautiful but are not so now...
The lake next to the kiosk is terrible, the first thing you see as you come into the gardens. The kiosk should go back to being a tea house as the new Visitors Center is far too small. Cutting down trees seems to be a favourite pastime of the CCC - remember this is a BOTANIC GARDEN and trees take hundreds of years to grow. Do children really need an outdoor classroom being outdoors is surely enough. You should be allowing money for employing and training gardeners - this is an important part of our future
I am very upset about the possibility of the Atlas Cedar and the large Macrocarpa trees on your list to be removed. I work on the caterpillar giving tours and have done for the last 7 years and visitors from all around the world and New Zealand are thrilled by the size of these 2 trees. The area down beside the river across from the lake with all the new planting is also noted by most. I have to say that maybe some of the people making these decisions perhaps need to come and quietly listen to the comments of our overseas visitors on these and other tours through the fabulous Christchurch Botanic Gardens. (The best in the world I tell people) and by the end of the tour you would be amazed how many agree with me.

This all sounds impressive but what has happened and is happening to the Rose Garden. For years these have drawn crowds. NO MENTION is made of this. No maintenance has been done here for some time and a lot of the same (icing) roses not good varieties as in the past are being planted. Camara has a much better Rose Garden than us now. Do we not employ gardeners only maintenance people for lawn & trees. I visited in January and was very disappointed in the lack of care. If we the ratepayers are going to pay for all these paths, bridges, laws we do expect qualified Nurserymen to look after what is left of our plants.

Taking trees out and not replacing so that we do not walk on the grass is not user friendly and trees are give out Carbon Dioxide to help with our pollution.

We have big IDEAS but in a low wage economy can we afford these.

I work as a Caterpillar Driver driving foreign tourists and New Zealanders around the Botanic Gardens on a daily basis. I have read the public spatial plan form and would like to give my feedback as below.

In driving people around the Botanic Gardens up to six times a day, one gets a feel for what is unusual and special in the gardens from the fresh eyes of the public and tourists. I stop the caterpillar ride at the Tropical House and offer the option of taking people through the Fragrance Garden as part of the tour. I find that 80% of the people take up this offer, the others usually head straight into the Rose Gardens. I have noted lately that some of the plants in the Fragrance Gardens haven’t been replaced when they have diseased or died and I assume that this may mean that the garden isn’t to be continued. I suggest that this garden be retained for the following points:

- Fragrance has a special way of bringing people into the present, reminding them of special incidents or people in the past. I see travelers shoulders relax as they smell the fragrances, share knowledge and smile;
- I’ve taken blind people through the gardens, some on the Caterpillar and some have wandered past on the roadway with sighted companions. I’ve suggested they try the garden and they’re delighted to go through, having no idea that the garden was right beside the main walkway;
- Locals are amazed to find this area and want to know why it’s not labelled;
- For the children, it’s a wonderful learning experience. They pick the leaves and try and identify the fragrance. Who knows what a treat like this can mean to a child who previously had no interest in gardens, but suddenly find the smell and touch is something they can identify with. It’s fun watching them clutching handfuls of different leaves and holding them up to their noses with huge smiles on their face.

Rather than remove the garden, could I suggest that a sign or labels be placed beside the main pathway advising people of the Fragrance Garden? Perhaps place signs beside the plants encouraging people to take a leaf, or smell a flower? If there is a medicinal or practical use of the plant, a sign placed to highlight the use.

Tourists comment that the Botanic Gardens are the best they’ve seen in the world (including Kew Gardens). They say that to climb the trees and pick the leaves is unique. They say how lucky we are to be able to do this in our gardens.

Another comment from a lot of the tourists is the size of the trees in the gardens. Trees that they thought were big at home, they see here much taller and wider. For example the Macrocarpa which is just a shrub in its native land of Northern California. In reading the plan I understand that the Macrocarpa tree is to be removed (NP on the plan). If I have this correct, I find this incredibly disheartening. Anyone visiting the gardens on a warm day, or even not so warm, will see young and old climbing up the tree getting photos taken. Surely a designer can incorporate such a majestic tree into a plan rather than remove it?

I would like to offer to take the designers around the Gardens, as tourists on the caterpillar, so they can experience firsthand as our visitors do and rediscover the importance and significance of each area of these special gardens.

1. It’s very distressing to see that the magnificent copper beech tree (which is pictured on the cover of your Spatial Plan leaflet) appears to be sacrificed for a large building! Gardens are for plants NOT buildings. This tree is a treasure - PLEASE DO NOT FELL IT!
2. It appears that the trees in the in-crowd car-parking area are to be removed. These are beautiful and valuable shade trees, a habitat for birds and they add so much to this entrance to the Gardens. They should remain.
3. Why is the Evelyn Coutts Memorial Gateway to be removed? It is an important feature in the history of the Gardens and frames a beautiful vista.
4. Very large areas set aside for Centenarian plants may mean that other areas of interest are sacrificed. Diversity is important.
Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback on the final revised Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan, February 2017. My feedback relates mainly to the Visitor Centre Bridge, part of Project 31, vehicle circulation and traffic management. It also touches on opportunities for the use of public art and reimagining Christchurch’s internationally recognised Garden City status. It is based on my experiences and observations during visits to the Gardens on a frequent (almost daily) basis.

1. VISITOR CENTRE BRIDGE

It is virtually impossible for anyone to stroll through Christchurch’s Botanic Gardens without at some point, having to make way for heavy vehicles, utility trucks, maintenance or delivery vans, even private cars, occasionally at the behest of a horn! (see images 1, 2 in attachment)

The decision to build the major new CBG complex without a vehicle access bridge from Armagh Street was a mistake. It means the Botanic Gardens is routinely used as a series of road links for motorised traffic. This is inappropriate, it is unsafe, and it is debilitating in what should be a pedestrian precinct. It is the antithesis of an enjoyable garden experience. Just as cycles are banned from the inner garden sanctuary, so too should motorized vehicles. There must be zero tolerance of vehicles, other than for approved exceptional or circumstantial needs. (see images 3, 4 in attachment)

That is why -

* The highest priority should be given to eliminating all vehicle and pedestrian conflicts from Christchurch Botanic Gardens by constructing, in the first instance, a vehicle-only access bridge between Armagh Street carpark into the CBG Complex yard; and

* This bridge should be prioritised for inclusion in the Council’s LTCP, with costs for its design and construction allocated to years 2018/2019.

It’s worth noting that this bridge would arguably be an essential first step in the realisation of the CBG’s Spatial Plan itself, by lessening the impact of the growing number of vehicle movements associated with the proposed development and construction of the Botanic Gardens during the years to come.

Regardless of whether or not a new bridge is supported, eventually funded and constructed, action should be taken now to curb the existing vehicle nuisance with:

* A review of vehicle movements throughout the inner gardens with the aim of adopting approved protocols for traffic movements that will reduce vehicle nuisance. This survey of vehicle use might include:
  a) The appropriateness of vehicles for the task at hand in a sensitive garden environment. (The oversized truck on the left is used for CBG’s rubbish collection. Buggies, as depicted on the right, are used to collect garbage from the inner areas of Central Park, New York. (see images 5, 6 in attachment)
  b) Whether workers based at the CBG complex, or staff and external consultants meeting in site need to park or drive through the inner Gardens, when there are public car parks nearby? Should designated parking areas be allocated within those carparks for work-related vehicles and visits? (see images 7, 8 in attachment)
  c) Whether deliveries to the CBG complex are restricted so they only occur outside popular public visiting hours? Whether this should apply to event installations and deconstructions too? Ironically even the Friends of the Gardens seem to have taken to their cars to open up the plant sales kiosk. (see images 9, 10 in attachment)
  d) Whether all vehicle use associated with the ongoing maintenance, care and development of the Gardens is undertaken in a manner that respects visitor enjoyment and experience.

Two other points.

* Vehicle circulation

It’s unclear to what extent light traffic would continue to circulate between the Tea Kiosk and the Riccarton Avenue bridge, if direct access via a bridge into the CBG complex exists. From my on-site observations, a number of the light vehicle movements through the Gardens are absolutely unnecessary and could be minimised with a designated stand still/drop off parking zone in the adjacent Armagh Street carpark. If however it is ultimately decided that there is a convincing need for light vehicles to continue to make this journey, I suggest their movements are restricted to outside popular visiting hours.

* The necessity for a new pedestrian bridge to access the Visitor Centre

If it is agreed that the higher objective of the new access bridge is to empty the Botanic Gardens of vehicles, it’s unclear why heavy vehicles and pedestrians would then be merged together in a major new bridge gateway experience, albeit separated by design elements. If the rationale is to get visitors straight into what is not so much a Visitor Centre, but primarily a retail store and cafe, the Botanic Gardens experience could start to become little more than that.

I suggest -

* The proposed additional pedestrian bridge linking Armagh Street carpark with the CBG Complex be deferred for the time being.

2. PUBLIC ART IN CHRISTCHURCH’S BOTANIC GARDENS

Christchurch’s Botanic Gardens is a natural outdoor gallery to position public art of high quality. There is ample scope for implementing its exciting use in association with the Public Art Advisory Group and the arts community in the development of this Spatial Plan.

When it comes to the existing heritage sculptures in the Gardens it would be worthwhile considering placing a concisely worded interpretation panel providing brief biographical details of the individual artworks.

3. CHRISTCHURCH’S GARDEN CITY HERITAGE
I was surprised that there is no reference to Christchurch’s acclaimed Garden City heritage in 2.2 Context and Significance, p.14 of the Spatial Plan. The only reference to it on p.28 of the Plan - Garden City traditions of colour and seasonal display - seems to consign the city’s garden identity to outdated but quaint garden practice. This Yetts Garden Guide approach lacks imagination. There can be no better opportunity to re-imagine Christchurch’s Garden City brand with a modernised attitude and approach, utilising it in its widest possible sense in the renewal and revitalisation of not only Christchurch Botanic Gardens, but the city and region.

1906
I find the spatial plan very vague.
Would it affect any existing plant/tree collection? I hope not!

The spatial plan only focuses on the Botanic Gardens, meanwhile there is a large increase of native planting around the city (Red zone, Port Hills, river ...). The gardens should offer a different experience for visitors instead of repeating the same thing over and over!

1907
I would not want to see any of the Heritage buildings destroyed e.g. Towrend House.
Also no lovely trees removed to be replaced by others thought to be a bit different.
I think the lovely bush should be offering at least some cabinet food so we can sit and watch children playing in the pool.

I hope to see all the lovely flower beds that we are used to. Also the lovely displays in the begonia house and all the interesting plants in the Towrend House.

1908
See Attachment 3 below
The spatial plan gives much food for thought on the future of Christchurch Botanic Gardens. As a member of the Friends of the Gardens and a retired volunteer guide in the Gardens, I have spent many hours there over the last 28 years and have visited quite a number of Botanic Gardens in New Zealand and overseas.

I attended on John Clemens walk recently and I support the proposals in the Plan and am impressed by the details provided.
A few thoughts ...
The Morton Arboretum in Chicago (www.mortonarb.org) has an innovative and appealing children’s area.
My granddaughters from Wellington love our Botanic Gardens and climbing has a great appeal. They like to be measured against the Wollemi Pine each time. Maybe some growth statistics could be shown on the protective fence and a measuring stick attached. (How much have I grown compared to the Wollemi Pine?)

I can find no mention of the Arbor in the Children’s Playground which was donated by the Friends of the Botanic Garden to provide shade for families. What is the proposal for this structure?

What a worthy project to have a Pavilion and outdoor classroom to encourage an early appreciation of plants and their vital importance to human life on this earth. The Chelsea Physic Garden was used as a resource for teaching so many curriculum subjects apart from botany. Examples include medicine, geography, history, maths, science, art and commerce.

Trees marked for possible removal
Removing trees can be a very emotional topic but as long as there are still trees of the same species left in our Gardens, the following ideas could attract positive interest, when the time does come, to remove some of the great old trees e.g. Atlas Cedar and Macrocarpa.

Maybe an event or ceremony with photos taken could be arranged to ‘Farewell’ such special trees with stories and history of the trees. (This chance to say goodbye and share stories, especially from staff and former staff, could help when buildings are taken down).

In the UK there have been projects to use every bit of trees, once cut. See attached pages about ONION44 Exhibition Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh. See www.OneOak.info

Here, after the quake, at Canterbury Museum we had the WHOLE HOUSE REUSE PROJECT in 2013 set up by REKINDLE see www.wholehousereuse.co.nz (This tells some of the story of the project, of a home that would have otherwise been destined for waste, being reconstructed and transformed into ... Nearly 400 objects created by reusing every single piece of 19... home in New Brighton, Christchurch which was scheduled for demolition in 201)

There will be other uses from the felled trees apart from the many uses for the timber e.g. the compost potential. If positive publicity is given it may not be such an issue to lose loved trees.

Evelyn Cousins (Mayoress of Christchurch 1941 to 1945)
If/WHEN the memorial to Evelyn Cousins is moved or removed, please ensure some recognition remains with a plaque perhaps.

Pathways Changes.
Some of the proposed pathway changes were well explained by John Clemens on his walk. When I was a Guide in the Gardens, one of the joys was taking local visitors and overseas folk to explore the quieter more sheltered parts, often quite unknown to locals. So keeping some of these lesser used and possibly obscured paths, will be a welcome contrast to the proposed more open vistas on main routes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor Centre Bridges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I fully approve of a bridge for vehicles and separate one, but possibly somehow attached, for pedestrians to arrive at the new Visitor Centre from the Carpark. Lighting for night time events will be needed. This new access would seem to be top priority and also remove much vehicle traffic crossing the Gardens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many of the grounds staff will no doubt be involved in the extra work this plan will bring. This could mean additional funding in the budget to enable extra help to maintain the grounds in the best possible way, especially in light of our Garden City title.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many residents know and love the Gardens just as they are, but with well-considered and accurate information published over time, these new proposals should receive general acceptance and new features become loved in their time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1921</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More money should be spent on maintaining and improving current features of the Gardens eg., species signage, rather than spending on additional structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Possible shared toilets by Robert McDougall/Museum redevelopment - location identified as 1 on Spatial Plan is very poor. Visually obnoxious, and discreet. Current facilities should be renovated sympathetically.
2. No need to remove Evelyn Cousins Gateway. It provides visual interest and seating.
3. New conservatory complex building suggested in front of Rose Garden on Spatial Plan is a disastrous location. Would hugely compromise the area visually if fitted into existing plantings, and possibly necessitate the removal of existing plantings if large size, which is totally unacceptable and unnecessary. Location behind current conservatory building Cunningham House is better as long as it is sympathetically designed and to scale.
4. It is not necessary to extend the area devoted to the evolution of the Canterbury Plains as further planting would not fit in with existing exotic planting and would visually compromise the open aspect of the Gardens. Native plants of NZ are accessible in other NZ locations visited by tourists and known to NZers. The Botanic Gardens are valued for their open aspect and the Victorian heritage of Christchurch and the existing native plantings are adequate to explain their role in Canterbury.
5. Care must be taken in expanding the childrens area as there is a danger of hard structures cluttering the existing vistas. Childrens adventure play is catered for at the Margaret Mahy playground. Children can already engage with nature in the Gardens through running, walking and playing in autumn leaves, and in the play pool. Some educational facilities might be desirable but must not compromise existing vistas and restorative values of the Gardens.
6. Gateway bridges - added access to the Gardens is needed and MUST be sympathetically designed and to scale with their locations.
Council  
28 September 2017

Introduction:
Tourism is a leading economic sector in Christchurch. Each year an estimated 1,287,154 international and 1,267,563 domestic visitors stay overnight in our city, with an estimated annual spend of international and domestic visitors to the Christchurch area is $332 million.

The Christchurch Botanic Gardens is the most visited free, Christchurch visitor attraction. In the Summer of 2016 there was an estimated 56,008 visitors to the Christchurch Botanic Gardens. The Botanic Gardens is rated as Christchurch visitors second best experience (behind "friendly welcoming residents").

The ICT Visitor Insights research July-December 2016 named the Christchurch Botanic Gardens in the top three visitor attractions in Christchurch.

"The Botanic Gardens are beautiful!"
"The gardens are very pretty. Lovely flowers everywhere"
"Visiting your amazing gardens, so green and pretty."
"The first thing I think of is the beautiful botanic gardens"
"I think of visiting local attractions and natural beauty"

In order to provide a world-class, unique experience we support the establishment of a journey proposition through the Botanic Gardens. This would include the proposed unique NZ plants and sub-Antarctic plantings, Gondwanaland Heritage story - indigenous and colonial including the Ngai Tahu stories around Mahinga Kai.

The addition of these story telling components of the Botanic Gardens experience would allow our visitors to understand more about the city pre colonisation as well as giving our visitors a uniquely New Zealand experience.

We would encourage all access points have NZ plantings to ensure a unique welcome and experience to visitors. This would ensure there was a unique selling point in the marketing of the Gardens as a must-see attraction.

Hours:
We would like consideration given to opening the Gardens and built attractions within the Gardens such as the conservatories for longer, especially in Summer. This would allow conference organisers to utilise the Gardens buildings for the conference and group markets for special events.

The Christchurch Visitor Centre has received feedback from the visitors about their disappointment in the limited access to the conservatories during the current Gardens operating hours.

Events:
Events held at the Gardens have been well received by residents and the visitor market. The visiting friends and relatives (VFR) visitor cohort is very high for Christchurch and the visitor experience is intertwined with the residents.

Highlights include Botanic D’Lights, Christmas decorations, Summer weekend afternoon concerts and the current Jenny Gilles exhibition. Consideration could also be given to include live theatre to further bring the Gardens into the lives of our residents and add value to the visitor experience in summer.

Entry:
Armagh Street:
In the Summer of 2016, 42% of all visitors to the Gardens gained access via the Arman Street entrance compared to 22% visitors who gained entry via Rolleston Avenue.

Therefore it is essential not only that the proposed Visitor Centre Bridge be functional for both vehicles and pedestrians, but that it also be visually attractive as it is the key entry point and feature of the Gardens to many visitors.

A well-designed pedestrian access is essential for elderly visitors and people with disabilities. The bridge would also provide necessary vehicle access to event contractors (services such as theming, audio visual, etc.). The proposed joint access is key to a wide range of opportunities to improve and increase the visitor experience. It will lead to increased visitor connection with the Gardens Visitor Centre, as well as the ability to encourage the site to be used as a key visitor event site.

There also needs to be consideration given for coaches, this includes coach parking, ease of turning and access of visitors into the Gardens Visitor Centre and surrounds.

Rolleston Avenue:
To ensure a warm Christchurch and New Zealand welcome, there should be a new main entry to the Gardens from Rolleston Avenue. Consideration should be given to the correct infrastructure. This could include allowing area for a gathering space for events and/or welcome, signage (including hours) and information delivery (including multi-lingual), as well as
<p>| |having a prominent New Zealand native focus to ensure the Christchurch Botanic Gardens has a unique selling point from other cities. We would like consideration for this important visitor infrastructure be featured at all key entrances (Armagh St, Rolleston Ave and Riccarton Ave). |
|---|
|INFRASTRUCTURE:|There needs to be an increase in the number and placement of bathroom facilities provided within the grounds of the Gardens. An increase in such facilities will ensure a better experience for tour groups, especially the elderly. There should also be improved signage on where these are located. Shelters are also necessary given Christchurch’s weather. |
|MAINTENANCE:|We are aware Council’s Parks Management are addressing around immediate maintenance issues including the upkeep of the paths and garden beds at the Christchurch Botanic Gardens. This work is essential to ensure visitors can enjoy a world class gardens experience. |
|FUTURE RESEARCH:|We would like to encourage market research be undertaken to ensure knowledge is gained as to what visitors are wanting when they go to the gardens. This would be segmented to gain the views of visitors wanting a pleasant place to go for a short walk, to international experts on gardens and plants. This would ensure visitors individual needs are catered for in the Gardens experience as well as in surrounding infrastructure (e information, signage, walking routes, story-telling, guided tours etc.). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I am a resident of Christchurch and a mother of two adult children who have grown up in Christchurch during which time we frequented the Botanic Gardens. I have a Master's in Environmental Policy and have a sound understanding of the Statutory Planning Processes and Kaibaitangi. I am employed as a Caterpillar Tour Guide in the gardens and I have engaged with locals and visitors throughout my garden tours. I wish to make several comments on the Spatial Plan which is proposed for the Botanic Gardens. I agree that it is important to ensure that the features that make the gardens unique (in terms of the collection; landscape and heritage) are not lost.

To me some of these unique features include from: the history of the planting; the choice of trees; the New Zealand Native Area; the formal and informal plantings (Armstrong lawn and the herbaceous border); the Archery Lawn; to intuitions such as the Bentham's Cornell with the fascinating fruit. But also importantly, I love seeing the way people enjoy the gardens, from families playing in the autumn leaves to teenagers just hanging out under the trees in the spacious areas. Tourists have often commented how it is so good to see so many people just relaxing in the gardens and how beautiful the gardens are.

I am therefore concerned that some of the modifications suggested in the Spatial Plan may compromise the feeling of space and naturalness of the Gardens. The suggested changes next to the GondwanaLand area, where playgrounds and class rooms are proposed, will I believe reduce the sense of space between the family area and the Avon River. I have often seen families, groups of teenagers and many individuals just sitting and spending time in this area. I see it as a place for people to relax and enjoy being in a natural environment. I therefore question the benefit of constructions to emulate the natural environment when the Gardens already has the New Zealand Native Area. This native area already provides such a good area for understanding our natural environment as well as how Avon lived within the forest. It has the resources of the Kawakawa, the Cabbage Trees, native flax as well as all the native bird life which lives in this area. It provides a complete ecosystem which would not be provided in the proposed educational development in the Spatial Plan. I would like the proposal to redevelop the family area next to GondwanaLand to be reassessed to give higher priority to retaining open spaces and using resources the Garden already has for educational purposes.

The Spatial Plan includes removal of the Macrocarpa tree opposite the Ice Centre. Is this a safety issue? This is a very popular playground and this can be seen by how polished the trunk edifices are. Both local and visiting children climb this tree and I have seen many photos taken of children barefoot while sitting in the tree.

Another area which children love is the Sensory Garden. On the Caterpillar Tour we stop off at the Tropical House so that people can enjoy the Rose Garden, the Tropical House, and the Cacti, Orchid and Townsend rooms. I also encourage people to walk through the Sensory Garden. This allows people to physically engage with nature. Visitors to the Gardens are so surprised to be allowed to pluck leaves off a plant and they enjoy the surprisingly different smells and touch sensations which they encounter. I find that children particularly enjoy the sensory garden and it comes across to me as a completely unique experience for them. I would like to see the Sensory Garden retained and nurtured.

The Spatial Plan suggests a realignment of the entrances to the Gardens. I agree that the entrance next to the Museum could be improved. Now that the temporary site has been relocated, a more informative Gateway area could enhance the experience and understanding of the Gardens. However, I do not agree that a traffic bridge is required next to the Ice Centre. Current access for traffic, including heavy traffic, is sufficient for activities within the Gardens. From my experience, current traffic movement within the Gardens is sporadic with minimal disturbance to the ambience of the gardens.

I would like to know why it has been proposed that the Evelyn Cousins Gateway to the Archery Lawn is to be removed and the pathways realigned? I see this gateway as a heritage feature of the garden and enables the flow into the Archery Lawn.

Overall the Spatial Plan appears to be increasing the Social Construction footprint within the Gardens, and this includes next to the rose garden and behind the Tropical House, and the numerous shelters which are suggested. These constructions at the expense of the sense of open spaces in the gardens. I believe that the Christchurch Botanic Gardens has a great structure and this reflects our heritage as a multicultural city. I would like the Spatial Plan to focus more on enhancing the gardens within this great structure by giving a higher priority to nurturing the flora and fauna, as well as providing more investment in Botanic research and development to make our Botanic Gardens even more impressive. Let's not move away from the natural beauty that everyone seems to enjoy in our Gardens.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my points in this submission.
### Item 13

| 1929 | We applaud the council’s initiative in seeking to advance the development of the 2007 Master Plan which had resulted from extensive consultation. It is very pleasing that the council decided to reopen consultation (overturning a committee recommendation to proceed with the Spatial Plan forthwith), given the enormity of disruption to Christchurch and its citizens since late 2010. The Spatial Plan clearly aims at bringing to life the series of projects in the Master Plan within an ordered structure. This structuring has been much needed, but the question is: how much should the gardens be changed to accommodate this thematic base which drives the Spatial Plan? In our view the top priority should be to raise the standards of care and maintenance of the existing gardens by putting money into funding extra gardening positions, apprenticeships, professional development and the like. This will help ensure that the former world class status of this city treasure is re-established. Please refer to a suggestion in point 7.

Aspects of concern to us in the Spatial Plan
1. The proposal to place a toilet block in the corner between McDougall Art Gallery and Museum wing would deprive the entrance axis of a small but very important horisuctural feature. The toilet block near the McDougall could surely be modified, upgraded inside and out, to harmonise with its surroundings and to function as an effective public facility.
2. The proposal to remove the Evelyn Gosling Gateway to the Archery Lawn appears to offer no aesthetic or practical benefit, diverting funds from other more important tasks or projects: this gateway has heritage values associated with it which we consider should be retained and enhanced, if anything.
3. The proposal to aggregate greenhouse buildings either in front of the rose garden or behind Townsend House building offer possible benefits, but only if placed in the area behind Townsend building. Any incursion into the other area would mean the probable loss of significant trees and loss of important vistas.
4. The extent of the proposed Canterbury plantings / native plantings depends very largely on whether or not existing large exotic trees are to be removed. If the natives are to exist as underplanting, judicious selection and layout of native species would be acceptable. The question of focus (seeing the trees for the woods, so to speak) would be important. An issue of balance is the extent to which native grasses are to dominate large areas - especially given their ubiquity in the landscape and in urban and suburban settings now.
5. Children’s areas, again a matter of balance: the laudable goal of familiarising children with plants and gardens and educating them about them should not give way to the desire to provide extended ‘play’ areas in the gardens. The city has many play areas for children, not least the Margaret Mahy Family Playground which provides enormous scope for play.
6. The bridges: the material and visual character of the proposed bridges needs to be considered with great care. They are necessary, practical additions, but to prevent their being intrusions a great deal of care needs to be taken with their design.

- A link to the opening statement: the visual quality and educational effectiveness of the gardens could be greatly improved by something as simple as a significant upgrade and extension of species ID signage; presently it’s extremely hit and miss and very poorly designed and presented, will just the use by date?

Note: A project by a senior student at Cashmere High School to design a set of planting / trees ID "plaques" for the school grounds a number of years ago proved to be very successful. I will send in a scanned image if I can locate a photo I took at the student’s art teacher at the time.)

Overall: it is imperative that in the desire to update the Botanic Gardens the existing “natural” rhythm of open spaces, close planting and “structural” large trees is not spoilt by unnecessary clutter, particularly with elements which do not have a place in a garden of this type. To this end, our suggestion is that local urban and suburban parks (Abbeyley, Woodham etc) might be developed as satellites of the Botanic Gardens in which specialist plantings and groupings could be situated. The red zone itself surely also offers such opportunities in the longer term.

| 1930 | It appears that there are to be a number of new water bodies proposed. It is very difficult on the plans provided to differentiate “the proposed” from “the existing” and I am wondering why there needs to be more water bodies in an area so close to the Ohakea- Avon River.

I am concerned at the inclusion of several new “River Gateways” of varying sizes. What is their purpose, what will their effect be on the existing riverside pathways where I and many others walk our dogs (or lead them) on a daily basis?

It appears that there is an extensive Mahinga Kai proposed for development in the north west sector of the site and whilst I think that this will be a valuable addition and could become a notable point of difference for our garden, I assume that this major work and its ongoing maintenance will be funded by Ngai Tahu/huri and or Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.

I would like to think that there will be an opportunity for “ongoing engagement” as progress on implementation of the Spatial Plan proceeds. | 1, 2 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I found this plan difficult to decipher, but from what I could understand here are my views. That the Spatial Plan should be more concerned with botanical input instead of buildings and hard landscaping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thoughts on proposed projects:
1. Gondwana Garden
   Does this take in the existing Native Garden? As this could certainly do with some restoration. It would be good to take some pointers from the brilliantly successful Australian Botanic Garden at Cranbourne, near Melbourne, in terms of design and education and adapting similar concepts for a Gondwana Garden.
2. Childrens Garden
   A natural adventurous environment including trees, plants, foliage and organic materials rather than a built environment and brightly coloured plastic play equipment
3. Conservatory
   Please retain the existing authentic Victorian Conservatory as the focus of any conservatory development. It says it all about Conservatory Heritage as well as a successful environment for Tropical plants. What is new conservatory space to be used for? Why do we need it? Please don’t upstage with a contemporary building, spoiling the character of the buildings we already have!
4. Bridge to Visitors Centre
   Why is this necessary? There is a perfectly good bridge from the car park to the charming octagonal building which reflects the era of the Botanical Gardens. The new Visitors Centre is an ugly coach house which seems to be more about commercial interests than anything else. It seems to consist mostly of shop and cafe which has an inadequate kitchen, and toilet facilities which take up a lot of space but are also inadequate. There should have been much more space allocated to the exhibition/educational areas which is cramped and doesn't show off the excellent displays to best advantage. Altogether a badly designed building which has no aesthetic value!!

Why is there virtually no planting around this Visitor Centre? This is a Botanic Garden, yet there is nothing but a handful of badly shaped specimen trees in a vast empty lawn. Is this for the architects ego - that he wanted the view to his poorly designed building unobstructed by plants? Never mind that it happens to be sitting in the middle of a Botanic Garden.

PLEASE NO MORE BUILDINGS - JUST GARDEN AND PLANTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13      | The gardens are already enjoyed by over one million people a year. This shows we don't need to make huge changes. It's true the gardens have changed over time but a large part of their appeal is their constancy. The stability of no drastic changes is important to the local community particularly after the Canterbury earthquakes. The gardens have been an important sanctuary.

People need to be allowed to explore and find their own way around. Please don't put in lots more paths or cut down trees to improve sightlines and circulation. Trees can act as totems, sign posts, markers for finding one's own way.

Intuitive, self-guided navigation through the gardens does not need to be our way dictated by someone else. Part of the existing charm of the gardens is the element of self-discovery. People actually treasure the quirkiness of paths that don't necessarily connect up – where they can get a little bit 'lost'. It's not something to be fixed! It's something to be valued.

Keep the macrocarpa tree on the path between Cunningham House and the Visitors Centre. Kids love climbing in it and enjoy simply looking up at it for its large size and shape. Trees are important as their scale reminds us all of who we are.

Kids also love the hedge in the children's play area. Please keep this as part of the redevelopment. And please keep the open grass area around the kids’ area. It's easier to keep an eye on children and avoid dodging people covertly watching them. It is pretty obvious at the moment if someone is lurking around that shouldn't be. Why not build any new conservatory complex on or as part of the old kiosk. It is closer to the children's area and could be used to incorporate teaching.

It would be cool if the playground could have giant plants and flower structures the kids could play on, like they were in a giant garden. Similar to the beautiful metal sculptures already present, like the big daffodil, the rose, the leaves, etc but bigger and more robustly suitable for playing on or under.

I'm opposed to the new conservatory complex on the central lawn (site option 1) and to removal of the fernery (site option 2). Option 1 would mean loss of precious open space. Option 2 encroaches on the charm of the lakelet and the fernery is a magical place for children.

Please don't put a boardwalk in for the lakelet next to the old visitors' centre. There is a lovely winding gravel path already. New hard landscaping, particular with unnatural straight lines, would detract from the relaxing atmosphere of the lakelet.

I really like the idea of the dual bridge across the Avon from the Aragahl Street carpark to the new visitors centre as this will reduce vehicle flow through the gardens. But I don't want trees removed from the Aragahl Street carpark or a tree-unfriendly, non-permeable carpark surface such as asphalt or concrete. The tree filled carpark is a really beautiful place – it's the most beautiful carpark in town! Please don't change it. But I don't want a bridge in the native area because the existing area has a wild natural feel and a bridge would detract from it. I don't want a bridge from the hospital to the curator's garden area. There are already bridges to go over either side of Rolleston Ave and the band rotunda.

Please keep or add introduced trees for colour contrast with any new native planting. I love our native flora but also love the colourful diversity of deciduous trees.

And please don't seal existing pathways. We travel primarily on hard surfaces in an urban environment and the gardens are a place where people can experience natural surfaces, grass, and a connection with the earth. We don't want to see more of the buildings! Please don't cut down the trees around the McDougall gallery. It's rich how it's needled into greenery.

Surely part of the gardens' mission is repeat visitors, like we've been for many years. Part of the draw is being able to go back and see things you haven't seen before. Removing trees so you can see everything detracts from this. Don't erode the present charm by making everything visible, everything obvious, telling people where to go and how to experience the space. Having distinct, unique areas of charm and interest that can be rediscovered time and time again is an existing strength of the gardens. Keep it a place that people want to keep coming back to!

People get outside less and less in this digital age. You don't need to 'fancy up' the gardens. Yes, upgrade the playground, yes keep things maintained - but keep the magic that we've already got.
I consider any major revamp of our beautiful gardens to be grossly inappropriate use of money - this is a time with many more urgent priorities - roads, footpaths, cycle-ways etc. The two bridges are ridiculous and unnecessary. There are enough as it stands. My ideal vision for the gardens is to not briker with them apart from a gentle tidy-up of the beds and better labelling for more plants plus better pedestrian surfaces throughout that don't get muddy in the water.

I love your plans for the children's garden.

I would love to see a grand entrance to the gardens in between the museum and the Curators place. At present the gate nearest to the museum and the one that goes to the carpark have no impact whatsoever.

Heritage New Zealand / Pouhere Taonga, a member of which was part of the original Key Stakeholder Reference Group

"I don't know if things will improve, if we change BUT I do know that to improve, things must change".

I feel the "Botanic Gardens" are currently being run as a glorified park: with deteriorating horticultural standards and management/team dysfunctional. Please reassess where the cities parks are at - current standards are not acceptable. If the spatial plan gives me clarity & vision to achieve the cities aims & aspirations for the CBG, then I am all for supporting it BUT if the spatial plan is just a red herring to the business at the botanic gardens: horticulture/education/collections/interpretation then I'd say please do the basics & do these well - which they are currently not!

Historic Places Canterbury welcomes the development of a spatial plan for the Botanic Gardens and the opportunity to comment on it. We support the broad principles outlined in the plan and trust that there will be future opportunities to comment on more detailed projects that result from the spatial plan.

We recognise the importance of having an overall view and vision for the direction of the Botanic Gardens. However, we wish to stress that, before any further major expenditure occurs on, for example, rebuilt conservatories, it is vital that the standards of care and maintenance of the existing gardens is raised by putting money into funding extra gardening positions, apprenticeships, professional development and the like. The visual quality and educational effectiveness of the gardens could be greatly improved by something as simple as a significant upgrade and extension of species ID signage; presently it is extremely hit and miss and very poorly designed and presented. Ahead of more grandiose schemes, we need these sorts of measures to ensure that the world-class status of this city treasure is re-established and maintained.

Aspects of concern in the Spatial Plan

1. It appears from the plan that it is proposed to locate new toilets in the corner between the McDougall Art Gallery and the Museum. If this is so, we consider that it is a visually intrusive location and quite inappropriate. The rather awkward conjunction of the two buildings is at present attractively disguised by planting, which nevertheless still allows glimpses of the brick wall of the McDougall. The toilet block near the McDougall could surely be modified, upgraded inside and out, to harmonise with its surrounds and to function as an effective public facility.

2. The proposal to remove the Evelyn Cousins Gateway to the Archery Lawn appears to offer no aesthetic or practical benefit, diverting funds from other more important tasks or projects. It provides a useful meeting place with seating and attractive vistas. This commemorative feature should not be removed without appropriate consultation and consideration of alternatives.

3. Of the suggested locations for new conservatory buildings, the area to the east and south of the rose garden is completely inappropriate. It is unclear whether it would be designed to fit around existing trees, or whether this location would involve removal of trees. The latter approach would be entirely unacceptable, involving the loss of trees of significant scale. On the other hand, if it is intended to fit conservatories around existing trees, this would only result in visual clutter and loss of important vistas and potential damage to root systems of the trees. The option to redesign the area around Cunningham House is more acceptable, though design and scale would require careful consideration.

4. We are concerned at the proposed extent of plantings showing the evolution of Canterbury plants. For example the area to the south and southwest of the rose garden is shown as intended for native planting. At present this area contains a number of large and interesting exotic trees. Underplanting of this area with shade-tolerant natives would completely change the character of this area and be unacceptable.

5. We are concerned that the proposals for the children’s area risk clutter, loss of vistas and increasing use of hard structures. Familiarizing children with plants and gardens and educating them is a laudable goal but careful design will be needed to avoid the dangers listed above. We recognize that the existing playground provides the useful role of drawing
parents with their children to the gardens but providing extended play areas for children is not essential to the role of the Botanic Gardens. The city has many play areas for children, not least the magnet which is the Margaret Mahy Family Playground, created at considerable cost. The whole of the gardens provides a natural play area with extensive lawn areas, trees to hide behind, autumn leaves to play in. We question the need or appropriateness of designing specific wilderness play areas. This is a great concept but one that could surely be met in other parks throughout the city or in a designated area of the Red Zone.

6. We support the planned location of the proposed new bridges but the material and visual character of them needs to be considered with great care, the illustrations provided in the Spatial Plan hopefully were provided as a rough guide only.

The feature of the Botanic Gardens which is most greatly admired is the existing “natural” rhythm of open spaces, close planting and “structural” large trees, not spoiled by unnecessary clutter. Botanic gardens aspire to meet a wide range of educational and other purposes but with a tightly confined site, there is a real danger that the key quality which makes the current gardens so appealing could be lost in the desire to meet all possible needs and aspirations. The question that has not been raised, but perhaps which should be, is have we reached a point where in order to avoid unnecessary clutter and loss of what we most value about the gardens, is it now time to develop a concept of satellite gardens which could provide the room for extended plantings on a particular theme? Already there are examples of specialized plantings such as the Heritage Rose Garden at Beverly Park, the fuchsia and iris gardens at Mona Vale and the sister-city gardens at Halswell Quarry. Certain of our heritage parks contain rare plants which could usefully be incorporated into a city-wide plant identification system. The Red Zone opens up another possibility for themed gardens and might be a more appropriate and expansive location for gardens themed around the plants of the Canterbury Plains. These could be linked with actual remnants (Owens Bush) or restored areas e.g. Taroa Swamps. Is it too far fetched to envisage the day when visitors to the Botanic Gardens might also be able to take minibus trips to these satellite gardens, so that Christchurch would truly begin to live up to its name as a Garden City.

2155 Submission on Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan 2017

My first thought was puzzlement over the title of the plan, because there is not enough space; however, I was surprised to see that the check out of the river loop made by Christ’s College has been there since the beginning, so the Gardens have been successful with the management of the ground they do have.

The Spatial Plan is very good, and has obviously utilised a lot of research, including Botanic Gardens overseas, and has already undergone one round of consultation. I am not qualified to speak on mahogany car aspects but the other subject divisions make sense. I also found the Curator’s guided walk of great benefit. The Visitor Centre Bridge proposals seem logical, and I was surprised to hear that there is opposition.

My own special interest has been in the trees, and I have spent a few summer hours trying to make an inventory of the trees listed in your brochures “Notable Trees” and “Commemorative Plantings”, which may now be out of print. It was difficult to discover what the fate of these would be under the Spatial Plan. Although there is a surfeit of trees planted by successive presidents of Rotary International which do not commemorate any event other than their visits, nevertheless in total they still represent a part of “discovery” in the sense of the Plan’s section of this name. It is true that some have failed, some plaques have been half-buried by tree-root subsidence, and some have been removed or transplanted during developments. I also understand that plaques are now unacceptable, and the issue with space is clear from the number planted over the river outside the traditional confines of the Gardens, such as the Bhotan Pine planted by His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama in the Pizzutoli. I can see my interest in these trees is out-dated, but I wonder whether they might not make another perspective on history if they were “connected” in the Plan’s sense.
Attachment 2 to Submission ID #1903

Images 1-2

Images 3-4
OneOak exhibition, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh

Final report for the Scottish Forestry Trust

The OneOak exhibition, co-ordinated by the Sylva Foundation, was hosted by Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh (RBGE) for a period of six weeks between October 12th and December 2nd. Funding was provided by the Scottish Forestry Trust to support the creation of the exhibition, its transport to the venue, and its curation.

The OneOak exhibition

The exhibition comprised educational materials (2D information panels) and interpretation of exhibits, plus music and film. 3D materials included a number of articles of fine furniture, craft items, sculpture, toys, household items on display. The exhibition filled completely the large exhibition space immediately adjacent to the main entrance to the John Hope Gateway (West Gate).


Private View

A private view was held on the evening of 11th October. Some 450 people were invited. Numbers attending were disappointingly low (25). The most likely cause was the weather which was very inclement. The event was opened by the Regius Keeper Dr Stephen Blackmore, followed by a short presentation by Gabriel Hemery and curator Jane King. The support of SFT was acknowledged.

Media and social interest

A press release was prepared jointly by Sylva and RBGE and circulated by RBGE by their Media Officer.

Separately, Sylva authored two articles for the forestry press: one for The Chartered Forester, and a smaller piece in Forestry & Timber News. The SFT was credited in both articles. Copies of the articles are appended.

Sylva’s active website for the OneOak project, and associated social media, made the most of the exhibition. The homepage at www.OneOak.info includes an interactive 360° degree panorama of the exhibition.
During the six weeks, October to December 2012, we received unprecedented interest through our websites and social media. The OneOak website attracted 9,249 unique visits, and Sylva’s main website an additional 12,573 (total 21,822). The project’s Facebook and Twitter accounts attracted good numbers of ‘likes’ and followers.

Visitor attendance
Two members of staff from Sylva and the curator spent three days interacting with visitors following its opening. Comments were extremely positive, both relating to the overall presentation of the exhibition, and its content and story.

RBGE provided visitor numbers for the entire run of the exhibition, these were: 49,608 visitors. These do not denote actual visitors to the exhibition but given its placement immediately adjacent to the entrance, a high proportion of these visitors were exposed to it.

The exhibition was highlighted specifically in a report by Visit Scotland that awarded RBGE with their highest standard as a visitor attraction of 5 stars, and they were impressed by the quality of the OneOak exhibition and found it ‘fascinating and worth visiting in itself’.

