



# Ashburton District Council

## AGENDA

An Extraordinary Meeting of the ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held as follows:

**Date:** Thursday 29 July 2010  
**Venue:** Council Chamber  
5 Baring Square West  
Ashburton  
**Time:** To follow the Finance & Community Services Committee

- 1 Apologies
- 2 Notification of Extraordinary Business
- 3 Proposed Second Bridge (Ashburton River) Consultation Strategy 1
- 4 Heritage Grant Policy Review 6

### **BUSINESS TRANSACTED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

- 5 Contract 589 – Award of Tender  
Section 7(2)(h) Commercial activities. 15

### **MEMBERS:**

His Worship the Mayor, M B O'Malley  
Cr R C Beavan  
Cr N A Brown  
Cr I J Burgess  
Cr J A Everest  
Cr K L Holmes  
Cr R J Kilworth  
Cr J A Kingsbury  
Cr L J Leadley  
Cr K W P Lowe  
Cr P W Reveley  
Cr J Sparks  
Cr B A Tasker

**B LESTER**  
**Chief Executive**

23 July 2010

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: C554  
DATE: 29 July 2010  
REPORT TO: Extraordinary Council Meeting  
FROM: Operations Manager  
SUBJECT: Proposed Second Bridge – Consultation Strategy

---

### 4. PROPOSED SECOND BRIDGE (ASHBURTON RIVER) CONSULTATION STRATEGY

#### 4.4.1 SUMMARY

A strategy has been prepared for the site selection/land designation phase of the second bridge project to outline how the future consultation for the second bridge project will be carried out, and the consultation programme.

The purpose of this report is to briefly summarise the document and seek Council's approval of the consultation strategy.

#### 4.4.2 RECOMMENDATION

"That Council approves the Ashburton Second Bridge Consultation Strategy."
--

#### 4.4.3 BACKGROUND

An issues and options report was considered by Council on 25 February which set out options for the location of a second bridge across the Ashburton River. Council identified a preferred site which is Chalmers Avenue to Grove Street and a "fall back" option, Chalmers Avenue to the rural area to the east of Tinwald.

Consultation and information dissemination was carried out based on all options considered in the Issues and Options Report. This resulted in significant feedback.

As a result of the feedback received through this process, Council approved additional technical investigation and social impact assessment work, and the formation of a community reference group.

This additional work and formation of the reference group has been the subject of previous reports and Council approval.

Given the additional technical and social impact assessment work to be carried out, it will be necessary to effectively communicate the results of this work to the wider community. To assist in this, a consultation strategy has been prepared. This will be an "internal" document and will set the scene for the consultation delivery mechanisms and timelines.

Key sections of the strategy are summarised below:

##### **Issues arising from Stage 1 consultation**

The following issues were identified during Stage 1 consultation

- Support and opposition for all proposed options.
- Effects on residents of Grove Street (including increase in heavy traffic, noise, pollution, safety).
- The need for a second bridge?
- Exit strategy onto the State Highway?
- Consider options around the existing State Highway / Melcombe Street.

- Consider the need for a bypass rather than a local bridge.
- The effect of increased traffic on the Tinwald School.
- Clarify the local traffic issue.
- Can traffic lights be put in first?
- The need to think long term and have the best solution for the future.
- Funding options from NZTA.

The first stage of consultation indicated a high level of community interest in the project and highlighted the community would like to be kept more informed.

### **Additional Work**

Further investigation work will cover the following:

- Social Impact Assessments (looking at social effects of the second bridge on the community)
- Potential road alignments
- Impacts on local road/State Highway 1 connections
- Existing ground conditions/services assessment ie water, sewer
- Indicative cost estimates

The following options are being further investigated:

- Chalmers Avenue to Grove Street
- Chalmers Avenue to East of Tinwald
- Melcombe Street Options
- Bypass Options

A community reference group has been formed to assist with the above, in particular consultation.

### **Objectives of the Consultation Strategy**

The strategy includes the following specific objectives:

- to acknowledge that it is important to engage the local community to increase the likelihood of mutually acceptable outcomes and better decisions;
- to communicate effectively - be proactive and positive;
- to provide the community with clear information and feedback to enable them to fully understand the decision making process;
- to meet the legal requirements of the LTMA, LGA and RMA;
- to build relationships and trust with all the stakeholders and the public;
- to obtain stakeholder and public feedback on the information provided, and to generate dialogue, about the project;
- Understanding other peoples and organisations' views on the project;
- Provide information and obtain views on the project through involvement of council elected members and senior organisation staff.

