



Christchurch City Council

LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 19 SEPTEMBER 2007

AT 4.00 PM

HOLY TRINITY CHURCH MEETING ROOM,
17 WINCHESTER STREET, LYTTELTON

Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board: Claudia Reid (Chairperson), Jeremy Agar, Stuart Bould, Ann Jolliffe, Dawn Kottier, Bob Parker

Community Board Adviser

Liz Carter

Telephone: 941 5682

Email: liz.carter@ccc.govt.nz

- PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION
- PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION
- PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

- PART B 1. APOLOGIES
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – BOARD MEETING OF 15 AUGUST 2007
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
 - 3.1 Parking On Norwich Quay – David Bundy & Proprietor Of Video-Ezy
 - 3.2 Diamond Harbour Early Childhood Centre – Bernadette Macartney
- PART C 4. PETITIONS
- PART C 5. DIAMOND HARBOUR COMMUNITY EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTRE – POSSIBLE SITES
- PART C 6. PURAU BAY FORESHORE DEVELOPMENT PLAN – FUNDING APPLICATION
- PART C 7. NORWICH QUAY PROPOSED 60 MINUTE PARKING RESTRICTIONS
- PART A 8. LYTTELTON SCHOOLS VARIABLE SPEED LIMIT
- PART C 9. CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANTS

We're on the Web!

www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/

- PART C 10. LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT BOARD OBJECTIVES**
- PART B 11. LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT BOARD FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT 2006/2007**
- PART B 12. NOTICES OF MOTION**
- PART B 13. CORRESPONDENCE**
13.1 Diamond Harbour Roads – John Rimminton
13.2 Diamond Harbour Early Childhood Centre – Karyn Davis
13.3 Diamond Harbour Early Childhood Centre – Nicola Green & H Laird
- PART B 14. BRIEFINGS**
14.1 Lyttelton Town Centre Plan – Jack Wormald, Project Manager,
Capital Programme Team
14.2 Update On Roading Issues - David McNaughton, Asset Engineer
- PART B 15. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
15.1 Customer Services Request – Report from 13 June – 6 September 2007
- PART B 16. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B 17. MEMBERS QUESTIONS**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 15 AUGUST 2007

The report of the Board's ordinary meeting of 15 August 2007 has been **separately circulated** to members.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 PARKING ON NORWICH QUAY – DAVID BUNDY & PROPRIETOR OF VIDEO-EZY

David Bundy and the Proprietor of Video-Ezy wish to address the Board regarding parking on Norwich Quay.

3.2 DIAMOND HARBOUR EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTRE

Bernadette Macartney wishes to address the Board regarding the Diamond Harbour Early Childhood Centre.

4. PETITIONS

Nil

5. DIAMOND HARBOUR COMMUNITY EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTRE – POSSIBLE SITES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	Community Support Unit Manager
Author:	Kathy Jarden, Property & Leasing Advisor

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - (a) Report back on the Board resolution of 18 October 2006 to *“request council staff to work with the Diamond Harbour Community Early Childhood Centre Inc. (DHCECC) to identify suitable sites for the establishment of an early childhood centre in Diamond Harbour.”*
 - (b) Resolve the level of support the Council is prepared to provide the DHCECC.
 - (c) Resolve the general process the Council wants to see undertaken from here in terms of it's proposed commitment.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Following approaches from the DHCECC the Board have acknowledged that there is a need in the community and surrounding area for such a service and have furthered their support with the resolution outlined in 1.a) above.

In conjunction with the DHCECC a number of sites in the area have been considered and are outlined in this report along with a recommendation for a preferred site at 2M Waipapa Avenue, hereinafter referred to as “the site”.

This report also seeks to set out and agree a process from here that deals with the issues of planning, property tenure, establishing Council's commitment to and involvement in this project and the matters required to be attended to by the DHCECC, namely:

- (a) That the Board note that the property at 2M Waipapa Avenue is the preferred site.
- (b) That the Council will consult with the wider community to seek it's views on the use of the site by the DHCECC and/or alternative uses through the consultation process required for the approval of the Reserves Management Plan for Stoddart Point.
- (c) That the DHCECC will need to meet certain conditions and criteria before the Council will commit to leasing the site to them.
- (d) That the lease terms and conditions will need to be agreed along with clearly establishing the extent of Council's support for this project.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3. In terms of financial return, the site is currently vacant and does not return an annual rental income.
4. An independent rental valuation completed in December 2006 indicates that lease of the site, if reclassified to a recreation reserve, could be expected to sustain a current market rental of \$4500 per annum plus GST and outgoings. A current market rental valuation would be required prior to agreeing to any terms and conditions of a lease.
5. It would be recommended that a Memorandum of Understanding, yet to be developed, between Council and DHCECC should limit Council's financial obligations to only the costs associated with a lease of land, if appropriate and possible, and not extend to any other capital and operating costs of the DHCECC.

5. Cont'd

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

6. There is no money currently budgeted for this proposal in the LTCCP though this would realise a small revenue return if successful.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. A portion of the preferred site has been used by the neighbouring residents of Purau Avenue to gain access to the back of their properties. Users of this current right of way may argue that they have been using this right of way for so long that the right of way should be deemed as an access way. Legally, this argument holds no basis. The right of way is not an easement and has no basis for its creation. It has not been created by a legal document, has not been created on an equitable basis with consideration and has not been implied by grant or reservation. The lack of creation provides users of the right of way with no rights to the land which is owned by Council. The users of this land have no rights in relation to the land. The land is Council owned and any decision to close off the access that has been used is ultimately Council's decision.

A review of the individual property files indicates that several of the former and current property owners have approached Council regarding their right to access through this land and that Council would consider an approach from the adjoining property owners to formalise use of the land for access purposes if the applicants were prepared to meet all costs of creating the easement.