Feedback from RBGE
Ian Edwards, Head of Exhibitions at RBGE, commented that the exhibition was a “triomphe.”

Elnor Gallant, Exhibitions Officer at RBGE said: “The Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh is delighted to be the final host venue for OneOak. The story of OneOak links well with our experiences as a botanic garden and with our policy of communicating about the environment at every level. Having hosted two particularly well received drop-in sessions bringing insight to the project, back in January 2011, it made absolute sense for us to present the full exhibition, and what a finale it is. In its first 11 days the exhibition has not only proved very popular with our visitors, of all ages, but has also provoked passionately positive feedback from our staff.”
OneOak Sales

The OneOak exhibition was not designed primarily as a selling event but rather an educational activity. Nonetheless a number of the larger items on display were sold on behalf of makers, and a reasonable quantity of prints and smaller wooden items sold. This was very welcome given the very considerable investment made by Sylva to the project over the last three years.

Legacy

The Sylva Foundation’s next major educational initiative is a celebration of John Evelyn’s Sylva of 1664. The Sylva Foundation has supported the writing and illustration of The New Sylva, to be published by Bloomsbury in 2014, to celebrate the 350th Anniversary of the original work. Sylva is also planning exhibitions to accompany the book’s publication, consisting of a proportion of the 200 new drawings made for the new book, together with some information panels communicating the importance of forests and of forest management to a general public audience. As a direct result of the success of the OneOak exhibition at RBGE, the Head of Exhibitions at RBGE has not only invited Sylva to launch The New Sylva exhibitions at RBGE, but is also co-ordinating on Sylva’s behalf a series national touring exhibitions. Starting at RBGE in April 2014, the exhibitions will move on to Royal Botanic Garden at Kew, National Botanic Garden of Wales, Westonbirt Arboretum, and National Botanic Garden at Glasnevin (Ireland). Through these exhibitions we hope to reach a very wide audience and be able to communicate effectively about sustainable forest management in the 21st Century.

The educational work undertaken in the OneOak project has also been instrumental in the development of a new programme of work starting in 2013 being funded by B&Q. The concept of engaging the public in positive stories about sustainable forest management has been included in the B&Q project, which is supported by their Corporate Social Responsibility team. It is hoped that some ‘mini one tree’ projects will be undertaken in this work.

The OneOak finale exhibition at Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh has been significant at a number of levels. It has assisted very significantly in the delivery of Sylva’s core educational objectives in bringing people closer to sustainable forest management and in using wood. It has created a lasting legacy in feeding directly in the development of two new major projects. The funding provided by the Scottish Forestry Trust and their support for the exhibition was fundamental to its success.

Dr Gabriel Hemery
Chief Executive, Sylva Foundation
7th February 2013
Christchurch Botanic Gardens
Spatial Plan

Feedback Form

Please let us know your comments about the proposed Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan.

1. Special thanks to Dr John Clemens for his very informative talk and for showing us the proposed changes. He was an excellent tutor; greatly appreciated.

2. Thanks to John Clemens for the hard copy of the CBG Spatial Plan.

3. Where Maori words are used with the English equivalent in brackets, I’m grateful to the planners, as I’m one of those Pakeha who are completely confused by the meaning of Maori words and phrases. So thank you for your assistance.

4. But the Feb 2017 booklet should not be the “FINAL REVISED” version. Our submission being made now in May 2017 should have some relevance.

5. Thanks for the information on page 2. It’s good to acknowledge and publish the names of the Project Team, Partners, Authors etc.

    [see my further feedback on attached pages] [to page(s) 16 Items]

Please fold with the reply paid portion on the outside and return by 5pm, Saturday 27 May 2017.
6 Why are so many of the photos very dark, poorly lit, especially the ones taken in Christchurch? They give the impression that our Botanic Gardens are very gloomy. And that’s misleading. Let’s have some well-lit Christchurch photos, please.

7 The print is too small for me. There’s plenty of meaty stuff to read and try to understand. But, like many older folk, I need larger, clearer print to be able to comprehend it all.

8 The Christchurch Botanic Gardens Management Plan, 2007, is printed in the standard portrait format. But the Spatial plan has used the landscape format of printing documents. It is not conducive to reading, studying or making notes. It’s more of a coffee-table format. We need to print public documents in the portrait format wherever possible, so that they are bound on the longer side, just as normal books do and have proven to be the best format for humans to handle and use.

9 The sketches by Helen Kerr are too pale to let us differentiate between the lighter and darker blues. And between the lighter and darker greens. It does matter. Use bolder colours, please.

10 Helen Kerr’s cute and artistic hand-printing on her sketches are incomprehensible to me. The plan should enlighten the public, not confuse or confound us. As does that unintelligible printing. Please use clear writing.
1. "All new toilet facilities are required to provide accessible units." (your page 16). Yes, of course.
   And all new toilet facilities to be Unisex - as are the toilets in the new Civic Transport Interchange on Colombo St.
   That's so much safer and more dignified for our LGBTQ folk; and for carers taking little daughters or little sons to the toilet.

2. The Robert McDougall Art Gallery.

12(b) Please be aware the Civic City Council which owns this beautiful 1920's building in the Civic Botanic Gardens, has NOT signed any lease for the Robert McDougall Art Gallery building.
   And the Canterbury Museum may never be able to renovate all its own buildings.
   Meantime, we believe that the Robert McDougall Art Gallery should once again be used for showing our glorious old treasured art that we loved seeing in that wonderful 1920's setting.

12(b) The 3 historical photos on page 57 of the Robert McDougall Art Gallery, are interesting.
   But the title "1930's, Christchurch, Louise Beamont" is puzzling. For the building, since opening in 1932, has always been our Art Gallery.
   Perhaps that wording means something else. Do the photos come from the Christchurch Library - or not?
I believe that Trees are more important than visitas or buildings in our Christchurch Botanic Gardens. Christchurch has plenty of magnificent views of the Southern Alps, the Port Hills, the rivers and the Pacific Ocean. But the living trees are so special in our Botanic Gardens.

Do not remove any more trees or shrubs to improve a vista.

I'm still very sad over the unannounced removal of the magical old Winter-Sweet tree (Chimonanthus praecox) that was nearly as old as the McDougall Gallery itself. It grew facing West, in front of the Art Gallery, to the north of the entrance steps.

Because the tree was sheltered from those cold easterly winds by the Gallery behind it, the sweet perfume from the Chimonanthus flowers wafted across the front area outside the Gallery, enchanting the visitors as we walked around.

Many people were intrigued by the warm, spicy perfume in the late afternoons, from May onwards. They wondered where it was coming from. That was a special heart-warming experience every Winter and we should have cherished it.

But by 2016 the Chimonanthus had completely vanished. That's a petty way of enhancing a vista, at the price of a true botanical delight. Don't do it any more, please.
Council
28 September 2017

Item No.: 13

I cherish our beautiful CTC Botanic Gardens.

My favourite part is the romantic Heritage Rose Gardens in Hagley Park area, west of the CTC Public Hospital's new multi-storey wing.

It appears that this Spatial Plan does not cover that Heritage Rose Garden and the surrounding botanic plantings, through to Riccarton Avenue.

For that, I'm grateful.

The Heritage Rose Garden has developed into a hidden jewel where fairies live and play.

So, don't disturb our fairies, please.

The best gathering place in the CTC Botanic Gardens is the 1987 first Information Centre beside the duck pond and near the old Tea Kiosk and the charming footbridge connecting the Gardens to a parking space in North Hagley Park, over the Avon.

That 1987 Information Centre is a delightful building, on a warm, human scale.

It's a lovely, inviting space.

Whereas the new, white, cold, commercial building is soul-less.

We treasure the 1987 Information Centre.

Please let us use it well and protect and preserve it as a friendly place for people to share and learn about things Botanical.

I've been an active member since 1997 of the Friends of CTC Botanic Gardens Inc. It was set up to promote, protect and preserve our Botanic Gardens — not to vandalise the trees for architectural designs.

Keep the precious tranquility for the future. Thank you.
26 May 2017

Senior Engagement Advisor
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73013
Christchurch Mail Centre
Attention: Tessa Zant

Dear Tessa

Heritage New Zealand Feedback - Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan

1. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan, and to be involved in the key stakeholder reference group.

2. Heritage New Zealand was involved with the Spatial Plan reference group and we understand that the Spatial Plan will sit within a hierarchical suite of documents that guide the management and development of the Botanic Gardens.

3. Heritage New Zealand's interest in the Spatial Plan is in regards to any impacts on heritage items entered on the New Zealand Heritage List, and ensuring that archaeology is appropriately managed in the implementation of the Spatial Plan.

4. The following items within the Botanic Gardens are entered on the New Zealand Heritage List:
   - Robert McDougall Art Gallery – Category 1, List no. 303
   - Cunningham House - Category 2, List no. 1862
   - Tea kiosk - Category 2, List no. 3449
   - Band rotunda - Category 2, List no. 3093
   - Curators House - Category 2, List no. 1863
   - Canterbury Museum - Category 1, List no. 290

5. Heritage New Zealand considers that the design of the gardens should ensure that important heritage features such as those listed above are celebrated and provide maximum opportunities for the public to interact with and appreciate these features. A key outcome of the Spatial Plan development is to “respect and highlight built, cultural and biological heritage,” and Heritage New Zealand supports this approach.

6. Heritage New Zealand understands that there will be resultant projects and the work on conceptual design, refinement and implementation detail is yet to be done. Furthermore, any project outcomes will take into consideration the policies and the heritage values as identified in the Conservation Plan for the Christchurch Botanic Gardens (2013).

7. Heritage New Zealand has previously made comment about new bridges and new buildings being inserted into the Botanic gardens setting, and how these changes need to be carefully considered in terms of their visual impact on the heritage items, for example by keeping view shafts and views unobstructed, particularly of Cunningham House (through feedback provided as part of the key stakeholder reference group). Various sections of the draft Spatial Plan pick up on the importance of maintaining and opening up views, including particular reference to Cunningham House. Heritage New Zealand supports this.
8. Heritage New Zealand would like to take this opportunity to ensure that the Council continues to consult us around any change related to our listed items, particularly the identified new build projects adjacent to the Robert McDougall Art Gallery, Cunningham House and the Tea kiosk.

   Archaeology

9. Heritage New Zealand would also like to take this opportunity to ensure that the Council is aware of the legal requirements of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA 2014) in relation to the management of archaeological sites.

10. An archaeological site is defined in the HNZPTA 2014 as:

    (a) any place in New Zealand, including any building or structure (or part of a building or structure), that—
    (i) was associated with human activity that occurred before 1900 or is the site of the wreck of any vessel where the wreck occurred before 1900; and
    (ii) provides or may provide, through investigation by archaeological methods, evidence relating to the history of New Zealand; and
    (b) includes a site for which a declaration is made under section 43[1].

11. The HNZPTA 2014 makes it unlawful for any person to modify or destroy, or cause to be modified or destroyed, the whole or any part of an archaeological site without the prior authority of Heritage New Zealand. Work that may affect an archaeological site requires an authority from Heritage New Zealand.

12. Certain projects signalled in the Spatial Plan may require an archaeological authority. Accordingly Heritage New Zealand encourages the Council to consult with the Heritage New Zealand Regional Archaeologist at as an early a stage as possible in order to ensure that any such requirements are understood and incorporated into project planning. This is advice to encourage early dialogue and again, no changes to the Spatial Plan are considered necessary.

13. Thank you for considering this feedback and if there are any queries please don’t hesitate to contact my office.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Sheila Watson
General Manager – Southern Region
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### Part 1: Summaries of feedback on 44 feedback forms, and accompanying staff commentaries cross-referenced to community feedback

Refer to Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan Community Engagement and Feedback, Attachment A to connect numbered summary paragraphs below to individual community feedback.

---

### 1. The Spatial Plan itself (19 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine respondents expressed support for the Spatial Plan; three did not want any significant change or Master Plan projects; five opposed or found the plan vague, and two requested further engagement as projects are developed. Most of these 19 and the remaining 25 respondents provided feedback on specific aspects of the Spatial Plan (see below).</td>
<td>The concerns of the respondents are acknowledged. As each of the Master Plan projects is designed and developed, the public will have further opportunity to provide specific feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 2. Existing plant collections (16 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleven respondents provided feedback on the existing plant collections. Two of these (and five additional submissions) requested better labelling of plants. Respondents generally appreciated existing plant collections and did not want to see them lost. Two expressed support for the retention of the Fragrant Garden (fragrance or sensory garden).</td>
<td>The Spatial Plan provides lists of most existing and proposed plant collections (page 11 of the Spatial Plan) while acknowledging that these will need to be considered in light priorities set out in the Management Plan and the outcome of the Audit of assets and operations being completed in parallel with the Spatial Plan (as noted on page 8 of the Spatial Plan). Labelling of plants will also be considered and actioned. Staff thank respondents for their feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1
### 3. Bridges (16 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen respondents provided feedback on one or more of the proposed bridges spanning the Avon River. Thirteen comments related to the Visitor Centre bridge(s). Respondents either were generally supportive of a bridge or bridges (2/13), or specifically supported a dual bridge to the Visitor Centre (8/13) for both service vehicles and pedestrian/wheelchair users. Fewer supported a pedestrian/wheelchair only bridge (one respondent) or a service vehicle only bridge (2 respondents). Five of the above respondents supported the construction of a bridge specifically to remove service vehicle use of the Botanic Gardens, which was particularly well illustrated by one respondent (submission ID #1303)). The remaining three comments expressed opposition to a bridge or bridges at this location. Only two respondents commented on the proposed bridge across the Avon from the Woodland / Hospital (one in support, one opposed).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is noted that the majority of respondents supported a direct bridge connection for service vehicles and for pedestrians/wheelchair users between the Armagh Street car park and the Visitor Centre (with a few supporting one or the other). These are the top two priority bridge connections indicated in the Spatial Plan. The Woodland bridge near the hospital is a third priority in the Spatial Plan. As any bridge project is designed and developed, the public will have further opportunity to provide specific feedback to ensure design, appearance and other factors are thoroughly considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. New Conservatory Complex (15 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine respondents supported the conservatory project, six of these indicating a more favourable location to be north of Cunningham House, i.e. rebuiling in the area of existing buildings being replaced. Four respondents opposed the conservatory project, and two expressed concern without expressing strong support or opposition.</td>
<td>The new Conservatory Complex is a project listed in the Master Plan and referred to in the Management Plan. It will enable better visitor accessibility and circulation, better display conditions for plants, and a wider range of plants from the Botanic Gardens nursery to be displayed. The Spatial Plan indicates two potential locations, each having the advantages of being close to Cunningham House (to be retained), services and existing operational facilities. A decision on the location and appearance of the new Conservatory Complex will be made following extensive public consultation as part of the design and development process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Tree removals (14 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourteen respondents did not support the tree removals shown in the Spatial Plan. This was predominantly in connection with the removal of specific trees (10 respondents) although four did not want any trees removed. One respondent considered the productive and educational use to which a felled tree could be put.</td>
<td>Tree removals and enrichment plantings with new trees occur continually in the normal operation of the Botanic Gardens. A tree’s removal will typically coincide with the end of its useful life, might be necessary to address an identified public safety concern, or might result as part of capital works following public consultation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree removals indicated in the Spatial Plan are not pre-emptive but are expected to occur over many years (over the terms of several Long Term Plans), and will be guided by these principles.

6. Children’s Play Landscape (13 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine respondents specified support for the children’s areas or made constructive suggestions about play equipment.</td>
<td>A Children’s Garden is a Master Plan project and Council has already indicated its support for the capital renewal of the Children’s Playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four respondents opposed more space devoted to children’s activities, and expressed concerns about encroachment or whether aspects of the play landscape were needed.</td>
<td>Staff acknowledge the importance of not allowing the combined Play Landscape to encroach on other aspects of the Botanic Gardens and thank respondents for their constructive suggestions. The public will have the opportunity to be further consulted during the design and development process for the Play Landscape project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Proposed plant collections (13 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seven respondents expressed concern about the extent of New Zealand plantings or about the evolution of Canterbury Plants garden theme because of their potential effect on open space and existing exotic plantings, or their similarity to city amenity plantings.</td>
<td>The Evolution of Canterbury Plants garden theme includes not only current Canterbury plant communities but the origins of the New Zealand flora and its relatedness to other Southern Hemisphere floras from Gondwanan origins to the present. This supports the clause in the Primary Goal of the Botanic Gardens to “[include] Southern Hemisphere plants”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four other respondents provided suggestions or supported the Gondwana Garden, which is included in this garden theme.</td>
<td>The theme is illustrated as an envelope that will contain a number of Master Plan projects, such as Collection Revitalisation (New Zealand native plants first priority), the Gondwana Garden, and New Collections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were two comments from these or other respondents about the proposed River Gateways (unclear what they were or concern about potential effects on existing pathways), proposed riparian margin plantings (two comments supporting), and proposed mahinga kai (one support, one concern).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Buildings and open space (10 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five respondents opposed further building in the Botanic Gardens or wanted emphasis on plants instead of buildings.</td>
<td>The Spatial Plan illustrates the locations and outlines the concept briefs for capital projects listed in the Botanic Gardens Master Plan. It recognises the need to retain open space character, for instance, in relation to the sequence of lawns in the Gather / Kohkohi Structuring Layer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five others were concerned in general about the potential loss of open space from built or other proposed developments.</td>
<td>The public will have the opportunity to be further consulted during the design and development process for each project when the retention of open space can be further considered and addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **Grounds maintenance** (8 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eight respondents commented on what they regarded as the unacceptably poor standard of grounds maintenance in the Botanic Gardens. They wanted this to be addressed as a priority, and ahead of spending on Spatial Plan projects.</td>
<td>The Spatial Plan focuses on illustrating the locations, connections, and concept briefs for Master Plan projects. It does not extend to grounds maintenance. However, feedback on grounds maintenance is welcomed and noted. It will be considered along with the findings of an Audit of the Botanic Gardens assets and operations being completed in parallel with the Spatial Plan (as noted on page 8 of the Spatial Plan).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Toilets** (8 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five respondents supported better and/or more toilet facilities. Three other respondents objected to the proposed location of toilets in relation to the Robert McDougall Art Gallery.</td>
<td>The Spatial Plan addresses the shortage of toilet facilities as part of the Gather – Kohikohi Structuring Layer and elsewhere. Staff note the feedback on the proposed location of a toilet in relation to the Robert McDougall Art Gallery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **Evelyn Couzins Gateway** (7 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Evelyn Couzins gateway was mentioned by seven respondents, with five opposing its removal. Two respondents suggested that the stone be reused elsewhere or the gateway be replaced with a plaque if it were to be removed.</td>
<td>The Spatial Plan indicates the removal of this feature to enable better circulation and views to and from the entrance of the Robert McDougall Art Gallery. The public will have the opportunity to be further consulted during the design and development process for paths and gardens near the Robert McDougall Art Gallery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **Path network** (6 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six respondents commented on the path network, with three either appreciating the existing network or the proposed changes. Three respondents wanted no more paths, fewer straight paths, or existing small and meandering paths be retained.</td>
<td>The Spatial Plan addresses path hierarchy and surfacing in the Journey – Haerenga Structuring Layer. Concerns that small paths be retained are noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **Shelters** (4 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two respondents supported the shelters in the grounds, and two opposed them because there were too many or because they could affect a sense of open space.</td>
<td>The Spatial Plan includes shelters as part of the Gather – Kohikohi structuring layer to encourage diverse and more inclusive use of the Botanic Gardens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. **Entrances** (3 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three respondents supported a new entrance to the Botanic Gardens on Rolleston Avenue, stressing the importance of enhanced entry points that celebrate the Botanic Gardens and their importance to Christchurch.</td>
<td>The Spatial Plan indicates a new entrance directly opposite a pedestrian exit from the Arts Centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **Kiosk** (3 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three respondents appreciated the retention of the [octagonal] Kiosk in the Spatial Plan and wanted some provision of teas and/or food to be restored to the building.</td>
<td>The Spatial Plan retains this historic building. Its use in future has not been determined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other issues were mentioned less frequently in feedback supplied on feedback forms (refer Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan_Attachment A).
Part 2: Summary of informal feedback given verbally during guided tours of the Botanic Gardens

Thirty members of the public joined one of the six scheduled guided walks in the Botanic Gardens. Several of those attending said they would complete and submit a feedback form.

Summarising notes made during each walk, the key themes were:

- Visitor Centre bridge(s) proposal: four in support, none opposed.
- Children’s Play Landscape: five in support, none opposed; many imaginative suggestions made.
- Magnetic Observatory project: three in support, none opposed.
- New Conservatory Complex: three in support, none opposed; one preferred North location (near Cumingham House), one the South (near Rose Garden).
- Robert McDougall Art Gallery: three supported greater visibility of the Gallery.
- Path changes: four in support, none opposed.
- General: one respondent asked why fix the Botanic Gardens when they are fine as they are; two asked that the old information centre not be removed; others asked about various aspects of grounds maintenance, e.g. keeping favourite trees, not planting more native plants, achieving a ‘balance’ of native and exotic plants, and keeping bedding plant displays.
Have your say on the Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan

The Christchurch City Council would like your feedback on a spatial plan prepared for the Christchurch Botanic Gardens. Feedback can be given from Saturday 29 April 2017 until 5pm Saturday 27 May 2017.

Background

The Hagley Park and Botanic Gardens Master Plan is a long term vision that outlines a number of transformational projects. Since 2011, three major projects from the Master Plan have been finished including the development of the new visitor centre and nursery.

The Spatial Plan

Now, to help progress other projects, a Spatial Plan is needed to represent visually how they can be developed. The Spatial Plan shows where important Master Plan projects such as the children’s garden, Gordon’s Garden, the new conservatory complex and visitor centre bridge could be located.

Where can I view the plans?

• Online at ccc.gov.nz/the-council/our-plan/
• At the Christchurch Botanic Gardens Visitor Centre, open daily 9am to 5pm.
• The plans will be available at several City Council libraries. The display plans are online: ccc.gov.nz/the-council/our-plan/

Guided walks available

For a tour of project sites, start at the Hunter Information Centre in the Botanic Gardens near the Ayleigh Bridge pedestrian crossing:

• Saturday 29 and Sunday 30 April 2017, 10am—1pm
• Friday 5 May 2017, 10am—1pm
• Thursday 11 May 2017, 10am—1pm
• Saturday 13 and Sunday 14 May 2017, 10am—1pm

How can I provide feedback?

• Fill out our online feedback form at ccc.gov.nz/the-council/our-plan/
• Fill out the feedback form in this booklet.
• Email your feedback to engagement@council christchurch.govt.nz with the subject: Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan Feedback.
• In person on the guided tours with Dr John Clements, Christchurch Botanic Gardens Curator.
• Post a letter to
  Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan Feedback
  Christchurch City Council
  PO Box 7354
  Christchurch 8540

Any questions?

Tessa Zant
Senior Engagement Advisor
Ph: (03) 941 8885
Tessa.zant@council christchurch.govt.nz

Feedback closes 5pm Saturday 27 May 2017.
Council
28 September 2017

Christchurch Botanic Gardens
Spatial Plan

Feedback Form

Please let us know your comments about the proposed Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan.

[Feedback form]

Please fold with the reply paid portion on the outside, seal and return by 2pm, Saturday 27 May 2017.

Thank you for taking the time to respond. If you would like to be kept informed about the project, please note your contact details below:

Name:
Address:
Phone: (daytime) (cell)
Email:

[Signature]

Christchurch City Council
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Tell us what you think

Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan

The Spatial Plan shows how the Botanic Gardens could look in the future.

It was developed from the Master Plan for the Gardens and Hagley Park, which was first published in 2007 after extensive public consultation.

We know from past and recent surveys what visitors love about the Gardens. We took all this into account when developing the Master Plan—and it's been expressed visually in the Spatial Plan.

Journey
You love walking with friends and family around the Gardens and cherish the peace and seclusion.

Discover
You enjoy discovering seasonal displays and established plants and trees.

Gather
You told us how you love to socialise and relax in open spaces.

Connect
You truly value the heritage buildings and landscape features.

How can I have my say?

On line – cc.govt.nz/haveyoursay

In writing – pick up our information sheet and post your thoughts

In person – come on a guided walk with Curator Dr John Clemens – times and dates are on the information sheet
Our progress

These plans were researched and developed during 2004–2007.
The Master and Management plans outline our vision for the Botanic Gardens over the next 50 years. We’ve made progress on these projects.

The earthquakes of 2010–11 caused disruptions and delays, and a rethink of resources. To help fundraise for some of the major projects, The Botanic Gardens Charitable Trust was formed in 2015.

The award-winning Botanic Gardens Visitor Centre opened in 2014, and includes purpose-built operational facilities, library and herbarium.

To protect the Garden’s heritage buildings and landscape features, we created the Heritage Conservation Plan. This plan has greatly influenced the Spatial Plan.

Christchurch Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan

The key projects in the Spatial Plan are subject to publish consultation and they will evolve as we receive your feedback.
Layered approach

The team developing the spatial plan recognise that visitors experience the Gardens in different ways. They have illustrated these concepts in four layers.

Gather/Kohikohi
How you like to socialise and relax in open spaces

Discover/Rapu ora
Ways you encounter dynamic plant collections

Journey/Haerenga
How you move around the Gardens

Mahinga kai Trail
This mahinga kai trail echoes some of the possibilities for a cultural narrative woven into the grounds and waterways of the Botanic Gardens.

To find out more, review the full plan here or online

Connect/
Hononga wāhi, Hononga tāngata
Appreciating heritage buildings and landscape features
This Master Plan outlines a number of projects to enhance the Gardens, with development spanning the next 50 years. We've finished three key projects, and progressed many others. Here's our thoughts on upcoming projects.

**Play Landscape/Playground Renewal (1–10 years)**

Our aim is to encourage future generations to form a close relationship with the Botanic Gardens. Play Landscape is a leap forward in nature play, designed to inspire and form lasting memories. Inside the new Children’s Garden and revitalised playground, we will create various habitats which nurture different approaches to learning about nature.

**Pedestrian access/Visitor Centre Bridge and path network (1–10 years)**

At present delivery vans have to drive through the Gardens to access the Visitor Centre's service entrance. It’s disruptive for visitors and causes damage to the network of pathways. Our first job is to repair these pathways.

We also want to make it easy for pedestrians to access the Visitor Centre. This indicative illustration shows a proposed new entrance across the River Avon. This dual-purpose bridge gives vehicles and pedestrians direct access from the Armagh Street car park to the Visitor Centre.

**Observatory Lawn (1–5 years)**

More than a century ago, explorers calibrated their instruments in this Magnetic Observatory Workshop before heading south to Antarctica. Our intention is to tell the continuing story of the facility and give this important historic building, and the neighbouring Weather Station, greater prominence and accessibility for visitors.

**Conservatory Complex (20 years)**

Behind the scenes, skilled Botanic Gardens staff maintain fascinating collections of living plants for scientific study and conservation. Visitors rarely get to see this aspect of our work. Our response is to build a new conservatory complex (two possible locations shown). As well as better accessibility for visitors, this complex will offer better conditions for displays.
14. Draft Events Policy Framework

Reference: 17/997642
Contact: Karena Finnie karena.finnie@ccc.govt.nz 941 5394

1. Staff Recommendations

That the Council:


2. Note that the Draft Events Policy Framework is a high level document intended to outline responsibilities for events between the Council and ChristchurchNZ, and set a combined vision for events in Christchurch.

3. Note that feedback from the events sector and teams across Council has been incorporated into the Draft Events Policy Framework.

4. Note that ChristchurchNZ is currently developing a Major Events Strategy, and Council staff will soon begin work on a Community Events Implementation Plan.

5. Agree to forward the Draft Events Policy Framework to Council and recommend it approves the Draft Events Policy Framework to be released for public consultation.

2. Social and Community Development Committee Recommendation to Council

That the Council:


2. Note that the Draft Events Policy Framework is a high level document intended to outline responsibilities for events between the Council and ChristchurchNZ, and set a combined vision for events in Christchurch.

3. Note that feedback from the events sector and teams across Council has been incorporated into the Draft Events Policy Framework.

4. Note that ChristchurchNZ is currently developing a Major Events Strategy, and Council staff will soon begin work on a Community Events Implementation Plan.

5. Approve the Draft Events Policy Framework to be released for public consultation.

6. Instruct staff to facilitate a workshop with the Social and Community Development Committee and Strategic Capability Committee to inform the Draft Events Policy before it is released for consultation.

Secretarial Note: Staff will update the Council regarding the Committee’s intention for the timing of the workshop referred to in recommendation 6.
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1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Social and Community Development Committee to be presented with the Draft Events Policy Framework (Attachment A), and to request that the Committee recommend to Council to release the Draft Events Policy Framework for external consultation.

Origin of Report
1.2 This report is staff generated for the Social and Community Development Committee.

2. Significance

2.1 The decision(s) in this report are of medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by cross referencing against the Council’s significance policy and guidelines.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Social and Community Development Committee:


2. Note that the Draft Events Policy Framework is a high level document intended to outline responsibilities for events between the Council and ChristchurchNZ, and set a combined vision for events in Christchurch.

3. Note that feedback from the events sector and teams across Council has been incorporated into the Draft Events Policy Framework.

4. Note that ChristchurchNZ is currently developing a Major Events Strategy, and Council staff will soon begin work on a Community Events Implementation Plan.

5. Agree to forward the Draft Events Policy Framework to Council and recommend it approves the Draft Events Policy Framework to be released for public consultation.

4. Key Points


4.2 The purpose of the Draft Events Policy Framework is to:

4.2.1 Update the vision for all events in Christchurch;

4.2.2 Enable Christchurch to be a more appealing and efficient place to hold events;
4.2.3 Outline the division of events responsibilities following the establishment of ChristchurchNZ, and to guide the development of all event plans, including the Major Events Strategy developed by ChristchurchNZ and the Community Events Implementation Plan, developed by Council.

4.3 The Events Policy Framework is intended to sit above other events documents as reflected below:

![EVENTS POLICY FRAMEWORK Diagram]

- **Major Events Strategy**: ChristchurchNZ led, covering mega and major events
- **Community Events Implementation Plan**: Council led, covering regional, local and community events

4.4 The Events Policy Framework provides the definitions and descriptions of the different types of events and describes the roles and responsibilities of Council and ChristchurchNZ in those areas.

4.5 The Events Policy Framework explains the rationale behind the division of responsibility for events, with ChristchurchNZ taking responsibility for mega and major events and the Council leading regional, local and community events. The different drivers for major events and community events mean different approaches are required to achieve the best results. Having ChristchurchNZ take responsibility for major events maximises the opportunities for the city to leverage wider benefits from those events.

4.6 Under this framework, each organisation will be able to focus its attention on its own area of expertise, while helping to deliver on a shared vision for events. This ensures all event types are covered while avoiding duplications.

4.7 The shared vision for events in Christchurch is *creating a more vibrant city through memorable events*. While major events focus more on economic drivers and community events primarily focus on social outcomes, both of these contribute towards creating a more vibrant city, which is attractive for residents and visitors alike.

4.8 More detail for the various types of events will be provided in the Major Events Strategy and the Community Events Implementation Plan. The Major Events Strategy is being developed in conjunction with the events sector, and the Community Events Implementation Plan will be developed in consultation with the community.

4.9 As the Major Events Strategy will be presented to the Strategic Capability Committee, and given the links between that strategy and this Draft Events Policy Framework, Council staff recommend holding a joint presentation to both committees on 1 November 2017. This timing would allow for both Committees to see both documents after public consultation has taken place on the Draft Events Policy Framework, before documents go to Council for final adoption.
5. Context/Background

Council support for events

5.1 The Council has a long history of supporting events in Christchurch. Events are important for Christchurch because they give life to the city, they create interest in and reflect the kind of city Christchurch is. A more vibrant event city will help attract and retain creative people. The Council supports events due to the wide array of social, cultural and economic benefits events provide.

5.2 The Council believes facilitating a calendar of events helps deliver on its community outcomes for Christchurch including Strong Communities, a Liveable City and Prosperous Economy.

Establishment of ChristchurchNZ and division of responsibility for events

5.3 In late 2016 the Council decided to merge the functions of the Canterbury Development Corporation, Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism, International Education, the Convention Bureau, and Council’s Major Events into a new organisation – ChristchurchNZ. It was decided that ChristchurchNZ would be responsible for Major Events, and the Council would continue to be responsible for Community Events.

5.4 ChristchurchNZ began operating in July 2017, and was tasked by Council with developing a Major Events Strategy. The Events Strategy 2007-2017 was approaching the end of its shelf life, and needed replacing with an updated version. In early 2017 Council staff and establishment staff from ChristchurchNZ agreed on a joint approach to ensure that there would continue to be alignment between the ChristchurchNZ led Major Events Strategy and the Council led Community Events Implementation Plan.

5.5 It was agreed that Council staff (in consultation with ChristchurchNZ staff and the events sector) would lead the development of an overarching framework document which sets out a high level vision and goals for events in Christchurch and clearly explains responsibility for different categories of events. This would ensure all events are covered and that the public is aware of the various roles and responsibilities of each organisation in supporting events. The Draft Events Policy Framework is the resulting document.
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Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.
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Draft Events Policy Framework

Purpose of this Events Policy Framework
The purpose of this policy framework is:
1. Update the vision for events in Christchurch
2. Enable Christchurch to be a more appealing and efficient place to hold events
3. Guide the development of, and to outline responsibility for, all event plans including the Major Events Strategy, developed by ChristchurchNZ and the Community Events Implementation Plan, developed by Christchurch City Council (Council).

Introduction
This Events Policy Framework document replaces the Christchurch City Council Events Strategy 2007-2017. Since the release of the 2007 strategy there have been significant changes in the events sector in Christchurch. This framework coordinates the roles Council and ChristchurchNZ will play in events and provides a fresh approach to take advantage of new opportunities to ensure that we get the most out of events in our city.

Hierarchy of events documents

How this policy framework will guide events work and ensure positive outcomes for the city
This policy framework outlines the roles and responsibilities the Council and ChristchurchNZ have for events. Under this framework, each organisation will be able to focus its attention on its own area of expertise, while helping to deliver on a shared vision for events. Working together, the Council and ChristchurchNZ will enable the development of a coordinated and complimentary year-round calendar of events for Christchurch.

The Events Policy Framework defines the areas in which Council and ChristchurchNZ will create more detailed strategies or implementation plans, to ensure all event types are covered while avoiding duplications. The strategies or implementation plans will provide more detail on how events will be facilitated in the city.

Stakeholder engagement and community consultation will be undertaken during development of the respective plans, to ensure the views of the events sector and wider community are reflected in those plans.

Scope of this policy framework
This Events Policy Framework:
• explains why the Christchurch City Council and ChristchurchNZ support events
• sets out the Council’s events vision – what we seek to achieve for Christchurch through events
• outlines how events help to give effect to the Council’s wider vision for Christchurch, by promoting Community Outcomes
• explains the rationale behind ChristchurchNZ taking responsibility for major and mega events and the Council leading regional, local, and community events
• provides definitions and descriptions of the different types of events
• describes who is responsible for different categories of events
• covers a range of events in Christchurch – from small local community events through to major and mega events which attract international visitors
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**Why we support events**

Events are important for Christchurch because they give life to the city, they create interest in and reflect the kind of city Christchurch is. The Council supports events due to the wide array of social, cultural, and economic benefits events provide. Events can lead to stronger communities by bringing people together, raising community spirit and pride in local neighbourhoods and the city. They help celebrate our diverse cultures and city identity. Events help raise the profile of a city, nationally and internationally, providing a ‘wow’ factor which helps attract visitors, boost the hospitality and tourism industries, and support economic development in the city. A more vibrant event friendly city will help attract and retain creative people.

The Council believes facilitating a calendar of events helps deliver on its community outcomes for Christchurch, including Strong Communities, a Liveable City and a Prosperous Economy.

---

**Vision for Events in Christchurch**

*Creating a more vibrant city through memorable events*

Our vision is to contribute towards creating a more vibrant city through memorable events – making Christchurch a more desirable place to live, play, and to visit year-round. Our city’s events will help us celebrate our identity and environment – through arts, culture, heritage, and sport. From small community-led events to major events attracting an international audience – Christchurch’s diverse and evolving calendar of events will offer something for everyone. The Council and ChristchurchNZ will partner with the community and private sector to facilitate a wide variety of memorable events for our residents to enjoy. By working together, we can become known as an events friendly city and attract more events which will raise our profile as an exciting destination for visitors, boosting the visitor sector.
What we seek to achieve through this Events Policy Framework

OVERALL GOALS FOR EVENTS:

- A well balanced and coordinated calendar of events to create a more vibrant place year round – for residents and visitors
- A variety of events are accessible for residents and visitors
- A range of socially inclusive events reflect the diversity of people and communities in Christchurch and assist in the city’s regeneration
- Christchurch enhances its reputation as an events friendly city; it becomes known as an easy place to hold events with a smooth and efficient consenting process
- Leverage and legacy opportunities are identified and taken when hosting events in Christchurch
- All events promote one or more of the Council’s Community Outcomes
- A number of major events attract visitors to the city and boost the economy
- Our events aim to:
  - be environmentally sustainable with efficient use of resources, minimal impact on the natural environment and implementation of sustainable practices (e.g. effective waste management and recycling systems etc.)
  - be financially viable (can include social outcomes in any cost/benefit analysis)
  - minimise any negative impacts on neighbourhoods

ORGANISATIONAL GOAL FOR COUNCIL AND CHRISTCHURCHNZ

We are committed to ensuring that events are embraced by all sections of Council and ChristchurchNZ with all areas playing their part in making the facilitation of events as easy as possible. By working together we can make Christchurch more events friendly.

Rationale for splitting responsibility for events

The Council has a long history of facilitating events in the city, from small community-led events, to major and mega events which attract visitors to the city. Different events have different drivers, or reasons for being held. Some events are organised with a focus on achieving social and cultural benefits, drawing communities closer together and providing a fun day out for families and friends. Others may be held for the purpose of generating an economic return; major events draw in visitors to the city who boost the local economy through spending on accommodation and other services, and also provide opportunities to promote the city to national and international audiences, helping attract migrants and investment. As different drivers target different outcomes, the Council determined that a division of responsibility for events may lead to better outcomes in each area.

In 2016 the Council decided to merge the Canterbury Development Corporation, Christchurch and Canterbury Tourism, International Education, the Convention Bureau, and Council Major Events into a new organisation, ChristchurchNZ. One of its objectives is to further develop Christchurch’s major events calendar as outlined in the Christchurch Visitor Strategy. It was considered that a single organisation would provide better value for ratepayers, and allow for greater opportunities for tourism and economic development to leverage off major events. ChristchurchNZ began operating in July 2017.

By assigning responsibility for major and mega events to ChristchurchNZ, the Council is now able to focus its resources more effectively on supporting a variety of regional, local, and community events for Christchurch. The Council is committed to working with the people of Christchurch to deliver a rich range of events which celebrate our unique culture and lifestyle, and brings the vision of a more vibrant city to life.

Definitions of the types of involvement in events

To produce: create, develop and deliver events such as festivals, ceremonies, commemorations, concerts etc.
To facilitate: provide advice, guidance and assessments for events held in public spaces, in line with the regulatory environment to ensure compliance for safe and successful events.
To partner: to provide assistance to event producers to develop and deliver an event. Does not require contractual agreement. Could result in co-production, or resource allocations.
To support: in kind or financial assistance in the form of a grant, industry workshops, training, and provision of infrastructure
To sponsor: a cash investment towards an event. Requires a contractual agreement.
To host: to provide places, spaces, and venues to hold events.
To attract: to identify, secure, and provide leverage and legacy opportunities from events held in the city.
To participate: attending or taking part in an event.
Roles and Responsibilities

The Council and ChristchurchNZ have key roles to play in the events industry. Responsibility for different types of events will be split between the Council and ChristchurchNZ:

- Mega and Major events will be the responsibility of Christchurch NZ
- Regional, Local, and Community events will remain the Council’s responsibility

New Zealand Major Events and Sport New Zealand have definitions of event categories which are widely used in New Zealand and provide a good basis for identifying the distinction between mega, major, regional, local, and community events. Those distinctions have informed the tables below, which contain the characteristics used by Council when classifying, and determining responsibility for, the five different types of events (mega, major, regional, local, and community).

### Responsibility of ChristchurchNZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEGA</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International participants and audience</td>
<td>Attract large number of national and international spectators and participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive international media coverage</td>
<td>National or international interest and media attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant and widespread benefits</td>
<td>Pivotal to Christchurch brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Major Events or National Sporting Body has been given hosting rights</td>
<td>Increase tourism revenue e.g., length of stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage and legacy opportunities</td>
<td>Leverage and legacy opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple agency involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New business/trade opportunities</td>
<td>Adds vibrancy to the central city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responsibility of Christchurch City Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National or regional participation and audiences</td>
<td>Local participants</td>
<td>Local suburb or community participants and audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and local media coverage</td>
<td>Local media coverage</td>
<td>Minimal media coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily delivers social or recreational outcomes</td>
<td>Social and civic benefits</td>
<td>Benefits to suburb or community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May have large numbers</td>
<td>Civic ceremonies, commemorations and events</td>
<td>Foster community spirit – participation and volunteerism. Typically held by or in partnership with not-for-profit or community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May involve utilisation of Council facilities such as Ngā Puna Wai and Metro Sports</td>
<td>Local volunteers</td>
<td>Opportunities for recreation, entertainment and celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Council involvement through Events and Arts Team</td>
<td>Primary Council involvement through Events and Arts Team</td>
<td>Primary Council involvement through Community Recreation Advisors and Community Boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Note that Council will continue to provide the necessary regulatory and compliance functions for all events

6 Draft Events Policy Framework
ChristchurchNZ

ChristchurchNZ will be a promoter of "brand Christchurch" and in this role will act as a facilitator, broker, sponsor and champion of mega and major events. Functions of ChristchurchNZ include:

- Developing a Major Events Strategy for Christchurch
- Brand and event strategy to facilitate attraction and acquisition of mega and major events and positioning the city as an events destination
- Researching and investigating the feasibility and Impact of new mega and major events
- Identifying and attracting mega and major events, including developing or partnering on bids
- Managing relationships with mega and major events and wide stakeholders, including event owners and organisers, the film industry, venue operators and accommodation providers
- Promoting and marketing mega and major events nationally and internationally to maximise the economic, media, and community value of major events
- Leveraging benefits arising from mega and major events to maximise them for city and region

Engaging with promoters, funders, sponsors and strategic partners to grow awareness of the various outcomes that events can achieve.