The above will be achieved by:

- Setting timeframes for release of material and key consultation dates;
- Ensuring high visibility and awareness of the consultation process throughout the project to provide certainty and consistency to the community;
- Actively seeking participation from a broad range of stakeholder groups;
- Using a range of communication and consultation options, which will maximise information 'reach';
- Acknowledging public contributions directly in writing to those who provide feedback and through newsletters and media releases;
- Where possible, illustrating how decisions have been impacted by stakeholder involvement and contributions;

- Presenting messages in simple concise language and use simple, visual materials (images, maps, diagrams, models) where possible.

### **Consultation Methods/Processes**

The following methods will be used during the consultation process:

#### **Community Reference Group**

The reference group will be used to provide comment on consultation material to ensure the information will be easily understood by the intended audience.

#### **Newsletters**

Newsletters will be used to ensure information is provided to the wider community.

The newsletters will be distributed to the residents in the entire district. At this stage it is anticipated that five newsletters will be distributed during the site selection/land designation phase of the project.

The intent of the first newsletter will be to update the community on what investigation work is being carried out in response to the feedback received.

The remainder of the newsletters will be aimed at communicating progress and updates on technical investigations.

#### **District Diary**

Items/articles will be included in the District Diary. This will also be used to provide information on open days etc.

#### **Website**

The council's website will be used to provide project information updates in addition to the newsletters. The website address will be provided on written consultation information where appropriate.

#### **Media**

The use of the media will be explored during this phase of the project.

#### **Open Days**

Further open days are proposed at the completion of technical and social impact assessment work.

#### **Displays**

The possibility of setting up a static display at public locations will be investigated. Static displays will use the same material used for or proposed to be used for open days.

#### **Face to face meetings**

Meetings will be arranged with key stakeholders and directly affected parties.

These meetings will be in addition to any meetings arranged as part of the social impact assessment work.

#### **Feedback**

All feedback will be recorded and considered. All written feedback responses will be acknowledged.

## Timeline

Set out below are some of the key consultation dates:

- First reference group meeting 19 July 2010
- Newsletter 1 distributed Early August
- Second reference group meeting 25 August 2010
- Newsletter 2 distributed Early to mid September
- Third reference group meeting Mid October
- Newsletter 3 distributed Late October
- Fourth reference group meeting Late November
- Newsletter 4 distributed Early December
- Open days Early December
- Feedback closes 17 December 2010
- Fifth reference group meeting February 2011
- Draft additional investigation report prepared March 2011
- Final additional investigation report prepared Mid March
- Council workshop April 2011
- Council deliberations May 2011
- Newsletter 5 distributed May/June 2011

The strategy also includes information on:

- The makeup of the consultation team.
- Approach to engagement:
  - Inform
  - Consult
  - Involve
  - Collaborate
- Consultation framework

### 4.4.4 OPTIONS & RISKS CONSIDERED

Options available to the Council are as follows:

#### **Option 1 – to approve the consultation strategy**

This option will allow the project team to develop the necessary consultation documentation and material in a structured way with defined timeframes.

Approvals will be sought as required from Council and the community reference group will also be involved.

Copies of all consultation material will be forwarded to councillors prior to distribution for their information.

#### **Option 2 – to not approve or seek significant change to the proposed strategy**

This will result in additional time delays and additional cost.

***The recommended option is Option 1 – to approve the consultation strategy.***

### 4.4.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

Consultation is required as part of statutory processes as follows:

The Local Government Act sets out the parameters for robust decision making.

Every local authority is required to consider the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by or have an interest in the matter being decided. This consideration must take place at various stages throughout the decision making process.

Section 82 sets out the six principles of consultation that Council must comply with.

The consultation strategy will ensure Council's statutory requirements with respect to consultation will be complied with.

#### **4.4.6 CONSULTATION**

The consultation strategy has been discussed and considered by the project team.

The content of the strategy was outlined to the community reference group on Monday 19 July. The reference group were happy with the proposed approach to consultation.

The strategy has not been the subject of consultation with the wider community.

#### **4.4.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

The recommendation in this report is consistent with the community outcomes and objectives in the 2009/2019 Long Term Council Community Plan.

#### **4.4.8 FINANCIAL**

There are no financial implications arising from the approval of the recommendation in this report.