Christchurch City Council

Council's roles and responsibilities include:

- Creation of the Community Events Implementation Plan covering regional, local, and community events
- Facilitation of events including the management and production of consents for events and filming in public places
- Production and promotion of a well balanced and coordinated calendar of events
- Produce, facilitate, and partner with others to provide events for our community
- Management of relationships with producers of regional, local, and community events
- Provision of regulatory support, approvals, and compliance functions
- Partnering and sponsoring
- Promotion and marketing of regional, local, and community events
- Attraction of events to Council facilities
- Activating the central city to make it a more vibrant place

Others with key roles in the event sector

The Council and ChristchurchNZ are just two of the organisations involved in Christchurch’s events sector. Others play a significant role and we need to collaborate and partner with them to ensure the sector thrives. Others with key roles in events include:

- Christchurch Transport Operations Centre
- Vbase
- Community groups, clubs, and organisations
- New Zealand Major Events
- New Zealand Events Association
- Tourism New Zealand
- Sport New Zealand
- Sport Canterbury
- Ngāi Tahu
- Owners and operators of event venues
- Promoters
- Event producers
- Event sponsors
- Food, beverage and other service providers
- Media

NZ Cup and Show
15. Social and Community Development Committee Minutes - 6 September 2017

Reference: 17/999115
Contact: Liz Ryley liz.ryley@ccc.govt.nz 941 8153

1. Purpose of Report
The Social and Community Development Committee held a meeting on 6 September 2017 and is circulating the Minutes recorded to the Council for its information.

2. Recommendation to Council
That the Council receives the Minutes from the Social and Community Development Committee meeting held 6 September 2017.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Social and Community Development Committee - Minutes - 6 September 2017</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Liz Ryley - Committee Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Social and Community Development Committee
OPEN MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 6 September 2017
Time: 1.03pm
Venue: Council Chamber, Level 2, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

Present
Chairperson
Councillor Phil Clearwater
Deputy Chairperson
Councillor Glenn Livingstone
Members
Councillor Jimmy Chen
Councillor Anne Galloway – departed at 4.50pm
Councillor Yani Johanson
Councillor Tim Scandrett

5 September 2017
Principal Advisor
John Filsell
Head of Recreation, Sports and Events
Tel: 941 8999

Liz Ryley
Committee Advisor
941 8153
liz.ryley@ccc.govt.nz
www.ccc.govt.nz

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:
www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/meetingminutes/agendas/index
The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   
   Part C
   Committee Resolved SOC/2017/00032
   That an apology for absence from Councillor Keown be accepted.
   Councillor Scandrett/Councillor Galloway **Carried**

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   Part B
   Councillor Livingstone declared an interest in the briefing by Te Runanga o Nga Maata Waka about social housing on the Nga Hau E Wha Marae.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   
   Part C
   Committee Resolved SOC/2017/00033
   Committee Decision
   That the minutes of the Social and Community Development Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 2 August 2017 be confirmed.
   Councillor Livingstone/Councillor Chen **Carried**

4. **Deputations by Appointment**
   
   Part B
   Historic Places Canterbury
   Mark Gerrard spoke on behalf of Historic Places Canterbury regarding the engagement process relating to Item 10 Mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei For us and our children after us: a new direction for heritage.

5. **Presentation of Petitions**
   
   Part B
   There was no presentation of petitions.
6. Multicultural Subcommittee Minutes - 28 July 2017
Committee Resolved SOC/2017/00034

That the Social and Community Development Committee receives the Minutes from the Multicultural Subcommittee meeting held 28 July 2017.

Councillor Chen/Councillor Galloway

7. Briefing - Nga Maata Waka
Arana Talbot and Phil Moran of Te Runanga o Nga Maata Waka briefed the Committee about social housing on the Nga Hau E Wha National Marae.

Committee Comment:
As a result of the presentation, the Committee thanks Te Runanga o Nga Maata Waka, and suggests Nga Maata Waka writes to the Christchurch City Council requesting the development contribution on its social housing project be remitted. Staff will update the Committee once this has occurred.

8. Briefing - Residential Advisory Service Update
An update on the Residential Advisory Service (RAS) was provided by Jenny Hughey, Council representative on RAS, Darren Wright, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, and Ken Pope, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment on:
- Activity levels
- Structure and delivery model
- Governance and funding changes
- Focus for RAS.

Committee Resolved SOC/2017/00035

Part C

That the Social and Community Development Committee:

1. Thanks the Residential Advisory Service for their presentation.
2. Requests staff prepare a report on the possibilities of measures including legislative change to address the long delays which have occurred in settling insurance claims arising from the Canterbury earthquakes.

Councillor Livingstone/Councillor Chen

Josiah Tualamali’I from the Pacific Youth Leadership and Transformation (PYLAT) Council, and College student Sofia, addressed the meeting about running a youth-led trial of citizenship/civics education in Christchurch.
Committee Resolved SOC/2017/00036

Part C

That the Social and Community Development Committee:

1. Thanks Josiah Tualamali’i and Sofia for the presentation, and acknowledges the work being undertaken by Kendall Lutton.

2. Request staff provide a memorandum to the Committee about the Cobham Intermediate School’s Citizenship Programme, about how the Council can support the programme through the Council’s civic education resource, and consider a request for a champion from Council.

Councillor Johanson/Councillor Livingstone Carried

11. Heritage Incentive Grant Approval for the Former Pumphouse, 544 Tuam Street, Christchurch

Staff Recommendations

That the Social and Community Development Committee recommend to Council that it:

1. Approves a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $200,000 for conservation, strengthening and repair work to the protected heritage building located at 544 Tuam Street.

2. Notes that payment of this grant is subject to the applicant entering into a full conservation covenant, with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property title.

Committee Decided SOC/2017/00037

Part A

That the Social and Community Development Committee recommend to Council that it:

1. Approves a Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $200,000 for conservation, strengthening and repair work to the protected heritage building located at 544 Tuam Street.

2. Approves a further second Heritage Incentive Grant of up to $200,000 for conservation, strengthening and repair work to the protected heritage building located at 544 Tuam Street in the 2018-2019 financial year, subject to funding being allocated to the Heritage Incentive Grant Fund through the 2018-2028 Long-term Plan process.

3. Notes that payment of this grant is subject to the applicant entering into a full conservation covenant, with the signed covenant having the Council seal affixed prior to registration against the property title.

Councillor Scandrett/Councillor Johanson Carried
12. Heritage Incentive Grant Application for St Peter's Church, 24 Main South Road, Christchurch

Committee Decided SOC/2017/00038

Staff and Committee Recommendations

Part A

That the Social and Community Development Committee recommends that the Council:

1. Notes that Council heritage staff have considered the application for a Heritage Incentive Grant for strengthening of St Peter’s Church against the relevant policy and operational guidelines criteria and have concluded that the application does not meet the policy and operational guidelines criteria.

2. Declines a Heritage Incentive Grant for the strengthening component of the proposed work to St Peter’s Church located at 24 Main South Road, Upper Riccarton.

Councillor Scandrett/Councillor Clearwater  Carried

Councillor Chen requested that his vote against the resolution be recorded.

An adjournment was taken from 3.03pm to 3.13pm.

10. Mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei
For us and our children after us: a new direction for heritage

Committee Comment

1. The Committee acknowledged the hard work by staff on the new direction for heritage, along with contributions by building owners and others to saving heritage.

Staff Recommendations

That the Social and Community Development Committee recommend to Council that:

1. It instruct staff to prepare a Heritage Strategy with an implementation plan outlining a new direction for heritage.

2. The Strategy is based on the following principles:
   - our inheritance and legacy;
   - the recognition of both tangible and intangible heritage;
   - a story-based approach that acknowledges all our cultures;
   - under-pinning our local and community sense of place and city identity.

3. The Strategy is developed in partnership with Ngāi Tahu.

4. Implementation of the Strategy is developed in partnership with key stakeholders, owners and the community to include, but not limited to:
   a. A charter or shared values agreement developed through further engagement to implement the new strategic direction collaboratively.
   b. Regular workshops to facilitate a collaborative approach to achieving positive heritage outcomes.
c. Establishment of regular hui with the ngā Rūnanga.

Committee Resolved SOC/2017/0039

Part C

That the Social and Community Development Committee seek staff advice on the process and feasibility of a Heritage Regeneration Plan in response to the deputation by Historic Places Canterbury and the feedback on the new direction for heritage.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Scandrett  
Carried

Committee Decided SOC/2017/00040

Committee Recommendation to Council/Committee

Part A

That the Social and Community Development Committee recommend to Council that:

1. It instruct staff to prepare a Heritage Strategy with an implementation plan outlining a new direction for heritage.

2. The Strategy is based on the following principles:
   - our inheritance and legacy;
   - the recognition of both tangible and intangible heritage;
   - a story-based approach that acknowledges all our cultures;
   - under-pinning our local and community sense of place and city identity.

3. The Strategy is developed in partnership with Ngāi Tahu.

4. Implementation of the Strategy is developed in partnership with key stakeholders, owners and the community to include, but not limited to:
   a. A charter or shared values agreement developed through further engagement to implement the new strategic direction collaboratively.
   b. Regular workshops and/or forums to facilitate a collaborative approach to achieving positive heritage outcomes.
   c. Establishment of regular hui with the ngā Rūnanga.

5. Council facilitate a workshop with relevant organisations and agencies to consider an overarching strategic approach to moveable cultural property in Christchurch city.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Scandrett  
Carried

13. Review of the Three Council Heritage Grants Schemes, Incentive, Central City Landmark and the Arts Centre

Staff Recommendations

That the Social and Community Development Committee:

1. Receive the report on the Review of the Three Council Heritage Grants Schemes; Incentive, Central City Landmark and the Arts Centre.

Committee Resolved SOC/2017/00041
Part C

That the Social and Community Development Committee:

1. Receive the report on the Review of the Three Council Heritage Grants Schemes; Incentive, Central City Landmark and the Arts Centre.
2. Request staff workshop the results of the review with the Committee to identify any recommendations for improvement into the future.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Livingstone  Carried


Committee Decided SOC/2017/00042

Staff and Committee Recommendations

Part A

That the Social and Community Development Committee recommend to Council that it:

1. Endorse the Botanic Gardens Spatial Plan in its current form.

Councillor Galloway/Councillor Scandrett  Carried

15. Draft Events Policy Framework

Staff Recommendations

That the Error! No document variable supplied.:  

2. Note that the Draft Events Policy Framework is a high level document intended to outline responsibilities for events between the Council and ChristchurchNZ, and set a combined vision for events in Christchurch.
3. Note that feedback from the events sector and teams across Council has been incorporated into the Draft Events Policy Framework.
4. Note that ChristchurchNZ is currently developing a Major Events Strategy, and Council staff will soon begin work on a Community Events Implementation Plan.
5. Agree to forward the Draft Events Policy Framework to Council and recommend it approves the Draft Events Policy Framework to be released for public consultation.

Committee Decided SOC/2017/00043

Part A

That the Social and Community Development Committee recommends that Council:
Social and Community Development Committee
06 September 2017

2. Note that the Draft Events Policy Framework is a high level document intended to outline responsibilities for events between the Council and ChristchurchNZ, and set a combined vision for events in Christchurch.
3. Note that feedback from the events sector and teams across Council has been incorporated into the Draft Events Policy Framework.
4. Note that ChristchurchNZ is currently developing a Major Events Strategy, and Council staff will soon begin work on a Community Events Implementation Plan.
5. Approves the Draft Events Policy Framework to be released for public consultation.
6. Instruct staff to facilitate a workshop with the Social and Community Development Committee and Strategic Capability Committee to inform the Draft Events Policy before it is released for consultation.

Councillor Galloway/Councillor Livingstone

Committee Comment

The Committee referred to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee for consideration, the issue of adoption of best practice guidelines for blue paint on mobility carparks.

Committee Resolved SOC/2017/00044

Part C

That the Social and Community Development Committee:
1. Receives the information in the Community Facilities Rebuild Monthly Update report.

Councillor Johanson/Councillor Chen

17 Resolution to Exclude the Public
Committee Resolved SOC/2017/00045

Part C

That at 4.50pm the resolution to exclude the public set out on pages 274 to 275 of the agenda be adopted.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Scandrett

Councillor Galloway departed.

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 5.20pm.
Meeting concluded at 5.20pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 4TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2017

COUNCILLOR PHIL CLEARWATER
CHAIRPERSON
16. Performance report for the year ended 30 June 2017

Reference: 17/978988
Contact: Bruce Moher  
Bruce.moher@ccc.govt.nz  941 8497

1. Staff and Finance and Performance Committee Recommendation to Council

That the Council:

1. Receives the information in the report.
2. Approves net operational carry forward requests from 2016/17 of $30.2 million (as detailed in Attachment C), to enable completion of projects in 2017/18 and beyond.
3. Approves (as detailed in Attachment E) capital carry forward and bring back requests to/from 2016/17 of $49 million to enable completion of capital projects in 2017/18 or later as indicated, noting $52.9 million moves to 2017/18 and replaces an unspecified $57.4 million already included in the 2018 Annual Plan.
4. Approves capital revenue and funding net carry forwards to/from 2016/17 of $27.9 million to align with the capital programme, noting this includes $11 million of development contribution rebates.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Performance report for the year ended 30 June 2017</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>June 2017 - Levels of Service Exceptions</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>June 2017 - Financial Performance</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>June 2017 - Operational Carry Forwards</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>June 2017 - Significant Capital Projects</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>June 2017 - Capital Carry Forwards</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>June 2017 - Special Funds</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose and Origin of Report**
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Finance and Performance Committee and Council to be updated on service delivery, financial and capital works programme performance results for the 2016/2017 financial year ended 30 June 2017.

2. **Staff Recommendations**
   That the Finance and Performance Committee recommends that the Council:
   1. Receives the information in the report.
   2. Approves net operational carry forward requests from 2016/17 of $30.2 million (as detailed in Attachment C), to enable completion of projects in 2017/18 and beyond.
   3. Approves (as detailed in Attachment E) capital carry forward and bring back requests to/from 2016/17 of $49 million to enable completion of capital projects in 2017/18 or later as indicated, noting $52.9 million moves to 2017/18 and replaces an unspecified $57.4 million already included in the 2018 Annual Plan.
   4. Approves capital revenue and funding net carry forwards to/from 2016/17 of $27.9 million to align with the capital programme, noting this includes $11 million of development contribution rebates.

3. **Key Points**
   3.1 The Council’s financial operating results for the year show an operating deficit after requested carry forwards of $0.5 million. This is less than 0.1% of expenditure and considered a good result given the net cost of the Port Hills fire was $0.57 million. The result is $3.8 million better than the March forecast mainly due to higher revenues. This includes higher subvention receipts of $1.3 million and higher rates income of $1.1 million. The operating deficit will need to be funded from rates in line with Council policy. This will require a one year rates increase of 0.1% in 2018/19 (reversing in 2019/20) to cover the $458,354 cash deficit.

   3.2 Capital expenditure of $614.4 million was incurred during the year representing delivery of 87% of the original gross programme. Programme delivery was better than the 80% planned, however this did require earlier than planned funding of $57.5 million.

   1.1

4. **Context/Background**
   **Levels of Service**
   4.1 The yearend data shows 85.9% of Levels of Service performance targets (set by the Council in the 2016 Amended LTP and Annual Plan) were achieved in 2016/17. This result is consistent with previous years. Audit NZ will review the results as part of their audit and this figure may alter depending on their findings.
4.2 Attachment A lists details of those Levels of Service where Council’s target was not achieved, as well as providing comments and remedial actions from the accountable managers.

Financial Performance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Results</th>
<th>After Carry Forwards</th>
<th>Capital Plan Pre-reprogramming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Var</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenditure</td>
<td>554.7</td>
<td>552.0</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues and Funding</td>
<td>-533.0</td>
<td>-502.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratepayer financing required</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Programme Expenditure</td>
<td>614.4</td>
<td>655.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less planned Carry Forwards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-98.3</td>
<td>-98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure to be funded</td>
<td>614.4</td>
<td>556.9</td>
<td>-57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues and Funding</td>
<td>-491.6</td>
<td>-489.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratepayer borrowing required</td>
<td>122.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>-55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Key commentary on operational and capital year to date results is given below. This is followed by a section for each area giving further detail. A view of the Council’s financial results by Group of Activity is provided in Attachment B.

4.4 Operational expenditure is significantly higher than budget after requested carry forwards. The biggest contributors are operational savings not identified ($8.9 million), higher maintenance costs ($8.4 million) and higher debt servicing costs ($4.7 million) which are largely recovered by increased interest revenues. Clauses 4.9 and 4.10 provide details.

4.5 Operational revenues and funding are significantly higher than budget due to a combination of higher dividends/interest/subvention revenues; Crown contribution for Three Waters; higher housing revenues (offset by maintenance costs), rates income and parking revenues. Clauses 4.11 to 4.14 provide details.
4.6 Capital expenditure is $84.1 million below the gross original programme budget of $698.5 million. During the 2017/18 Annual Plan $43.3 million was reprogrammed, with $48.9 million requested as end of year carry forwards. The resultant over budget result of $8.1 million is primarily related to SCIRT overspend. Financially the updated programme budget was $57.5 million overspent, as the financial budget assumes that there will be higher carry forwards, although $49.4 million is only timing. Additional permanent funding of $8.1 million is required. Clauses 4.17 and 4.18 provide details.

4.7 Capital revenues and funding finished $25.4 million lower than budget after taking into account required carry forwards. The negative result is mainly due to the lower CCHL capital release ($40 million), partially offset by higher NZTA revenues. Clauses 4.22 to 4.26 provide details.

4.8 Borrowing required in 2016/17 to fund the capital programme was $55 million higher than budget. Of this, $21.5 million was timing related, with permanent extra borrowing required of $33.5 million largely due to the lower capital release. This is $14.3 million higher than what was forecast in March. The change is mainly the result of an over spend within the SCIRT programme. Clause 4.18 provides details.
4.9 Annual operational expenditure is $29.2 million above budget after requested carry forwards of $26.5 million as detailed in Attachment C.

4.10 The $29.2 million unfavourable expenditure result after carry forwards is mainly due to:

4.10.1 Higher personnel costs of $3.4 million mainly driven by an over spend relating to vacancies which are being covered by consultants for Three Waters ($0.9 million); Transport ($0.3 million); and Asset management ($0.2 million). On top of this were savings targets of $0.6 million that were not achieved in these areas. In the Three Waters and Asset Management area fewer costs were also capitalised than planned. Higher resourcing of $1.3 million for the IT capital programme was recorded through Opex, although this was recharged to budgeted capital projects.

4.10.2 Unspecified operational savings not found ($8.9 million),

4.10.3 Higher operating and maintenance costs for Parks ($1.6 million). Contributing to this is Neighbourhood parks ($0.8 million), mainly due to unplanned work for playground safety surfaces. Riverbank maintenance is also impacting the Neighbourhood Parks over spend which is primarily associated with increased public access to red zone areas. Regional Parks has a maintenance contract over spend of $0.5 million, mainly due to improved asset data management identifying which parks require maintenance, and Port Hills fire damage. Sports Parks is over spent which is driven by higher safety pruning activities required and unplanned repairs necessary to drains, sumps and vandalism to Sports Parks pavilion facilities ($0.4 million),

4.10.4 An over spend on housing maintenance of $1.2 million. It was assumed the Trust would take on minor maintenance costs when the funding model was created. These costs were covered by additional revenue from the Trust,
4.10.5 Increased maintenance costs for water collection and supply ($5.6 million), with earthquake work continuing longer than planned. These are offset by accrued Crown recoveries,

4.10.6 Both interest expense and revenue were over budget, with net interest slightly over budget due to an unplanned one off interest payment for the Crossing Carpark. Higher interest costs of $4.7 million also related to borrowing costs on unplanned additional advances to CCHL (recovered via higher interest revenue received from CCHL); and early borrowing for December 2017 pre-financed debt (offset by interest earned on re-investing these funds).

4.11 Operating revenues for Council activities were $16 million higher than budget for the year. Major contributors to the additional revenue are:

4.11.1 Accrued Crown contributions for earthquake response ($6.4 million),

4.11.2 Higher housing rental revenue ($2.2 million). As stated above the funding model assumed the Trust would take on minor maintenance,

4.11.3 Increased parking revenues ($1.6 million). The budget was reduced in anticipation of losing parking sites due to the Accessible City projects, however some phases and projects have not yet commenced,

4.11.4 Cost recoveries of $1 million in relation to the Port Hills fire,

4.11.5 Over recovery of residual waste collection due to increased volumes of liquid waste dumping at Burwood Landfill and Bromley Treatment Plant ($0.6 million), and higher trade waste charges ($0.6 million).

4.12 Interest and dividends revenues were $13.6 million higher than budget. This is mainly due to:

4.12.1 Additional interest revenues ($4 million), resulting from increased advances to CCHL and investing pre-financed debt, and Transwaste dividend relating to the Burwood Resource Recovery Park being received a year earlier than planned ($3.9 million),

4.12.2 A higher CCHL dividend ($2.8 million),

4.12.3 Higher than planned subvention receipts ($2.4 million).

4.13 Rates revenue was higher than budget due to higher growth than anticipated.

4.14 Special fund drawdowns were slightly lower than budget due to a surplus in Housing operations ($0.7 million), and lower Housing earthquake response costs ($0.6 million). Carry forwards required for projects funded from the Capital Endowment fund are shown in Attachment C.

4.15 The residual financing required for net operational costs was $27.8 million below budget, but with $28.3 million required to fund carry forwards. The net result is a $0.5 million funding deficit which it is proposed to recover in 2018/19 from rates.

4.16 The net costs of individual activities are shown in Attachment B.
## Capital Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Annual Results</th>
<th>After Carry Forwards</th>
<th>Capital Plan Pre-reprogramming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>$m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Waters</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading and Transport</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Land</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM&amp;CT</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Works Programme</strong></td>
<td><strong>188.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>235.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure - SCIRT</td>
<td>189.3</td>
<td>170.7</td>
<td>-18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure - Non SCIRT</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional / Recovery Projects</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Rebuild</td>
<td>138.7</td>
<td>129.3</td>
<td>-9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockfall</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rebuild Programme</strong></td>
<td><strong>425.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>419.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Capital Spend</td>
<td>614.4</td>
<td>655.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Carry forwards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-98.3</td>
<td>-98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funded Capital Spend</strong></td>
<td><strong>614.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>556.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>-57.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Contributions</td>
<td>-33.9</td>
<td>-17.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less DC Rebates</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPMC Recoveries</td>
<td>-43.4</td>
<td>-44.5</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA Capital Subsidy</td>
<td>-147.9</td>
<td>-125.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vbase recovery - Town Hall</td>
<td>-35.0</td>
<td>-29.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital release / Special dividends</td>
<td>-116.0</td>
<td>-151.9</td>
<td>-35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Capital Revenues</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Sales</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>-389.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>-370.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cost</td>
<td>225.3</td>
<td>186.9</td>
<td>-38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates (Renewals / Landfill / Tsfrs)</td>
<td>-113.3</td>
<td>-113.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Funds</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>-16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>-102.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>-119.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>-16.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing Required</td>
<td>122.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>-55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.17 Capital expenditure for the year was $614.4 million. 69% of spend related to the rebuild programme which delivered 89% of what was originally planned. The works programme delivered 81% of what was planned.

4.18 The $8.1 million permanent over spend after carry forwards is mainly due to:

4.18.1 Infrastructure – SCIRT –$18.6 million over budget for the year; partially offset by,

4.18.2 An under spend on non-SCIRT infrastructure of $5.5 million.

4.19 Group of Activity level variance commentary for the Capital programme is included in Attachment B.

4.20 Financial results of significant (>-$250,000) capital works programme projects are shown in Attachment D.
4.21 Requested capital carry forwards are detailed in Attachment E.

4.22 Development contributions are higher than budget as development was higher than planned outside of the rebate areas. Rebate spend was well under budget and the balance is requested to be carried forward.

4.23 Capital release/special dividends are lower than budget for the year due to the lower CCHL capital release ($40 million); partially offset by a higher Tuam dividend ($4.1 million).

4.24 Miscellaneous capital revenues are higher than budget primarily due to the Port Hills Mass Movement recoveries of $2.9 million and higher water connection fees of $0.8 million.

4.25 Property asset sales are $3.3 million under budget for the year, an improvement of $1.7 million on what was forecast in the March report. The improvement was due to the QEII park land sale, although these funds have been set aside for the QEII Park redevelopment plan.

4.26 Special funds drawdowns are $16.6 million lower than budget, mainly due to higher development contribution revenue set aside to fund future qualifying growth projects ($11 million) and the QEII land sale above ($4.5 million).

4.27 Borrowing for the Capital Programme was $55 million more than budget, or $33.5 million higher after funding bring backs. The permanent extra borrowing of $33.5 million is largely a result of the decreased capital release from CCHL ($40 million).

Special Funds

4.28 The current and forecast movements and balance of the Housing Account, Capital Endowment Fund and Earthquake Mayoral Relief Fund are shown in Attachment F.

4.29 The balance of funds currently unallocated in the Capital Endowment Fund is $543,457 being $247,305 available at 30 June and $296,152 available in 2017/18 as planned. This is better than that published in the 2017/18 Annual Plan due to unallocated budget of $125,139 not being utilised in 2016/17; this has been requested to be carried forward.
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Attachment A – Level of Service Exceptions June 2017
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Level of Service Exceptions
As of 30 June 2017 (year-end)

Levels of service that failed to meet LTP target (prior to Audit NZ confirmation)
Measures marked in bold are LTP-level measures i.e. will appear in the Annual Report

Community Services
Civil Defence Emergency Management

Measure: 2.5.4 Improve the level of community and business awareness and preparedness of risks from hazards and their consequences (PCat4)
Target: At least 50 CDEM public education activities occur annually.
Actual: Unknown - this target hasn’t been measured during the year.
Comments: Target not measured due to Kaikoura earthquake response and Port Hills fires EOC activation.
Remedial Action: Ensure measures are undertaken for 17/18.

Measure: 2.5.9 Council is prepared for and maintains an effective response capability to manage civil defence emergencies. Operative radio communications are maintained between the Emergency Operations Centre and specified organisations on a weekly basis (PCat1)
Target: At least 90% of weekly and monthly radio tests are successful.
Actual: Currently 81% of tests are successful. We will not achieve the 90% target.
Comments: 1 - There are on-going issues with getting personnel at radio locations to remember to participate in radio checks. 2 - A repeater issue has affected radio operability on Banks Peninsula.
Remedial Action: 1 - We send a weekly radio check reminder, have visited all sites, and perform follow up phone calls. There is no more we can do here and we suggest this measure needs to be amended in future. 2 - The Communications Engineer is coordinating a fix of the repeater issue.

Measure: 2.5.10 Enhance professional development of personnel involved in CDEM through training and exercises: Council staff with CDEM roles are appropriately trained for their position (PCat1)
Target: The minimum number of staff trained for EOC roles (or with previous experience) exceeds 200
Actual: Target not measured during 2016/17.
Comments: Staff absence occurred during the year which lead to training not being undertaken.
Remedial Action: System for recording training undertaken to be reviewed in 2017/18.

Measure: 2.5.11 Enhance professional development of personnel involved in CDEM through training and exercises. (PCat1)
Target: At least 60% ‘operational’ welfare volunteers are appropriately trained.
Actual: 45%
Comments: Not meeting this target is in part due to recent changes to the volunteer makeup of the Welfare Team i.e. volunteer turn-over. CDEM Staff changes have also contributed to training not being delivered.
Remedial Action: Welfare Volunteer training programmed for 2017/18 in order to meet this target.
**Council**

**28 September 2017**

---

**Measure:** 2.5.12 Improve the level of community and business awareness and preparedness of risks from hazards and their consequences: Develop partnerships to increase disaster resilience (PCat4)

**Target:** At least 17% of Christchurch residents participate in CDEM meetings to enable their local community to cope better.

**Actual:** 12%

**Comments:** Staff were involved with Emergency Operations Centre response for both the Kaikoura earthquake and the Port Hills fires which resulted in less public education engagements.

**Remedial Action:** The number of community engagements will increase during 2017/18.

---

**Community Facilities**

**Measure:** 2.0.5 Provide and lease Early Learning Centre facilities at market rate (PCat4)

**Target:** 10 Facilities leased exclusively to Early Learning Centres at market rate (subject to maintenance and facility rebuild priorities)

**Actual:** 2016 Rental Review not carried out due to uncertainty about Council’s continued funding for the centres.

**Comments:** The decision not to review the market rates was based on uncertainty about Council’s continued funding of the Centres and the ability of the Centres to pay a higher rate. The rent review was therefore placed on hold.

**Remedial Action:** A review of Council’s policy will be completed during 2017/18.

---

**Measure:** 2.0.7 Support community based management of community facilities (PCat4)

**Target:** At least 82% of the community facilities are managed by third parties (subject to maintenance and facility rebuild priorities)

**Actual:** 74%

**Comments:** This is due in part to the number of community facilities that are still being rebuilt. Two of those to be completed in early 2017/18 will be community managed in whole or in part.

**Remedial Action:** The introduction of the Council - Community Partnership Management Model in 2017/18 will assist with the effective management of community facilities by community organisations.

---

**Events and Festivals**

**Measure:** 2.8.2 Lead the promotion and marketing of Christchurch events and the city as an events destination (PCat4)

**Target:** At least 90% resident satisfaction with range of events and festivals delivered

**Actual:** 80% satisfaction, 2017 residents' survey

**Comments:** From January 1 2017 this activity became the responsibility of the TEEA.

**Remedial Action:** Work with ChristchurchNZ to take such steps as is necessary to meet the target in future.

---

**Measure:** 2.8.3 (non LTP) Deliver, partner and produce events, programmes and festivals for the city (PCat4)

**Target:** Present programme of events and festivals to Council for approval, annually by March

**Actual:** Delivered in May 2017.

**Comments:** This has been presented to Council in May 2017. Delayed due to scheduling with Council.

**Remedial Action:** To agree a programme of reporting events with the social and community development committee.
---

Measure: 2.8.8 A review of Arts Strategy and Policy instigated (PCat4)
Target: Revised policy, strategy and processes have been adopted and implemented.
Actual: Not achieved. Organisational approach to the project confirmed but no further action taken to this point.
Comments: Organisational approach to the project now confirmed. Resources previously repositioned to the creation of TEED now made available to this project.
Remedial Action: Aim to complete by Dec 2017.
---

Measure: 2.8.9 Public arts framework is developed and adopted; procedures for commissioning and accepting gifts are clearly set out (PCat4)
Target: Implement framework and procedures for Communities to support, develop and manage robust, quality private and public arts projects.
Actual: Not achieved, will be delivered under an overarching Arts Policy and Strategy currently being developed.
Comments: Work has started on developing a plan for an overarching review of the Council Arts Policy and Strategy and it is likely any further development and confirmation of recommended processes will fold into this larger review.
Remedial Action: Aim to complete by December 2017.

---

**Rural Fire Management**

Measure: 2.7.6 Enhance the professional development and competency of personnel involved in rural fire through participation in training and exercises (PCat4)
Target: At least 55% Voluntary Rural Fire Force members have obtained the ‘Basic Fire Fighter’ national training standards.
Actual: Only achieved 48% (47/98) of VRFF members having completed requirements for Basic Fire Fighter National Training Standard.
Comments: Hectic fire season and work to support pending legislative changes have meant opportunities to undertake formal training did not eventuate. Other priorities for volunteer engagement through FENZ Transition process. Also took on and commenced training for new recruits - not yet at Basic Fire fighter level.
Remedial Action: No longer a function of Council - responsibility for the training and management of VRFF transfers to Fire and Emergency New Zealand at 1 July 2017.
Economic Development
City Promotions

Measure: 5.3.1 Residents are satisfied with Council provision of information available to them about events, activities and attractions in Christchurch. (PCat4)
Target: 85%
Actual: 79% of residents satisfied with information about events, activities and attractions in Christchurch. Target of 85% not achieved.
Comments: Target not achieved.
Remedial Action: Consolidate information about events, activities and attractions into the Councils’ website to improve accessibility and visibility for the community.

Civic and International Relations

Measure: 5.0.16 Christchurch is recognised by Antarctic programmes as an excellent / globally competitive Antarctic gateway city (PCat4)
Target: Implement Antarctic Strategy
Actual: 20%
Comments: Action Plans will be developed more fully with stakeholders following Council’s endorsement of the Antarctic City Strategy in October 2017.
Remedial Action: Action Plans will be developed more fully with stakeholders following Council’s endorsement of the Antarctic City Strategy in October 2017.

Venue Management (Phase)

Measure: 5.2.1 Financial performance (PCat4)
Target: EBITDA of -$2,176,000
Actual: ($2,457,867)
Comments: Soft year particularly for ticketed events.
Remedial Action: However $355k better than last year.

Measure: 5.2.10 High utilisation of Horncastle Arena (PCat4)
Target: At least 90 events delivered at Horncastle Arena.
Actual: 84 events
Comments: Over 90 event days were delivered. The Arena was closed for all of January and most of February for roof repairs.
Remedial Action: The Arena was closed for all of January and most of February for roof repairs.

Measure: 5.2.12 High utilisation of Air Force Museum (PCat4)
Target: At least 170 events delivered at Air Force Museum.
Actual: 159 events
Comments: As alternative venues open (e.g. hotel function rooms) we are seeing a decline in quantity of events at AFM.
Remedial Action: 50% target for 2017/18 set at 150 events.
Council
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---

Measure: 5.2.14 High utilisation of ilex function room (PCat6)
Target: At least 100 events delivered at ilex function room.
Actual: 80 events
Comments: Vbase exited the venue in May, so events started to decline from January onwards.
Remedial Action: If the agreement had not ended this would have been exceeded.

Heritage Protection

Measure: 1.4.5 The policy and operational guidelines for Council purchase of heritage properties through the Historic Places Fund is written and agreed by Council (PCat4)
Target: Policy is implemented as agreed by Council.
Actual: Target not met due to staff limitations and demands of other projects, particularly the heritage strategy.
Comments: Requirement to focus on heritage strategy and upcoming staff absence limited ability to complete the work within 2016/2017.
Remedial Action: Target for completion of work pushed back to next financial year to align with completion of heritage strategy.

Housing

Measure: 18.0.1 Provide a portfolio of Social Housing rental units that are fit for purpose (PCat3)
Target: Maintain at least 2,347 units in Council Housing Portfolio and increase to at least 2,363 by year end (schedule subject to contractor availability, Council rebuild priorities and timing of owner occupier unit acquisitions).
Actual: 2,478 Units currently exist in the wider CCC Social Housing Portfolio. This is expected to reduce after capitalisation of OCHT and pending redevelopment/demolitions are realised.
Comments: Out of the portfolio of 2,478, 2,446 Units are associated with the OCHT lease arrangement. 32 Units are leased to others. 2,446 is configured as follows: 2,122 Units are deemed to be open and available for renting, 224 Units are deemed to be currently closed/un-tenantable for the following reasons: EQ Repair, Methamphetamine Contamination, Asbestos, Fire Damage, Major/Planned Work, Pending Redevelopment/Demolition, and Use as Temporary Accommodation.
Remedial Action: Focus on returning the non-operative units to the Trust for leasing. This will involve a minimum of 50 units being non-operative due to ongoing programmes of work.

---

Measure: 18.0.2 Deliver a rebuild programme to improve housing quality (PCat4)
Target: Future exemplar and partnership programme to be agreed with Council.
Actual: Comments: Exemplar outcomes to form a report to Council for future direction.
Remedial Action: Provide report to Council to identify current status and future requirements.
Libraries, Arts and Culture

Christchurch Art Gallery

Measure: 3.0.1 Visitors per annum (PCat4)
Target: Visitors per annum within a range of 380,000 - 420,000.
Comments: Although school and public programme attendees are at predicted levels, visitor numbers are not as high as they were pre-earthquake.
Remedial Action: In general, it is assumed that art gallery visitation will return as the central city is more repaired and open, as central city transportation options improve and as other attractions, such as the Arts Centre are completed. A new café (scheduled to open here in September 2017) will ensure the Gallery appears more active from Worcester Boulevard.

---

Measure: 3.0.10 International Museum standards maintained: climate control (PCat1)
Target: Humidity is maintained at 50% +/- 5% 24/7/365
Actual: Annual performance in the high 90% range, however, some non-conformance so this LOS means target not achieved.
Comments: Works have been undertaken to install dehumidification equipment in the Gallery. Controls have been adjusted and, monitoring and response times refined. Given the high level of performance, and low level of non-compliance, further intervention does not seem to be justified at this stage. Cost / benefit analysis would be required to justify further investment. There is also evidence of more strict interpretation of performance evident in the reporting.
Remedial Action: None proposed. Should the number and level of breaches indicate a real trend, then further remedial action will be considered.

---

Target: Temperature is maintained at 21°C +/- 1°C 24/7/365
Actual: Temperature is not achieved due to previous no conformance.
Comments: Works have been undertaken to improve temperature in the Gallery including the dehumidification project and improvements to the supply of chilled water. Controls have been adjusted and, monitoring and response times refined. Given the high level of performance, and low level of non-compliance, further intervention does not seem to be justified at this stage. Cost / benefit analysis would be required to justify further investment.
Remedial Action: None proposed.

---

Measure: 3.0.12 Cost of providing Christchurch Art Gallery services (PCat4)
Target: Operating cost per visitor to CAG of no more than $21.00 per annum
Actual: Cost per visitor = $35.75
Comments: This reflects an overall increase in the art gallery’s operational costs, as well as a decrease in visitors relative to before the Gallery’s closure from Feb 2011-Dec 2015. However, costs are within the Australasian benchmarking group average of $2536.
Remedial Action: The number of visitors to CAG is expected to rise as the central city increasingly returns to normal.

Libraries

Measure: 3.1.1 Collections in a variety of formats are available to and meet the needs of the community. (PCat4)
Target: Increase current size of purchased downloadable e-format collection by at least 30% per year.
Actual: 28%
Comments: This is not sustainable as the market matures. The actual increase continues to be high, delivering the expected results for customers, but continuing with 30% increase year on year is not feasible within budget.
Remedial Action: The percentage has been adjusted to a more sustainable 15% for next year.

Parks and Open Spaces

Garden and Heritage Parks

Measure: 6.2.11 Proportion of visitors satisfied with the appearance of garden and heritage parks (PCat4)
Target: \( \geq 80\% \) satisfaction
Actual: 78%
Comments: Levels of Service - point of contact surveys 2016/17 6.2.11
Remedial Action: improve levels of service

- Measure: 6.2.8 Cost of maintaining Garden and Heritage Parks (excluding the Botanic Gardens) (PCat4)
  Target: $50,966 / hectare
  Actual: $52,854 / hectare
  Comments: 3.7% over budget
  Remedial Action: Variance created by increase of costs for non-glyphosate weed control. This has been accounted for in forward budget.

Neighbourhood Parks

Measure: 6.0.1 Neighbourhood Parks are maintained to specifications so parks are clean, tidy, safe and functional (PCat4)
Target: \( \geq 95\% \) of contract technical specifications pertaining to neighbourhood parks are met.
Actual: 83.1% based on average of all KRA components Business Practice, Quantity, and Quality Scores across all contract areas.
Comments: Contractor failure on achieving quantity during spring growth period brought down overall performance.
Remedial Action: Monitor and early communications with contractors to develop a plan for achieving quantity targets for programmed maintenance.

- Measure: 6.0.2 Customer satisfaction with the range of recreation facilities (PCat4)
  Target: \( > 90\% \) satisfaction with the mix of recreation facilities.
  Actual: 83%
  Comments: 23% of residents dissatisfied up from 15% in previous year will need to be addressed
  Remedial Action: Comments indicate dissatisfaction with age of equipment, can address by revisiting renewal programmes, seek funding in next annual plan and target new ranger activities to address minor maintenance issues through a proactive programme of work.

- Measure: 6.0.3 Overall customer satisfaction with neighbourhood parks (PCat4)
  Target: \( \geq 80\% \) satisfaction with neighbourhood parks.
  Actual: 62%
  Comments: Satisfied results increased by 2% Condition of Parks showed as a strong area of dissatisfaction.
  Remedial Action: Address condition of parks with contract maintenance, new field ranger staff and budget to target look and feel of parks.

- 8 -
Measure: 6.0.5 Cost of maintaining Neighbourhood Parks (PCat4)
Target: $7,522 / hectare
Actual: $8,983
Comments: Changes in costs for Glyphosate Opex were not indicated when Horizon KPI’s were set at the beginning of the financial year. (Variance of $1,419 /hectare in this area) Target adjusted for this would show actual at $7,558 /hectare.
Remedial Action: Increase of costs for non-glyphosate weed control accounted for in forward budget.

Regional Parks

Measure: 6.3.5 Provide, develop and maintain facilities to the satisfaction of park users (PCat4)
Target: 80% satisfaction
Actual: 69%
Comments: Target not achieved.
Remedial Action: Review satisfaction report to target improvements.

---

Measure: 6.3.6 Manage and maintain Regional Parks to budget (PCat4)
Target: $1,002 / hectare
Actual: $1,083
Comments: Unexpected operational demands in Regional Parks meant cost per hectare was greater than the target amount.
Remedial Action: Planning for the unexpected can be done, to a certain extent.

Refuse Minimisation and Disposal

Recyclable Materials Collection and Processing

Measure: 8.0.6 Proportion of incoming recyclable materials that are contaminated and sent to landfill (PCat4)
Target: Less than or equal to 10% (by weight) contamination of incoming recyclable materials
Actual: 10.6%
Comments: Cannot be calculated exclusively to CCC as measures inputs from other Councils sent to landfill.
Remedial Action: Redefine calculation method to read: Proportion of incoming recyclable materials that are contaminated.
Regulation and Enforcement
Building Consenting, Inspections and Monitoring

Measure: 9.1.4 Ensure satisfaction with building consents process (quarterly review survey results and feed common issues to issues register for resolution) (PCat4)
Target: 80%
Actual: Result below target at 63.9%.
Comments: Survey for November to April.
Remedial Action: Survey questions are being rewritten, due for completion when the next survey is due to go out - by September 2017.