Preparation of material is included in the work already approved. Printing and distribution costs can be accommodated within the contingency sums previously approved by Council.

Prepared By:

R ROUSE  
**Operations Manager**

Approved by:

B LESTER  
**Chief Executive**

## ASHBURTON DISTRICT COUNCIL REPORT

FILE NO: 3/7/4  
DATE: 29 July 2010  
REPORT TO: Extraordinary Council Meeting  
FROM: Senior District Planner  
SUBJECT: Heritage Grant Policy Review

---

### 5. HERITAGE GRANT POLICY REVIEW

#### 5.1.1 SUMMARY

This report seeks the Council's approval of proposed amendments to the Heritage Grant Policy, which proposes to allow grants to be made for projects on heritage buildings/ items in Groups A and B of the Proposed District Plan.

#### 5.1.2 RECOMMENDATION TO EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

"1. That the report be received.  
2. That Council approves the proposed amendments to the Heritage Grant Policy as shown in Appendix 1 of the report."

#### 5.1.3 BACKGROUND

A review has been undertaken of the Heritage Grant Policy since notification of the Proposed District Plan with the Heritage Subcommittee meeting on 8 and 15 July 2010. A number of proposed changes were agreed by the Subcommittee for consideration by Council before applications are invited for the 2010/11 year. **Pages 10-13**

##### **Proposed amendments and explanation**

#### **1. Recognition of projects related to heritage buildings/ items in Groups A and B in the Proposed District Plan**

A proposed change is the inclusion in the criteria of heritage buildings/ items scheduled in Groups A and B of the Proposed District Plan. The reasons for this include –

- a. *Proposed rules for heritage buildings/ items in Groups A and B having effect from 21 April 2010*

The proposed rules for heritage buildings/items and the scheduling of Group A and B heritage buildings/ items in the Proposed District Plan have legal effect from 21 April 2010, the date the Proposed District Plan was notified for submissions. While the weight that can be attributed to these rules and the proposed schedule of heritage buildings/ items is limited, proposed works to a heritage building/ item in the Proposed District Plan, for example, additions/ alterations requires resource consent even if the building/item is not identified in the Operative District Plan.

Furthermore, any proposed heritage buildings/ items that submissions have not been received on cannot be considered in the further submission period or at hearings on the Proposed District Plan, effectively giving these listed items more weight.

The proposed rules in effect introduce new requirements for landowners who may not be subject to controls under the Operative District Plan. In order to encourage the protection of and restoration to items/ buildings it is considered appropriate to extend the grants policy to allow applications for projects related to Group A and B buildings in the Proposed District Plan.

In discussing the proposed change with the Heritage Subcommittee, it was recognised that the policy should exclude heritage buildings/ items that submissions have been received on through the District Plan Review. This is to avoid a situation arising of projects being funded for heritage/ items that are subsequently removed from the Proposed District Plan through the District Plan Review process.

*b. Change to the definitions of categories/ groups in the Operative/ Proposed District Plans*

The Operative District Plan identifies two categories of Heritage buildings/ items – Category A and Category B. Category A items have ‘significant value to the District’ and Category B items are ‘of interest to the District’s community’. In the Proposed District Plan there are two groups, Group A and Group B that differ in definition when compared with the Operative District Plan. Group A heritage items are of ‘national or regional significance’ and Group B items are of ‘significant value to the District’.

As a result of the change in the definitions, there are heritage buildings/ items that are identified in Category A in the Operative District Plan, due to their significant value to the District, which are assigned to Group B in the Proposed District Plan. This reflects the similarity in definitions of Category A in the Operative plan and Group B in the Proposed District Plan.

The current policy provides funding for Category A buildings/ items and given the change to the definition it is considered appropriate that projects relating to heritage buildings/ items in Group B of the Proposed District Plan are also considered for grants.

*c. Rules for Group B buildings/ items*

While there are changes to the definitions and terminology, buildings/ items in Category B of the Operative District Plan are in general included in Group B in the Proposed District Plan or removed from the Proposed District Plan. Although Category B buildings/ items are identified in the Operative District Plan the demolition or removal of these items is permitted without the need for resource consent. It is on this basis that the current Heritage Grant Policy has only included Category A buildings/ items.

Group B items under the Proposed District Plan are given greater protection than category B of the Operative plan with any works except repair/ maintenance requiring resource consent. In order to encourage the protection of and restoration to buildings/ items in Group B it is considered appropriate for the grant policy criteria to extend to not only include Group A but also Group B buildings/ items in the Proposed District Plan.

## **2. Increase in the funding allocated for individual projects**

The current policy sets a maximum limit for individual grants of no more than 50% of the cost of the approved project and in any event no more than \$5,000. It is proposed that this is increased to \$7,000 to recognise there may be larger projects where \$5,000 is not sufficient, particularly with grant funding now applying to Group A buildings/ items in the Proposed District Plan, that is buildings/ items of national/ regional significance.

## **3. Grants for Heritage buildings/ items on private land**

The question of whether the Heritage Grant Policy should exclude buildings/ items on Council owned property has arisen in review of other Council’s policies. For example, Auckland City Council’s criteria requires that projects ‘Be on land or property that is under private ownership within Auckland city ie land or property that is under ownership of a public authority is not eligible’.

In excluding items on land or property owned by the Council, private landowners with heritage buildings/items receive the greatest benefit from the grants scheme. However, there are heritage buildings/ items managed by other organisations on Council owned land, which require financial support as much as private landowners.

The proposed wording is therefore to enable those who manage heritage buildings/ items on Council land to apply for funding while excluding those buildings/ items which are owned and managed by the Council. This is on the basis that Council managed buildings are funded through the Property department.

#### **4. Changes to apply for applications in August 2010/ Need to review policy in 2011**

The proposed amendments are intended to form part of the policy against which applications received in August 2010 are assessed.

The proposed policy with amendments continues to refer to Category A Heritage buildings/ items in the Operative District Plan and will do so until such time that the Proposed District Plan supersedes the Operative District Plan. When this takes place the policy will need to be updated to only refer to the Proposed District Plan.

#### **5.1.4 OPTIONS & RISKS CONSIDERED**

1. Status quo – The retention of the existing policy without amendments would continue to provide for grant funding of Category A buildings/ items in the Operative District Plan, therefore ensuring their protection and demonstrating the Council's support for heritage.
2. Amend the policy to allow grants towards projects relating to Group A and B heritage buildings/ items in the Proposed District Plan and other changes as detailed above. This is considered to be appropriate given that works to heritage buildings/ items identified in the Proposed District Plan such as additions/ alterations requires resource consent.

#### **5.1.5 STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

The Heritage Grants Policy supports the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development in accordance with Section 6 (Matters of National Importance) of the Resource Management Act.

#### **5.1.6 CONSULTATION**

No consultation has been undertaken on the proposed amendments to the Heritage Grant policy. However, it is intended that the amended policy does not apply to proposed heritage buildings/ items in the Proposed District Plan that submissions have been received on. Through the District Plan review process those buildings/ items that are the subject of submissions may be removed from the Proposed District Plan. Funding is therefore not appropriate with this uncertainty.

#### **5.1.7 STRATEGIC LINKS**

The following Community Outcomes from the LTCCP are relevant –

**Community Plan Outcome 3:** *A community with a strong sense of identity and heritage, which welcomes new residents and encourages diversity*

- *Our community recognises and preserves the cultural and social heritage of our district.*

**Community Plan Outcome 6:** *A community with access to a variety of cultural, recreational and heritage experiences and facilities that enrich our quality of life*

- *Cultural, recreational and heritage facilities are maintained and developed to meet community needs. (Priority Objective)*

### **5.1.8 FINANCIAL**

The implication of the amendments, particularly a maximum of \$7,000 per project rather than \$5,000 is the allocation of a larger amount of money towards individual projects and/or more projects being funded. However, this does not affect the budgeted amount already allocated for the 2010/11 year of \$15,000 plus additional funds proposed to be rolled over from the last financial year.

Prepared By:

**M STEVENSON**  
**Senior District Planner**

Approved by:

**J MCKENZIE**  
**Environmental Services Manager**

## APPENDIX 1

Proposed additions to the policy are underlined while text with ~~striketrough~~ is proposed deletions

### Heritage Buildings/ items Grants Policy

Council will make provision in its annual budget for funds for the disbursement of heritage grants which shall be allocated annually in or about August of each year. The maximum individual grant from this source shall be no greater than 50% of the estimated cost of the approved project and in any event shall be no more than \$7,000. Council will hold in reserve an amount to be determined from time to time to address requests for emergency funding made at other times of the year.