Measure: 9.1.6 Efficiency: Cost per consent / transaction (PCat4)
Target: Average cost $2,058 of processing a building consent (actual result for 2015/16)
Actual: Overall, $2,576 for each of 6,755 consents.
Comments: This return is $49 less than last month, $469 more than notional target (last year’s result) of $2,058, four month trend of slight monthly improvement.
Remedial Action: The “Feas” Project is still in progress to address the impact and makeup of our cost and overheads to provide clearer understanding of our overheads.

District Planning

Measure: 9.5.1 Prepare the Replacement District Plan in three stages (PCat4)
Target: Ensure Replacement Plan is fully operative.
Actual: There is one appeal outstanding on the DFR.
Comments: There is one appeal outstanding to the Court of Appeal.
Remedial Action: Oppose the leave application to the Court of Appeal.

Land and Property Information Services

Measure: 9.4.3 Retrieve and provide commercial property files in hard copy for customers (PCat3)
Target: Retrieve and provide 95% of optional requests for scanning of records within 5 working days (charges apply).
Actual: This level of service does not reflect what the contractor (Iron Mountain) is required to provide. They currently have 5 days for completion of this service.
Comments: This level of service does not reflect what the contractor (Iron Mountain) is required to provide. They currently have 5 days for completion of this service. The contract expires on September 30th 2017, and the renewal process will potentially bring the LOS into line with Council requirements.
Remedial Action: None required with the demise of this particular process, the “new” system will have tasks and targets which reflect actuality.
Regulatory Compliance, Licencing and Registration

Measure: 9.0.16 All known earthquake waste demolition storage sites and clean fill sites inspected bi-monthly (PCat3)
Target: Report at least 6 monthly to Council Committee.
Actual: The 6 monthly reporting target was not achieved this year due to changes in the management structure of the WEMT team.
Comments:
Remedial Action: An annual report capturing the teams activities is currently being prepared.

Resource Consenting

Measure: 9.2.1 % of simple land use resource management applications processed within timeframes (PCat3)
Target: 99% within 10 working days
Actual: Year to date 96/98 92%
Comments: Target not achieved. A stretch target as not a statutory timeframe. 4/4 100% for June.
Remedial Action: Have seen improvement throughout the year. Missed several towards the start of the year which meant the end of year target would be difficult to meet.

Measure: 9.2.2 % of complex non-notified resource management applications processed within statutory timeframes (PCat3)
Target: 99% within the statutory timeframes
Actual: Year to date 2396/2447 98%
Comments: Close to meeting target at 98%. Towards the end of the year more applications went over the statutory timeframe due to high workloads and complexity. 197/203 97% for June.
Remedial Action: Reviewing staff resources and training development under the new District Plan.

Measure: 9.2.5 % of Site Specific Temporary Accommodation applications processed within timeframes (PCat3)
Target: 99% within ten working days.
Actual: Year to date 6/9 67%. Target of 99% not achieved.
Comments: Unit has experienced more complicated applications coming through this year. It has taken a greater amount of time to process and receive community board comments. (0/0 100% for June).
Remedial Action: No action is proposed as it is a process that is seldom utilised and also it is more important to process these applications properly rather than achieve a tight timeframe.

Measure: 9.2.7 % satisfaction with resource consenting process (PCat4)
Target: 76% satisfaction achieved
Actual: Achieved 64% in annual survey.
Comments: This is a reduction on the previous year. Anecdotal feedback is that the new District Plan has increased complexity for applicants and is contributing to reduced satisfaction.
Remedial Action: It is expected that customer satisfaction will increase as the new District Plan becomes more familiar. The unit continues to build on the work completed on developing a customer service strategy.
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Measure: 9.2.17 Average controllable cost of processing non-notified resource management applications (PCat4)
Target: The average controllable cost of non-notified resource consents, $1,890 or less (reduces from the previous year).
Actual: Average controllable cost of $2,092.
Comments: Unit has experienced increased complexity thus driving up costs.
Remedial Action: Complexity is beyond the control of the unit.

---

Measure: 9.2.13 % of notified resource consents processed within statutory timeframes (PCat3)
Target: 99% within the statutory timeframes
Actual: Year to date 41/42 95%.
Comments: Only two exceeded the statutory timeframe but with small numbers 95% achieved. Timeframes can also be outside staff control as consents go through a hearings and commissioner process. 3/3 100% achieved for June.
Remedial Action: None proposed as still considered a good result and not significantly different than target.

---

Measure: 9.2.20 Audit of processing of resource consent applications (PCat4)
Target: Undertake an annual audit and implement recommendations through an action plan
Actual: A formal annual audit has not been completed during the 2016/17 financial year.
Comments: The audit was proposed to be carried out by staff but due to workload constraints the audit was not completed. While a formal audit has not been carried out this year, each consent is audited more informally via the delegated officer sign off process.
Remedial Action: It is proposed to complete an audit in the next financial year.

---

Measure: 9.2.22 % Development Contribution reconsiderations completed within statutory timeframes (PCat4)
Target: 99% within 15 working days
Actual: Reconsideration Request - 89% (17 out of 19) met within the 15 day KPI.
Comments: One was due to it being closed without being completed and the other one was due to a delay in getting the necessary approvals. These are manually monitored at the moment.
Remedial Action: The DC Connect enhancements currently underway (new dials and reporting for this category) will give real time visibility of processing days.

---

Roads and Footpaths

Roads and Footpaths

Measure: 16.0.2 Maintain road condition (PCat3)
Target: The average quality of the sealed local road network, measured by smooth travel exposure (STE) >= 71%
Actual: Target measure achieved is 67%, based on roughness measures carried out in Nov 16; survey carried out Nov 16 by Transport Asset Management.
Comments: There will be some improvement post CCC’s own reseal works and EQ AC works being largely done post this survey, and further SCRT works. However, corollary to that is that further roads were able to be surveyed this year (i.e. more sections of road open post SCRT works completing) and this appears to have brought the average down.
Remedial Action: Increase focus on smoothing works as part of reseals, and to address peak roughness at manholes etc.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>16.0.11 Maintain Street Trees (PCat0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Percentage of trees compliant with Electricity (hazards from trees) Regulations 2003: &gt;= 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual:</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>YTD 533 (9.6%) of 15,876 trees are non-compliant. Several of these trees have protected status and others will require complete removal to become compliant or power lines will need to be run underground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Action:</td>
<td>Work with the Parks Arborist team and City Arborist to identify work that can be undertaken to comply with the electricity regulations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sewerage Collection, Treatment and Disposal**

**Wastewater Collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>11.0.1 Provide wastewater collection in a safe, convenient and efficient manner (blockage complaints; odour complaints; sewerage system faults; complaints remediation) (PCat1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Number of odour complaints received per 1,000 connected properties per year: &lt;= 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual:</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>There were 64 odour complaints attributable to the wastewater network equating to 0.39 per 1,000 connected properties. There were 11 that were on the long trunk main line and pump stations from PS0105 Wigram to PS0011 Randolph St. There is a chemical dosing trial underway which needs to continue and potentially develop into a permanent dosing station to remove these odour complaints. Other odour complaints from new infrastructure passed on by SCIRT features highly. These are being addressed as the issues are noted and will continue over the next year or so as leaking faults connected to the SCIRT programme of work surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Action:</td>
<td>PS0105 to PS0011 permanent chemical dosing or odour control sites needed (currently under trial).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Target: | Number of sewerage system faults received per 1,000 connected properties per year (excludes blockages and odours): <= 0.3 |
| Actual: | 0.69 per 1,000 connected properties |
| Comments: | These are responses to low pressure tank alarms. There are more and more of these being put in so this measure is unlikely to be met in the future. |
| Remedial Action: | Continue review of the causes and potential preventions. |

**Wastewater Treatment and Disposal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>11.1.6 Effectively use self-generated energy (PCat0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Proportion of energy used at the CWTP that is self generated from bio-gas: &gt;=75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual:</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Generator 3 suffered damage to its turbo charger, and a replacement was not an ‘off the shelf’ item with the overseas supplier. This resulted in a delay of several weeks until a replacement was delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Action:</td>
<td>Replacement part has been installed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sport and Recreation

Recreation and Sports Facilities

Measure: 7.0.9 Achieve a cost efficient level of service for recreation and sport facilities (PCat4)
Target: The cost of service delivery for recreation and sport facilities: Less than $3.98 per resident
Actual: $20.08
Comments: Total $7,531,850 and 375,000 residents. Increased operational costs for maintenance and the development of new facilities are primarily responsible. The city growth has not met expectations when this target was agreed.
Remedial Action: Review costs and wherever possible reduced; particularly increased maintenance.

Sports Parks

Measure: 7.1.1 Provide access to fit-for-purpose sports parks (PCat4)
Target: More than 95% of Urban Parks contract technical specifications pertaining to sports park facilities are met.
Actual: 92%
Comments: Contractor performance (both failure to achieve quantity and low quality) during spring brought this score in slightly below benchmark.
Remedial Action: Monitor and communicate early with contractors to assure quality and quantity targets are met.

Measure: 7.1.2 Deliver a high level of customer satisfaction with the range and quality of sports parks (PCat4)
Target: 90% customer satisfaction with the range and quality of sports parks
Actual: 64%
Comments: Strong satisfaction with the condition of sports parks delivered, biggest dissatisfaction was in range of facilities (lack of equipment, pools, etc.).
Remedial Action: Continue to monitor range of sports parks delivered but develop ways to enhance the range of use.

Measure: 7.1.6 Achieve a cost efficient level of service for recreation and sport facilities (PCat4)
Target: At a cost per hectare not exceeding budgeted controllable costs / the number of hectares expected by year end: $4,189 / hectare
Actual: $5,787
Comments: Additional mowing and harvesting on sports fields to respond to usual spring growth added to cost of maintenance. Changes in costs for Glyphosate were not indicated when Horizon KPI’s were set at the beginning of the financial year (Variance of $1,608/hecate in this area). Target adjusted for this would show actual at $5,629/hecate.
Remedial Action: Budget adjusted to include non-glyphosate cost increase to maintenance.
Stormwater Drainage

**Stormwater Drainage**

**Measure:** 14.6.3 Customer satisfaction with Stormwater Drainage Management (PCat4)
**Target:** >70%
**Actual:** 53%
**Comments:** Increased from 50% in 2016, and 45% in 2015, reversing downward trend seen annually since earthquakes (51% 2014, 56% 2013, 61% 2012, n/a 2011, 72% 2010).
**Remedial Action:** Changes being made to maintenance contract to improve operations and maintenance of waterways and networks. Land Drainage Recovery Programme now actively contributing to network performance improvements.

Strategic Governance

**Public Participation in Community and City Governance and Decision-making**

**Measure:** 4.1.8 Elected member satisfaction with the Council’s public consultation processes (PCat4)
**Target:** At least 70% of elected members (Community Board Members) are satisfied or very satisfied with the consultation processes involving their community.
**Actual:** Survey not undertaken.
**Comments:** This year we introduced a process in that we included elected member feedback into our consultation plan. The response to this has been positive.
**Remedial Action:** Work with the monitoring team to undertake a survey in 2017/18.

**Measure:** 4.1.9 Percentage of residents that feel they can participate in and contribute to Council decision making (PCat3)
**Target:** At least 50%
**Actual:** 41%
**Comments:** We have introduced a number of new initiatives to make it easier for people to participate and contribute to Council decision making.
**Remedial Action:** There is a new digital platform for consultation. It is citizen friendly. Engagement staff are carrying out engagement on behalf of Regenerate Christchurch. Large number of projects in year ahead which will involve major engagement with the public.

**Measure:** 4.1.10 Provide external communications and marketing that are timely, relevant, accurate and cost effective (PCat3)
**Target:** At least 67% of residents are satisfied that Council communications are timely, relevant and accurate.
**Actual:** 54%
**Comments:** Target not achieved in Residents Survey. However 28% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. The survey was being taken after the Port Hills fires. Funding has been discontinued for a printed publication. This may have affected the result, although it is Council policy to produce...
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digital first communications.
Remedial Action: We must continue to try new ways of communicating with our residents. We have recently introduced community board newsletter which will target information at a ward level. Our digital news channel Newsline is increasing readership and we are also reaching more people through social media.

--
Measure: 4.1.14 Develop and implement internal communications that are effective for staff and elected members (PCat3)
Target: At least 65% of staff satisfied with internal communications (per Engagement Survey)
Actual: 61%
Comments: This result is based on 33 people (out of nearly 3,000 staff).
Remedial Action: A new visual identity and tone of voice strategy is designed to ensure we are consistent in how we communicate internally and externally. We want to be helpful, personal and proud of working at the Council.

--
Measure: 4.1.20 Percentage of residents that feel the public has some or a large influence on the decisions the Council makes (PCat3)
Target: At least 55%
Actual: 45%
Comments: In comparison to the last three years the target is increasing. 2015 - 44%, 2016 - 42%.
Remedial Action: Improve the benchmark to reach the target of 55%.

--
Measure: 4.1.21 Percentage of residents that feel the public has some or a large influence on the decisions the Council makes - targeted survey (PCat3)
Target: 67%
Actual: 33%
Comments: In total 75% of residents felt they had small to some influence on the decisions the Council makes, but only 33% felt they had some to a large extent of influence. The challenge and opportunity is to shift the percentage of people who feel they had a small influence to having ‘some or a large influence’.
Remedial Action: We need to understand why people didn't feel they were able to influence the decisions of Council, and to what extent it was issue dependent.

--
Measure: 4.1.22 All Council and Community Board decisions are held with full statutory compliance with relevant legislation (PCat4)
Target: 100%
Actual: 100% for all Council meetings. 100% for all Community Boards meetings. Target of 100% not met from the Secretariat team.
Comments: Secretariat: The Agenda for the Council Meeting on the adoption of the draft Annual Plan for consultation in February 2017 was one day late and therefore did not meet the two clear working days requirement. This was beyond the control of the secretariat. All Council meetings 100% legislative compliance for agenda availability for all ordinary meetings. 100% notification of extraordinary meetings compliant with legislation. Community Board meetings 100% legislative compliance recorded on each Board's KPI spreadsheet to record the dates in which agendas were uploaded online.
Remedial Action: The Secretariat is unable to meet this target without the assistance of other units in the Council. We need to ensure the Annual Plan and LTIP processes allow appropriate time for agenda processes to be completed.

---
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Strategic Planning and Policy

Strategic Planning and Policy

Measure: 17.0.1.1 Advice is provided to Council on high priority policy and planning issues that affect the City (PCat4)
Target: Recommended work programme submitted by 30 June for the following financial year.
Actual: Recommended work programme submitted to the Executive Leadership Team.
Comments: Work programme developed in accordance with community outcomes and Council’s strategic priorities.
Remedial Action: None.

Measure: 17.0.8 Coordination of information and reporting on progress with the LURP Actions that CCC is responsible for (PCat4)
Target: Report progress with CCC components of LURP to the Council biannually.
Actual: This was only reported once to council.
Comments: The LURP has limited relevance and there was no point in reporting this to council.
Remedial Action: Modify the LURP.

Measure: 17.0.14 Facilitating community engagement in innovative transport solutions to achieve mode shift (PCat4)
Target: 100% of available funds allocated.
Actual: 0%
Comments: Funds have been carried over at the request of Councillors.
Remedial Action: Grant funding has been integrated into a larger programme and will be distributed in 2017/18.

Measure: 17.0.23 Development of new policies, strategies and plans (PCat4)
Target: Peer review of Coastal Hazards Assessment report completed and update of the report is underway.
Actual: Review and revision of the technical information on the risk from coastal hazards has delayed this work.
Remedial Action: Coastal Scenarios work to be carried out in 2017/18.

Measure: 17.0.32 Review of existing policies, strategies and plans (PCat4)
Target: Landscape Strategy developed June 2017.
Actual: Situational analysis completed and draft strategy framework developed.
Comments: Work deferred due to requirement to contribute to Otakaro-Avon corridor regeneration.
- 18 -
Actual: There are currently 2,273 metered/paid spaces within the 4 avenues. This figure includes the 110 spaces in the Art Gallery car park. The number of spaces is determined quarterly, the last being in June.

Comments: The Accessible City infrastructure programme has had an impact on the number of metered spaces within the CBD. However, privately owned and managed Parking buildings have opened in the last few months to supplement parking availability and these include the West End, the Herford and the Crossing car parks. In addition, the Innovation car park opened to the public last year. In total, this has provided approximately 2,250 paid parking spaces.

Remedial Action: In support of the AAC projects (where parking is removed), investigations will be undertaken to identify land that may be suitable to provide off street parking.

Measure: 10.3.3 Improve customer perception of the ease of use of Council parking facilities (PCat4)
Target: > 58%
Actual: The result for the 2016/17 year which is based on the annual resident survey was, on average 48%.
Comments: While there was a 62% satisfaction result for the ease of use of parking meters, other areas such as the range of Council parking facilities available and information provided regarding parking options affected the overall result. It is also believed that the perception of parking is influenced by the ease of travelling in and out of the City centre.

Remedial Action: It is recommended that regular “pulsar” surveys be conducted during the year which would allow an improved and more timely analysis and response to any issues raised. Further communication and marketing should be developed to highlight the improvement and positive aspects of the Council’s role in parking, in particular highlighting the Lichfield St Car Park, expected to open in October 2017.

Measure: 10.3.7 Improve customer perception of motor vehicle and personal security at parking facilities (PCat4)
Target: > 61%
Actual: The result for the 2016/17 year which is based on the annual resident survey was, on average 51%.
Comments: Nearly half of the participants in the survey believed their motor vehicle was safer in off street car parks compared to on street and approximately 1/3 had no particular view. There was also a significant (69% vs 35%) difference in the way people felt safe when using Council off street parking during the day or night.

Remedial Action: While the annual survey provides a one off result, further clarity is required to identify the specific reasons behind these and therefore Council’s ability to influence. It is recommended that additional “pulsar” surveys be conducted during the year which would allow an improved and more timely review and response to any safety issues raised.

Public Transport Infrastructure

Measure: 10.4.3 Provide journey reliability on high frequency core services (PCat3)
Target: Blue Line: <= 3.0%
Actual: 5.6%
Comments: Attempts to reduce the travel time variance through traffic signal modifications have proved unsuccessful.

Remedial Action: Further change is anticipated through the AAC programme and on-going works such as Northern Arterial reducing congestion on Main North Road.

Road Operations

Measure: 10.0.22 The temporary traffic management system supports the city rebuild whilst minimising
Council
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Impact on the transport network (PCat2)

Target: Lead time between Traffic Management Plan (TMP) application and Delivery >= 2 weeks:
Approval rate of submitted TMPs > 95%
Actual: Average lead time for new TMPs during FY 2016/17: 7 days. Average approval rate of
submitted TMPs: 92%
Comments: Actual matches forecasts provided throughout year. However the realistic CTOC target of >= 7
days lead time and approval rate of >= 90% was achieved, and in our opinion indicates
satisfactory system performance.
Remedial Action: None intended unless resources or priorities change.
--

Measure: 10.0.31 Protect vulnerable users - minimise the number of fatal crashes involving pedestrians
and cyclists (PCat1)
Target: The number of fatal crashes per year involving pedestrians or cyclists: 0
Actual: 1 fatal crash involving a cyclist.
Comments: This is an improvement from the previous year where the result was 2.
Remedial Action: Continue with cycleway and pedestrian facility improvement programme particularly the
Major Cycleway Programme, together with traffic safety education initiatives.
--

Measure: 10.0.37 Promote modal shift: Contribute to increasing the percentage share of public
transport trips (PCat4)
Target: The percentage share of public transport trips: >= 3.5%
Actual: The most recent MoT survey is from 13/14. Data from patronage surveys indicate that public
transport trips are decreasing thus the target has most likely not been met.
Comments: The result of the most recent MoT survey from 13/14 was 3.6%. Data from patronage surveys
indicate that public transport trips are decreasing thus the target has most likely not been met.
Remedial Action: Review MoT 15/16 data once published in Sept 17.

Transport Education

Measure: 10.7.3 Increase carpooling registrations (PCat6)
Target: >= 400 registrations
Actual: 142 total registrations post re-launch to ‘Smart Travel’ in May. 130 new registrations were
completed up to that point over the year.
Comments: Late in the year ‘let’s Carpool’ was re-launched as ‘Smart Travel’. Members needed to re-
register to make use of the additional features and update their details. Despite some
promotion, uptake has been low compared to previous levels.
Remedial Action: Smart Travel will be part of workplace Travel Demand Management engagement for 2017/18
so the target is expected to be exceeded in the coming year.
--

Measure: 10.7.4 Mode Shift: Contribute to overall increase in percentage of trips made by alternative
transport modes (PCat6)
Target: >= 3.5% public transport
Actual: The most recent MoT survey is from 13/14 at 3.6%
Comments: The result of the most recent MoT survey from 13/14 was 3.6%. Data from patronage surveys
indicate that public transport trips are decreasing thus the target has most likely not been met.
Remedial Action: Review MoT 15/16 data once published in Sept 17.
### Water Supply

*Water Supply (combining water conservation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>12.0.2 Ensure portable water is supplied in accordance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (network reticulation complaints) (PCat1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Proportion of complaints remediated to the customers' satisfaction: &gt;= 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Not all customer complaints remediated satisfactorily. This comes down to a matter of opinion of the complainant. Sometimes the reason that the person has complained can't be put right (the work that prompted the complaint is in the past) and whether it can be remediated or not depends on the customers' acceptance of an apology and determination that it will not happen again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Action</td>
<td>Continue to strive to remediate complaints satisfactorily.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>12.0.3 Monitor the condition of the water supply network (PCat1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Number of breaks per 100km sub-main each year (excluding 3rd party damage): &lt;= 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>130.73 breaks per 100km of sub-main.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Only just exceeded target of 130.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Action</td>
<td>More renewal investment would be required to replace a greater amount of sub-mains each year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment B – Financial Performance

### Activity Operating Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Results</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Var</td>
<td>Net G/P</td>
<td>Result</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Grants</td>
<td>10,585</td>
<td>10,802</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>5,491</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events &amp; Festivals</td>
<td>6,004</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-99</td>
<td>-197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence Emergency Management</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Fire Management</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Services &amp; Online Channels</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,854</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>-161</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services</strong></td>
<td>30,317</td>
<td>32,434</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic &amp; International Relations</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCHC Economic Development Leadership</td>
<td>12,183</td>
<td>12,388</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>-205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Promotions</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue Management (Volunte)</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>-102</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development</strong></td>
<td>16,809</td>
<td>15,080</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Protection &amp; Control Works</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>6,493</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>-2,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>6,493</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>-2,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Protection</strong></td>
<td>5,497</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>-595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Protection</td>
<td>5,497</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>-595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>13,082</td>
<td>13,626</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>-544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues - Housing</td>
<td>-1,016</td>
<td>-1,016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>12,066</td>
<td>12,610</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>-544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Art Gallery</td>
<td>10,773</td>
<td>7,025</td>
<td>-3,748</td>
<td>-3,748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>7,261</td>
<td>14,651</td>
<td>8,390</td>
<td>8,286</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>34,934</td>
<td>34,273</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>-329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>-130</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries, Arts &amp; Culture</strong></td>
<td>53,838</td>
<td>58,182</td>
<td>4,314</td>
<td>8,157</td>
<td>-3,843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Education</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks</td>
<td>15,752</td>
<td>15,415</td>
<td>-337</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden &amp; Heritage Parks</td>
<td>11,399</td>
<td>12,673</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>-382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>9,339</td>
<td>8,985</td>
<td>-354</td>
<td>-354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>-413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Revenues</strong></td>
<td>-1,055</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>4,845</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Open Spaces</td>
<td>34,243</td>
<td>40,084</td>
<td>5,841</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Waste Collection &amp; Disposal</td>
<td>11,954</td>
<td>13,313</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recyclable Materials Collection &amp; Processing</td>
<td>5,708</td>
<td>6,244</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>-536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Material Collection &amp; Composting</td>
<td>14,140</td>
<td>13,944</td>
<td>-196</td>
<td>-196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refuse Minimisation &amp; Disposal</strong></td>
<td>31,842</td>
<td>32,501</td>
<td>6,659</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Plan</th>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Net CF</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Compliance/Licensing/Enforcement</td>
<td>4,332</td>
<td>4,143</td>
<td>-189</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Consent &amp; Inspections</td>
<td>5,142</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>-916</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Consent</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>-726</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Policy</td>
<td>4,259</td>
<td>4,790</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land &amp; Property Information Services</td>
<td>-1,448</td>
<td>-1,150</td>
<td>-298</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Planning</td>
<td>9,880</td>
<td>5,951</td>
<td>-399</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation &amp; Enforcement</td>
<td>21,353</td>
<td>16,625</td>
<td>-4,728</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-4,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads &amp; Footpaths</td>
<td>100,890</td>
<td>92,936</td>
<td>-7,954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-7,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>-185,046</td>
<td>-115,758</td>
<td>69,288</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>66,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads &amp; Footpaths</td>
<td>-84,196</td>
<td>-22,822</td>
<td>61,374</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>66,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage Collection</td>
<td>102,197</td>
<td>98,708</td>
<td>-3,489</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-3,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage Treatment &amp; Disposal</td>
<td>22,135</td>
<td>20,130</td>
<td>-2,005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>-185,050</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>165,345</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>162,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage</td>
<td>-36,618</td>
<td>81,323</td>
<td>117,941</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>115,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Sports Facilities</td>
<td>17,763</td>
<td>16,621</td>
<td>-1,142</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>-1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Parks</td>
<td>11,175</td>
<td>9,558</td>
<td>-1,617</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>-3,900</td>
<td>-1,752</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>28,036</td>
<td>24,427</td>
<td>-3,609</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>-3,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Drainage</td>
<td>23,346</td>
<td>27,512</td>
<td>4,166</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>-26,839</td>
<td>-7,291</td>
<td>19,548</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Drainage</td>
<td>-3,493</td>
<td>20,221</td>
<td>23,714</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>19,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>20,662</td>
<td>25,264</td>
<td>4,602</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Governance</td>
<td>20,662</td>
<td>25,264</td>
<td>4,602</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Policy &amp; Planning</td>
<td>11,033</td>
<td>12,218</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>11,033</td>
<td>12,218</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Operations</td>
<td>5,674</td>
<td>5,321</td>
<td>-353</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Cycleways</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>-2,105</td>
<td>-558</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Infrastructure</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Education</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbours &amp; Marine Structures</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>-27,000</td>
<td>-11,646</td>
<td>15,354</td>
<td>10,853</td>
<td>4,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-20,897</td>
<td>-3,600</td>
<td>17,297</td>
<td>10,853</td>
<td>6,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>47,274</td>
<td>42,317</td>
<td>-4,957</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-4,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>-10,027</td>
<td>-2,680</td>
<td>7,347</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>6,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>37,247</td>
<td>39,637</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of Activities</td>
<td>155,992</td>
<td>396,158</td>
<td>240,166</td>
<td>42,022</td>
<td>188,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Revenues &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>-377,267</td>
<td>-637,740</td>
<td>260,473</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>-260,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP &amp; Eliminated Internal</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>10,005</td>
<td>6,805</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cost of Service (Excl Vested)</td>
<td>-217,946</td>
<td>-231,577</td>
<td>-13,631</td>
<td>53,439</td>
<td>-267,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc P&amp;L, Unallocated</td>
<td>-11,128</td>
<td>-4,550</td>
<td>6,578</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Cost of Service</td>
<td>-229,074</td>
<td>-236,127</td>
<td>-7,053</td>
<td>53,439</td>
<td>-269,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Notes
1. Community Facilities favourable variance is driven mainly by a gain on sale of the Riccarton Community Centre of $1 million. Also contributing is a delay in the demolition and rebuild of community facilities which will be carried forward.
2. Flood Protection & Control Works favourable result relates to consultants fees being lower than expected, primarily for earthquake related works for land drainage.
3. Flood Protection Capital Revenues favourable variance for the year relates to development contributions. The budget included $4 million for rebates which have not yet been paid and are recommended to be carried forward. This is offset by actual contributions received being $3.4 million lower than planned.
4. Heritage Protection favourable result is largely due to an under spend in professional advice. The demand for assistance with resource consents and advice on heritage projects is lower than expected.
5. Housing favourable result largely relates to depreciation being lower than planned.
6. Christchurch Art Gallery unfavourable variance is driven by higher depreciation ($2.6 million) now that repairs are complete. There is an unfavourable operating variance of $1.2 million due to lower shop and rental revenues, lower grants being received, additional building health and safety security costs; and higher maintenance costs.
7. Museums favourable variance is a result of the timing of the Canterbury Museum Development Grant which was planned to be paid this year ($5.3 million). There is a requirement to carry this forward to the 2018/19 year.
8. Libraries favourable variance largely relates to delays on facilities rebuild works; a carry forward is recommended. The unfavourable result after carry forwards is due to higher depreciation.
9. Libraries, Arts & Culture capital revenues favourable result relates to development contributions. The budget included $0.2 million for rebates which have not which have not been paid and are recommended to be carried forward. Actual contributions received were $0.1 million higher than planned.
10. Neighbourhood Parks unfavourable variance for the year is driven by an over spend on parks contracts ($0.8 million), and a loss on disposal of assets ($0.5 million), mainly relating to Spencer Cove Community Hall, partially offset by nursery sales being $0.6 million above budget. An under spend on project management costs due to delays in the rebuild of facilities (mainly toilets) is also contributing to the offset; a carry forward is requested.
11. Garden and Heritage Parks favourable variances mainly relate to a delay in the rebuild programme with carry forwards requested.
12. Regional parks unfavourable result is due to maintenance contracts being over spent.
13. Cemeteries favourable result is driven by increased operational revenues due to a higher demand for plot purchases and burial fees. Lower maintenance costs are also contributing.
14. Parks and Open Spaces Capital Revenues favourable variance is due to higher development contributions ($9.1 million). Offsetting this are lower NZTA accrued recoveries ($2.1 million). Carry forwards include development contribution rebates and NZTA recoveries.
15. Residential Waste Collection and Disposal favourable result for the year is driven by internal service charges for waste disposal at Burnwood ($0.6 million). Additional revenue for Burnwood Landfill of $0.5 million and maintenance savings due to delays ($0.2 million) are also contributing to the result.
16. Recycling Materials Collection and Processing favourable variances are driven by lower promotional expenses and lower service contract charges than planned.
17. Building Consent and Inspections unfavourable result is primarily due to revenue from building consents and inspections being lower than expected. Commercial consent volumes are comparable to last year’s levels, but residential consents (which generate about 80% of the overall volume) have fallen by approximately 25%, which was much more than expected. The effect of these factors is a revenue shortfall of $3.2 million. In addition, the cost of production has been more than expected. Despite the reduced volumes, staffing has not been maintained with many vacancies throughout the year. The service has required much more support from external contractors as a result, generating a net (after vacancy-related savings are offset) unfavourable variance of $1.1 million.
18. Resource consenting unfavourable variances relate to external support to help deal with high volumes of non-notified consents. Recoveries are not fully covering the additional outlay.
19. Building Policy favourable variance relates to lower consulting fees ($0.5 million). The budget for consulting fees provided $0.8 million in each of three years (starting from July 2016) to support Council’s response to new legislation on Earthquake-prone building. Management cannot progress in this area until legislation is finally enacted.
20. District Planning unfavourable results are driven by a high number of appeals.
21. Roads and Footpaths unfavourable variances mainly relate to depreciation on additional SCIRT roading assets that have been capitalised.
22. Roads and Footpaths Capital Revenues favourable variances relate to the higher NZTA revenues.

A bring back is required for the timing of some of these revenues.
23. Sewage Collection unfavourable variances are driven by loss on asset disposals of $33.5 million. These relate to SCIERT capitalisations which replaced existing infrastructure. Additional depreciation of $7.4 million resulting from the revaluation of assets is also contributing. From an operating perspective there have been higher maintenance costs for earthquake repairs ($5.1 million), offset by accrued Crown contributions ($2.3 million). Higher electricity costs as infrastructure is handed over from SCIERT, and increased staff costs due to ongoing network maintenance are also contributing.

24. Sewage Treatment and Disposal unfavourable result is driven by higher operating costs for chemical treatment of ponds, primarily for midge control ($0.8 million); consultant fees ($0.6 million) due to additional support required; and biosolids disposal fees ($0.5 million) due to higher volumes.

25. Sewage Capital Revenues favourable variance relates to earthquake expenditure recoveries on sewage projects ($155 million), and higher development contributions ($10.7 million). The carry forwards relate to the development contribution rebates with funding required for future years.

26. Recreation and Sports Facilities unfavourable variance is largely driven by pool and fitness revenues being behind budget ($1.7 million). These are partially offset by delayed rebuild related costs which are included as a carry forward.

27. Sports Parks unfavourable result is mostly driven by higher than planned staff costs.

28. Sport and Recreation Capital Revenues favourable result is due to higher than planned development contributions ($19.9 million), and a capital grant received for Denton Oval ($0.2 million). A carry forward is requested for the balance of development contributions rebates.

29. Stormwater Drainage favourable result is caused by maintenance costs being behind plan. A carry forward has been signalled.

30. Stormwater Drainage Capital Revenues result reflects higher Crown contributions for earthquake related repairs.

31. Public Participation favourable result is mainly due to a delay in mental health grant funding ($3 million) with a carry forward required. A lower spend on service contracts of $0.5 million mainly for treaty relations, safety projects, and strengthening communities is having an impact along with Future Christchurch newsletter advertising and freight cost recoveries.

32. Strategic Policy and Planning favourable variance is mainly due to timing of project consultancy fees, largely for the Urban Development Strategy, Natural Hazards and Urban Regeneration. A carry forward has been signalled to enable delivery of projects.

33. Road operations unfavourable result is driven by an over spend on maintenance for kerb, channel and pavement repairs.

34. Major Cycleways favourable variances relate to lower depreciation than planned.

35. Parking favourable result relates to parking revenue being higher than planned. The budget was reduced in anticipation of losing parking sites due to the Accessible Cities projects, however some phases and projects have not yet commenced.

36. Transport Capital Revenues favourable variance year to date reflects higher NZTA operational subsidy revenue, for expenditure on road projects ($10.9 million), and higher development contributions ($4.3 million). Bring back (of budget) from future years is required for NZTA revenues received earlier than planned.

37. Water Supply unfavourable variance is predominately due to the loss on disposal of assets of $5.2 million, as a result of SCIERT capitalisations which replaced existing infrastructure.

38. Water Supply Capital Revenues favourable variance relates to higher development contributions revenues ($3.4 million); higher accrued Crown contributions for earthquake works ($3.3 million); and higher water connection fees ($0.8 million). The carry forward relates to the development contributions rebate balance for use in future years.

39. Corporate Capital Revenues variances partially offset other GOA capital revenue variances (mainly Roads and Sewage) and are related to Crown recoveries (OPMC and NZTA). These reflect the transfer of prior years’ recoveries to the appropriate Group of Activities now that the assets are fully burned and appropriately capitalised. Also included are a lower than planned CCHL capital release ($40 million). Great for Christchurch savings not realised ($8.9 million), and higher debt financing costs ($4.7 million). These are partially offset by a higher Tuam dividend ($4.9 million); additional interest revenue ($4 million); dividend from Transwaste ($3.7 million) received earlier than planned; delay in rockfall grant payments ($3.5 million); CCHL dividend ($2.8 million); higher rates revenue ($2.4 million); and higher subvention receipts ($2.4 million).

40. Vested Asset Income favourable variance is due to higher subdivision development than budgeted.
### Group of Activities Capital Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017's</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Net Diff</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,008</td>
<td>11,427</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>6,521</td>
<td>-202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Protection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,878</td>
<td>14,836</td>
<td>5,958</td>
<td>5,183</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Protection</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>8,395</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,274</td>
<td>6,321</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41,216</td>
<td>41,318</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Open Spaces</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,758</td>
<td>21,536</td>
<td>5,778</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Minimisation &amp; Disposal</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation &amp; Enforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads &amp; Footpaths</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>260,664</td>
<td>153,578</td>
<td>-107,086</td>
<td>29,462</td>
<td>-136,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage Collection &amp; Treatment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>335,661</td>
<td>155,368</td>
<td>-180,294</td>
<td>18,371</td>
<td>-161,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35,108</td>
<td>47,620</td>
<td>12,512</td>
<td>12,420</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Drainage</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>55,468</td>
<td>-45,532</td>
<td>-10,764</td>
<td>-34,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Governance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Policy &amp; Planning</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56,956</td>
<td>31,580</td>
<td>-25,377</td>
<td>-30,842</td>
<td>5,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42,222</td>
<td>28,497</td>
<td>-13,726</td>
<td>-61</td>
<td>-13,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-308,915</td>
<td>70,372</td>
<td>378,187</td>
<td>13,490</td>
<td>368,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Land Acquisitions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4,278</td>
<td>6,451</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Capital Spend</strong></td>
<td>614,376</td>
<td>655,228</td>
<td>40,852</td>
<td>49,033</td>
<td>8,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment C provides financial results of individual significant projects.

**NOTES**

1. **Community Services**

   Significant under spends include the rebuild of the St Albans Permanent Community Centre. A number of changes to the concept design in response to the budget and community consultation has delayed this project. Risingholme Homestead is under spent due to a fire in June 2016 which caused significant damage and delayed work. The associated Risingholme Hall is also under spent and a carry forward is requested for both.

2. **Flood Protection and Control Works**

   Projects with significant variances to budget include the following: Sutherlands Basin (Welsh) development due to the later commencement of physical works; a carry forward is required. Qualifex/Murphys basin works have been rephased to reflect delays around soil contamination and ground stability. The project under spend is requested to be carried forward. The Cox’s Quaifes facility is under spent due to delays in land purchases; the under spend is signalled as a carry forward. Works are ahead of plan for Priestsor/Clare Park storm water. Adjoining subdivision developments rely on these works to meet consent conditions. A bring back of budget from future years is required.

3. **Housing**

   The overall under spend year to date is largely due to the timing of work on the housing improvements. Carry forwards are requested.

4. **Libraries, Arts & Culture**

   Projects with significant variances include the Sumner Community Centre and Library with a bring back required to align with the construction progress. A carry forward is required for the South Library and Service Centre which has been rephased to later years.
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5. Parks and Open Spaces
The under spend is a result of delays in the Groyne development; the rebuild of the Cathedral Square toilets; and numerous other projects. These under spends are signalled to be carried forward.

6. Roads and Footpaths
The over spend for the year largely relates to SCIRT costs that have been appropriately reallocated from Corporate as project completion details are received. It is only on completion that enough information is received to enable the costs to be allocated against individual activities. Partially offsetting this are significant under spends that are requested to be carried forward for the following projects: Summer Road, Shag Rock Reserve – Clifton Hill where the roadworks repairs cannot be completed until the water and sewer mains are renewed; Hatwell Junction Road, negotiations with Kiwirail continue on the scheme design; non-SCIRT retaining walls, construction commenced in January 2017 and will continue into the 2018 financial year; the Northern Arterial Extension, due to a delayed start in the Cranford and Innes Road intersection works; and the Medway Street – Street Renewal which is awaiting the completion of the Dudley Creek bypass land drainage project.

7. Sewage Collection and Treatment
The over spend for the year largely relates to SCIRT costs that have been appropriately reallocated from Corporate (as above). Delays in other projects are creating a carry forward requirement. These projects include the Riccarton Road Trunk Main and the Colombo Street Trunk Main. The timing for construction for these projects have been adjusted based on tender evaluation. The Biosolids Dewatering Renewal requires a carry forward due to delays encountered during the restoration works on site.

8. Sport and Recreation
The main driver for the under spend is the Nga Puna Wai hub infrastructure project. An overall concept plan for Stage 1 has been finalised. Construction was originally planned in the current year but the project is a year late and a carry forward is requested. Jelle Park Recreation and Sports Centre is recording an under spend; the detailed design has been completed and a request for tender has been made. A carry forward has been signalled. A bring back is required for the Metro Sport Facility due to a payment that was made as part of the cost share development agreement which was recently finalised.

9. Stormwater Drainage
The over spend for the year largely relates to SCIRT costs that have been appropriately reallocated from Corporate (as above). Dudley Creek has an over spend for the year due to an earlier than planned acceleration of works which will be covered by a bring back of budget from 2018. The Upper Heathcote stormwater detention has a requested bring back due to purchasing of land in this financial year.

10. Transport
Over spend and the required bring backs are primarily driven by the Major Cycle Ways programme in order to meet the Urban Cycleways Programme funding requirements. The Lionfield Street Carpark rebuild is scheduled to be completed this year and is also requesting a bring back of funds.

11. Water Supply
The over spend for the year largely relates to the reallocation of SCIRT costs (as above).
12. Corporate

The year to date under spend largely relates to the allocated SCIRT costs which were previously coded to Corporate. The community facilities tranche programmes have an under spend resulting from savings across various completed projects being returned to the programme. The projects with significant under spends that were returned to the programmes include the Paddling Pools and New Brighton Library repairs. The programme under spends are requested to be carried forward to future years as they form part of the programme contingency.

13. Strategic Land Purchases

The under spend is due to the timing of settlements. The requirements are still within the capital programme and the balance is to be carried forward.
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### Attachment C - Operational Carry Forward Requests from 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Reason for Carry Forward</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League World Cup 2017</td>
<td>GFL funds flagged for future use</td>
<td>$194,919</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Assets - Community Centres</strong></td>
<td>Carry forward unspent balance is for Roscarorn Community Centre (new build), Yaldhurst Memorial Hall Demolition Integration with RMS Park Scout Days, Demolition Blenheim Community Facility, Yaldhurst Memorial Hall Demolition, Centennial Hall Demolition, Centennial Hall New Build, Partial Demolition - Shirley Community Centre (New Build), Partial Demolition Allendale Community Centre, and Wockton Community Facilities.</td>
<td>$848,919</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Paul Trinity Pacific Presbyterian Church</strong></td>
<td>Funds already committed by Council</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Works Grants</strong></td>
<td>Grant committed in 2017 financial year - Comedy Festival 2017</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dee-Ad</td>
<td>Carry forward required to deliver work in the next financial year.</td>
<td>$153,758</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries, Arts &amp; Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Trust Board Eng. &amp; Dev Grant</td>
<td>Canterbury Museum development grant was not paid this year due to delays in site progress. Tender carried forward to 2017/18. Remaining 2 annual instalments reprogrammed to 2018/19 and 2019/20.</td>
<td>$6,285,800</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Assets - Libraries</strong></td>
<td>Carry forward unspent balance is due to delays re Old Horwood Library, Macandrew Library - Queenspark, Linwood Library (New Build), and other unspecified projects.</td>
<td>$1,667,349</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks &amp; Open Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assets - Heritage Protection</td>
<td>Carry forward unspent balance is for Cob Cottage, Edith Cavell Band Rotunda, Former Council Offices - Donald St, Kapahupu (Old School House), Kapahupu House, Little River Park, Mair Memorial Carpark, Rolleston Community Centre - Workshop, and Maraekakaho Bridges</td>
<td>$894,943</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Mgmt - Greenspace Buildings</td>
<td>Carry forward unspent balance is for Community Trail, Christchurch Central options &amp; concept work, Hagley Park Pheasants, Reindorp and robust of St Albans Park - Pavilions/Toilets</td>
<td>$546,462</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refuse Minimisation &amp; Disposal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORWARD LENGTH</td>
<td>Chernway reinstatement has been delayed due to cooler weather making it unsuitable for heavy equipment.</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport &amp; Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assets - Sporting Facilities</td>
<td>Carry forward unspent balance is for Pioneer Leisure Centre, Spencer Park Camping Ground, Concept Design (Dargan Spencer Park), and the Demolition/Refurbishment Spencer Park (Old) Building.</td>
<td>$293,752</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ERU Reserves</strong></td>
<td>Grant not paid this financial year, carry forward required to pay next financial year.</td>
<td>$73,162</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater Drainage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weedon Ltd</td>
<td>Project delayed due to discovery of salinity in soil. Further funding has been undertaken to understand the extent and volume of the salinity before disposal of the dredged material is arranged.</td>
<td>$2,763,000</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miner Drains Silt Removal</strong></td>
<td>The contractor delayed starting and is using an unsuitable methodology which is slowing down the time to remove the silt, so the project delivery is delayed.</td>
<td>$499,075</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aoratonga Loop Silt Removal</strong></td>
<td>Site conditions have been challenging and weather conditions have been unfavorable. Additional work to Shirley stream has also been added to this project.</td>
<td>$75,831</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanaka Stream Bank</td>
<td>Repairs to the bank on Glenduan Road have required additional time since project commencement.</td>
<td>$67,590</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Trust</td>
<td>$2 million as per agreement from Ministry of Health received but unable to be spent in 2016/17. Contractual commitment to spend.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Fund</td>
<td>Contractual partnership funding with Crown retained; contractual commitment to spend.</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participatory Democracy Project Proposal is to transfer this funding to Smart Cities project. This funding was originally part of CBD drawdown for both projects.  
265,000  
(4)

Community Hub Carry forward funds for delivery of project.  
90,000  
(4)

Community Action Carry forward funds for delivery of project.  
50,000  
(4)

**Strategic Planning**

**UCS Partnership** New members coming onboard have accelerated UCS Partnership strategic review. Project will now continue into next financial year.  
168,462  
(1)

**UCS Partnership** Funding from UCS partners towards delayed strategic review above.  
-150,137  
(1)

**Committee of Mayors’ project** Signing of agreement has been delayed until August 2017.  
149,000  
(1)

**Transport Innovation Fund** Grant will not be paid until next financial year.  
40,000  
(1)

**Ecosystem & Biodiversity Strategy Policy** To support landowners in the Sites of Ecological Significance (SES) programme. We are working with a number of landowners. The money would not actually be paid out until the work is done.  
80,000  
(1)

**Build Back Smarter Partnership** Following the Christchurch Earthquakes CCC and MBIE entered a funding partnership (2013 Stront Phased 2 of 3). We need to deliver Build Back Smarter service. The service uses 2 external providers to deliver home improvement advice aiming to improve the health and wellbeing of patients and families. Annual plan level of service 2018/19 $1,935,000 (2017/18 $1,835,000). Staff are now requesting a carry forward equivalent to the last MBIE contribution. These expenses incurred in 2016/17. The actual value will be calculated following final costing as at year end. An estimated $186,000 will remain due to lower costs being negotiated for rental properties and lower costs for project management and marketing. Carrying forward this MBIE funding will supplement the Council’s 2018/19 Annual Plan allocation, allowing the service to continue uninterrupted, whilst new funding partnerships are explored, and the longer term options for the service are considered through the Council Long Term Plan. The carry forward would also help to meet agreed levels of service for this externally provided service. Stopping the service prematurely would undermine longer-term options for its continuation.  
88,170  
(1)

**Transitional City** Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) recently received approval from the Minister supporting Christchurch Regeneration to increase transitional use of the residential red zone. Prior to this when the Minister and Mayor noted they both wanted more transitional use in the area. This was identified as a collaboration with Regenerate Christchurch and Christchurch City Council. The briefing outlined a proposal to engage LINZ in vacant figures (CVF) to enhance transitional use of Crown owned and Christchurch City Council owned land in the Colenso/Avon River Corridor. This use will take place in Summer 2017/18 and will introduce vibrancy and activity with short-term activations with a Regeneration plan for the area developed.  
20,000  
(1)

Gravel named aware of the LINZ proposal in May 2017 and supports this in principle. For a successful outcome LINZ will need to secure funding to prepare sites for activations as well as community members to deliver short term activations on these sites. Council’s Gravel Places Protect Fund has an underspend of $200,000 in F16/17. Staff request is carry forward equivalent to the underspend. This would be granted for CVF to progress the proposal and support community members to activate identified sites in the Red Zone. Carrying forward this funding will support the proposal going forward, sending a strong signal of Council support, whilst also exploring other funding partnerships.  
44,000  
(1)

**Streets for People** The project was delayed and a couple of POs have already been raised.  
26,000  
(1)
Council  
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---

**Ernys Plaas Programme**: A number of projects are currently underway as well as the need to maintain existing assets. The External Open for FY16 is already accounted for to deliver the FY16 projects. Additionally a reduction in the programmes maintenance budget results in insufficient Open to maintain the current and future programme assets and therefore this external Open is required to be carried forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework and Strategy</th>
<th>Project is adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corporate / Internal Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Contingencies</th>
<th>Consultancy fees relating to costs which will be required in the next financial year to advance legal proceedings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>This relates to the scanning of invoices which is contingent on other work being done first in the Finance &amp; Commercial Work plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend - Transwaste</td>
<td>Bring back of Biswood dividend budget planned in 17/18 to match early receipt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart City</td>
<td>Currently have $550k commitment and most of them won’t be invoiced/recorded until next financial year due to delay of the work in process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>249,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>IRA in commitment to carry forward the balance as the total budget is small and the balance is substantial for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>This budget is for SCRT Transition Communications. As SCRT Transition is ongoing the unspent portion of this budget needs to be carried forward to 2017/18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated Rostel Budget</td>
<td>Funds required to be carried forward for future roster/shifts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,477,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brighton Regeneration Plan Grant</td>
<td>Committed funds to DCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>715,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated EFG Grants</td>
<td>To be available for future use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing Asset Management</td>
<td>Advancing Asset Management Programme. Carry forward is required to ensure continuation of endorsed projects and work to deliver the Advancing asset management programme. Delays to expenditure incurred due to budget and forward expenditure certainty. This has had a knock-on effect where the team grows to meet the demand. Without the carry forward projects and programmes (SCRT adoption) will stop and the benefits will not be realised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>797,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management - Centre of Excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Operational Carry Forwards from 2016/17 to 2017/18: 23,977,688
Total Operational Carry Forwards from 2016/17 to 2018/19: 36,283,468

**Funding to be carried forward:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate-funded</td>
<td>10,890,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Grants Borrowing</td>
<td>8,349,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFG Response Borrowing</td>
<td>6,179,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFG Fund</td>
<td>1,771,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFG Mayoral Relief Fund</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Revenues</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 36,283,468
## Attachment D - Significant Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after C/Funds ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services</strong>&lt;br&gt;Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities A &amp; R</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>(389)</td>
<td>-31.28%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Civil Defence Bldg (Emerg Ops Centr)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mervika Cottage Capital/Endowment Fund</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Alban's Permanent Community Centre</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolley Public Library</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent Park</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent Park Homestead</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcote Community Centre</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Bay Community Centre &amp; Pottery</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99.64%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martins Community Centre</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>100.02%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allendale Community Centre Repair</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>51.24%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oparau Public Library/Earthquake Repair</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>39.12%</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>(316)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services Total</strong></td>
<td>5,908</td>
<td>11,427</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>43.82%</td>
<td>6,621</td>
<td>(202)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after C/Funds ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development</strong> Balance of Programme</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Flood Protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after C/Funds ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preston/Clara Park</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>(1,115)</td>
<td>31.72%</td>
<td>(1,115)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrans/Wapakura Wetland</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>31.19%</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Park Wetland</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>79.18%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaldens road drainage works</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>46.77%</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winands spur stormwater pipe drain syst</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avakura stormwater spine network project</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>52.20%</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash basin</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Highstedt Infrastructure Agreement</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60.64%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Roseburn Redevelopment Provision</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>(145)</td>
<td>122.11%</td>
<td>(145)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Okawa Corridor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Rogers Park Class - IPA</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>76.49%</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Bell's Creek Ferry Road (Storm) Filter V</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>71.92%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW P117 New new drain Delivery Package</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>40.04%</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Coxe - Quakeflex Facility</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Balloons Stream Restoration &amp; Facil</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>63.41%</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDRP 512 No 1 Drain</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>105.85%</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDRP 510 Mt Hutt/Hakatere Bank Stabilisation</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>105.71%</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>45.96%</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Protection Total</strong></td>
<td>8,878</td>
<td>14,826</td>
<td>6,948</td>
<td>48.64%</td>
<td>5,183</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Heritage Protection & Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after C/Funds ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Municipal Chambers (Ori City)</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(712)</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>(712)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Vale - Gatehouse</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>128.39%</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Vale - Homeless</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>94.72%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Stone House</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>73.72%</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Chapel</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>101.29%</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Of Takah</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.87%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chekotara Lodge</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Provincial Chambers Protective</td>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>(987)</td>
<td>221.54%</td>
<td>(987)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edendale Band Rotunda - Poplar Cres Pavl</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>7.88%</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Vale Bathroom</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>(507)</td>
<td>190.58%</td>
<td>(517)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Protection &amp; Policy Total</strong></td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>8,835</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>97.51%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Actual ($000s)</td>
<td>Budget ($000s)</td>
<td>Variance ($000s)</td>
<td>% Spend to Budget</td>
<td>Carry Forwards ($000s)</td>
<td>Result after CF/Paid ($000s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Improvements / Remodelling</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>-62.39%</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Improvements / Remodelling - P</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>81.44%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Street Social Housing Inf Dis</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-10.65%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes Courts Social Housing Inf Dis</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88.21%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Housing Govt Partnerships</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Taylor</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>90.97%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.21%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Total</td>
<td>5,274</td>
<td>6,321</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>83.44%</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Capital Project</td>
<td>4,684</td>
<td>4,958</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>94.67%</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA NA Collections Acquisitions</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>100.52%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery Renewal RMR</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.40%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery Demolition Project</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79.27%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Library and Service Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Central Library</td>
<td>20,676</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>103.38%</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Library and Service Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyttleton Library</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>94.53%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brighton - Library at Parnell</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>50.20%</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklands Queenpark Library</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>14.69%</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexhope Community Centre &amp; Library</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>88.98%</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Community Centre &amp; Library Rebuild</td>
<td>7,185</td>
<td>5,011</td>
<td>(2,174)</td>
<td>143.38%</td>
<td>(2,174)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>69.73%</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, Arts &amp; Culture Total</td>
<td>41,218</td>
<td>41,318</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99.75%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Open Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head to Head Track</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83.76%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast Cemetery Extension</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>49.92%</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roto Kāneau Reserve (ex landfill sites)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>13.09%</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Groveys Development</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel park surface water and drainage p</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>103.48%</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks Glyphosate Programme</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>45.41%</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvus Ten Days of Cinema</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona Vale Reserve driveway and carpark</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>19.21%</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South new Brighton Domain Boardwalk Rebu</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brighton Pier repairs</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>(1,661)</td>
<td>262.89%</td>
<td>(1,661)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds Rd Retarders Retaining Walls</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham Park Reconstruction</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>108.88%</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorton Brookweater</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>101.40%</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South new Brighton Jetty</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98.73%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Structures Work Package</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89.64%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Statue</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83.52%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Of The Kiwi - Shop Residence</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>145.28%</td>
<td>(158)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagley Park North - Bicentenary Memorial Ru</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(278)</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td>(278)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallenwil Quarry Old Store House</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>100.70%</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallenwil Quarry Chester Building</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallenwil Quarry Skiptronic Quarters</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87.72%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockyards Cottage</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.98%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets Repairs Tranche II</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>111.42%</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Square Toilet Rebuild</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagley Park North - RSA Bowling/Petanque</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87.72%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Zone Sports Parks EQ Repairs</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>(168)</td>
<td>148.30%</td>
<td>(168)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scortonbrook Stews - EQ repair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>5,948</td>
<td>8,506</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>69.63%</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>2,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Open Spaces Total</td>
<td>19,758</td>
<td>21,836</td>
<td>5,078</td>
<td>76.74%</td>
<td>5,078</td>
<td>5,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Minimisation &amp; Disposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Transfer Stations and Bins (RMR)</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.94%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>82.21%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Minimisation &amp; Disposal Total</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>87.69%</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Roads & Footpaths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after CF/Out ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.92%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulation &amp; Enforcement</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.92%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Roads & Footpaths - $324a

- Carriageway Smoothing
  - Road Resurfacing
  - Subdivisions
  - Carriageway Sealing and Surfacing
  - Road Pavement Replacement
  - Northern Irrigation Extension, etc
  - BPDC road metalling
  - Street Tree Renewals
  - Wigram Magra Road Grade Separation
  - MCR Grantmen’s Trail - Section 1
  - MCR South Express - Section 1
  - MCR Northern Link Gateway - Section 1a
  - MCR Hebron Link Expressway - Section 1
  - MCR NorWest Arc - Section 1
  - Sawyers Arms Road Corridor Improvements
  - Halswell Junction Road Extension
  - Inter Harford Road Improvement
  - Network Management Improvements - WAir
  - Interwaste Improvements: Curramore Tame
  - Main North Road Corridor Optimisation
  - Safety Improvements: Quail Drakes - Dover
  - Railway Crossing Renewals
  - Westmeunt Street - Jacobs # 87
  - Sumerville Centre Masterplan P1.1
  - Street Renewal - North Avon Road
  - Bridge Renewals - 2017
  - Road Lighting Renewals 2017 & 2018
  - Footscray Rebuilding FY2017
  - Traffic Signal Renewals FY2017
  - Medway Street - Street Renewal
  - EQ Renting Wall Repair
  - Street Lighting
  - Rook returning walls
  - Non-SCRIT Retaining Walls FY2017
  - Second Coast Sealing City Wide FY 2017
  - AC Surfacing 2017
  - AC surfacing to roads outside CBD FY2017
  - Paving Cathedral Square, City Mall and H
  - Street Lighting FY2017
  - Summer Road Geotechn & Roadworks Info
  - Wakefield Ave Geotechn & Roadworks Info
  - Mosese Geotechn & Roadworks Info
  - Passagio Gallop Geotechn & Roadworks Info
  - ACC Victoria Street
  - ACC Salisbury Street
  - TPPs Frew Street One way Conversion (Duha)
  - TPPs licenced
  - TPPs ACC Cheyne
  - TPPs 1 Colombo Street (Harwell to St Asap)
  - ACC Central City: Busways
  - ACC St Asbte Street (Ferry-Antique)
  - City Lanes - Strickland Loopway
  - Renting wall on Scott 11260 Strachan
  - ACC/CRIC Projects Roads & Footpaths

#### Balance of Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Sewage Collection, Treatment & Disposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after CF/Out ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WW Riccarton Trunk Main Project</strong></td>
<td>5,846</td>
<td>10,130</td>
<td>4,284</td>
<td>55.63%</td>
<td>4,504</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WW Alaka WWTP Improvements</strong></td>
<td>994</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>103.22%</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WW Lyttleton Harbours WWTP</strong></td>
<td>896</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89.12%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WW Subalaskos Ailke Infa to Dev-Gas-Oh</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>12.02%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Sedimentation Tank Upgrades</strong></td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>69.19%</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrical Renewals (balance)</strong></td>
<td>540</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>71.38%</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brogies Botum Renewals</strong></td>
<td>373</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade Waste Reuse Facility Renewal</strong></td>
<td>723</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>77.62%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biocells Dewatering Renewal</strong></td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>62.67%</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSI St Smith &amp; Stroud Gateway renewal</strong></td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>4,686</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>95.06%</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WW SE Hawke Sewer</strong></td>
<td>4,833</td>
<td>4,912</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>98.58%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pumproom Lifeboat Berth</strong></td>
<td>253</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>104.59%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCWIP000210 Pages WW Pumping Station Upgr</strong></td>
<td>387</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(387)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WW-Alaka BWP/Fs001/0 &amp; BWP/Fs001/16 Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>372</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WW North Waves Growth</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>53.49%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WW Upper St/K Berth</strong></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>19.48%</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WW infra R&amp;R Waste Reclamation</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(290)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WW EQ Legacy Lateral Renewals</strong></td>
<td>4,796</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>(2,754)</td>
<td>73.14%</td>
<td>(2,754)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Balance of Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

Item No.: 16
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after CF/Mods ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCWhele PS Switchboard &amp; Communications Ren</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Harding St For Repairs - Akaroa</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Colombo St Trunk Man</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>7.38%</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Riccarton Rd-Bee Ave to Haneseke St</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP Builder &amp; Media Replacement</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Main Repairs - City Core Maintenance</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW SCERT Watches Road Gravity Man Lpg</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Main Renewal - Cranford/Shorter St</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW SCERT Northern Relief Contingency</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(230)</td>
<td>230%</td>
<td>(230)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Main Renewal - PPECTs Gallop Surrey</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>44.09%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP EQ-Occupied Buildings</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP Bio Solids Drying Facility Repairs</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP EQ-Channel Restoration</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>4,737</td>
<td>3,707</td>
<td>73.74%</td>
<td>3,707</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP EQ-Browndale Holding Tank Replacem</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>40.66%</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP Outfall 3 Watermain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Coat Sealing City Wide FY 2017</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,614)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(1,614)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Main Renewal - Metone For Commercial</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Flood Monitoring Installations</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Red Zone Stormring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Main Renewal - Forest Dr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Vacuum System Monitoring Equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCERT Projects Sewage Collection, Treatment &amp; Disposal</td>
<td>298,797</td>
<td>103,345</td>
<td>(195,453)</td>
<td>299.12%</td>
<td>(195,453)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance of Programme | 4,186 | 5,903 | 1,718 | 70.90% | 2,142 | 476 |

Sewage Collection, Treatment & Disposal Total | 335,691 | 155,368 | (180,324) | 216.06% | 16,371 | (196,694) |

### Sport & Recreation
- **$200k**
  - Havelock Domain Car Park
  - RSU SouthWest Hub Infrastructure
  - New South West Leisure Centre
  - District Sports Park Purchases
  - Havelock Oval Sighthowers
  - Facility Management Delivery Package A
  - Facility Management Delivery Package B
  - RSU delivery package FY17
  - Refurbishment of Fitness Centres
  - Havelock Oval Delivery Package
  - Hospital Corner Sports Field Development
  - East Park (Recreation Facility QEO)
  - Men's Sports Centre
  - QEII Site renovation project
  - Jubilee Park Recreation and Sports Centre
  - Wharenui Recreation Centre
  - Spencer Park Carpark - All Buildings
  - Remaining Paddling Pools
  - South Brighton Camp Ground Earthquake Re
  - Sport Parks Grahame-Brownie FY17
  - Hot Salt Water Pools
  - Carlton Mill Corner
  - Wansdyke Park
  - Balance of Programme

### Sport & Recreation Total
- **$15,108**
  - 47,620 | 52,120 | 7,720 | 73.72% | 12,420 | 33 |

### Stormwater Drainage
- **$200k**
  - Lutahia Brook Barns
  - FY17 Natural Waterways Delivery Package
  - Upstream Rivers & Tributaries (URT)
  - Dudley Waterway
  - Matata Waterway
  - City Wide Modelling
  - Upper Heathcote Storage
  - Knights Drain
  - Elbow Drain
  - Beale Creek
  - LDRP 550 Cranford Basin Action Management
  - Temporary stop bank management
  - Knights Drain - Stage 2
  - LDRP 517 - River Hub Remediation
  - LDRP 520 Wairau East Retention Basin
  - SCERT Projects Stormwater Drainage

### Stormwater Drainage Total
- **$101,000**
  - 55,468 | (15,532) | 102.09% | (10,784) | (34,748) | 0 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after G/F Add ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Strategic Policy & Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after G/F Add ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93.62%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Policy & Planning Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after G/F Add ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93.62%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transport

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after G/F Add ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCR Rampuri - Shag Rock Section 1</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>128.23%</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR Quarryman's Trail - Section 1</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>2,689</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>30.83%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR Northern Line Cycleway - Section 1a</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>(433)</td>
<td>178.65%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR Heatproof Expressway - Section 1</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>(332)</td>
<td>142.08%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR Little River Link - Section 1</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>(2,253)</td>
<td>190.70%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery package for Marine structures</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>97.99%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR Uni-Cycle - Section 2</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>56.96%</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR Uni-Cycle - Section 3</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>(977)</td>
<td>152.17%</td>
<td>(977)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR Little River Link - Section 3</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89.69%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR Papuan Parallel - Section 2</td>
<td>8,347</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>(6,113)</td>
<td>373.69%</td>
<td>(6,113)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF Footpath - Nambour-Hub</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>25.22%</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 - Allelove Road to Davys Road</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(681)</td>
<td>616.14%</td>
<td>(681)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 - Greenside to Saxony Arms Road</td>
<td>3,281</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>(3,131)</td>
<td>2,290.90%</td>
<td>(3,131)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listfield Street Carpark Repairs</td>
<td>22,289</td>
<td>9,723</td>
<td>(12,566)</td>
<td>229.02%</td>
<td>(12,541)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Interchange - Papuan</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>29.86%</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Interchange - Riccarton</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>(1,504)</td>
<td>194.47%</td>
<td>(1,504)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Property RAR</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>(1,028)</td>
<td>782.70%</td>
<td>(1,028)</td>
<td>(1,014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Carpark</td>
<td>(643)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>3,189</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>74.47%</td>
<td>(5,607)</td>
<td>(6,817)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Supply

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after G/F Add ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply Total</td>
<td>56,966</td>
<td>31,589</td>
<td>(25,377)</td>
<td>160.34%</td>
<td>(30,642)</td>
<td>5,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Corporate Capital

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after G/F Add ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Council 28 September 2017

**Item No.: 16**

- Attachment D
- Item 16

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Actual ($000s)</th>
<th>Budget ($000s)</th>
<th>Variance ($000s)</th>
<th>% Spend to Budget</th>
<th>Carry Forwards ($000s)</th>
<th>Result after CFs ($000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCC Internet Infrastructure Upgrade</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo Council - Cash Receipting</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>97.23%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP Upgrade FY17</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Vote Upgrade</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84.75%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steampoint Enhancements Bundle FY17</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>100.65%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverpeake Enhancements Bundle FY17</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>91.19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Mapping for Citizens</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90.39%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consenting/Compliance Enhancements 17 Application Integration</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>103.32%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Contract Asset Management</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>69.38%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Data Management</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92.98%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability to inherit SCIRT Legacy</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>62.52%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Road</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase - Mass Movement Remediation</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>11.78%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRP Community Fac Tranche I Budget Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRP Community Fac Tranche II Budget Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Service Centre</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>27.81%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Budget Item</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency Projects (Budget only)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Redevelopment</td>
<td>35,023</td>
<td>36,090</td>
<td>(1,067)</td>
<td>103.01%</td>
<td>(1,020)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Project</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>10.16%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Engagement and Consultation</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91.82%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomodle GIS and Apolo Upgrade</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.70%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Fac Tranche I Budget Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational and Workforce Performance</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(401)</td>
<td>180.20%</td>
<td>(401)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIRT Project Allocations</td>
<td>(385,802)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>385,802</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>385,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Programme</td>
<td>4,102</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>67.36%</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Capital Total</td>
<td>(308,915)</td>
<td>70,272</td>
<td>379,187</td>
<td>-439.66%</td>
<td>12,490</td>
<td>366,697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Land Acquisitions**

- **$25m**

| Strategic Land Acquisitions                      | 8,301          | 12,000         | 3,699           | 69.18%            | 3,699                   | 0                        |
| SLP Land Value Offset                            | (4,520)        | (5,548)        | (1,028)         | 72.51%            | (1,028)                 | 0                        |

Balance of Programme                              | 0              | 0              | 0               | 0.00%             | 0                       | 0                        |

**Strategic Land Acquisitions Total**              | 4,781          | 6,451          | 1,670           | 66.31%            | 2,114                   | 0                        |

**Grand Total**                                    | 614,376        | 655,228        | 40,852          | 93.77%            | 49,033                  | (8,180)                  |
### Attachment E - Capital Carry Forwards from 2016/17

#### Capital Programme Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Services</th>
<th>Carry Forward Request</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDEM Rolling Package - Civil Defence R &amp; R</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chch Justice &amp; Emergency Services Precinct (including an Emergency Operations Centre)</td>
<td>454,000</td>
<td>454,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner Replacement Rolling Package</td>
<td>(115,013)</td>
<td>(115,013)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans Community Centre</td>
<td>3,043,027</td>
<td>1,089,030</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>568,047</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Rolling Package - Community Centres R &amp; R</td>
<td>(385,592)</td>
<td>(385,592)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau cottage Capital Endowment Fund project</td>
<td>483,811</td>
<td>483,811</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF Rolling Package - Fire Fighting Equipment</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rongotai Homestead</td>
<td>1,122,665</td>
<td>770,109</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>352,556</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rongotai Hall</td>
<td>673,847</td>
<td>673,847</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Hall - Speyrton Community Centre Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opawa Public Library Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>588,191</td>
<td>588,191</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allandale Community Centre Repair</td>
<td>263,781</td>
<td>243,781</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans Croche - EQ Repair</td>
<td>207,545</td>
<td>207,545</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rongotai Craft Workshops</td>
<td>173,123</td>
<td>173,123</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riccarton community house</td>
<td>139,138</td>
<td>139,138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodston Community Facility</td>
<td>37,737</td>
<td>37,737</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranui Community Centre Rebuild</td>
<td>54,890</td>
<td>54,890</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronation Library (Akari)</td>
<td>23,645</td>
<td>23,645</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathcote Combined Community Facility</td>
<td>17,328</td>
<td>17,328</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somercotes Community Centre</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Bay community centre and pottery shed</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fendalton Community Centre</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brighton Croche</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martins Opawa Tory Library</td>
<td>(11,148)</td>
<td>(11,148)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koteate Reserve &amp; Kingfisher Reserve SW Detention Basin Structure Renewals</td>
<td>67,553</td>
<td>67,553</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherlands Basin (Weeha) SW Treatment</td>
<td>1,085,136</td>
<td>1,085,136</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Coxes - Queens Facility</td>
<td>943,851</td>
<td>943,851</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Owha Creek</td>
<td>748,586</td>
<td>748,586</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks road development drainage works</td>
<td>256,119</td>
<td>256,119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Curletts Wetlands</td>
<td>206,344</td>
<td>206,344</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Fitted Infrastructure Agreement</td>
<td>56,513</td>
<td>56,513</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranui stormwater spine network project</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Owha Creek</td>
<td>(3,675)</td>
<td>(3,675)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(14,136)</td>
<td>(14,136)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW Treatment of Eastern Wetlands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW Rosedale Infrastructure Provision Agreement</strong> (145,431)</td>
<td>(145,431)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifiers/Murphys basin and Wetland</td>
<td>945,985</td>
<td>945,985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolpress spur stormwater pipe and drain system</td>
<td>580,970</td>
<td>580,970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Regents Park Close IPA</td>
<td>470,169</td>
<td>470,169</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW FY17 New Pipe Drains Delivery Package</td>
<td>299,221</td>
<td>299,221</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Butlers Stream Naturalisation and Facility</td>
<td>275,526</td>
<td>275,526</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Balls Creek Ferry Road Storm Filter Vault</td>
<td>148,954</td>
<td>148,954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Grove Stormwater Infrastructure</td>
<td>107,364</td>
<td>107,364</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford Basin Dudley Diversion</td>
<td>92,320</td>
<td>92,320</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Basin</td>
<td>75,580</td>
<td>75,580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highstated Cenverish stormwater management system</td>
<td>68,507</td>
<td>68,507</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapurinui Stream Diversion</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive project for new developments</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highstated on Tukett IPA</td>
<td>(5,800)</td>
<td>(5,800)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestons/Clare Park Stormwater</td>
<td>(1,115,460)</td>
<td>(1,115,460)</td>
<td>403,936</td>
<td>711,524</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDRP S12 No 1 Drain</td>
<td>(32,789)</td>
<td>(32,789)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDRP S18 Mid Heathcote Bank Stabilisation</td>
<td>(14,553)</td>
<td>(14,553)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Heritage Protection & Policy

- Robert McDougall Gallery - Weathercightness | (231,356) | (231,356) |
- The Chisholme Lodge | 945,988 | 776,372 | 168,761 |
- Mona Vale Bathhouse | 560,947 | 560,947 |
- Old Stone House (Cracroft) | 516,030 | 516,030 |
- Poplar Crescent Edmonds Pavillion | 303,868 | 303,868 |
- Mona Vale Homestead | 61,204 | 61,204 |
- Mona Vale Lodge | 14,500 | 14,500 |
- Kupariohe Dwelling | (3,248) | - (1,248) |
- Mona Vale - Fernery | (1,426) | (1,426) |
- Colf Cottage | (4,940) | - (4,940) |
- Lyttelton Clock Tower | (14,482) | (14,482) |
- Rose Historic Chapel | (18,203) | (18,203) |
- Nurses Memorial Chapel | (76,522) | (76,522) |
### Capital Programme Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mona Vale Gatehouse</td>
<td>(128,085)</td>
<td>[128,085]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Municipal Chambers</td>
<td>(752,484)</td>
<td>(752,484)</td>
<td>(385,701)</td>
<td>(326,741)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Provincial Chambers Stage 1 Works</td>
<td>(986,924)</td>
<td>(986,924)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAU - Capital Expenditure - Planned Capital Replacements (1)</td>
<td>571,369</td>
<td>571,369</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAU - Capital Expenditure - Planned Capital Replacements (2)</td>
<td>185,602</td>
<td>185,602</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgegate Knees (ex landfill site)</td>
<td>135,893</td>
<td>135,893</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Taylor Courts</td>
<td>95,388</td>
<td>95,388</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne Street - Social Housing Infill Development</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Courts - Social Housing Infill Development</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knightsbridge Lane - Social Housing Infill Development</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary McLean Place</td>
<td>(34,748)</td>
<td>(34,748)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries, Arts &amp; Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast Library &amp; Service Centre</td>
<td>57,460</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Rolling Package - Built Asset Renewal &amp; Replacement</td>
<td>(29,631)</td>
<td>(29,631)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>101,394</td>
<td>101,394</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAG Rolling Package - Art in Public Places</td>
<td>203,048</td>
<td>203,048</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaraa Museum FA Exhibition spaces Infrastructure</td>
<td>128,836</td>
<td>128,836</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaraa Museum Heritage Buildings Conservation and interpretation Rolling Package</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Library (Knowledge Centre)</td>
<td>(675,517)</td>
<td>(675,517)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hornby Library and Service Centre</td>
<td>250,932</td>
<td>250,932</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langlois-Eyre House Cottage</td>
<td>220,365</td>
<td>220,365</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom House</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaraa Court House</td>
<td>(14,946)</td>
<td>(14,946)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Library and Service Centre EQ</td>
<td>688,000</td>
<td>688,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolleston Library and Community Centre Rebuild</td>
<td>477,856</td>
<td>477,856</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklands Queenpark Library</td>
<td>290,424</td>
<td>290,424</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brighton Library EQ repair</td>
<td>257,933</td>
<td>257,933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyttelton Library EQ Repairs</td>
<td>98,416</td>
<td>98,416</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner Community Facility (Centre &amp; Library) Rebuild</td>
<td>(2,173,084)</td>
<td>(2,173,084)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks &amp; Open Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing capacity at Anuaki playground</td>
<td>17,684</td>
<td>17,684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herewa Reserve New Playground</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roto Kahu Reserve (ex landfill site)</td>
<td>276,724</td>
<td>276,724</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package FY17 - Renewal of NP Building Components</td>
<td>84,137</td>
<td>84,137</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland Re-vegetation</td>
<td>36,161</td>
<td>36,161</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package - NP Play and Recreation (Renewal)</td>
<td>30,605</td>
<td>30,605</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package - NP Water Supply Reactive Renewals</td>
<td>4,646</td>
<td>4,646</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Harewiti Masterplan Implementation</td>
<td>(2,333)</td>
<td>(2,333)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package FY17 - NP Green Assets (new)</td>
<td>141,150</td>
<td>141,150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1 Selwyn Street Reserve - Landscaping</td>
<td>(591)</td>
<td>(591)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aratua Road, new parks planted</td>
<td>(3,291)</td>
<td>(3,291)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchan Playground Remodel</td>
<td>(22,180)</td>
<td>(22,180)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package FY17 - Neighbourhood Parks Glyptothecae Reduction</td>
<td>456,500</td>
<td>456,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinsons Bay Reserve Renewals</td>
<td>164,459</td>
<td>164,459</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcliffs Pavilion</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package - NP Structures Renewal</td>
<td>28,339</td>
<td>28,339</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Park Renewal</td>
<td>24,719</td>
<td>24,719</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package - NP Furniture Renewal</td>
<td>38,586</td>
<td>38,586</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauk Bay Renewal</td>
<td>37,878</td>
<td>37,878</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarboro Park Playground Renewal</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks Structures Renewal Programme</td>
<td>(938)</td>
<td>(938)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks Tree Renewal Rolling Package</td>
<td>(1,520)</td>
<td>(1,520)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package - NP HS Renewal</td>
<td>(4,245)</td>
<td>(4,245)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taitel Park surface water and drainage project</td>
<td>(21,998)</td>
<td>(21,998)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F138 Delivery Package - NP Furniture (New)</td>
<td>(2,521)</td>
<td>(2,521)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery package detailed design landscape plans</td>
<td>(16,093)</td>
<td>(16,093)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glynmes Renewals</td>
<td>823,379</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>348,749</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package FY17 - Renewal of Regional Parks Building Components</td>
<td>42,568</td>
<td>42,568</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive renewals for port hills regional parks fences</td>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Equipment Renewal Rolling Package</td>
<td>(1,956)</td>
<td>(1,956)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive renewal for Regional parks buildings earthquakes</td>
<td>(13,389)</td>
<td>(13,389)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Sports Facilities Renewals Rolling Package</td>
<td>(15,148)</td>
<td>(15,148)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbay Edge Project</td>
<td>27,169</td>
<td>27,169</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package FY17 - Regional Parks Glyptothecae Reduction</td>
<td>50,162</td>
<td>50,162</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive renewals Port Hills signage project</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head to Head Walkway</td>
<td>69,698</td>
<td>69,698</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery package for Chalice and Nucleus renewal</td>
<td>100,550</td>
<td>100,550</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Package FY17 - Garden and Heritage Renewal of Building Components</td>
<td>98,968</td>
<td>98,968</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capital Programme Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Carry Forward Request</th>
<th>transferred to/(from)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alberley Park Playground Renewal</strong></td>
<td>60,516</td>
<td>60,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package - Garden and Heritage HS Renewal</strong></td>
<td>35,079</td>
<td>35,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery package for Memorials</strong></td>
<td>30,617</td>
<td>30,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery package for Artworks</strong></td>
<td>10,851</td>
<td>10,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Botanic gardens tea kiosk landscaping</strong></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Botanic Gardens Uplighting</strong></td>
<td>178,168</td>
<td>178,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central City Fleet Purchase</strong></td>
<td>63,332</td>
<td>63,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reactive renewal for Garden and Heritage parks buildings earthquakes</strong></td>
<td>61,460</td>
<td>61,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Botanic Gardens Playground Development</strong></td>
<td>19,826</td>
<td>19,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package PT17 - Garden and Heritage Furniture Renewal</strong></td>
<td>9,572</td>
<td>9,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package PT17 - Garden and Heritage Parks Glycolate Reduction</strong></td>
<td>46,741</td>
<td>46,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package PT17 - Garden and Heritage Structures Renewal</strong></td>
<td>31,618</td>
<td>31,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garden of Time Renewals</strong></td>
<td>4,892</td>
<td>4,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Botanic Gardens Irrigation Renewal Rolling Package</strong></td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mona Vale Irrigation Renewals Rolling Package</strong></td>
<td>(909)</td>
<td>(909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbados Cemetery Seats and House Renewal</strong></td>
<td>7,175</td>
<td>7,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package - Cemeteries Green Assets Renewal</strong></td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>5,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package - Cemeteries Furniture Renewal</strong></td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td>3,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package - Cemeteries Structures Renewal</strong></td>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruuru Cemetery Beam Renewal</strong></td>
<td>(121,395)</td>
<td>(121,395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diamond Harbour Cemetery drainage works</strong></td>
<td>101,035</td>
<td>101,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package - Cemeteries HS Renewal</strong></td>
<td>(3,242)</td>
<td>(3,242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemetery Tree Renewal Rolling Package</strong></td>
<td>(4,203)</td>
<td>(4,203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bellfast Cemetery Extension</strong></td>
<td>326,830</td>
<td>326,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemetery Beams</strong></td>
<td>(214)</td>
<td>(214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avon River Wall</strong></td>
<td>498,566</td>
<td>498,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mona Vale boundary brick wall</strong></td>
<td>477,010</td>
<td>477,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crespe Terrace Tennis Courts</strong></td>
<td>398,413</td>
<td>398,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South New Brighton Boardwalk</strong></td>
<td>324,705</td>
<td>324,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Searborough Steps - EQ repair</strong></td>
<td>294,471</td>
<td>294,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horseshoe Lake Reserve Footbridge repairs 2015</strong></td>
<td>236,426</td>
<td>236,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks Non Insurance Heritage and Artworks</strong></td>
<td>164,389</td>
<td>164,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South New Brighton carpark, driveway and tracks</strong></td>
<td>152,395</td>
<td>152,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jade Stadium War Memorial Entrance Gates</strong></td>
<td>134,461</td>
<td>134,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scott Statue</strong></td>
<td>64,342</td>
<td>64,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Port Hills Parks and Tracks Reopening - EQ specific</strong></td>
<td>51,734</td>
<td>51,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moncks Cave</strong></td>
<td>50,751</td>
<td>50,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horseshoe Lake Reserve EQ Repairs 2014</strong></td>
<td>46,564</td>
<td>46,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staunton Esplanade Reserve (Woodburn L oval)</strong></td>
<td>46,806</td>
<td>46,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Parks Structures Work Package</strong></td>
<td>43,156</td>
<td>43,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks Minster Structures</strong></td>
<td>40,084</td>
<td>40,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rollstone Portrait</strong></td>
<td>39,075</td>
<td>39,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Witch Hill War Memorial Earthquake Repair</strong></td>
<td>37,698</td>
<td>37,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South New Brighton Jetty EQ Repairs</strong></td>
<td>30,159</td>
<td>30,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coronation Reserve Retaining Wall</strong></td>
<td>641</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sydenham Park Reconstruction</strong></td>
<td>(156,847)</td>
<td>(156,847)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red Zone Parks EQ Repairs</strong></td>
<td>(173,277)</td>
<td>(173,277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Brighton Pier</strong></td>
<td>(1,683,362)</td>
<td>(1,683,362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cathedral square toilets rebuild</strong></td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addington Water Station</strong></td>
<td>131,738</td>
<td>131,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hagley Park North - RSA Bowling/Petanque Club</strong></td>
<td>73,665</td>
<td>73,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hawkes Bay Sterlingmen Quarters</strong></td>
<td>46,327</td>
<td>46,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signal Box - Norinch Quay</strong></td>
<td>38,073</td>
<td>38,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hawkes Bay Quarry Crusher Building</strong></td>
<td>30,908</td>
<td>30,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governors Bay Old School House</strong></td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>3,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signal Mart Cave Rock</strong></td>
<td>952</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kapaukotere Cottage</strong></td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>(200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hawkes Bay Quarry Old Stone House</strong></td>
<td>(3,572)</td>
<td>(3,572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akarua Weightbridge</strong></td>
<td>(10,200)</td>
<td>(10,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edmonds Telephone Cabinet</strong></td>
<td>(22,205)</td>
<td>(22,205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fenner Women's Reserve - Shelter</strong></td>
<td>(29,095)</td>
<td>(29,095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Toilets Work Package 2016/2017</strong></td>
<td>(54,880)</td>
<td>(54,880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign of the Kiwi</strong></td>
<td>(157,786)</td>
<td>(157,786)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hagley Banners Memorial Rotunda</strong></td>
<td>(275,104)</td>
<td>(275,104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Refuse Minimisation & Disposal

- **Burwood Gas Treatment Plant Renewal(s)**: 125,783
- **SWI Closed Landfill Monitoring**: 14,986
- **Closed Landfill Aftercare Burwood 5g**: 1,770