#### **The Council will make grants in respect of applications which comply with the following criteria:**

1. Projects which relate to heritage buildings/ items that are scheduled Category A in the Operative District Plan, Group A or Group B in the Proposed District Plan<sup>1</sup>.
2. Projects which provide for specialised maintenance such as replacing matching cladding or replacing matching windows or other fittings in order to retain the heritage state of the item.
3. Projects which have provided a full project plan and financial statements ~~e-plan~~ (including copies of work schedule and quotes).
4. Projects that are on private land (not owned by the Council) unless a Heritage building/ item on Council land is managed by a Community group or organisation.

#### **Considerations**

Council will consider the following:

1. The relative heritage value of the scheduled heritage item in the District Plan.
2. The contribution that the proposed work will make to the conservation of the scheduled heritage item.
3. The urgency of the work.
4. The availability of Council funds.
5. Other sources of funding available to the applicant.
6. The amount of any previous assistance.
7. Voluntary input.
8. Accessibility of the heritage item to the general public.
9. Such other matters Council considers relevant.

#### **Council will not fund**

1. Retrospective works.
2. Applicants that have not returned their accountability form from previous funding.
3. Applicants that have not provided appropriate financial information.
4. General maintenance such as re-painting.

#### **General —**

Council requires applicants to provide formal certification / receipt of work completed.

Council recognises there may be occasions when an application would appear not to fit the above criteria; however this would not necessarily preclude it from consideration on its merit."

<sup>1</sup> Heritage buildings/ items identified in the Proposed District Plan that a submission has been received on shall not be considered for grant funding until such time that any submissions are resolved and there are no appeals outstanding.

---

## HERITAGE ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

[Unconfirmed minutes]

**REPORT and MINUTES** of a meeting of the **HERITAGE ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE** held in the Council Chamber, 5 Baring Square West, Ashburton, on Thursday 8 July 2010, commencing at 10.30 am.

**PRESENT:** Councillors R Beavan (Chair), J Sparks and B Tasker.

Also in attendance Senior District Planner and Assistant Planner.

### *Heritage Grant Policy*

The Heritage Assessment Subcommittee met to discuss a review of the Heritage Grant Policy criteria in respect to

- a. Consideration of grants for buildings/ items under Proposed District Plan
- b. Consideration of funding of Group B Heritage buildings/ items under the Proposed District Plan and amount allocated.

The Community Services Officer, through the Senior District Planner, advised that applications for grants will close on 31 August and a suggested date for assessing the grants is set for the week commencing 13 – 17 September 2010.

The Senior District Planner outlined the issues as set out in a discussion document circulated to the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee agreed that the Heritage Grant Policy criteria should be extended to include heritage buildings/items in Groups A and B of the Proposed District Plan for the reasons put forward in the Discussion Document, namely that

- Rules in the Proposed District Plan for Group A and B buildings/ items and the listings themselves took effect from 21 April and any work not complying with proposed rules requires resource consent.
- Changes between the definitions of Categories A and B in the Operative District Plan and Groups A and B in the Proposed District Plan results in Category A items (significant value to the District and currently included in criteria for grant funding) falling into Groups A (National or regional significance) or B (District significance) of the Proposed District Plan.
- Rules proposed for Group B buildings/ items in the Proposed District Plan require resource consent for any works except repair and maintenance (subject to site standards), a change from rules in the Operative District Plan for Category B buildings/ items.

However, it was considered appropriate to exclude heritage buildings/ items in the Proposed District Plan that are subject to submissions and need to go through a process of review. This is to avoid a situation arising of projects being funded for heritage/ items that are subsequently removed from the Proposed District Plan through the District Plan Review process.

Reference was made to other councils' policies including protected trees. The Subcommittee advised that the policy should not include protected trees, the landowners of which are assisted through services of the Parks Manager in maintaining the health of protected trees.

Also with reference to other councils' policies, there was discussion on whether heritage buildings/ items on Council owned properties should be excluded from the criteria for grants. The view was expressed that Council owned property and buildings are funded through the Property Department and should therefore be excluded. However, it was pointed out that some heritage buildings/ items while being on Council property are privately managed by community organisations/ groups. It was therefore agreed that criteria should include heritage buildings/ items on private land while also allowing grants for buildings/ items managed by a Community group or organisation, even if it is on Council land. This was on the basis that the grants are to assist the Community and those managing the buildings/items rather than the Council as landowner.

---

A further issue discussed was whether a specific proportion of funding should be allocated to Category A/ Group A/ Group B buildings and items. It was agreed by the Subcommittee that funding for applications would be assessed on their merits having regard to the 'Considerations' in the policy including 'relative heritage value of the scheduled heritage item in the District Plan'.