### Roads & Footpaths

- **Hawkes Bay Junction Road Extension**: 4,072,264
- **Medway Street - Street Renewal**: 909,786
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Programme Carry Forwards</th>
<th>Carry Forward Request</th>
<th>Transferred to (from)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Avon Road (Hils North Parade) Street Renewal</strong></td>
<td>334,724</td>
<td>334,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Griffiths Avenue</strong></td>
<td>53,800</td>
<td>53,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kerb and Channel Renewal targeted sites FY17</strong></td>
<td>52,206</td>
<td>52,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selwyn Street (Brougham to Moorhouse) Street Renewal</strong></td>
<td>23,695</td>
<td>23,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nicholls Street - Street Renewal</strong></td>
<td>19,930</td>
<td>19,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rosebery Street - Street renewal</strong></td>
<td>14,581</td>
<td>14,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aynor Street - Street Renewal</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brittan Street - Street renewal</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guild Street - Street renewal</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redcliff Avenue - Street renewal</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tavender Street (Radley-Cumor) - Street renewal</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thame Street - Street renewal</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shelley Street - Street Renewal</strong></td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southey Street - Street Renewal</strong></td>
<td>2,929</td>
<td>2,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bradshaw Tce Kerb and Channel Renewal</strong></td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>2,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wembly St Kerb and Channel Renewal</strong></td>
<td>(2,973)</td>
<td>(2,973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humboldt St Kerb and Channel Renewal</strong></td>
<td>(4,193)</td>
<td>(4,193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wardens Street (Julia设有)</strong></td>
<td>(5,826)</td>
<td>(5,826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cecil PI Kerb and Channel Renewal</strong></td>
<td>(9,386)</td>
<td>(9,386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palmer Road (Brougham-New Brighton)</strong></td>
<td>(10,626)</td>
<td>(10,626)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancellor Street</strong></td>
<td>(18,855)</td>
<td>(15,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dunn St Kerb and Channel Renewal</strong></td>
<td>(53,638)</td>
<td>(10,154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stony Bay Road A39 Bridge Renewal</strong></td>
<td>109,185</td>
<td>109,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cressy Tce Retaining Wall Renewal</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culvert Renewal - 2017-2018</strong></td>
<td>93,385</td>
<td>93,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tizzards Road #5 Bridge A27</strong></td>
<td>75,690</td>
<td>75,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central City Historic Bridges - 2017-2019</strong></td>
<td>65,753</td>
<td>65,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gloucester Street Bridge - bridge painting</strong></td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wright's Road W12 Bridge Renewal</strong></td>
<td>38,103</td>
<td>38,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bridge Renewals Programme</strong></td>
<td>26,865</td>
<td>26,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bridge Renewal - 2017</strong></td>
<td>14,316</td>
<td>14,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rue Joliv Bridge A2 A100</strong></td>
<td>7,479</td>
<td>7,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage - Rural Relfing works package</strong></td>
<td>19,944</td>
<td>19,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marlfield Road Bridge Renewal</strong></td>
<td>(219,951)</td>
<td>(219,951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Village Centre Masterplan F3.1</strong></td>
<td>257,774</td>
<td>257,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P4.34 Summer Off Street Car Parking Provision</strong></td>
<td>200,704</td>
<td>200,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Footpaths FY2017</strong></td>
<td>143,398</td>
<td>143,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edgeware Village Masterplan - A1</strong></td>
<td>94,073</td>
<td>94,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ferry Road Masterplan - project W1L</strong></td>
<td>55,576</td>
<td>55,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tactile Pavers FY2017</strong></td>
<td>49,883</td>
<td>49,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selwyn Street Masterplan - 31</strong></td>
<td>38,478</td>
<td>38,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trail Joints</strong></td>
<td>29,638</td>
<td>29,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MP Moncks Bay Parking and Bus Stop Enhancements</strong></td>
<td>28,407</td>
<td>28,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linwood Village C3 Design &amp; Install Childrens Interactive Play Art</strong></td>
<td>24,845</td>
<td>24,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tram Base + Tram Overhead</strong></td>
<td>23,820</td>
<td>23,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W2 Reddish Village Streetscape</strong></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W1L Heathcote &amp; Oak Street Streetscape Improvements</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ferry Rd W5S Woollston Gateway Enhancements</strong></td>
<td>9,245</td>
<td>9,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburban Masterplan: Main Road Programme</strong></td>
<td>7,950</td>
<td>7,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Brighton MP Streetscape Enhancements A2, A4, A5</strong></td>
<td>(96,366)</td>
<td>(96,366)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linwood Village SS Streetscape enhancements</strong></td>
<td>(35,903)</td>
<td>(35,903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Arterial Extension including Cranford Street Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>922,859</td>
<td>922,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Management Improvements: Waterloo Park</strong></td>
<td>536,154</td>
<td>536,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inner Harbour Road Improvement (Lyttleton to Diamond Harbour)</strong></td>
<td>530,522</td>
<td>530,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection Improvements: Curves/ Taper</strong></td>
<td>460,379</td>
<td>460,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BNDG Safety Improvements: Sawyers Arms Pedestrian Crossing Points</strong></td>
<td>373,348</td>
<td>373,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Rd (3 Lanes)</strong></td>
<td>248,578</td>
<td>248,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection Improvements: Cashmir/ Noon Hay/ Worleys</strong></td>
<td>191,510</td>
<td>191,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Retaining Walls FY2017</strong></td>
<td>196,636</td>
<td>196,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Retaining Walls Programme</strong></td>
<td>175,070</td>
<td>175,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection Improvement: Blakely / Radcliffe</strong></td>
<td>135,996</td>
<td>135,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wigram Maggala Link</strong></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BNGS Downstream Intersection Improvements : Cranford Street Downstream</strong></td>
<td>53,040</td>
<td>53,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection Improvement: Lower Stays / Marshland</strong></td>
<td>50,466</td>
<td>50,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection Improvements: Augustine/ Halwill</strong></td>
<td>47,875</td>
<td>47,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport Corridor Optimisation Works</strong></td>
<td>40,800</td>
<td>40,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Counter FY2017</strong></td>
<td>52,407</td>
<td>52,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main North Road Corridor Optimisation</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Counter FY2018</strong></td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Management Improvements: Ferry &amp; Moorhouse Road Widening [Albion to Fitzgeralds]</strong></td>
<td>(20,630)</td>
<td>(20,630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avenues / Birmingham / Wights Route Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>(63,356)</td>
<td>(63,356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Lighting Conversion 2017</strong></td>
<td>42,960</td>
<td>42,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capital Programme Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street light pole replacement</td>
<td>6,256</td>
<td>6,256</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisions (Transport Infrastructure)</td>
<td>(255,939)</td>
<td>(255,939)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvements: Guardians - Dyers Pass route</td>
<td>292,268</td>
<td>292,268</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Safety: Manchester / Moeraki / Vigrin (5)</td>
<td>200,045</td>
<td>200,045</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Safety: Gaston / Madras / Moeraki House (1)</td>
<td>191,286</td>
<td>191,286</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RORE Downstream Intersection Safety: Main North / Marshall / Spenicove (Chaney's Cavern) (4)</td>
<td>190,291</td>
<td>190,291</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Safety: Ramin / Middleton / Riccarton (7)</td>
<td>143,228</td>
<td>143,228</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety Initiatives FY2017</td>
<td>78,756</td>
<td>78,756</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety At Schools FY2017</td>
<td>41,076</td>
<td>41,076</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Safety: Barrington / Lincoln / Whitelegh</td>
<td>29,681</td>
<td>29,681</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvements: Pedestrian / Cycle Safety Fence - Dyers Pass route</td>
<td>19,091</td>
<td>19,091</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes To School FY2017</td>
<td>14,935</td>
<td>14,935</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety Initiative: Heracles/Hammersley/Manifold</td>
<td>7,987</td>
<td>7,987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvements Programme: Marine Drive to Charteris Bay</td>
<td>4,512</td>
<td>4,512</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvements - Warrington/Barladoes Shopping area</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackspot Remedial Works - Hill Road</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvements Programme FY2017</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Safety: Adkins/ Enors / Ferry</td>
<td>(25,290)</td>
<td>(25,290)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Safety: Wesley / Madras (4)</td>
<td>(147,169)</td>
<td>(147,169)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Directional Signage FY2017</td>
<td>76,423</td>
<td>76,423</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Speed Zone Signs - Avondale and Shirley schools</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Speed Zone Signs FY2017</td>
<td>95,736</td>
<td>95,736</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Installations Rolling works package</td>
<td>31,244</td>
<td>31,244</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Crossing Equipment FY2017</td>
<td>29,499</td>
<td>29,499</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Crossing Renewals Programme</td>
<td>(146,989)</td>
<td>(146,989)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs Renewals</td>
<td>114,583</td>
<td>114,583</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape renewals FY2017</td>
<td>31,583</td>
<td>31,583</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Residential Street Trees FY2017</td>
<td>19,465</td>
<td>19,465</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signals Renewals FY2017</td>
<td>318,996</td>
<td>318,996</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Lighting Reactive Renewals FY2017</td>
<td>52,684</td>
<td>52,684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Lighting Safety 2017</td>
<td>54,523</td>
<td>54,523</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Lighting Renewals 2017 and 2018</td>
<td>(193,959)</td>
<td>(193,959)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Lighting Reactive Renewals Programme</td>
<td>(144,210)</td>
<td>(144,210)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non SCRT Retaining Walls FY2017</td>
<td>1,101,159</td>
<td>1,101,159</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC surfacing to roads outside the CBD FY2017 - HI CSA funded</td>
<td>1,023,529</td>
<td>1,023,529</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non SCRT Retaining Walls Programme</td>
<td>682,479</td>
<td>682,479</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining wall ex Scrt 11260 Stonehaven</td>
<td>399,484</td>
<td>399,484</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting FY2017</td>
<td>391,729</td>
<td>391,729</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>323,537</td>
<td>323,537</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining wall ex Scrt 11234 Hackthorne</td>
<td>132,904</td>
<td>132,904</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red rock retaining walls</td>
<td>70,024</td>
<td>70,024</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Surfacing CBD Including Four Avenues FY2017 - HI CSA funded</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Surfacing to roads outside the CBD</td>
<td>(2,215)</td>
<td>(2,215)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Cathedral Square, City Mall and High Street FY2017</td>
<td>(675,933)</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>(677,586)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Road Zone 3B Risk Mitigation - HI CSA funded</td>
<td>5,571,404</td>
<td>5,571,404</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shag Rock Reserve - Clifton Hill - Roading</td>
<td>2,963,361</td>
<td>2,963,361</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shag Rock Reserve - Clifton Hill - Risk Mitigation</td>
<td>1,395,388</td>
<td>1,395,388</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shag Rock Reserve - Deans Head - Risk Mitigation</td>
<td>643,605</td>
<td>643,605</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Road Zone 3A Roading - HI CSA funded</td>
<td>159,064</td>
<td>159,064</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moa Bore - Domain 1 and 2 - Risk Mitigation</td>
<td>104,203</td>
<td>104,203</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moa Bore - Domain 3 and 4 - Risk Mitigation</td>
<td>39,400</td>
<td>39,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shag Rock Reserve - Deans Head - Roading</td>
<td>(91,218)</td>
<td>(91,218)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Road Zone 3B High Road - HI CSA funded</td>
<td>(110,289)</td>
<td>(110,289)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield Avenue Risk Mitigation</td>
<td>(355,205)</td>
<td>(355,205)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Road Zone 3B Roading - HI CSA funded</td>
<td>(562,362)</td>
<td>(562,362)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Press Lane (Construction)</td>
<td>21,680</td>
<td>21,680</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Transitional projects in the Residential Red Zone (Fenland)</td>
<td>18,425</td>
<td>18,425</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Hoardings Extension</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP - Transitional City projects Programme</td>
<td>(30,492)</td>
<td>(30,492)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR2A AOC Slow Clear</td>
<td>1,474,119</td>
<td>1,474,119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS2L Lochfield Street 2 way conversion</td>
<td>150,049</td>
<td>150,049</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFPP Tair Oneway Conversion (Oxnam to Baradene)</td>
<td>(305,314)</td>
<td>(305,314)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS1 Colombo Street (Hereford to St Asaph)</td>
<td>(404,798)</td>
<td>(404,798)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC Victoria Street</td>
<td>1,304,324</td>
<td>1,304,324</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC Central City: Wayfinding</td>
<td>686,870</td>
<td>686,870</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC Salisbury Street and Kilmore Street</td>
<td>361,227</td>
<td>361,227</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC Harford St (Manchester-Cambridge)</td>
<td>195,335</td>
<td>195,335</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC St Asaph Street (Ferry-Antiqua)</td>
<td>125,375</td>
<td>125,375</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC Ferry Road (St Asaph-Fittingford)</td>
<td>53,638</td>
<td>53,638</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC Harford Street (Manchester-Madras)</td>
<td>(143,446)</td>
<td>(143,446)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Lanes / Blocks Land Purchases</td>
<td>1,180,312</td>
<td>1,180,312</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sewage Collection, Treatment & Disposal

- [Item No.: 16](#)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Civil/Building Renewals</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Pumping Stations - Electronic new</td>
<td>63,932</td>
<td>63,932</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCEwP500020 Hydraulic Improvements</td>
<td>157,865</td>
<td>157,865</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyttelton Wastewater Pump Station Renewals</td>
<td>123,678</td>
<td>123,678</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCEwP Pump Station Switchboard and Communications Renewals</td>
<td>80,562</td>
<td>80,562</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Pump Station MEICA R&amp;I Project for FY2016-2018</td>
<td>69,071</td>
<td>69,071</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernisation works for SCRT Pump Station Architectural Standards</td>
<td>8,164</td>
<td>8,164</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCEwP500015 SCRT Pumps Wastewater Pump Station Upgrade</td>
<td>(386,874)</td>
<td>(386,874)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Maoris Renewals - Delivery Package</td>
<td>758,823</td>
<td>748,423</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Rest Zones Wastewater Servicing</td>
<td>713,058</td>
<td>713,058</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Maoris Renewal - Marine Pde - New Brighton Regeneration Area</td>
<td>456,256</td>
<td>456,256</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Maoris Renewal - Forest Dr</td>
<td>296,640</td>
<td>296,640</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Maoris Renewal - Peacock Gallop - Sumner</td>
<td>268,345</td>
<td>268,345</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Maoris Lining - Hereford St - Manchester St to Liverpool St</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Riccarton Rd - Ocean Ave to Hanakeke St</td>
<td>53,136</td>
<td>53,136</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Riccarton Road - Hanakeke to Matapi</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Maoris Renewal - Cranford St / Sherborne St and Vicinity</td>
<td>44,295</td>
<td>44,295</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealing WW Manholes in Flood and Surface Ponding Prone Areas - 2017 FY</td>
<td>30,981</td>
<td>30,981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whero Ave WW Ret - Diamond Harbour</td>
<td>12,508</td>
<td>12,508</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Maoris Renewal - Palmer Rd</td>
<td>[30,243]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Maoris Renewal - Akaroa Foreshore North (Beach Rd and Rue Jolie)</td>
<td>[48,820]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW EQ Legacy Lateral Renewals</td>
<td>(2,082,881)</td>
<td>(2,082,881)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowells Sewerage Renewal</td>
<td>774,491</td>
<td>774,491</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grt Tank Upgrade for EQ Resilience</td>
<td>744,062</td>
<td>744,062</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW CWTP Electrical instrumentation and control renewal</td>
<td>218,424</td>
<td>218,424</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Waste Reception Facility Renewal and EQ Resilience</td>
<td>205,722</td>
<td>205,722</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP Aesthetica &amp; Unity Standards</td>
<td>62,284</td>
<td>62,284</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP Machine Guarding 3rd Tranche</td>
<td>40,038</td>
<td>40,038</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP Operations Building HVAC - Renewal</td>
<td>43,535</td>
<td>43,535</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP Roadways Renewals</td>
<td>42,312</td>
<td>42,312</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bongas Boilers Renewal</td>
<td>41,452</td>
<td>41,452</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP Thermophilic Sludge Heat Sink</td>
<td>37,284</td>
<td>37,284</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Renewals</td>
<td>24,334</td>
<td>24,334</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP Reactive Renewals 16/17</td>
<td>18,841</td>
<td>18,841</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW SCRT P150 Wet Well &amp; Standby Generator renewals</td>
<td>465,794</td>
<td>465,794</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Riccarton Trunk Main Project</td>
<td>4,503,851</td>
<td>4,503,851</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Columbo St Trunk Main</td>
<td>1,083,451</td>
<td>1,083,451</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Flow Monitoring Installations</td>
<td>417,234</td>
<td>417,234</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW SE Hakawai Sewer</td>
<td>79,516</td>
<td>79,516</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Avonhead Road Wastewater Main Upgrade</td>
<td>17,854</td>
<td>17,854</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Lyttelton Harbour WWTP</td>
<td>125,309</td>
<td>125,309</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW New Akaroa Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
<td>(27,856)</td>
<td>(27,856)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Automation Improvement Works</td>
<td>138,717</td>
<td>138,717</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Ballard P562 Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>24,695</td>
<td>24,695</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW North Aitken Growth</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Vacuum System Monitoring Equipment</td>
<td>880,345</td>
<td>880,345</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Worsleys Road Gravity Main Upgrade</td>
<td>431,736</td>
<td>431,736</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Upper Styx Biofilters</td>
<td>422,201</td>
<td>422,201</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW SCRT Pressure Main 11 / 15 Diversion at CWTP</td>
<td>114,543</td>
<td>114,543</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW SCRT Vacuum Tank Division Valves</td>
<td>79,228</td>
<td>79,228</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalgety St/Odior Treatment - Southern Relief</td>
<td>73,565</td>
<td>73,565</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW West Isokwell Growth</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlers Crescent Biofilter - PM2002 Discharge</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Highfield Connection to Northcote Collector</td>
<td>[73,399]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP EQ Channels Restoration</td>
<td>3,708,831</td>
<td>3,708,831</td>
<td>(71,399)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP EQ Biosolids Holding Tank Replacement</td>
<td>544,947</td>
<td>544,947</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP WW201 Restoration</td>
<td>289,835</td>
<td>289,835</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWTP EQ Repair Occupied Buildings</td>
<td>21,860</td>
<td>21,860</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sport & Recreation**

- Hot Salt Water Pools New Brighton Phase 1: 2,200,000
- Spencer Beach Holiday Park Delivery Package: 4,887
- Facility Management Delivery Package B: (11,354)
- Facility Management Delivery Package A: (40,473)
- RTO R&I Delivery Package: (25,950)
- Jellicar Park Car Park: (7,887)
- Hagley Oval Delivery Package: (257,123)
- Nga Puna Wai Sports Hub - Stage 3: 12,690,747
- Community Facilities South West Leisure Centre: 2,052,609
- Woolston/Linwood Pool: 72,960
- Leslie Park field upgrade: 76,452
- Delivery Package - SP Furniture Renewal: 27,579
- Papanui Domain Playground Renewal: 25,676
- Delivery Package - Renewal of Sport Parks Building Components: 8,567
## Capital Programme Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Carry Forward Request</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrington Park Play-ground Renewal</strong>&lt;br&gt;(accessibility standard)</td>
<td>(975)</td>
<td>(975)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport Park Hard Surfacing Renewals</strong>&lt;br&gt;(3,714)</td>
<td>(3,714)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halswell Domain Car Park</strong>&lt;br&gt;(156,671)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(156,671)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package FY17 - Sports Park Structures (New)</strong>&lt;br&gt;(37,005)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Halswell skate park</strong>&lt;br&gt;(4,090)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package FY17 - Sport Parks Glyphosate Reduction</strong>&lt;br&gt;(601,067)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>601,067</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Package - Sports Park Play and Recreation Renewal</strong>&lt;br&gt;(23,128)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,128</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery package sports park play and recreation facilities renewals</strong>&lt;br&gt;(30,025)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,025</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports Parks Tree Renewal Rolling Package</strong>&lt;br&gt;(17,461)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,461</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cricket Wicket Renewals</strong>&lt;br&gt;(27,188)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,188</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District sports park purchases / capacity building project</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1,044,884)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,044,884</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carbon MIE Corner field upgrade</strong>&lt;br&gt;(205,512)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>205,512</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ferryymead Park Development</strong>&lt;br&gt;(62,895)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62,895</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospital Corner Sports Fields Development</strong>&lt;br&gt;(33,705)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,705</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Papanui Domain Irrigation</strong>&lt;br&gt;(9,206)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,206</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wanono Park</strong>&lt;br&gt;(32,529)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(32,529)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jellicoe Park / Pioneer Recreation and Sports Centres - EOI Repair Project</strong>&lt;br&gt;(3,539,154)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,539,154</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Brighton Camp Ground Repairs</strong>&lt;br&gt;(890,159)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>890,159</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spencer Park Campground - All Buildings</strong>&lt;br&gt;(710,300)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>710,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lyttelton Playground &amp; Skate Park Retaining Wall</strong>&lt;br&gt;(240,325)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>240,105</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whereus Sports Centre</strong>&lt;br&gt;(104,984)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104,984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro Sport Facility</strong>&lt;br&gt;(9,441,202)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(9,441,202)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QEB site remediation project</strong>&lt;br&gt;(2,432,352)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,432,352</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QEB (Eastern) Recreation &amp; Sport Centre</strong>&lt;br&gt;(2,432,352)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,432,352)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stormwater Drainage

- **Lyttelton Brick Barrels**<br>(440,550) | 440,550 | 440,550 |
- **Jacksons Creek @ Addington park**<br>(26,164) | 26,164 | 26,164 |
- **Cass Bay Drain, or 34 Governors Bay Rd - Inlet arrangement improvement (construction)**<br>(220,409) | 220,409 | 220,409 |
- **Frees Creek Piping**<br>(121,529) | 129,359 | 129,359 |
- **FYE17 Work Package for SW Renewals Triggered by City Streets Renewals**<br>(132,971) | 132,971 | 132,971 |
- **SW Brick Barrels Renewals Work Package**<br>(96,608) | 96,608 | 96,608 |
- **7 Glens Place to 14 Holts Ave - 50m DN150 SW Pipe Renewal**<br>(62,701) | 62,701 | 62,701 |
- **SW Reticulation reactive renewals**<br>(52,941) | 52,941 | 52,941 |
- **Rocarlon Road - Hanakeke St to Drains Ave SW Renewals**<br>(43,723) | 43,723 | 43,723 |
- **Banks Peninsula SW Reactive Renewals**<br>(43,325) | 43,325 | 43,325 |
- **Bings Drain, Woodville Street - 10m Culvert Renewal**<br>(38,477) | 38,477 | 38,477 |
- **Nakitsons Drain, 103 Ranfurly - piping 20m of drain**<br>(35,311) | 35,311 | 35,311 |
- **Canterbury Creek, 22a Cornell Rd - Secondary inlet**<br>(25,988) | 25,988 | 25,988 |
- **Jacksons Creek Upper - Design for realignment along Brougham**<br>(15,273) | 15,273 | 15,273 |
- **Okeover Stream, 129 Eam Road - Naturalisation of 130m of existing timber lining**<br>(12,739) | 12,739 | 12,739 |
- **Cass Drain, 6 to 14B Sabina St - piping 140m of drain**<br>(30,681) | 30,681 | 30,681 |
- **Conisar Bay Drain, 44 Park Terrace - Inlet arrangement improvements (Construction)**<br>(8,615) | 8,615 | 8,615 |
- **Steam Wharf Stream Outlet Flap Valve Renewal (Construction)**<br>(8,800) | 8,800 | 8,800 |
- **Pump Station 601 Drain, 2B Cressy Terrace - Inlet Arrangement Improvement and pipe renewal**<br>(8,277) | 8,277 | 8,277 |
- **Conisar Bay drop structure renewal**<br>(7,722) | 7,722 | 7,722 |
- **Natural Waterways Renewals Work Package**<br>(6,486) | 6,486 | 6,486 |
- **Bottlefield Ave Drain, 26 Bottlefield - piping 5m of drain**<br>(4,365) | 4,365 | 4,365 |
- **Bayview Place Drain, 18 Governors Bay Road - Inlet Arrangement Improvements**<br>(2,587) | 2,587 | 2,587 |
- **Duelley Creek, 353 to 359 Hills Road - Naturalisation of 80m of existing concrete lining**<br>(1,746) | 1,746 | 1,746 |
- **Nakitsons Drain, 136 Springfield Rd - piping 80m of drain**<br>(806) | 806 | 806 |
- **Banks Peninsula SW Delivery Package**<br>(782) | 782 | 782 |
- **Structural replacements delivery package**<br>(56) | 56 | 56 |
- **Canterbury Creek, 83 Canterbury Street - Inlet arrangement improvement**<br>(375) | 375 | 375 |
- **Buckleys Road Drain - 76 to 58 Buckleys Rd - piping 125m of drain**<br>(1,488) | (1,488) | - | - |
- **Peer Street Drain, 84a Peer St - 25m Naturalisation of existing timber lining**<br>(1,743) | (1,743) | - | - |
- **Munday Drain**<br>(3,808) | (3,808) | - | - |
- **Mariner Parade / Cugnet Street - 100m DN300 SW Coastal Outfall Pipe Renewal**<br>(5,360) | (5,360) | - | - |
- **Pipers Stream, 9-11 Seaford Rd, Dusawcheil - Erosion Control**<br>(6,907) | (6,907) | - | - |
- **Rhodes Drain, 55 Walters Rd - Lined drain renewal**<br>(7,921) | (7,921) | - | - |
- **Okana River Lower Tributaries SW Network Condition & Performance Assessment**<br>(40,386) | (40,386) | - | - |
- **2x Wapping Ave, Stoddart Point, Diamond Harbour - SW Pipe Renewal**<br>(50,820) | (50,820) | - | - |
- **Trescotts Stream Branch Outlet Flap Valves Renewal (Construction)**<br>(74,407) | (74,407) | - | - |
- **Avoca Valley Stream Outlet Tide Doors Renewal (Construction)**<br>(84,833) | (84,833) | - | - |

### Item 16

- **Leigh 520 Wigram East Retention Basin**<br>(605,979) | 605,979 | - | - |
- **Leigh 515 Stream Drain**<br>(105,490) | 105,490 | - | - |
- **Leigh 503 Cranford Basin Active Management**<br>(88,192) | 88,192 | - | - |
## Capital Programme Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Carry Forward</th>
<th>Transfered to/(from)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LODP motel Waterway</strong></td>
<td>83,945</td>
<td>83,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LODP Utilities - Linear Drainage Investigations Programme</strong></td>
<td>82,028</td>
<td>82,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LODP 507 Temporary Stop bank management</strong></td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>7,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LODP 501 Linwood Canal and Culverters Drain South</strong></td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>4,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCERT 1122 Shirley Stream Culvert</strong></td>
<td>3,088</td>
<td>(1,088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LODP 513 PS205</strong></td>
<td>(4,323)</td>
<td>(4,323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LODP 518 Knights Drain - Waller Park</strong></td>
<td>(5,578)</td>
<td>(5,578)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LODP 509 Knights Drain - Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>(5,150)</td>
<td>(5,150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated City Wide Flood and Floor Level Modelling</strong></td>
<td>(106,785)</td>
<td>(106,785)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LODP 517 Residential Home Remediation</strong></td>
<td>(1,472,412)</td>
<td>(1,472,412)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LODP 500 Upper Heathcote Storage</strong></td>
<td>(3,430,125)</td>
<td>(3,430,125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dudley Creek land drainage recovery programme</strong></td>
<td>(6,522,997)</td>
<td>(6,522,997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Policy & Planning

- **Urban Renewal Rolling Package**
  - 16,980
- **Transitional Projects Suburban Centres**
  - 9,934
- **Urban Renewal Projects**
  - 2,143

### Transport

- **Parking Renewals: Off Street Rolling works package**
  - 110,589
- **Parking Renewals: On Street FY2017**
  - 203,960
- **Parking Renewals: On Street Programme**
  - 155,656
- **Suburban Parking Facilities and Management**
  - 37,128
- **MCR Queryman's Trail - Section 1 - Mossman Ave to Frankleigh Street**
  - 505,628
- **MCR Uni-Cycle - Section 2 - Hagley Park to Riccarton Bush**
  - 411,764
- **MCR Little River Link - Section 3 - Little River Township**
  - 91,168
- **Belgrave Park Plan Change 12 - Cycle/Pedestrian Rail Underpass**
  - 37,449
- **MCR Papamoa Parallel - Section 1 - Grassmore to Tones**
  - 6,508
- **MCR Raparangi - Shag Rock Cycleway - Section 3 - Dyers Road to Ferry Road Bridge**
  - (2,480)
- **MCR Avon- Otautau Road - Section 1 - Fitzgerald Avenue to Swanson Road Bridge**
  - (43,620)
- **LODP Wheels to Wings - Section 1 - Harwood Road to Groves Road**
  - (102,765)
- **MCR NorWest Arc - Section 3 - University to Harwood Road**
  - (176,936)
- **MCR Southern Lights - Section 1 - Strickland Street to Tennyson St**
  - (189,052)
- **MCR South Express - Section 1 - Templeton to Main South Road**
  - (673,033)
- **MCR Raparangi - Shag Rock Cycleway - Section 2 - Albecks Road to Dyers Road**
  - (680,881)
- **MCR NorWest Arc - Section 1 - Cashmere Road to Hillmorton**
  - (792,963)
- **MCR Raparangi - Shag Rock Cycleway - Section 1 - Worcester Street to Albecks Road**
  - (878,555)
- **MCR Uni-Cycle - Section 3 - Ngahere to Dowdale Ave**
  - (977,371)
- **MCR Northern Line Cycleway - Section 1a - Kilmarnock to Blenheim**
  - (1,109,589)
- **MCR Heathcote Expressway - City to Morris Rd**
  - (1,110,635)
- **MCR Little River Link - Section 1 - Moorhouse Ave to Barrington Street**
  - (2,204,086)
- **MCR Papamoa Parallel - Section 4 - Grassmore to Sawyers Arms Road**
  - (3,190,898)
- **MCR Papamoa Parallel - Section 2 - Bealey Ave to Trillian**
  - (6,113,380)
- **PT Facilities - Northlands Hub**
  - 396,233
- **Oteketi PT Route: Evers Road PT Priority**
  - 175,045
- **ITS Installation Bus Finding FY2017**
  - 56,306
- **Care PT Route & Facilities: South-West Lincoln Road Phase 1**
  - 37,725
- **Palm PT Facilities**
  - 27,741
- **Care PT Route & Facilities: Oteketi - Southwest Projects**
  - (2,662)
- **Coloured Surfacing Renewals Rolling works package**
  - 104,888
- **Off Road Cycleway Surfacing Rolling works package**
  - 20,133
- **ITS System Renewal - PT FY2017**
  - 17,746
- **Delivery package for Marine structures in Outer bay, Lyttelton Harbour and Akaroa Harbour renewals**
  - 32,668
- **Bus Interchange - Papamoa**
  - 275,862
- **Riccarton Interchange & Bus Priority**
  - (1,504,113)
- **Scifield Car Park Parking Rebuild Capex**
  - (12,541,380)
- **Coastal Pathway Project**
  - (1,013,930)

### Water Supply

- **WS Williams Road Gardiners Link Main**
  - 214,000
- **WS Farrington Grampian Link Main**
  - 21,630
- **WS Subdivisions Add Infra for Development**
  - (121,555)
- **WS El Halawal Water Supply Mains**
  - (728,013)
- **WS Riccarton Rd Drainage Renewal**
  - 625,373
- **WS Mains Renewal - Marine Pde Regeneration Area**
  - 297,093
- **WS Riccarton Road - Hanakotu to Malipo**
  - 147,575
- **WS Mains Renewal - Heath St**
  - 63,372
- **WS Malta Cres Renewal**
  - 50,943
- **WS Eastern Tce Tukur Main Renewal**
  - 40,250
- **WS Hereford St Bridge - Cambridge Tce to Oxford Tce**
  - 82,586

---

**Note:**
-Numbers in parentheses indicate negative values or reductions.

---

**Source:**
- Christchurch City Council

**Date:**
- 28 September 2017

**Item:**
- 16

**Attachment:**
- E
### Capital Programme Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 16</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WS Mains Renewal - Wights Rd and Cashmere Rd</td>
<td>(9,467)</td>
<td>(9,467)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Mains Renewal - Godley Quay</td>
<td>(41,629)</td>
<td>(41,629)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Mains Renewal - Bradshaw Tce</td>
<td>(91,119)</td>
<td>(91,119)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Mains Renewal - Division St</td>
<td>(106,395)</td>
<td>(106,395)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Mains Renewal - Quary Reservoir Pumping Main</td>
<td>(352,286)</td>
<td>(352,286)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Mains Renewal - Cheriton St, Eureka St, Hampshire St and Brokehurst St</td>
<td>(440,411)</td>
<td>(440,411)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Cranford St Renewal - McFaddens Rd to Dee St and Westminster St to Berwick St</td>
<td>(853,000)</td>
<td>(853,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch Ch Water Submain Renewals - Package C</td>
<td>(850,286)</td>
<td>(850,286)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWpWSS079 Jeffrey Suction Tank Replacement</td>
<td>197,221</td>
<td>197,221</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Pumping Station Electrical Upgrade</td>
<td>137,843</td>
<td>137,843</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP Insurance Renewals</td>
<td>86,374</td>
<td>86,374</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Esansy Pump Station Well 1 Renewal</td>
<td>42,888</td>
<td>42,888</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCPwWSS023 - Lake Terrace Generator</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Reservoir Roof Renewal</td>
<td>(45,024)</td>
<td>(45,024)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Pump Station MEICA R11 Project for FY2016-2018</td>
<td>(93,882)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(93,882)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wights Pump station Well Renewal</td>
<td>860,473</td>
<td>860,473</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunuhead PS well replacement ( NAWWS )</td>
<td>695,750</td>
<td>695,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Rawhilli Rozzing FY15</td>
<td>345,604</td>
<td>345,604</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Dassachere DWEIZE upgrade Stage 2</td>
<td>138,114</td>
<td>138,114</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Water Supply Security</td>
<td>5,773</td>
<td>5,773</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampian PS well replacement ( NAWWS )</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credible pump station well replacement ( NAWWS )</td>
<td>(99,602)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(99,602)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farringdon PS Well Replacement Project</td>
<td>(569,120)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(569,120)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrows PS Well Replacement Project</td>
<td>(802,103)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(802,103)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Gardiners New Pump Station</td>
<td>645,662</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>645,662</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Terrace WNS New Well</td>
<td>30,889</td>
<td>30,889</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Prestons Pump Station</td>
<td>(675,849)</td>
<td>(70,209)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(596,634)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley Pump Station ECL Replacement in Rawhilli Zone</td>
<td>549,997</td>
<td>549,997</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapmans PS Wd2 replacement ( ECL )</td>
<td>489,957</td>
<td>489,957</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Corporate Capital
- My Council - Cash Recepting
  - Request: 279,639
  - 2017/18: 279,639
- Council Contact Centre Upgrade
  - Request: 232,314
  - 2017/18: 232,314
- SAP Cloud Migration
  - Request: 198,945
  - 2017/18: 194,915
- Spatial Programme - Foundation Architecture
  - Request: 193,193
  - 2017/18: 193,193
- IT Equipment Renewals and Replacement
  - Request: 188,553
  - 2017/18: 188,553
- Libraries Server Replacements
  - Request: 124,288
  - 2017/18: 124,288
- Windows 10 Deployment
  - Request: 127,935
  - 2017/18: 127,935
- Council Chambers Technology
  - Request: 45,929
  - 2017/18: 45,929
- Council Voice Upgrade
  - Request: 60,222
  - 2017/18: 60,222
- CEO Internet Infrastructure Upgrade
  - Request: 60,116
  - 2017/18: 60,116
- Alcohol Licensing Shared Workspace Replacement
  - Request: 53,833
  - 2017/18: 53,833
- Development Management
  - Request: 67,755
  - 2017/18: 67,755
- Elections 2016 Technology Phase 1
  - Request: 44,599
  - 2017/18: 44,599
- CWP Upgrades
  - Request: 38,580
  - 2017/18: 38,580
- Citizen Engagement and Consultation
  - Request: 31,098
  - 2017/18: 31,098
- Customer & Community Software Upgrade Bundle #1
  - Request: 26,685
  - 2017/18: 26,685
- Community Meeting Spaces (Bank Peninsula)
  - Request: 11,543
  - 2017/18: 11,543
- Libraries Windows 10 Upgrade
  - Request: 10,151
  - 2017/18: 10,151
- InfoCouncil Upgrade 17
  - Request: 7,945
  - 2017/18: 7,945
- City Services Software Upgrade Bundle II
  - Request: 5,545
  - 2017/18: 5,545
- Organisational and Workforce Performance
  - Request: (403,004)
  - 2017/18: (403,004)
- My Council Concripts Invoicing
  - Request: 597,323
  - 2017/18: 597,323
- Integration - Application Integration
  - Request: 290,282
  - 2017/18: 290,282
- Transport Contract Management
  - Request: 218,183
  - 2017/18: 218,183
- Capability to Inherit SCRTY
  - Request: 217,478
  - 2017/18: 217,478
- My Council Request Management
  - Request: 147,145
  - 2017/18: 147,145
- Art Gallery Asset Management System
  - Request: 116,812
  - 2017/18: 116,812
- My Council Self Service Payments
  - Request: 132,833
  - 2017/18: 132,833
- Customers & Bookings
  - Request: 103,411
  - 2017/18: 103,411
- Mobile Apps Bundle FY17 (Public)
  - Request: 63,340
  - 2017/18: 63,340
- Libraries Online Registration
  - Request: 60,450
  - 2017/18: 60,450
- Intellelence Enhancement Bundle FY17
  - Request: 31,675
  - 2017/18: 31,675
- I & E Data Flow Automation - Notice of Sale Phase Two
  - Request: 20,000
  - 2017/18: 20,000
- BI Reporting Bundle
  - Request: 26,767
  - 2017/18: 26,767
- Workforce Data Management
  - Request: 26,604
  - 2017/18: 26,604
- Advancing Asset Management IT Bundle
  - Request: 18,679
  - 2017/18: 18,679
- HR Candidate Management Enhancements
  - Request: 14,603
  - 2017/18: 14,603
- Web Analytics
  - Request: 11,668
  - 2017/18: 11,668
- Enterprise Mobility
  - Request: 122
  - 2017/18: 122
- Common Business SAP Enhancements Bundle II
  - Request: (11,043)
  - 2017/18: (11,043)
- Geallowsity and Safety Management Project
  - Request: (11,186)
  - 2017/18: (11,186)
- Digital Survey Equipment Rolling Package - Replacement & Renewal
  - Request: (11,906)
  - 2017/18: (11,906)
## Capital Programme Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Carry Forward Request</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Compact of Mayors Programme of Works (Budget Only)</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Tranche 1</td>
<td>2,695,481</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Tranche 2 Programme</td>
<td>2,213,675</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,191,461</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities (incl. Heritage) Rebuild Programme</td>
<td>712,700</td>
<td>712,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Tranche 1</td>
<td>199,758</td>
<td>199,758</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Tranche 2 Programme</td>
<td>36,011</td>
<td>36,011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Rebuild</td>
<td>(1,023,628)</td>
<td>(1,023,628)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliorma Service Centre</td>
<td>564,264</td>
<td>564,264</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase - Mass Movement Remediation Programme</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hills Mass Movement Remediation - Quarry (The Brass)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Precinct</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Land Acquisitions Rolling Package</td>
<td>1,717,407</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,717,407</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Land Acquisitions Rolling Package</td>
<td>3,698,855</td>
<td>3,698,855</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP Land Value Offset Rolling Package</td>
<td>(1,525,338)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,525,338)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Capital Carry Forwards from 2016/17:</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,025,516</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,865,653</strong></td>
<td><strong>578,948</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,065,934</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,048,791</strong></td>
<td><strong>145,466</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Capital Revenues and Funding Carry Forwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Carry Forward Request</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Contribution Rebates Rebuilt recharged to Vbase</td>
<td>10,968,182</td>
<td>10,968,182</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTA Capital Subsidy - Transport</td>
<td>5,801,429</td>
<td>5,801,429</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTA Capital Subsidy - Roadng</td>
<td>9,448,418</td>
<td>9,448,418</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO NCTA Roadng Capital Recoveries</td>
<td>(2,643,767)</td>
<td>(2,643,767)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Account drawdown to fund housing capex</td>
<td>5,402,898</td>
<td>5,402,898</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS Reserve (Lyttelton Head to Head) account drawdown</td>
<td>(994,464)</td>
<td>(994,464)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Revenue Carry Forwards from 2016/17:</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,912,998</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,912,998</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment F - Special Funds

### Housing - Normal Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000's</th>
<th>Annual Results</th>
<th>After Carry Forwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>8,078</td>
<td>8,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>-12,819</td>
<td>-11,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditure</td>
<td>-2,781</td>
<td>-3,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on fund balance</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June Balance</td>
<td>8,816</td>
<td>5,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed carry forwards</td>
<td>-757</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing - Earthquake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000's</th>
<th>Annual Results</th>
<th>After Carry Forwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 July Opening Balance</td>
<td>34,408</td>
<td>34,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response costs &amp; repairs</td>
<td>-7,326</td>
<td>-8,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild expenditure</td>
<td>-2,493</td>
<td>-2,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild insurance recoveries</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on fund balance</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed carry forwards</td>
<td>-237</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Endowment Fund - Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000's</th>
<th>Annual Results</th>
<th>After Carry Forwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation protection</td>
<td>97,224</td>
<td>97,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opex expenditure</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June Balance</td>
<td>97,917</td>
<td>98,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed carry forwards</td>
<td>-1,635</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Endowment Fund - Income Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000's</th>
<th>Annual Results</th>
<th>After Carry Forwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td>3,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less inflation protection to capital</td>
<td>-1,575</td>
<td>-1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opex expenditure</td>
<td>-2,478</td>
<td>-2,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June Balance</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed carry forwards</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Earthquake Mayoral Relief Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000's</th>
<th>Annual Results</th>
<th>After Carry Forwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 July Opening Balance</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdowns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul's Trinity Pacific Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ballet Theatre Trust</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury University quake Centre</td>
<td>-106</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June Balance</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed carry forwards</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Finance and Performance Committee Minutes - 6 September 2017

Reference: 17/979640
Contact: Aidan Kimberley Aidan.kimberley@ccc.govt.nz 941 6566

1. Purpose of Report
   The Finance and Performance Committee held a meeting on 6 September 2017 and is circulating the Minutes recorded to the Council for its information.

2. Recommendation to Council
   That the Council receives the Minutes from the Finance and Performance Committee meeting held 6 September 2017.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0</td>
<td>Minutes Finance and Performance Committee - 6 September 2017</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aidan Kimberley - Committee and Hearings Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finance and Performance Committee
OPEN MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 6 September 2017
Time: 9am
Venue: Council Chambers, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

Present
Chairperson
Members
Councillor Raf Manji
Councillor Vicki Buck
Councillor Jimmy Chen
Mayor Lianne Dalziel
Councillor Mike Davidson
Councillor Anne Galloway
Councillor Jamie Gough
Councillor Yani Johanson
Councillor Dean Swiggs

6 September 2017
Principal Advisor
Carol Bellette
General Manager Finance and Commercial

Aidan Kimberley
Committee and Hearings Advisor
941 6566
aidan.kimberley@ccc.govt.nz
www.ccc.govt.nz

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:
www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/meetingminutes/agendas/index
The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   
   Part C
   
   **Committee Resolved FPCM/2017/00023**
   
   That the apology from Deputy Mayor Turner, apology for lateness from Councillor Swiggs and apology for early departure from Councillor Chen be accepted.
   