Discussion was also had on the maximum limit for a grant for an individual project, being \$5,000 in the current policy. It was agreed that this be increased to \$7,000, particularly given the amount of work that may be required to buildings of significance in a national/ regional/ district context.

The Subcommittee discussed whether the proposed grant policy should apply to applications invited in August 2010 (subject to Council's approval of the changes). Given the Heritage rules and listing of Group A and B Heritage buildings/ items in the proposed District Plan have already taken effect it was considered appropriate for the proposed policy to apply to this year's grant funding (subject to Council's approval).

The Subcommittee asked Senior District Planner to prepare a Draft Heritage Grant Policy and reconvene to discuss this on Thursday 15 July 2010.

## **APPLICATION FOR HERITAGE GRANT FUNDING**

### **Hakatere Historic Buildings Committee acting as a subcommittee of the Mt Somers District Citizens Association**

An application from Hakatere Historic Buildings Committee, acting as a subcommittee of the Mt Somers District Citizens Association, was tabled at this meeting seeking a grant of \$5,000 for an engineering assessment and restoration plan for Historic Stone Cottage at Hakatere Station.

Under the current heritage grant policy Council is able to make grants in respect of applications that are for:

1. Projects which relate to heritage items that are scheduled Category A in the District Plan and,
2. Projects which provide for specialised maintenance such as replacing matching cladding or replacing matching windows or other fittings in order to retain the heritage state of the item.
3. Projects which have provided a full project and finance plan (including copies of work schedule and quotes).

### **Assessment**

1. The Hakatere Stone Cottage and the Singlemens Quarters are not listed in the Operative District Plan as Category A.
2. Until the Heritage Grant Policy is amended to include Group A and B of the Proposed District Plan Review, these buildings cannot be considered for a heritage grant. (The Hakatere Stone Cottage and the single men's quarters are listed as Group A in the Proposed District Plan).
3. The grant of \$5,000 being sought is not for specialised maintenance etc.
4. A full project and finance plan (including copies of work schedule and quotes) was not available.

### **Conclusion**

The Heritage Assessment Subcommittee found that the request for a grant to enable a detailed engineer's report and specialist restoration plan to be compiled does not meet the criteria of the current Heritage Grants Policy (2002) and the Subcommittee had no option but to decline the application.

---

The Subcommittee directed that an advice note be given to the Hakatere Historic Buildings Committee acting as a subcommittee of the Mt Somers District Citizens Association that they should re-submit their application through the Community Grant Scheme. Applications will be called for these in August 2010.

Further, the Subcommittee suggested that the Hakatere Historic Buildings Committee should consider what aspects of repair work they could undertake, obtain the various quotations to support an application for a Heritage Grant in anticipation that the proposed amendments to the Heritage Grant Policy could make the Hakatere Station buildings eligible.

It is possible that the nature of the work involved may require planning approval.

The meeting concluded at 12.20 pm.

**REPORT and MINUTES** of a meeting of the **HERITAGE ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE** held in the Council Chamber, 5 Baring Square West, Ashburton, on Thursday 15 July 2010, commencing at 11.45 am.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Rod Beavan (Chair), J Sparks and B Tasker.

Also in attendance Senior District Planner and Assistant Planner.

### ***Heritage Grant Policy***

The draft policy was presented to the Subcommittee by the Senior District Planner with general agreement to the proposed changes.

Further amendments were sought to the draft as follows –

- That the maximum individual grant is no greater than 50% of the estimated cost. As the Council does not fund retrospective works it was considered appropriate to make it clear the cost of works can only be estimated.
- The requirement for a 'Project and Finance plan' should be reworded to reflect the documents being sought, that is a 'project plan' and 'financial statements'
- The draft policy presented to the subcommittee required amongst other criteria, that projects are on private land (not owned by the Council) "unless a heritage building/ item on Council land is managed by a Community group or organisation not otherwise funded by the Council".

It was considered that Community groups/ organisations should not be excluded if they receive other financial support from the Council as it may be for a different purpose. Furthermore, 'Considerations' in the existing policy allow the subcommittee to consider 'other sources of funding available to the applicant'.

It was agreed by the Heritage Assessment Subcommittee that a Committee report shall be prepared with the draft amendments to the policy for the Council meeting on 29 July 2010.

The meeting concluded at 12.45 pm.