   Councillor Gough/Councillor Galloway  
   
   Carried

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   Part B
   
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   
   Part C
   
   **Committee Resolved FPCM/2017/00024**
   
   **Committee Decision**
   
   That the minutes of the Finance and Performance Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 2 August 2017 be confirmed.
   
   Councillor Davidson/Councillor Gough  
   
   Carried

4. **Deputations by Appointment**
   
   Part B

5. **Presentation of Petitions**
   
   Part B
   
   There was no presentation of petitions.
Council
28 September 2017

Finance and Performance Committee
06 September 2017

Mayor Dalziel joined the meeting at 09:04 am.
Councillor Swiggs joined the meeting at 09:12 am.

6. Performance report for the year ended 30 June 2017

Committee Decided FPCM/2017/00025

Part A

That the Finance and Performance Committee recommends that the Council:
1. Receives the information in the report.
2. Approves net operational carry forward requests from 2016/17 of $30.2 million (as detailed in Attachment C), to enable completion of projects in 2017/18 and beyond.
3. Approves (as detailed in Attachment E) capital carry forward and bring back requests to/from 2016/17 of $49 million to enable completion of capital projects in 2017/18 or later as indicated, noting $52.9 million moves to 2017/18 and replaces an unspecified $57.4 million already included in the 2018 Annual Plan.
4. Approves capital revenue and funding net carry forwards to/from 2016/17 of $27.9 million to align with the capital programme, noting this includes $11 million of development contribution rebates.

Councillor Swiggs/Councillor Davidson  
Carried

The meeting adjourned at 9:47am and resumed at 10:50am
Councillors Swiggs and Chen left the meeting during the adjournment.
Councillor Johanson left the meeting during the adjournment and returned at 10:57am.
Councillor Buck left the meeting during the adjournment and returned during the Public Excluded session.

7. Asset Management Quarterly Report - Transport

Committee Resolved FPCM/2017/00026

Part C

That the Finance and Performance Committee:
1. Receive this report
2. Note that feedback is sought on suitability of this template (see attachment), to provide information to the Finance and Performance Committee on Asset Condition Assessment and Valuations
3. Note that feedback is sought regarding potential other transport data to be collected.

Mayor/Councillor Davidson  
Carried
8 Resolution to Exclude the Public  
Committee Resolved FPCM/2017/00027  

Part C  

That at 11:12am the resolution to exclude the public set out on pages 75 to 76 of the agenda be adopted.  

Mayor/Councillor Gough  
Carried  

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 11:26am.  

Meeting concluded at 11:26am.  

CONFIRMED THIS 4TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2017  

COUNCILLOR RAF MANJI  
CHAIRPERSON
18. Legalisation of Point Strips

Reference: 17/1007136
Contact: Justin Sims justin.sims@ccc.govt.nz 941 6424

1. Staff Recommendations

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee recommends the Council to:

1. Where there is a Point Strip Agreement, and the terms and conditions of the Agreement have been fulfilled,
   - a. delegate to the Chief Executive the power to apply to the Minister of Lands for land (which is the subject of the Agreement) to be declared as road under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981, and to give the written consent of the Council under section 114(2)(h) of that Act; and
   - b. that the Chief Executive may sub-delegate this power.

2. Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee Recommendation to Council

That the Council resolves that:

1. Where there is a Point Strip Agreement, and the terms and conditions of the Agreement have been fulfilled:
   - a. delegate to the Chief Executive the power to apply to the Minister of Lands for land (which is the subject of the Agreement) to be declared as road under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981, and to give the written consent of the Council under section 114(2)(h) of that Act; and
   - b. that the Chief Executive may sub-delegate this power.
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1. **Purpose and Origin of Report**

   **Purpose of Report**
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee to recommend to Council to delegate to the Chief Executive Officer the power to apply for and consent to land being vested as road under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981. This delegation will only apply in the case of Point Strip Agreements.

   **Origin of Report**
   1.2 This report is staff generated following an application by a developer who wishes to pass over a point strip contained in an agreement.

2. **Significance**

   2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by using the template for assessing significance.

   2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. **Staff Recommendations**

   That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee recommends the Council to:

   1. Where there is a Point Strip Agreement, and the terms and conditions of the Agreement have been fulfilled,-
      a. delegate to the Chief Executive the power to apply to the Minister of Lands for land (which is the subject of the Agreement) to be declared as road under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981, and to give the written consent of the Council under section 114(2)(h) of that Act; and
      b. that the Chief Executive may sub-delegate this power.

4. **Key Points**

   4.1 This report does not support the [Council's Long Term Plan (2015 - 2025)](#) as there is no specific reference to road legalisation procedures in the Long Term Plan.

   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

   - Option 1 – Where there is a Point Strip Agreement, and the terms and conditions of the Agreement have been fulfilled, delegate to the Chief Executive the power to apply to the Minister of Lands for land (which is the subject of the Agreement) to be declared as road under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981, and to give the written consent of the Council under section 114(2)(h) of that Act (preferred option).

   - Option 2 – Retain status quo – Full Council consent to the declaration of land referenced in Point Strip Agreements as legal road.
4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- Saves on wasted staff time and costs writing reports on matters that are essentially already set out in the agreements.
- The declaration as road of point strips is envisaged at the time the agreements are entered into.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- There are no identified disadvantages. The Council supports the principle of delegating decision-making to the lowest competent level.

5. Context/Background

Point Strip Agreements

5.1 A Point Strip Agreement is a mechanism for a developer of a new subdivision to receive a contribution to the cost of construction of roads in the development from adjoining land owners who will need to use those roads for access to their land at some future date.

5.2 Under the terms of a Point Strip Agreement, the land is usually transferred to Council, who is a party to the agreement and held in trust for the developer with a requirement that the Council will not allow access over the strip until satisfaction of the terms of the agreement.

5.3 The person wishing to obtain access over the Point Strip then pays to the Council a sum of money, defined in the agreement, which is then forwarded to the original developer. Under the terms of the agreement the Council then creates a legally enforceable right of access over the Point Strip.

5.4 Whilst there is no obligation to formalise the land as legal road it is normally sensible for this to be undertaken otherwise the Council would end up owning many un-useable parcels of land with ongoing liabilities.

5.5 As the land contained in Point Strip Agreements is envisaged as becoming road and abuts the formed road, a delegation to provide for land in such agreements as road would avoid wasted staff and elected members time in making such decisions.

5.6 The decision to declare land as road is set out in section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981 and requires the written consent of the Council. There is currently no delegation in place to staff to give the written consent of the Council under section 114 of the Public Works Act.
6. **Option 1 - Delegate to the Chief Executive authority to apply and consent to the declaration of land referenced in Point Strip Agreements as legal road**

**Option Description**

6.1 Where there is a Point Strip Agreement, and the terms and conditions of the Agreement have been fulfilled, delegate to the Chief Executive the power to apply to the Minister of Lands for land (which is the subject of the Agreement) to be declared as road under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981, and to give the written consent of the Council under section 114(2)(h) of that Act.

**Significance**

6.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report

6.3 There are no engagement requirements for this level of significance.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

6.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**

6.5 Community views and preferences are not specifically affected because this new delegation relates to an internal council process.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**

6.6 The Local Government Act 2002 emphasises that delegations are made for the purposes of efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation. The Council’s Delegations Policy states that the Council supports the principle of delegating decision-making to the lowest competent level. This option aligns with the Council’s Delegations Policy.

**Financial Implications**

6.7 Cost of Implementation – there is a staff time saving if the delegation is adopted. There is minimal staff costs to implement the change to delegations.

6.8 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – once the land is declared as road, the road will need to be maintained in the usual way.

6.9 Funding source – road maintenance budget.

**Legal Implications**

6.10 On 10 December 2015, the Council resolved to make a new suite of delegations to the Chief Executive and other staff, and also resolved to adopt a new Delegations Register.

6.11 The register is set out as follows:

- Contents
- How this delegation register works
- Delegations policy
- Part A – Statutory and Other Delegations to the Chief Executive
- Part B – Statutory and Other Delegations to Staff
- Part C – Statutory and Other Delegations from the Chief Executive to Staff
- Part D – Council to Community Boards, Committees, Sub-Committees, and Other Subordinate Decision-making Bodies
6.12 Under the Delegations Register, there are currently no delegations from the Council to staff with respect to powers under the Public Works Act 1981. Matters under the Public Works Act 1981 are ordinarily decided by the full Council.

6.13 Where the Council has entered into a Point Strip Agreement, and the conditions of the Agreement have been fulfilled, the Council will then ordinarily begin the process under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981 to have the point strip declared as legal road. The process under section 114 requires the Council to apply to the Minister of Lands, and the Minister of Lands, by notice in the Gazette, declares the land to be road. At this point the land vests in the Council as legal road.

6.14 Under section 114(2) of the Public Works Act 1981, part of the process involves the Council providing written consent to the Minister of Lands to the land becoming road.

6.15 If staff are to be able to apply for land which is the subject of a Point Strip Agreement to be vested as road, then the Council needs to put a formal delegation in place under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981. The delegation will only apply in respect of Pont Strip Agreements.

6.16 Clause 32(1) of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 provides a general power of delegation as follows:

> Unless expressly provided otherwise in this Act, or in any other Act, for the purposes of efficiency and effectiveness in the conduct of a local authority’s business, a local authority may delegate to a committee or other subordinate decision-making body, community board, or member or officer of the local authority any of its responsibilities, duties, or powers except—
> (a) the power to make a rate; or
> (b) the power to make a bylaw; or
> (c) the power to borrow money, or purchase or dispose of assets, other than in accordance with the long-term plan; or
> (d) the power to adopt a long-term plan, annual plan, or annual report; or
> (e) the power to appoint a chief executive; or
> (f) the power to adopt policies required to be adopted and consulted on under this Act in association with the long-term plan or developed for the purpose of the local governance statement; or
> (g) [Repealed]
> (h) the power to adopt a remuneration and employment policy.

6.17 The proposed delegation does not infringe the restrictions in the Local Government Act 2002.

**Risks and Mitigations**

6.18 There are no identified risks caused by this option.

**Implementation**

6.19 Implementation dependencies - none.

6.20 Implementation timeframe – the amended delegations will be recorded in the Council’s Delegations Register by the Legal Services Unit as soon as possible. The amended delegations will be exercised as and when required.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

6.21 The advantages of this option include:

- Saves on wasted staff time and costs writing reports on matters that are essentially already set out in the agreements.
- The declaration as road of point strips is envisaged at the time the agreements are entered into.
6.22 There are no identified disadvantages. The Council supports the principle of delegating decision-making to the lowest competent level. The advantages of this option include:

- Saves on wasted staff time and costs writing reports on matters that are essentially already set out in the agreements.
- The declaration as road of point strips is envisaged at the time the agreements are entered into.

7. **Option 2 – Retain status quo – Council consents to the declaration of land referenced in Point Strip Agreements as legal road**

**Option Description**

7.1 Maintain the status quo and do not delegate to the Chief Executive authority to consent to the declaration of land identified in Point Strip Agreements as road. Consents must continue to be given by the full Council.

**Significance**

7.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.

7.3 There are no engagement requirements for this level of significance.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

7.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**

7.5 The community views are not specifically affected by this option because it relates to internal Council processes.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**

7.6 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

**Financial Implications**

7.7 Cost of Implementation – staff time writing individual reports on each Point Strip Agreement.

7.8 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – once the land is declared as road, the road will need to be maintained in the usual way.

7.9 Funding source – road maintenance budget.

**Legal Implications**

7.10 Where the Council has entered into a Point Strip Agreement, and the conditions of the Agreement have been fulfilled, the Council will then ordinarily begin the process under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981 to have the point strip declared as legal road. The process under section 114 requires the Council to apply to the Minister of Lands, and the Minister of Lands, by notice in the Gazette, declares the land to be road. At this point the land vests in the Council as legal road.

7.11 Under section 114(2) of the Public Works Act 1981, part of the process involves the Council providing written consent to the Minister of Lands to the land becoming road.

7.12 Under this option, Council staff prepare a report to the Council and the full Council resolves to consent to the land becoming legal road and applying to the Minister of Lands under section 114.
Risks and Mitigations
7.13 There are no identified risks caused by this option.

Implementation
7.14 Implementation dependencies - none
7.15 Implementation timeframe – N/A.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.16 The advantages of this option include:
   - None

7.17 The disadvantages of this option include:
   - Staff and elected members time is wasted approving reports on matters that are merely putting into effect existing agreements.

Attachments
There are no attachments to this report.

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance
Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.
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19. Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee Minutes - 13 September 2017

Reference: 17/1016869
Contact: Samantha Kelly samantha.kelly@ccc.govt.nz 941 6227

1. Purpose of Report
The Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee held a meeting on 13 September 2017 and is circulating the Minutes recorded to the Council for its information.

2. Recommendation to Council
That the Council receives the Minutes from the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting held 13 September 2017.
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Item No.: 19
Page 379
## Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee
### OPEN MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday 13 September 2017  
**Time:** 1.05pm  
**Venue:** Council Chambers, Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chairperson | Councillor Pauline Cotter  
| Deputy Chairperson | Councillor Mike Davidson  
| Members | Councillor Vicki Buck  
| | Councillor Phil Clearwater  
| | Councillor Anne Galloway  
| | Councillor Aaron Keown  
| | Councillor Sara Templeton

---

**8 September 2017**  
Principal Advisor  
David Adamson  
General Manager City Services  
Tel: 941 8235

Samantha Kelly  
Committee and Hearings Advisor  
941 6227  
samantha.kelly@ccc.govt.nz  
www.ccc.govt.nz

---

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:  
www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/meetingminutes/agendas/index
The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**
   
   Part C
   Committee Resolved ITEC/2017/00043
   
   It was resolved on the motion of Councillor Clearwater, seconded by Councillor Keown that the apology for lateness from Councillor Buck be accepted.
   
   Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Keown  Carried

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   
   Part B
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   
   Part C
   Committee Resolved ITEC/2017/00044
   
   Committee Decision
   
   That the minutes of the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 9 August 2017 be confirmed.
   
   Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Davidson  Carried

4. **Deputations by Appointment**
   
   Part B
   There were no deputations by appointment.

5. **Presentation of Petitions**
   
   Part B
   There was no presentation of petitions.
6. Christchurch Coastal Pathway - Change of Status

Committee Comment

1. The Committee considered the report that presented the following recommendation to it from the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

   That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:
   
   Approve for the Christchurch Coastal Pathway project to be included in the Major Cycleway Routes Project to enable the Christchurch Coastal Pathway to access New Zealand Transport Authority urban cycleways funding in 2018.

Staff Recommendation

Staff have provided comment on the above recommendation by the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board that is appended to the report as Attachment A. The conclusion of the memorandum provided by staff is that, in summary, no changes to the current project structure should be made.

Committee Resolved ITEC/2017/00045

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

1. Request for staff to report back to the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board.

2. Request for staff to include the Coastal Pathway in any future funding applications should the opportunity arise.

Notes that the Committee request a memo on whether the Coastal Pathway was originally included in the Major Cycleway Route Programme and changes of status.

Councillor Templeton/Councillor Keown Carried

7. Prioritisation Process for Transport Projects

Staff Recommendations

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

1. Receive this report on the prioritisation process for transport investment that is currently underway.

Committee Resolved ITEC/2017/00046

Part B

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

1. Receive this report on the prioritisation process for transport investment that is currently underway.

Councillor Davidson/Councillor Templeton Carried
8. Legalisation of Point Strips

Staff Recommendations

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee recommends the Council to:

1. Where there is a Point Strip Agreement, and the terms and conditions of the Agreement have been fulfilled,-
   a. delegate to the Chief Executive the power to apply to the Minister of Lands for land (which is the subject of the Agreement) to be declared as road under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981, and to give the written consent of the Council under section 114(2)(h) of that Act; and
   b. that the Chief Executive may sub-delegate this power.

Committee Decided ITEC/2017/00047

Part A

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee recommends that the Council resolve that:

1. Where there is a Point Strip Agreement, and the terms and conditions of the Agreement have been fulfilled,-
   a. delegate to the Chief Executive the power to apply to the Minister of Lands for land (which is the subject of the Agreement) to be declared as road under section 114 of the Public Works Act 1981, and to give the written consent of the Council under section 114(2)(h) of that Act; and
   b. that the Chief Executive may sub-delegate this power.

Councillor Davidson/Councillor Templeton Carried

Councillor Buck arrived at 1.50pm.

9. Transport Unit - Bi-Monthly Report

Staff Recommendations

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

1. Receive the information in the attached Transport Unit report.

Committee Resolved ITEC/2017/00048

Part B

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

1. Receive the information in the attached Transport Unit report.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Davidson Carried
10. AAC ST Asaph Street - Proposed Road Layout Options

Committee Comment

1. The Committee resolved to establish an extraordinary meeting to receive and consider public feedback on the options within the report. The Committee extended the feedback period from ten days to three weeks following a request for an extension by Central City Business Group.

Staff Recommendations

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

(Note: Staff are not recommending an option in this instance. Staff are providing options for consideration by the Council)

1. Establish an extraordinary Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting to receive and consider public feedback on the options within this report following a ten day feedback period.

2. Following receipt of public feedback, review and consider the two options proposed and make a recommendation to Council.

3. Note that staff are undertaking actions related to the road safety audit. These actions will not limit the options outlined in this report.

Committee Resolved ITEC/2017/00049

Part C

(Note: Staff are not recommending an option in this instance. Staff are providing options for consideration by the Council)

1. Establish an extraordinary Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting to receive and consider public feedback on the options within this report following a three week feedback period.

2. Following receipt of public feedback, review and consider the two options proposed and make a recommendation to Council.

3. Note that staff are undertaking actions related to the road safety audit. These actions will not limit the options outlined in this report.

Councillor Galloway/Councillor Clearwater Carried

Councillor Templeton requested that her vote against the resolutions be recorded.

Councillor Templeton moved by way of an amendment:

4. For the original design as per the street spaces design guidelines to be included as a third option for public feedback.

Councillor Templeton/Councillor Davidson Lost

The above amendment was declared lost and the substantive motion was carried.
11 Resolution to Exclude the Public
Committee Resolved ITEC/2017/00050

Part C

That Shelly Perfect of Velos (Opus), David Aldridge of Peloton (Beca) and Brendan Bisley, consultant for the Christchurch City Council remain after the public have been excluded for Item’s 14 and 15 of the public excluded agenda as they have knowledge that is relevant to that item and will assist the Council.

AND

That at 2.39pm the resolution to exclude the public set out on pages 133 to 134 of the agenda be adopted.

Councillor Davidson/Councillor Clearwater Carried

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 3.40pm.

Meeting concluded at 3.40pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 21ST DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2017

COUNCILLOR PAULINE COTTER
CHAIRPERSON
20. Adoption of the Annual Report for ARLA for period ending 30 June 2017

Reference: 17/1005952
Contact: Allison Houston  Allison.houston@ccc.govt.nz  941 6566

1. Staff and Regulatory Performance Committee Recommendation to Council

That the Council:

1. Receive the information in this report.
2. Adopt the 2016/17 Annual Report to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority as set out in Attachment A, pursuant to section 199 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.
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Adoption of the Annual Report for ARLA for period ending 30 June 2017

Reference: 17/931000
Contact: Allison Houston  Allison.houston@ccc.govt.nz  941 8821

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 This report is required to be submitted by each Territorial Authority to the Alcohol Licensing Regulatory Authority (ARLA) in Wellington annually. The report covers the proceedings and operations of the Alcohol Licensing and the District Licensing Committee (DLC) for the reporting year ending 30 June 2016.

2. Staff Recommendations
   That the Regulatory Performance Committee recommends that the Council:
   1. Receive the information in this report.
   2. Adopt the 2016/17 Annual Report to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority as set out in Attachment A, pursuant to section 199 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

3. Key Points
   Background
   3.1 The Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 came into force on 18 December 2013 and saw the subsequent implementation of District Licensing Committees for each Territorial Authority area. The year ending 30 June 2017 has seen the three and half years of implementation of the new legislation.
   3.2 Christchurch continues to change with the rebuild, while licence numbers remain well below that of pre-earthquake numbers, this year has seen a continued increase in the number of licences as premises continue to repopulate within the central city.
   3.3 The implementation of the new Act has brought a number of challenges and opportunities.

   Legal Considerations
   3.4 Pursuant to the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, section 199 requires every territorial authority, within three months after the end of every financial year, to prepare and send to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA) a report of the proceedings and operations of its licensing committees during the year. This is required to be received by ARLA by 30 September 2017.
   3.5 Subsection (3) of section 199 requires the territorial authority to supply, on payment of any reasonable fee it may prescribe, a copy of each report to any person who asks for one.
   3.6 Subsection (5) of section 199 requires a copy of every annual report to be made available by the territorial authority, for inspection free of charge and on an internet site maintained by, or on behalf of the territorial authority, for a period of not less than 5 years.

   Financial implications
   3.7 There are no financial implications arising out of the report.
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25 August 2017

Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority
Tribunals Unit
Private Bag 32 001
Featherston Street
Wellington 6140

Attention: The Secretary

Dear Sir

Christchurch City Council District Licensing Committee Annual Report to the Alcohol Licensing and Regulatory Authority (ARLA) for Period Ending 30 June 2017

1. Christchurch City Council District Licensing Committee Workload Overview

District Licensing Committee Structure and personnel

The Council has 4 District Licensing Committees (DLC), each chaired by an appointed Commissioner.
The appointed Commissioners are:
Paul Rogers Robin Wilson
Al Lawn Grant Buchanan

Council approved list of members is as follows:
Paul Rogers Robin Wilson David Blackwell John Verry
Al Lawn Grant Buchanan Paul Buttiell Tanya Surrey

The Secretariat of the District Licensing Committee

On 9 December 2013 the Council’s Acting Chief Executive, in their capacity as Secretary of the licensing committees, determined sub-delegations of various functions, powers and duties under section 198 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (the Act). These sub-delegations continue to be in place with identified delegations being made (severally) to named persons that sit in the Regulatory Compliance Unit (formerly known as the Investigations and Enforcement Unit) and also the Council’s Governance Unit. The Team Leader for Alcohol Licensing, and Technical Officers of the Alcohol Licensing team, undertake most of the operational administration activities in accordance with these sub-delegations.

Secretariat hearings delegations and governance administration support for DLC Commissioners and Members is undertaken by the Hearings and Council Support Team, which sits in the Council’s Community Support, Governance and Partnerships Unit.

Christchurch City Council Alcohol Licensing Team Structure

The Alcohol Licensing Team sits in the Regulatory Compliance Unit. The team consists of a Team Leader (who is also appointed by warrant as the Chief Licensing Inspector), a Senior Inspector, three Inspectors and three Technical Officers. All Inspectors are appointed by warrant under the Act. The Technical Officers undertake the secretariat administration. There has been one personnel change in this reporting year being a change in Technical Officer in the team.

Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 Staff Training

All five Inspectors attended the New Zealand Institute of Liquor Licensing Inspectors Conference in September 2016 in Wellington. Jennifer Davison was elected as the President of the NZILLI Executive Committee for a two year term. Paul Spang (who has been a long standing member of the Committee) retired from the Committee. All five of the Christchurch Inspectors presented at the conference.

The Technical Officers completed the Health Promotion Agency Servewise online training tool. The Inspectors and Hearings Advisor have now received training on, and regularly use, WestLaw to review
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and research Alcohol case law and to access the online Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act and its commentary. The Alcohol Licensing team, as part of the wider Regulatory Compliance Unit, have commenced the Regulatory Compliance NZQA Qualification G-Reg level 3 core knowledge module. This is part of the Government Regulatory Practice Initiative.

District Licensing Committee Meetings or Hearings

The District Licensing Commissioners (DLC) usually meet every Wednesday to:
- allocate work for determinations that are made on the papers;
- set public hearing schedules;
- determine Temporary Authority applications; and
- discuss general procedural matters.

The chairing of public hearings has been systematically rotated amongst the Commissioners, as has the inclusion of DLC members on the DLC panels for public hearings.

In the reporting year commencing 1 July 2016 and ending on 30 June 2017 the District Licensing Committee Secretariat received over 3500 applications that were referred to the DLC for determination.

A summary of hearings activity follows:
- Two Temporary Authority Applications were heard by public hearing because of agency opposition and both were declined.
- Eight premises licences were heard by way of public hearing, because of either agency oppositions, public objections, or both. These comprised: three on-licence applications (two new licences and one renewal) of which one was granted, one was declined, and one is part heard; five new off licence applications (four bottle stores and one remote sales) of which three were granted and two were declined; and 12 Manager’s Certificate applications (new and renewal) were determined by way of public hearing.
- There were no Special Licences determined by public hearing in this reporting year.
- No applications were referred by the DLC to the Authority for hearing in this reporting year.
- The Authority heard a number of enforcement applications made by the Police (most following failed Controlled Purchase Operations) and these resulted in four premises and nine managers receiving suspensions during the reporting period.

A total of 3351 unopposed applications were also determined on-the-papers by the DLC (relating to 393 new or renewal premises licences, 1750 managers certificates, 1087 special licences, and 91 temporary authorities).

All renewals for existing licenced premises last renewed under the Sale of Liquor Act 1989 were filed for renewal under the Act by 18 December 2016.

A further five premises licence applications and three temporary authority applications were made but withdrawn and not determined by the DLC. A further 24 premises (on, off, club) licences were surrendered during the reporting year, due to either closure, relocation to a new site, or a business decision to no longer sell alcohol.

No appeals of DLC decisions have been made to ARLA in this reporting year.

Two further DLC applications for supermarkets (relating to single alcohol areas), granted by the DLC in 2014, remain subject to appeal: ARLA determined the original appeal proceedings in January 2015. The ARLA decisions were then appealed to the High Court and heard in June 2015. The High Court quashed the Authority’s decision and the High Court decision was then appealed (on points of law) and heard by the Court of Appeal in October 2016. This matter is related to the interpretation of new provisions in the Act around single alcohol area requirements for supermarkets/grocery stores. The Authority, High Court, and Court of Appeal have referred to these cases as test cases.

The premises decisions subject to the appeal proceedings are Bond Markets Limited (Bishopdale New World) and J C Vautrey Limited (South City New World). Following the Court of Appeal decision the cases were referred back to the Authority for a rehearing. The Authority re-heard the matters in July 2017 and decisions are pending.
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Item No.: 20
A further 21 supermarket applications are currently adjourned and awaiting for hearings to be set down by the DLC subject to the outcome of the above test cases. These adjournments are in accordance with a practice direction issued by ARLA in 2014.

Noticeable Trends or Issues

The DLC continues to be in a unique situation as a result of ongoing rebuilding activities, in particular within the central business district area. The Committee has continued to see an increase in the number of brand new premises with new operators in connection with redevelopment in the central city and, to a more limited extent, in the suburbs.

Redevelopment of the long-established pre-earthquake hospitality area along Oxford Terrace has progressed in the last year and trading is expected to commence in late 2017. Previous trends of development and demographic changes in suburban hospitality hubs has significantly slowed and settled over 2016-17. The major redevelopment focus has grown significantly within the CBD areas.

There continues to be an increased focus on amenity and good order considerations and increasing community input into licence applications through public objections. In particular, there has been a significant increase in community concerns and public objections in relation to applications for new bottle store off-licences in suburban areas of the city.

The implementation of the new alcohol licensing regime from December 2013 has significantly changed the regulatory processes associated with licensing decision making. Both the level of information required from applicants and the minimum standard expected in terms of an applicants’ knowledge and understanding of their obligations under the Act have increased. We are also continuing to see new licensees who have not previously operated in hospitality or under the new legislation.

In addition to meeting more rigorous reporting requirements, more detailed information about the licensing process has been provided to applicants to guide them through the new regime (including web and newsletter content).

To assist in ensuring that the legislative changes are properly understood by new operators and applicants for new premises licences, early engagement via pre-application meetings is encouraged and lodge meetings with inspectors are mandatory.

Inspectors held 181 lodge meetings for new applications in this reporting year. This included new licensees and new premises operations, as well as changes in ownership of existing premises. This service aims to ensure sufficiency of applications and to increase applicant understanding of the Acts obligations on the licensee and DLC licensing decision-making processes. This is a prevention first tool, where improved education and establishment of expectations at the first point of contact raises compliance levels across all licenced premises.

The number of special licence applications continues to be high, with 1,161 applications made during the reporting year. This continues to reflect the loss of function venues across the City and is representative of a significant number of events being held on Club premises for non-members. In 2016-17 there also continued to be a number of larger sized music festival and community events (including street festivals) which are becoming permanent annual fixtures in the city.

The central city (the CBD area within the four avenues) area has continued to see growth in the number of licensed premises with 145 on-licences now in this area as of 1 July 2017. However, these numbers are yet to return to pre-earthquake numbers of 282 for on-licences in the CBD.

New premises applications are trending towards permanent structures, established (where necessary) through the resource consent processes in accordance with District Plan requirements. A number of premises subject to Temporary Accommodation Permits (TAP’s) immediately following the earthquakes have now relocated (or are in the process of relocating) to permanent sites within the central city area, the remaining small number of licenced premises that are subject to a TAP have had the expiry date extended out to 2021.

The Victoria Street precinct has continued to see growth in the number of licensed premises seeking 3am licences in direct conflict to the wishes of the local residents. Residents’ concerns centre around the late night, 3am, closure of many premises and the impact on good order and amenity to adjacent
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residential areas. There are currently around 38 licences on Victoria Street (including the Carlton Corner area). Applications for new licences and the renewal of existing licences continue to attract resident’s discontent and concerns. No applications have been declined by the DLC for this area.

The central city hospitality precinct areas (where a number of premises with late-night, 3am, closing hours are located) continue to repopulate in the areas of Victoria, New Regent Street, High Street, Allen Street, Manchester Street and St Asaph Street. The area along Oxford Terrace, previously known as “The Strip” pre-earthquake, is expected to commence reopening over coming months and will see two separate large developments open with around 14 premises (a combination of small and large) in total. This area is expected to again become a significant late night entertainment area for the city.

The repopulation of late night entertainment activity in some precinct areas, particularly along St Asaph Street, is attracting the typical concerns associated with late-night economy areas. In particular the concerns related to people migration, amenity and good order, litter, breach of liquor bars, transportation and public safety (including those raised by reporting agencies) around late night traffic behaviour, and the sufficiency of late night taxi-stands for this area.

For the Christchurch City Council area as whole, the number of current licences now shows a steady but slow increase to 629 as of 1 July 2017. This number has increased from 590 in the previous reporting year, but remains a considerable reduction from the peak of 1149 in 2011.

The number of changes in ownership of premises also continues to be relatively high with around 20 premises trading under current Temporary Authorities at any one time while changes in licensees for existing alcohol licences are completed. The number of current manager’s certificates held for the Christchurch DLC area remains steady now but has increased slightly in the last year with around 3590, up from 3455 in the previous year.

With the new fees regime now entering its fourth year, costs associated with administering the District’s alcohol licensing activities are cost recovered from licencing fees. However, there remains a continuing impact overall on licencing fees income, due to total licence numbers remaining lower than pre-earthquake numbers.

2. DLC District Initiatives

Controlled Purchase Operations

There were two Controlled Purchase Operations (CPO’s) carried out during the year, resulting in 47 premises being visited. Both CPO’s were conducted using minors. Of the 47 premises visited, three premises (all on-licences) sold to a minor in breach of the Act resulting in applications being referred to the Authority. The typical suspension periods recommended vary depending on the type of licence and whether this is a first offence and are made in accordance with ARLA guidelines.

Alcohol Accords for precinct areas

Work has been continuing with the hospitality industry and a number of other partners to strengthen alcohol accords to cover the main hospitality areas of the city. This work continues to be driven within precinct cluster areas and led by the hospitality industry. The various precinct accords have developed to meet the particular needs of the licensees and characteristics of the hospitality areas in which they are situated. This has worked well as various parts of the city have unique issues in the current rebuild and re-establishment environment. Work is also currently underway for a BYO Accord. The Accords also support a set of minimum standards which licensees must sign up to in order to become an accord member.

The Victoria Street Accord has been in place since early 2014. The Addington (Lincoln Road) Accord was reinstated this year with a focus on premises collaboration on managing this hospitality precinct area when large events are held at venues in the locality, such as at AMI Stadium, Horncastle Arena, and Addington Racourse.

Current efforts are being directed at supporting the St Asaph Street Accord which has developed as a late night precinct hot spot. The focus for this area is the management of the large numbers of people lingering in the area when leaving, or who can’t get access to, the bars. This year we have run a pilot
initiative involving multiparty collaboration with the Taxi Federation, Police, Land Transport New Zealand, and the Council Parking Enforcement and Alcohol Licensing teams with premises and their security. The goal being to foster improved communication between premises, security, taxis, and the public in order to discourage illegal parking in taxi stands, improve better taxi movement, and ensure pedestrian and traffic safety in the area as the public come and go. The programme has resulted in better parking compliance, increased education of taxi drivers, and increased safety for the area.

A new Terrace Accord group has recently formed and is being led by the licensees. The Terrace is the new name for the area that was formally known as “The Strip” along Oxford Terrace. There are 17 plus proposed hospitality venues already committed to open in this area over the coming months. A prevention first approach has been adopted for this area by proactively initiating the Accord before the area fully reopens. The Accord will help to ensure all proposed premises establishing in this area have systems and protocols in place to support members working together to proactively minimise any potential for adverse effects of the pending significant increase in late-night entertainment activity reappropriating this area. This Accord also marks a new inclusive approach with members including not only the prospective licensees, but also the developers and building owners.

3. Local Alcohol Policy

Christchurch City Council began the development of a Local Alcohol Policy under the Act in early 2013. Public consultation of the draft Local Alcohol Policy document was completed at the end of June 2013. Public Hearings were held in July 2013. Notification of the provisional LAP was deferred awaiting the outcome of appeals against other territorial authority policies. On 28 May 2015 Council approved notification of the Provisional LAP. Nineteen appeals were received by ARLA, and an additional eight parties have been granted “interested party” status to be heard at the appeal hearings.

The Council entered a mediation process in 2016, and subsequently 17 out of the 19 appeals were settled. The Council filed a resubmitted provisional LAP with ARLA in October 2016, and 2 new appeals were filed. A number of parties were again granted interested party status. In December 2016, one of the appeal’s files was judicially reviewed and in the High Court in relation to the LAP processes in determining the form of the resubmitted provisional LAP. In June 2017, the High Court found in favour of the applicant and stayed the current appeals to the resubmitted provisional LAP before ARLA.

The DLC look forward to the final outcome of the LAP process which is anticipated to provide guidance and a measure of certainty around some aspects of alcohol licensing for all parties involved in the licencing application processes.

4. Current legislation

We wish to comment on the following matters (in addition to those noted in previous reports):

s211 Decision to be given in writing

There is a lack of clarity in relation to section 211 of the Act and to whom copies of decisions are required to be provided. It would be desirable to clarify that copies of the decisions (whether or not the matter has been determined at a hearing) should be provided to the inspectors, Police and the Medical Officer of Health.

s40 Remote Sellers and ‘premises’ requirements and s8 definition of ‘premises’.

Clarification of the definition of “premises” as applies to “online” remote sellers is desirable. For online remote sales, business promotion and sales activities can be run from a laptop or a cloud based.

The product purchased maybe dispatched by a third party (and often from a separate storage location).

The determination of the “premises” address for the location of the licence is unclear as the lap top/webpage can be managed by the licensee from any physical location. Technically, it’s likely that the relevant location is the webpage url not a physical street address. A “premises location” as stated on the licence is separate from a physical “address for service” for the licensee.

Managers Certificate Form 18, prescribed forms in the Regulations
The use of legal jargon in the prescribed wording relating to currency and renewal requirements for manager's certificates is confusing for applicants. This would benefit from updating into plain English wording.

5. Any other matters the TA wishes to draw to the attention of the Authority

Alcohol related Bylaws

Christchurch has the Christchurch City Council Alcohol Restrictions in Public Places Bylaw which came into force on 1 July 2009. There are currently 13 permanent Alcohol Ban areas, the most recent areas came into force on 9 September 2012 in Papanui and Merivale.

A one-day temporary ban for Cup Day at Addington Raceway was successfully implemented in November 2013 and repeated again in each successive year. A similar one-day temporary ban for an area around Riccarton Park Racecourse for the New Zealand Cup was implemented for November 2015 and again in 2016. The Council has approved another temporary alcohol ban in the Riccarton Racecourse area on New Zealand Cup Day for November 2017. The Alcohol Ban By-Laws will be coming up for review in the coming year.

Safer Christchurch

The Safer Christchurch Strategy was recently reviewed and refreshed by Council, with reaccreditation being achieved in 2016. Safer Christchurch continues to prioritise alcohol harm minimisation. In September 2016 the Governance Group determined that Alcohol and Drug Harm minimisation was a priority area for Safer Christchurch. The Goals of the Safer Christchurch Strategy will address aspects of this priority.

Alcohol Strategy - Christchurch Alcohol Action Plan

In 2013 Christchurch City Council undertook extensive consultation on a draft Local Alcohol Policy (LAP) which elicited more than 4000 submissions. A large number of submitters raised concerns and suggested initiatives outside the scope of a LAP to address alcohol related harm. Consequently the Council resolved (October 2013) to "Undertake an Alcohol Strategy and/or other collaborative initiatives, as a wider means of minimising alcohol related harm in the community". In 2014 the newly elected Council endorsed the development of an Alcohol Strategy.

Council has been in consultation with partner agencies, including a workshop in late 2015 that the Christchurch City Council supported. A draft discussion document (February 2016) was developed titled the 'Christchurch Alcohol Action Plan' (CAAP). The principal agencies within the CAAP include Christchurch City Council, Canterbury District Health Board and the NZ Police.

There has been significant progress on this collaborative document and a final draft was consulted on at a further workshop in July 2017. Policy work is continuing on the development of this inter-agency ‘strategy’ with the Safer Christchurch Interagency Group taking a governance role.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design – CPTED

The Council's CPTED specialist advisor completed two CPTED reports on licensed premises during the reporting period. The Alcohol Licensing team commissioned a report for the St Asaph Street Precinct and surrounding CBD area to assist with providing information on, and assessment of, potential alcohol related harm in public spaces to inform DLC in its decision making on licence applications in this area.

The Council's CPTED advisor noted that up to thirty other CPTED reports were commissioned during the year for non-licensing purposes that also considered the impact of licensed premises on study sites.

Tri-Agency Collaboration

The Christchurch Licensing Inspectors, NZ Police, and Community and Public Health officers have maintained a strong working relationship as the Tri-Agency Group. This includes weekly meetings, controlled purchase operations, inter-agency monitoring teams and collaboration on alcohol related harm initiatives, such as licensee education and support for alcohol accords. The Christchurch Inspectors have also provided monitoring and support for other inspectors from neighbouring Territorial...
Authority areas within the wider Tri-Agency region. An annual District Licensing Group training workshop was held in March 2017, hosted by the Police and supported by the Health Promotion Agency, and included agencies from the West Coast, Ashburton and Timaru.

The Tri-Agency Group continues to use a Licensed Premises risk assessment methodology approach to support the identification of monitoring priorities. One focus in recent years has been developing a coordinated approach to monitoring large events, including pre and post event liaison with licensees, such as for the Wine and Food and Beer festivals, large music concerts, and during Cup Week.

Christchurch Licensing Inspectors also continue to maintain a collaborative working relationship with other City Council officers in relation to health licensing, environmental (noise), and other regulatory and compliance issues (building, planning, consenting, and leasing areas) that touch on alcohol licensing matters. In the last year, in collaboration with these other teams in Council, the Alcohol Licensing Team developed an information sheet for hospitality property developers, building owners and prospective tenants. The aim is to provide information to inform of potential licensing and compliance considerations for building developments and proposed future business operations of potential tenants. This prevention first approach to educate and inform these parties early about licensing considerations and timelines.

The Tri-Agency Group continues to collaboratively deliver education sessions for licensees, managers, and staff to assist and increase their understanding of their obligations and responsibilities under their premises licence conditions. These sessions are delivered regularly at the invitation of institution providers for the Licence Controller Qualification (LCQ) in the Christchurch area. Onsite sessions are also provided for licenced premises as part of a graduated enforcement and the risk based compliance strategy approach followed by the Inspectors.

The Christchurch Tri-Agency newsletter has now become a quarterly publication. The format was revamped last year and the newsletter is now emailed to all stakeholders by the Secretariat. This avenue of communication has also been utilised to assist with communication of other prevention information, such as Police guidance about cash handling, environmental layout of premises and safety for licensees following the recent aggravated robberies in Christchurch.

Liaison with other agencies and groups

The Christchurch Alcohol Licensing Team has also had regular contact with the Department of Internal Affairs, the Ministry for Business, Innovation and Enterprise (MBIE), ACC, Health Promotion Agency (HPA), Hospitality Standard Institute, Hotel Association of NZ, Hospitality New Zealand (HANZ), the Restaurant Association, and Workingmen’s Clubs NZ.

6. Statistical information

Please see attached Territorial Authority statistical and fees return for applications received during the reporting year ending 30 June 2017. As of 30 June 2017, in the Christchurch Territorial Authority area there were 829 current premises licences (on, off, club) and 3591 manager certificate holders.

Allison Houston
Team Leader Alcohol Licensing
Regulatory Compliance Unit
On Behalf of the Secretary, Christchurch City Council District Licensing Committee
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End of Year Financial return for ARLA:

TERRITORIAL AUTHORITY - Christchurch City Council

Return for year ending - 30 Jun 2017

Application fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number accepted in fee category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club licence new</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club licence renewal</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club licence variation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-licence new</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-licence renewal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-licence variation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-licence new</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-licence renewal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-licence variation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fee paid to ARLA (GST incl)</td>
<td>$465.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number paid in fee category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club licence</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off licence</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On licence</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fee paid to ARLA (GST incl)</td>
<td>$1759.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Managers' certificate applications accepted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fee paid to ARLA (GST incl)</td>
<td>$54337.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of year report for ARLA - Christchurch District Licensing Committee 2016-2017
### Special licence applications accepted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special licence</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Temporary authority applications accepted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary authority applications</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Permanent club charter payments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent club charter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total paid to ARLA (GST incl)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total paid to ARLA (GST incl)</td>
<td>$124,251.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*End of year report for ARLA - Christchurch District Licensing Committee 2016-2017*
## Appendix 2

**TERRITORIAL AUTHORITY:** Christchurch

**ANNUAL REPORT** of licensing income from fees payable, and costs incurred: Reporting year ending 30 June 2017

As required under Regulation 19 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol (Fees) Regulations 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Income from Licensing Fees (less fees payable to ARLA)</th>
<th>Costs incurred from Licensing activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s19(1)(a) District Licensing Committee (DLC) Performance of the functions of its committee under the Act</td>
<td>Includes all Commissioner costs, and Secretarial support/administrative costs associated with DLC functions, including hearings and transcription costs.</td>
<td>$284,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s19(1)(b) Licensing Inspectors Performance of the functions of its committee under the Act</td>
<td>Includes all Inspector costs and Secretarial support/administrative costs associated with: Promises Licences (ON/OFF/CLUB), Managers Certificates, Special Licences, Temporary Authorities, Permanent Charter Clubs, Certificates of Compliance (Alcohol)</td>
<td>$827,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s19(1)(c) Undertaking Enforcement (including Appeals) Activities under the Act</td>
<td>Includes all costs associated with: Monitoring and enforcement (under the VADE approach) activities and applications, related Education of licensees and managers, Liquor Ban By Law activities Appeals to ARLA and High Court, and associated legal costs.</td>
<td>$196,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,339,390</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,309,472</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of year report for ARLA - Christchurch District Licensing Committee 2016-2017
1. Purpose of Report

The Regulatory Performance Committee held a meeting on 13 September 2017 and is circulating the Minutes recorded to the Council for its information.

2. Recommendation to Council

That the Council receives the Minutes from the Regulatory Performance Committee meeting held 13 September 2017.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Minutes Regulatory Performance Committee - 13 September 2017</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aidan Kimberley - Committee and Hearings Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regulatory Performance Committee
OPEN MINUTES

Date: Wednesday 13 September 2017
Time: 9am
Venue: Committee Room 1, Level 2, Civic Offices,
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

Present
Chairman
Councillor David East
Deputy Chairman
Councillor Jamie Gough
Members
Councillor Jimmy Chen
Councillor Anne Galloway
Councillor Glenn Livingstone
Councillor Tim Scandrett
Councillor Sara Templeton

12 September 2017

Principal Advisor
Leonie Rae
General Manager Consenting & Compliance

Aidan Kimberley
Committee and Hearings Advisor
941 6566
aidan.kimberley@ccc.govt.nz
www.ccc.govt.nz

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:
www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/meetingminutes/agendas/index
The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**

   **Committee Resolved RPCM/2017/00025**

   That the apology for lateness from Councillor Gough be accepted.

   Councillor Templeton/Councillor Livingstone

   **Carried**

2. **Declarations of Interest**

   **Part B**

   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**

   **Part C**

   **Committee Resolved RPCM/2017/00026**

   **Committee Decision**

   That the minutes of the Regulatory Performance Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 26 July 2017 be confirmed.

   Councillor Livingstone/Councillor Chen

   **Carried**

4. **Presentation of Petitions**

   **Part B**

   There was no presentation of petitions.

5. **Regulatory Compliance Unit Status Report**

   **Committee Resolved RPCM/2017/00027**

   **Part C**

   1. That the Regulatory Performance Committee receive the information in this report.

   Councillor Chen/Councillor Scandrett

   Councillor Gough joined the meeting at 09:24 am.

   **Carried**
4. Deputations by Appointment

Part B

4.1 Anna Youngman and Dr Kelvin Duncan addressed the Committee on behalf of the Yaldhurst Rural Residents’ Association regarding the health impacts from dust associated with quarries.

7. Adoption of the Annual Report for ARLA for period ending 30 June 2017

Committee Decided RPCM/2017/00028

Part A

That the Regulatory Performance Committee recommends that the Council:

1. Receive the information in this report.
2. Adopt the 2016/17 Annual Report to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority as set out in Attachment A, pursuant to section 199 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

Councillor Gough/Councillor Scandrett  
Carried

8. Building Consenting Unit Update - September 2017

Committee Resolved RPCM/2017/00029

Part C

1. That the Regulatory Performance Committee receive the information in this report.

Councillor Scandrett/Councillor Chen  
Carried


Committee Resolved RPCM/2017/00030

Part C

1. That Regulatory Performance Committee receive the information in this report.

Councillor Gough/Councillor Scandrett  
Carried

Meeting concluded at 10:05am.

CONFIRMED THIS 11TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2017

COUNCILLOR DAVID EAST  
CHAIRMAN
22. New Central Library Naming

Reference: 17/929031
Contact: Carolyn Robertson Carolyn.Robertson@ccc.govt.nz 941 7841

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Council to approve the permanent name recommended by the Executive Leadership Team for the new Central Library.

2. Significance

2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the level of community interest in the building as a metro facility and there is both some risk and some opportunities for Council in giving the facility a non-traditional name.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation with Ngāi Tahu and Plato Creative outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Council:

1. Approve the proposed permanent name for the new central library:
   a. That this name be Tūranga; the Māori name gifted by Matapopore and Ngāi Tūhāhuriri
2. Note that an English descriptor, A Place of Discovery, will be used for communications and marketing purposes where applicable.

4. Key Points

4.1 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2015 - 2025):

4.1.1 Activity: Libraries

- Level of Service: 3.1.2 Residents have access to a physical and digital library relevant to local community need or profile

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Matapopore and Ngāi Tūhāhuriri have gifted a Māori name, Tūranga, to the new building
- Council engaged a creative agency to undertake primary and secondary research to determine a suitable name, and naming convention.

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- It gives effect to Council’s partnering relationship with Te Hononga and the appropriate Mana Whenua rūnanga, strengthening our commitment to our on-going bi-cultural relationship
It reflects the qualities of a good name:

- Meaningful, brings out the essence of the brand, the image of the organisation
- Distinctive, easy to remember, pronounce and spell
- Future-oriented, positions the organisation for growth and change
- Modular, will work within any naming convention
- Protectable, we own it
- Positive, should have positive associations
- Visual, could provide cues towards a graphic presentation

3.1.1.1.1.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- No disadvantages were identified

5. **Context/Background**

**New Central Library Naming**

5.1 A permanent name needs to be agreed for the new Central Library which will open to the public in approximately one year. To date the project has been using working titles, including “New Central Library” and “Knowledge Centre”, for different purposes.

5.2 There are diverse perceptions and opinions within the community and amongst key stakeholders as to what a library is, its relevance and value in the 21st century. The Council is keen to convey that the new facility and service will redefine the stereotype of a library and play a transformational role for Christchurch citizens. In short, the new library will be “so much more than just a place with books.”

5.3 Matapopore and Ngāi Tūāhuriri have gifted a Māori name, Tūranga, to the new building. In terms of the cultural narrative, Tūranga reflects the relationship with Whitireia, the traditional name for the Cathedral Square. In oral tradition Whitireia was the name of Paikea’s house, Paikea being the ancestor who travelled here on the back of a whale. Tūranga was where Paikea’s house was located.

**Background Information**

5.4 Plato Creative was engaged earlier this year to assist Council with the development of a name and naming convention that would inform the approach to communications and marketing for the new library.

5.5 Plato undertook desk research to identify best practice examples of naming and brand identity for libraries in New Zealand and overseas. The second phase involved targeted ethnographic research, the results of which were organised into three broad groupings: general public; business sector and educators, academics and libraries. People were asked questions to elicit their views on the role and relevance of libraries today, whether and how people use libraries and how they could be made more relevant and/or attractive.

5.6 Feedback from the research was used to identify issues, conduct a gap analysis, then produce a name and strapline that would be meaningful, enduring and help to position the new library in a positive and engaging way with the public.

5.7 The outcome is a proposed naming convention comprising the gifted Māori name with an English descriptor:
Tūranga – Maori name gifted by Matapopore and Ngāi Tūāhuriri

A Place of Discovery – conveys the concept of the 21st century library service.

5.8 It is anticipated that over time there would be less requirement to use the English descriptor. For this reason it may only be appropriate to use the English descriptor in places that can be modified over time e.g. signage or the website, as opposed to permanent placements on buildings.

5.9 The key elements:

- The official Māori name, Tūranga, which denotes the place of the library within Cathedral Square and celebrates our unique cultural heritage.
- An English descriptor, A Place of Discovery, conveys the concept that the new facility and services will redefine the traditional stereotype of a library, while expressing the notion that libraries are, and always have been, places of discovery and learning. This could be used for communications and marketing purposes where applicable.

5.10 The name of an institution should be enduring and not subject to fad or whim.

5.11 The addition of a strapline allows us to re-imagine the role of an entity and add a future-focused angle.

5.12 A strapline:

5.12.1 Can be a series of words that collectively redefine the role of a library today, e.g.:

- “Read, learn, discover” – Chicago Public Library
- “Spread the words” – Edmonton Public Library

5.12.2 Can be changed over time or be totally removed once people understand and ‘get it’.
6. Option 1 - Tūranga

Option Description
6.1 Tūranga – Maori name gifted by Matapopore and Ngāi Tūāhuriri

A Place of Discovery – an English descriptor to be used for communications and marketing and applicable.

Significance
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.
6.3 The community engagement and consultation with Ngāi Tahu and Plato outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

This name was gifted and endorsed by Ngāi Tūhahuriri Rūnanga.

Community Views and Preferences
6.5 Customer research conducted by Plato Creative was used to inform the suggested naming convention.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.6 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies, including the Branding policy.

Risks and Mitigations
6.7 Risk: The working title Knowledge Centre has been used in earlier presentations and communications with philanthropic partners.

Mitigation: Provide partners with rationale for the naming convention. Ensure regular updates are provided to key stakeholders.

Risk: Visitors to the city will not necessarily know Tūranga is a public library. Due to the longevity and universality of the brand, people implicitly understand what the word “library” means. Without the functional, descriptive component on the building, wayfinding and signage, visitors to the city are more likely to need assistance finding “the library.” Also, existing library customers and stalwarts of the traditional library concept may have a negative reaction to the removal of the word.

Mitigation: Effective communications, marketing and wayfinding signage would need to clearly reinforce Tūranga’s purpose and function. A rationale or response would need to be developed for the public as to why “library” was not part of the name (contrary to the naming convention for other Council libraries).

3.1.2. Residual risk rating: the rating of the risk is Low.

Implementation
6.8 Implementation dependencies - The confirmed name will form the basis for a comprehensive marketing and communications strategy. The primary purposes of this strategy will be to raise awareness of the library’s progress and unique features, shape perceptions about the step-change in its service offerings and the role of modern public libraries, and build excitement and anticipation about its return to the city centre.

6.9 Implementation timeframe – the marketing and communications strategy will be rolled out between now and the library’s opening mid-next year. A marketing budget has been allocated so
that city-wide public branding and promotional activities can begin to take place, particularly from the start of next year, in the six-month lead-up to the opening. Where possible, these activities will look to leverage existing community events to raise awareness and engage a cross-section of audiences.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

6.10 The advantages of this option include: the name is strong, memorable and tells a clear story of the Library’s role, place and purpose.

The disadvantages of this option include: No disadvantages have been identified.

**Attachments**

There are no attachments to this report.

**Confirmation of Statutory Compliance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) This report contains:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Carolyn Robertson - Head of Libraries and Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Mary Richardson - General Manager Citizen and Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update on progress of the Taylors Mistake Bach Working Party and to recommend revocation and amendment of two previous resolutions.

Origin of Report
1.2 The report is made at the request of the Working Party as the Council’s resolution of 22 June 2017 directed the Working Party to report back to Council by 30 September 2017.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by consideration of the negligible effect of the decisions on any person, given the early stages of the Council’s process for considering the current issues regarding occupation of unformed road.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Council:
1. Receive the information in this report;
2. Amend Council Resolution 25 Part 1(a) of 22 June 2017 to include Hobsons Bay and delete Maori Gardens, so that the resolution is:
   To recommend to the Council, as land owner, whether to authorise, and on what terms to authorise, baches to continue to occupy Council land at Taylors Mistake, Hobsons Bay and Boulder Bay;
3. Revoke paragraphs (c), (d), (e) and (f) of the Council’s resolution of 23 July 2010 for item 26 Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay Baches.

4. Key Points

4.1 The Working Party is at the information gathering stage and will soon be engaging with interested parties on the issues for the Council as landowner.

4.2 The geographical areas of interest for the Working Party should be amended to be Taylors Mistake, Hobsons Bay and Boulder Bay, as the issues related to structures on Council land at Maori Gardens and elsewhere are likely to be different.

4.3 It is appropriate that the Council alters its 23 July 2010 resolution by revoking those paragraphs not relevant to the working party’s deliberations. Paragraphs (c), (d), (e) and (f) give effect to provisions that are no longer in the City Plan.
5. Background

5.1 Council established the Working Party for the purposes of making a recommendation to the Council, as land owner, whether to authorise, and on what terms to authorise, baches to continue to occupy Council land at Taylors Mistake, Boulder Bay and Maori Gardens (Resolution 25 part 1(a) of 22 June 2017, which mirrored the resolution that established a previous Working Party on 11 December 2014).

5.2 At the time of preparing this report the Working Party has met twice and has conducted a site visit. The Working Party is at the information gathering stage prior to establishing its process for taking account of the views and preferences of its communities.

5.3 Relevant information being gathered includes that related to: hazards; public access; infrastructure services; landscape and visual effects; legal issues; heritage; and strategic planning matters. The Working Party is conscious of possible overlaps between work on these landowner issues and other high level planning matters in the Council – such as the Heritage Strategy, or consideration of coastal hazards – and will be considering any broader implications in relation to its recommendations on these baches.

5.4 The Working Party meeting on 22 September 2017 will receive staff advice on, and decide on, the process for engaging with interested parties. The result of that meeting will be reported when this report is presented to Council.

5.5 With regard to the bach areas that are the focus of its work, the Working Party considers that the issues in relation to Taylors Mistake, Hobsons Bay (adjacent to Taylors Mistake) and Boulder Bay are best addressed together, and separate from consideration of issues related to structures on Council land elsewhere in the District. Maori Gardens is geographically separate. There is no need to group it with consideration of the issues related to the occupation of the Council’s unformed road at Taylors Mistake, Hobsons Bay and Boulder Bay. Structures on Council land at Maori Gardens would be considered if the Council in the future requires a wider assessment of any issues arising in relation to private structures on Council land.

5.6 As a result, the Working Party and staff recommend an amendment to the geographical areas of the baches being considered by the Working Party.

5.7 As staff have noted, there was a Council resolution on 23 June 2010 which implemented provisions in the then-current City Plan which have now been superseded by the new District Plan.

5.8 An Environment Court decision of 2003 had determined the relevant content of the City Plan, in a manner broadly supported by the Council. Those provisions scheduled some baches to remain, deemed others to be prohibited, and provided for a bach zone into which baches could be relocated or rebuilt.

5.9 Council’s resolution for item 26 Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay Baches on 23 July 2010 was:

That the Council resolves to:

(a) Receive the information about planning procedures contained in the staff report.

(b) Rescind the resolution passed by the Council on 22 April 2010 that:

(i) All baches be retained whilst

(ii) Council staff report back on planning procedures to effect (i)

(c) Confirm that it give effect to the Environment Court 2003 decision regarding the baches which is now incorporated into the City Plan.

(d) Request the Taylors Mistake Association to take immediate steps to:
(i) Prepare a planting concept plan for the TMB zone to the satisfaction of the Council.

(ii) Issue the fee simple and leasehold titles in the TMB zone in accordance with the provisions in the City Plan.

(iii) Transfer the land contained in CT35B/158 and that land contained in CT35B/160 to the east and south of the TMB zone up to and in line with the edge of the western boundary of the TMB zone to the Council for no further consideration, to be vested in the Council as recreation reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.

(iv) Confirm the Association’s undertaking on behalf of affected bach owners that immediately upon fulfilment of the conditions in (d)(i) to (iii) above, all unscheduled baches will be removed.

That the Council also resolves to:

(e) Authorise the Chief Executive to negotiate and to enter into licences to occupy with the owners of the baches scheduled to remain at Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay on such terms and conditions as he considers appropriate.

(f) Note that the Council’s decision to grant licences in respect of baches at Taylors Mistake and Boulders Bay is not an indication that such licences will automatically be granted in other situations where unauthorised structures have been built on land vested in the Council as legal road.

5.10 As the District Plan now has different provisions, and some owners of baches which were then scheduled as prohibited activities have established existing use rights under the Resource Management Act 1991, the Working Party and staff recommend that paragraphs (c), (d), (e) and (f) of the 2010 resolution be revoked.

5.11 It is for the Working Party to consider whether to recommend to the Council as landowner that it should licence or require removal of any baches having regard to the changed physical and legal environment.

5.12 Standing Order 19.6 provides that revocation or alteration of a resolution at a previous Council meeting “…can only be on a recommendation in a report by the chairperson, chief executive, or any community or community board…” . The Chief Executive has seen this report and recommends the resolutions set out in this report.

Attachments
There are no attachments to this report.

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance
Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.
### Signatories

| Authors                      | Kristine Bouw - Project Manager  
|                             | Brent Pizzey - Senior Solicitor  
|                             | Ian Thomson - Senior Legal Advisor, Governance |
| Approved By                 | David Adamson - General Manager City Services  
|                             | Carolyn Gallagher - Programme Director – Strategic Support |
1. **Purpose and Origin of Report**

**Purpose of Report**
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider the applications for funding from their 2017/18 Discretionary Response Fund from the organisations listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Request Number</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57016</td>
<td>Special Olympics Canterbury</td>
<td>Providing Sports Training for People of all Ages with an Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>$60,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57026</td>
<td>St John of God Hauora Trust (Waipuna)</td>
<td>Staffing for Youth at Risk and Vulnerable Youth</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56275</td>
<td>Te Roopu Kaiako Kura Tuarua Waitaha Trust</td>
<td>Waitaha Secondary Schools Regional Kapa Haka Competitions 2017</td>
<td>$22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57037</td>
<td>Toimata Foundation</td>
<td>Enviroschools Christchurch</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Origin of Report**
1.2 This report is to assist the Council to consider an application for funding from Special Olympics Canterbury, St John of God Hauora Trust (Waipuna), Te Roopu Kaiako Kura Tuarua Waitaha Trust and Toimata Foundation.

2. **Significance**

2.1 The decision(s) in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the number of people affected and/or with an interest.

2.1.2 Due to the assessment of low significance, no further community engagement and consultation is required.

3. **Staff Recommendations**

That the Council:

1. Approves a grant of $20,000 to Special Olympics Canterbury towards Sporting Opportunities for People with Intellectual Disabilities for venue hire.

2. Declines a grant to St John of God Hauora Trust (Waipuna) for staffing for youth at risk and vulnerable youth.

3. Approves a grant of $10,000 to Te Roopu Kaiako Kura Tuarua Waitaha Trust towards Waitaha Secondary Schools Regional Kapa Haka Competitions 2017.

4. Declines a grant to Toimata Foundation for Enviroschools Christchurch.
4. **Key Points**

4.1 At the time of writing, the balance of the Discretionary Response Fund is as detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Budget 2017/18</th>
<th>Granted To Date</th>
<th>Available for allocation</th>
<th>Balance If Staff Recommendation adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$225,635</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$207,135</td>
<td>$177,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 The total budget consists of $155,519 opening budget, $116 of unspent funds transferred from the 2017/18 Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund and $70,000 transferred from the 2017/18 Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund to be set aside for specific applications which may be considered from this fund if other options currently being investigated are not appropriate.

4.3 Based on the current Discretionary Response Fund criteria, the applications listed above are eligible for funding.

4.4 The attached Decision Matrix provides detailed information for the applications. This includes organisational details, project details, financial information and a staff assessment.

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2017/18 Metropolitan Discretionary Response Fund Decision Matrix September 2017</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Confirmation of Statutory Compliance**

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

(i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and

(ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Thompson - Community Funding Advisor</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Pursey - Team Leader Community Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved By</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lester Wolfreys - Head of Community Support, Governance and Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Richardson - General Manager Citizen and Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2017/18 DRF METROPOLITAN DECISION MATRIX

### Council
28 September 2017

#### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Name and Description</th>
<th>Funding History</th>
<th>Request Budget</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics Canterbury</td>
<td>Providing Sports Training for People with an Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>2016/17 - $25,000 (Venue Hire) SCF</td>
<td>$68,300</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics Canterbury (SOC) offers sporting opportunities to people of all ages with an intellectual disability. They offer weekly/senior training in 10 different sports including: Basketball, Athletics, Swimming, Ten Pin Bowling, Football, Equestrian, Golf, Indoor Bowls, Skiing and Power Lifting.</td>
<td>2015/16 - $25,000 (Venue and Volunteers) SCF</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15 - $25,000 (Venue and Volunteers) SCF</td>
<td>Other Sources of Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer Costs - $1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14 - $25,000 (Venue and Volunteers) SCF</td>
<td>Funds on Hand - $10,000, User Fees - $30,000</td>
<td>Overheads - $4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisation Details:
- Service Base: 4 Smugglers Cove, Summer
- Legal Status: Incorporated Society
- Established: 1/01/1983
- Staff: Paid
- Volunteers: 80
- Annual Volunteer Hours: 4500
- Participants: 420
- Target Groups: Disability
- Networks: Volunteering Canterbury, Special Olympics New Zealand

### Organisation Description/Objectives:
- Special Olympics Canterbury offers year round sports training and competition for people of all ages with an intellectual disability. Training is organised weekly, fortnightly or seasonally depending on the sport's requirements.

### Alignment with Council Strategies and Board Objectives:
- Equity and Access for People with Disabilities Policy
- Strengthening Communities Strategy
- Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy
- Recreation and Sport Policy

### Alignment with Council Funding Outcomes:
- Support, develop and promote capacity
- Community participation and awareness
- Increase community engagement
- Provide community based programs
- Reduce or overcome barriers
- Foster collaborative responses

### How Much Will The Project Do? (Measures):
Offer weekly sport training in 10 sports including: Basketball, Athletics, Swimming, Ten Pin Bowling, Football, Equestrian, Golf, Indoor Bowls, Skiing and Power Lifting. Provide over 270 opportunities for participation each week. Provide Tier 1 competition in some sports (Basketball, Ten Pin Bowling, Indoor Bowls, Swimming and Athletics) Provide opportunities for athletes to compete at other club Tier 1 events in Mid Canterbury, North Canterbury and the West Coast.

### How Will Participants Be Better Off?
Participants will have specialised sports training suited to their individual needs. All athletes will experience improved confidence, increased social skills, the opportunity to achieve and gain recognition and the thrill of competition. Sports training will be provided at a very low cost. Families and volunteers gain many benefits being involved with the Special Olympics organisation.

### Staff Assessment
This project is recommended as a Priority One due to the large number of challenges already faced by this sector of the community to gain access to sporting and recreation activities and the strong alignment with Council funding priorities and strategies.

- The provision of sporting opportunities in a safe environment for people with intellectual disabilities is a specialised service. Special Olympics Canterbury (SOC) currently provides opportunities in ten sports in weekly or seasonal training sessions. Athletes attend regular competitions at local, regional, national and international levels. Over 270 opportunities are provided weekly to over 380 participants every year.

- The provision of sporting opportunities is a vital service for people with intellectual disabilities. It provides essential support and resources to help them achieve their goals and dreams. It is also a great way to increase social participation and create positive experiences for people with intellectual disabilities.

- The staff at Special Olympics Canterbury are dedicated and passionate about delivering high-quality services to their clients. They are committed to ensuring that every participant has a safe and enjoyable experience.

- Special Olympics Canterbury actively fundraises to assist sending individuals and teams to national and international events. They operate a four year cycle in competitions. Year One is local competitions, Year Two and Three are regional competitions and Year Four are the Special Olympics National Games.

- A team of 115 Canterbury athletes will attend the Special Olympics National games this year, travelling to Wellington in November 2017. Cost of entry and airfare is approximately $12,000.

- SOC has created an Athlete Committee which is aimed at mature athletes who have graduated from the national Athlete Leadership Programme. They seek new challenges and look for ways to utilise the wisdom that comes from their life and Special Olympic experiences.

- Volunteers are the backbone of the Special Olympics movement, all coaches, trainers, officials, managers and fundraisers are volunteer. There is only one employee, a full-time administrator who coordinates the day to day running of the sports, club finances and other activities.

- The group usually applies to the Strengthening Communities Fund but have stated in their application that they missed the deadline this year. Funding is recommended as the organisation lacks the financial resources to support the programmes applied for by without assistance.

- Staff will work with SOC to reduce reliance on Council funding by seeking more diverse funding streams.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rating</th>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Name and Description</th>
<th>Funding History</th>
<th>Request Budget</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Te Ropo Kaka Kura Tuanau Waitaha Trust</td>
<td>Waitaha Secondary Schools Regional Kapa Haka Competitions 2017</td>
<td>2013/14 - $20,000 (Kapa Haka Competition) DRF Metro</td>
<td>Total Cost: $30,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Sources of Funding: Funds on hand: $4,700, Registration Fees: $900, Sponsorship: $1,000, Other Grants: $1,000</td>
<td>Requested Amount: $22,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Organisation Details:
- Service Base: 30 Acacia Ave, Riccarton
- Legal Status: Charitable Trust
- Established: 1/01/2001
- Staff: 0
- Volunteers: 9
- Annual Volunteer Hours: 100
- Participants: 400
- Target Groups: Multicultural
- Networks: None

#### Organisation Description/Objectives:
- Promote Te reo Maori through activities organised by the Trust and to ensure the survival of Te Reo Maori.
- Promote Kapa Haka and Whakairo to fulfil the goals and objectives of the Trust.
- Assist in providing platforms to promote and encourage whakaeungaunanga among young Maori.

#### Alignment with Council Strategies and Board Objectives:
- Strengthening Communities Strategy
- Arts Policy and Strategy
- Youth Strategy

#### Alignment with Council Funding Outcomes:
- Support, develop and promote capacity
- Community participation and awareness
- Provide community-based programmes
- Reduce or overcome barriers
- Foster collaborative responses

#### How Much Will the Project Do? (Measures):
- Hold monthly meetings with committee to organise event, financially and logistically.
- Meeting with judges prior to competition
- Run and manage the event.

#### How Will Participants Be Better Off?
- Participants will build their kapa haka skills during the campaign and will have the opportunity to demonstrate this to the community.
- Participants will bond with other schools during the competition. Most kapa haka teams are composite teams and performing in and watching the competition will help to build networks and strengthen relationships among schools in Canterbury.

#### Staff Assurance
- This request is recommended as a Priority One due to its reach in the Maori community, the youth community and fit with various council strategy outcomes.
- The Secondary Schools Kapahaka Competition is a vehicle for young Maori to understand the discipline of the traditional Maori performing arts.
- Competitions for Kapahaka were introduced in the 1930s by the late Sir Apirana Ngata to promote and support cultural development and promotion of Te Reo Maori from within Maori communities.
- Kapahaka provides the opportunity to develop leadership skills through the various disciplines involved - choreography, composition, mentoring of younger students by older students, and running practices.
- Tutors of these groups are usually volunteers and often the young people within the group are responsible for running extra practices so that the contact time for tutors means maximum use of their expertise.
- Kapa haka provides the opportunity to develop leadership skills through the various disciplines involved - choreography, composition, mentoring of younger students by older students, and running practices.
- Tutors of groups are usually volunteers and often the young people of the group are responsible for running extra practices so that the contact time for tutors means maximum use of their expertise. The organisers of this event are all volunteers, as are the people who provide the stage and crew support for the event. Only the technicians provided by the Aurora Centre are paid as per the venue agreement.
- Kapa haka is an extracurricular activity with the participants practising outside of normal school hours and in weekends and holidays in order to prepare for their performance.
- This event is often sold out weeks before the date. It is the only event of its type in the city, a kaupapa Maori youth event for the wider community.
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**Priority Rating**
- One
- Two
- Three
- Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.: 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Organisation Details:
- **Service Base:** 189 Peterborough St, City
- **Legal Status:** Charitable Trust
- **Established:** 29/06/1993
- **Staff – Paid:** 187
- **Volunteers:** 30
- **Annual Volunteer Hours:** 1,150
- **Participants:** 1,000
- **Target Groups:** Children/Youth
- **Networks:** Canterbury Alcohol and Drug Advisory, ANDAS, NZAC, NZ Outdoors Instructors Asan, SSSB, Carity Youth Workers

#### Organisation Description/Objectives:
St John of God Haora Trust is a not-for-profit provider of youth and disability services that promote life to the full by enhancing the physical, intellectual, social and spiritual dimensions of being human. The Trust invites those they work with to discover the richness and fullness of their lives, giving them a reason to hope, and a greater sense of their own dignity.

#### Funding History
- **2016/17:** $1,500 (Carols by Treechord) SGP
- **2016/17:** $50,000 (Youth Services) SGP Metro
- **2015/16:** $1,000 (Carols by Treechord) DRF R/W
- **2015/16:** $50,000 (Salaries) SGP
- **2014/15:** $3,000 (Adventure Therapy Equipment) SGP
- **2014/15:** $3,000 (Play Centre Equipment) SGP
- **2014/15:** $50,000 (Salary Cost) SGP

#### Request Budget
- **Total Cost:** $1,408,320
- **Requested Amount:** $70,000
- **5% percentage requested**
- **Contribution Sought Towards:** Salaries/Wages - $70,000

#### Staff Recommendation
That the Council declines the application from St John of God Haora Trust (Waipuna) for Staffing for Youth at Risk Services.

#### Alignment with Council Strategies and Board Objectives
- Strengthening Communities Strategy
- Youth Strategy

#### Alignment with Council Funding Outcomes
- Community participation and awareness
- Enhance community and neighbourhood safety
- Provide community based programmes
- Reduce or overcome barriers

#### How Much Will The Project Do? (Measures)
- Provide young parents (mothers and fathers) development courses and social work, to work with at least 200 young people.
- Run 10 adventure therapy programmes courses.
- Provide Mental Health, Drug and Alcohol and Eating Disorder assessments/social work/counselling - target 600 young people.
- Provide specialist support and help to young people.

#### How Will Participants Be Better Off?
Waipuna services provides early intervention and addresses health and social issues. These issues can develop to have significant life-long impacts for them personally, their family and the wider community.
Waipuna services will encourage and support young people to:
- Improve their health and wellbeing
- Engage in violence free lifestyles
- Live drug and alcohol free lives
- Develop and demonstrate high personal resiliency
- Increase in meaningful and positive personal relationships
- Engage in active and positive support networks
- Embark on a pathway to lifelong learning, training, education and/or employment
- Participate in and contribute to community life and wider society.

#### Staff Assessment
This project is recommended as a Priority One, as it demonstrates best practice through the highly collaborative and integrated service model which is offered to clients and their families.

Community Youth and Child Services, St John of God Waipuna (Waipuna) is a specialist youth service provided by the St John of God Haora Trust.

Funding is sought for salary for specialist staff to deliver their services and programmes to young people most at risk.

Young Parent's Development: this service provides intensive social work support, educational and development programmes. These include specialised evidence based/ outcome focused pregnancy and parenting programmes for the most vulnerable young parents and their children.

Health and Wellbeing Service: this is a mental health, alcohol and drug (AOD) service providing assessment, as well as both short and medium term treatment (up to a year) to young people with mental health and addiction issues. Treatment includes one to one talking therapies and Adventure Therapy for difficult to engage clients often not reached by traditional models of treatment.

Community Development Service (Adventure Therapy): this is an individualised approach to allowing vulnerable young people to explore and develop their strengths in a supportive yet challenging environment through the outdoors and adventure activities. It is a strengths-based and relationship focused programme where outdoor activities are combined with facilitated self-reflection, intensive mentoring, and counselling to meet individual developmental needs. The programme aims to increase personal resilience through developing the skills, personal strengths, and relationships that each young person has to help them to get through life.

The funding request is for a contribution towards salary costs beyond that paid for by contracted services. It will meet service demand for at risk youth in addition to central government contracts.

Waipuna has engaged and worked with over a 1,000 complex and high needs young people and their whānau in the last year.

The group usually applies to the Strengthening Communities Fund but have stated to the Advisor that they missed the deadline this year.

Funding is not recommended as the group has sufficient reserves to continue their services.
2017/18 DRF METROPOLITAN DECISION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rating</th>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Name and Description</th>
<th>Funding History</th>
<th>Request Budget</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Tomata Foundation</td>
<td>Enviroschools Christchurch</td>
<td>2016/17 - $30,000 (Enviroschools SCF Y12)</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017/18 - $30,000 (Enviroschools SCF Y12)</td>
<td>Requested Amount: $30,000, 13% percentage requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/15 - $5,000 (Enviroschools SCF Y12)</td>
<td>Contribution Sought Towards: Salaries/Wages - $30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisation Details:
- Service Base: 293 Grey Street, Hamilton
- Legal Status: Charitable Trust
- Establish: 12/12/2003
- Staff - Paid: 12
- Volunteers: 0
- Annual Volunteer Hours: 2000
- Participants: 7,000
- Target Groups: Environment
- Networks: NZ Asian Environmental Education, Sustainable Business Network

Organisation Description/Objectives:
- A charitable trust that develops and supports nationwide educational programmes to bring about sustainability through learning and action. Programmes are collaborative, empowering and action-focused. The aim is to bring about a healthier, peaceful, more equitable world through learning, creativity and action.

Alignment with Council Strategies and Board Objectives

- Strengthening Communities Strategy
- Youth Strategy
- Physical Recreation and Sports Strategy
- Children’s Policy
- Sustainability Policy

Alignment with Council Funding Outcomes

- Support, develop and promote capacity
- Community participation and awareness
- Increase community engagement

How Much Will The Project Cost? (Measures)

Make regular contact with participating schools and centres for planning and support.

Work with participants to support 40 school level activity projects and six community level activity projects.

Run two, one-day sustainability workshops for teachers and students.

Organise and run an enviro leaders over-night camp.

How Will Participants Be Better Off?

Children and young people: Enviroschools enables young people to take real action on projects that they design. It is learning in a meaningful context that is fun and works educationally for a range of learning styles.

School staff are supported by a trained Enviroschools Facilitator who acts as a mentor. They have access to resources, tools and professional development in sustainability. Facilitators also support networking and peer support between schools in Christchurch City and the wider Canterbury region.

Whanau and the community: Enviroschools supports schools to be community hubs resulting in more connected communities, positive physical changes to local environments e.g. stream restoration, and sharing of knowledge and skills to make changes at home e.g. sharing a compost and vegetable garden. Communities invest their time and material resources into Enviroschools projects.

Staff Assessment

Enviroschools is a comprehensive sustainability education programme that is nationwide, and reaches schools and the wider community and is delivered locally through a collaborative partnership.

Enviroschools was launched nationally in 2001, and the Canterbury network was established in 2003. The delivery model is a partnership between the regional council and territorial authorities, with involvement from local community agencies and supported by the Enviroschools facilitators.

Enviroschools provides facilitation support and community connections to the 27 registered Enviroschools in Christchurch City.

Every school makes a long-term commitment to create a more sustainable, resilient community both within the school and into the local community.

A key strength of Enviroschools is they involve children and young people in real life projects that make a meaningful impact in the physical and social environment, and is linked with both the New Zealand curriculum and the operations of the school.

The support provided by the Enviroschools Canterbury team includes, resources for teachers, guidance and advice for teachers from an Enviroschools Facilitator, cluster meetings, and events.

Enviroschools Facilitators work with schools and communities to support action within school grounds, for example developing a plan and taking action to install a rainwater tank to provide a sustainable source of water, creating habitat to attract native birds, developing vegetable gardens and fruit trees. At a community level the groups will be working with local business and groups on local projects, for example, restoration groups such as the Banks Peninsula Conservation Trust, and sharing between schools through student workshops and school visits.

Enviroschools is acknowledged by schools as a very effective vehicle that integrates real life projects with learning.

Tomata Foundation usually applies to the Strengthening Communities Fund but missed the deadline this year.

Funding is not recommended as the Foundation has sufficient reserves to continue their services.
25. Resolution to Exclude the Public


I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely items listed overleaf.

Reason for passing this resolution: good reason to withhold exists under section 7.
Specific grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution: Section 48(1)(a)

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

(a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
(b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority.”

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>SUBCLAUSE AND REASON UNDER THE ACT</th>
<th>PLAIN ENGLISH REASON</th>
<th>WHEN REPORTS CAN BE RELEASED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>PUBLIC EXCLUDED COUNCIL MINUTES - 24 AUGUST 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REFER TO THE PREVIOUS PUBLIC EXCLUDED REASON IN THE AGENDAS FOR THESE MEETINGS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>PUBLIC EXCLUDED COUNCIL MINUTES - 7 SEPTEMBER 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REFER TO THE PREVIOUS PUBLIC EXCLUDED REASON IN THE AGENDAS FOR THESE MEETINGS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>PUBLIC EXCLUDED COUNCIL MINUTES - 14 SEPTEMBER 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REFER TO THE PREVIOUS PUBLIC EXCLUDED REASON IN THE AGENDAS FOR THESE MEETINGS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>FACILITIES REBUILD PROGRAMME UPDATE</td>
<td>S7(2)(B)(II)</td>
<td>PREJUDICE COMMERCIAL POSITION</td>
<td>THE FIGURES QUOTED IN THE ATTACHEMENTS, IF DISCLOSED, ARE LIKELY TO PREJUDICE COUNCIL'S COMMERCIAL POSTION AT THE TIME OF TENDERING THESE WORKS.</td>
<td>29 JUNE 2018 END OF FINANCIAL YEAR, WORKS SHOULD BE TENDERED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>COUNCIL OWNED HERITAGE BUILDINGS STATUS REPORT</td>
<td>S7(2)(H), S7(2)(I)</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES, CONDUCT NEGOTIATIONS</td>
<td>THE ESTIMATED COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE STRENGTHENING AND REPAIR WORKS, AS WELL AS THE FUNDING REQUIREMENTS INITIALLY ESTIMATED FROM THE COUNCIL ARE COMMERCIALY SENSITIVE AT THIS STAGE. UNTIL SUCH TIME AS CONTRACTS ARE ENTERED INTO, RELEASING THE INFORMATION IS LIKELY TO UNDERMINE COUNCIL'S NEGOTIATING POSITION.</td>
<td>ONCE CONTRACTS ARE ENTERED INTO BY COUNCIL AND THE INFORMATION IS NO LONGER COMMERCIALY SENSITIVE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC EXCLUDED SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES - 6 SEPTEMBER 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>REFER TO THE PREVIOUS PUBLIC EXCLUDED REASON IN THE AGENDAS FOR THESE MEETINGS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>VBASE LTD - INDEPENDENT DIRECTOR’S FEES</td>
<td>S7(2)(F)(II) PROTECTION FROM IMPROPER PRESSURE OR HARASSMENT</td>
<td>TO ALLOW COUNCILLORS TO CONSIDER UNDISTURBED THE ISSUE OF WHETHER TO PAY FOR THE SERVICES OF INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS ON THE VBASE BOARD, IN VIEW OF THERE BEING ONE INDEPENDENT DIRECTOR ALREADY APPOINTED.</td>
<td>AFTER VBASE HAS BEEN NOTIFIED OF THE COUNCIL'S DECISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>DRAFT STATEMENT OF INTENT FOR YEAR ENDING 30 JUNE 2018 - WORLD BUSKERS FESTIVAL TRUST</td>
<td>S7(2)(F)(II) PROTECTION FROM IMPROPER PRESSURE OR HARASSMENT</td>
<td>TO ALLOW THE WORLD BUSKERS FESTIVAL TRUST TO CONSIDER THE COUNCIL'S COMMENTS WITHOUT DISTURBANCE.</td>
<td>AFTER THE STATEMENT OF INTENT HAS BEEN FINALISED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>PUBLIC EXCLUDED FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES - 6 SEPTEMBER 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>REFER TO THE PREVIOUS PUBLIC EXCLUDED REASON IN THE AGENDAS FOR THESE MEETINGS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ITE REPORT FOR RFP 18331044 ROAD LANDSCAPES</td>
<td>S7(2)(H) COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION ON A CONTRACT WHERE TENDERS HAVE BEEN RECEIVED BUT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED</td>
<td>2 OCTOBER 2017 INFORMATION CAN BE RELEASED AFTER CONTRACT HAS BEEN AWARDED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPTIONS FOR SUMNER ROAD REOPENING</td>
<td>S7(2)(H)</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>THE REPORT CONTAINS COMMERCIAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE CONTRACTOR.</td>
<td>FOLLOWING AWARD OF CONTRACT VARIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>PUBLIC EXCLUDED INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES - 13 SEPTEMBER 2017</td>
<td>S7(2)(H)</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>REFERENCE TO THE PREVIOUS PUBLIC EXCLUDED REASON IN THE AGENDAS FOR THESE MEETINGS.</td>
<td>FOLLOWING AWARD OF CONTRACT VARIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>PUBLIC EXCLUDED INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES - 13 SEPTEMBER 2017</td>
<td>S7(2)(H)</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>REFERENCE TO THE PREVIOUS PUBLIC EXCLUDED REASON IN THE AGENDAS FOR THESE MEETINGS.</td>
<td>FOLLOWING AWARD OF CONTRACT VARIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>TRANSFER OF ASSETS TO OTAUTAHI COMMUNITY HOUSING TRUST</td>
<td>S7(2)(I)</td>
<td>CONDUCT NEGOTIATIONS</td>
<td>DISCUSSION ON THIS MATTER IS LIKELY TO INCLUDE REFERENCE TO HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES SUBJECT TO NEGOTIATIONS, WHICH WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED PART OF THE MEETING.</td>
<td>FOLLOWING THE AGMS OF THE RELEVANT SUBSIDIARY COMPANIES, OR AT A DATE AGREED BY CCHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>CHRISTCHURCH CITY HOLDINGS LTD - APPOINTMENT OF NEW DIRECTORS TO SUBSIDIARIES</td>
<td>S7(2)(F)(II), S7(2)(I)</td>
<td>PROTECTION FROM IMPROPER PRESSURE OR HARASSMENT, CONDUCT NEGOTIATIONS</td>
<td>THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE PROPOSED APPOINTMENTS NEED TO BE AGREED BETWEEN CCHL AND THE DIRECTOR-CANDIDATES.</td>
<td>FOLLOWING THE AGMS OF THE RELEVANT SUBSIDIARY COMPANIES, OR AT A DATE AGREED BY CCHL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>