A site visit indicates that any access to the front of these properties is via pedestrian walkways. Access is somewhat steep and any drive-on access to the properties would require extensive engineering works.

If Council decide to grant rights of way to these properties, increased visibility and presence when the facility was not operating would provide increased security for any development on this site.

8. The Board has the delegated authority of the Council to:
- (a) Declare land as a reserve (s. 14 Reserves Act 1977).
 - (b) Change of classification or purpose or revocation of a reserve (s. 24 and 24A Reserves Act).
 - (c) Granting of leases or licences on reserves pursuant to ss. 54, 56, 58A, 61, 73 and 74 of the Reserves Act.
 - (d) Granting of rights-of-way and other easements over reserves (s.48 Reserves Act).
9. The Corporate Support Manager has delegated authority to consent to the registration of easements on land excluding reserve land.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

10. Yes

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Community outcomes identified that Christchurch be a "City of Lifelong Learning" with one of the measures being the numbers of children who have attended early childhood education.

5. Cont'd

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

12. No – The Council provides and operates three early-learning centres where children aged under five are safe, well cared for and nurtured. It also provides an additional 13 facilities that are operated by the community. The Council is looking at this service over the next year and the Council's role in how it is to be delivered. LTCCP page 99.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. The decision to work unilaterally with the DHCECC is a departure from Council's sale of property policy "*that, in principle, the Council should publicly tender properties for sale unless there is a clear reason for doing otherwise*". (This policy is applied for leased property transactions.)

Strengthening Community Strategy

The Council has developed a Strengthening Communities Strategy to guide its work with community organisations, which in turn work in a range of ways to help develop strong communities. A number of processes and disciplines can be used in working with and for communities to enhance their strength. These processes include the provision of community services, community capacity building, community development, community activism and advocacy. All these processes can be legitimate and effective ways of working when used appropriately.

The Strengthening Communities Strategy also encompassed a review of the Council's Community Group Grants and the Community facilities Plan.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Does not align with Council's sale of property policy as stated above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. The Greenspace team is currently developing a Reserves Management Plan for the Stoddart Point reserves. The process associated with this is outlined later in this report. It is expected that this will be able to be undertaken in a timeframe that suits the DHCECC project and submissions to the Reserve Management Plan could take into account the community's desire to have a centre established on this site.
16. Public consultation has not been carried out to identify other potential uses for this land. With the preparation of the Reserves Management Plan for Stoddart Point, community consultation will be undertaken and the Board's recommendation noted in the concept plan for that site. This will determine support and/or alternative community uses for that land.
17. An internal property survey was circulated among all Council units to determine if the recommended site was required for other internal/community purposes. No expression was made for this land; however, a submission was made by the Policy and Planning team of the Strategic Support Unit highlighting the need for a Concept Development Plan for the Stoddart Point promontory. This proposes rationalising the ongoing management and development of the town centre, wharf, and recreation area comprehensively, taking into account future projected village growth, rather than continuing to process proposals on an ad hoc basis.
18. The land is currently held by the Council in Fee Simple and zoned recreation reserve in the district plan. Future development of the site would be limited to those activities permitted by the district plan rules related for that zoning. Should the DHCECC's use of this land be supported, it would be sensible to classify the land as local purpose (community) reserve to align with the zoning, consultation will be undertaken during the Reserve Management Plan process.

5. Cont'd

19. It is expected that if managed well the Reserve Management Planning process could attend to all the consultation requirements and to a large degree satisfy the planning issues. Public notification of the intention to prepare the management plan as required by Reserves Act 1977 Section 41(5) could be commenced immediately and this could be done together with a request for expressions of interest on the 2m Waipapa Avenue property and the intention to convert to reserve. In the event that no other interest occurred in the property, there would be a smooth, secure, and transparent transition to including the DHCECC's proposed use in preparation of the Draft Management Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended:

- (a) That the Board acknowledge the property at 2M Waipapa Ave as the preferred site for the DHCECC and as such be incorporated in the Reserve Management Plan process.
- (b) That the process as **appended** to this report is endorsed by the Board.
- (c) That authority is delegated to the Corporate Support Unit Manager to negotiate and finalise easements for vehicular access by the adjoining property owners located at numbers 6, 8, 10, 12, 14 Purau Avenue.
- (d) That the Community Support Unit Manger is delegated authority to enter into a memorandum of understanding (or other form of agreement as deemed appropriate) that provides the frame work for how the Council and DHCECC will progress this project as generally encompassed in this report.

5. Cont'd

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

20. The Board resolved at its meeting held 18 October 2006 to "request council staff to work with the Diamond Harbour Community Early Childhood Centre Inc. (DHCECC) to identify suitable sites for the establishment of an early childhood centre in Diamond Harbour."
21. The DHCECC is an incorporated society whose main objective is to establish and manage an early childhood centre that provides high quality care and education for children up to the age of seven.
22. Council staff identified seven preliminary sites that may be suitable locations for the centre:
- (i) Purau Avenue, below bowling club
 - (ii) Waipapa Avenue near medical centre
 - (iii) Purau Avenue adjoining play centre
 - (iv) 38 Waipapa Avenue
 - (v) Hunters Road adjacent to school
 - (vi) Ngatea Road – adjacent to 27-28
 - (vii) Whero Avenue – adjacent to number 40
23. A meeting was held on 2 November with trustees of the DHCECC to discuss the sites and narrow down the list to three preferred locations, namely:
- (a) Purau Avenue, below bowling club
 - (b) Waipapa Avenue, near medical centre
 - (c) Whero Avenue, adjacent to number 40
24. Options

Preference	A	B	C
Site Address	20B Purau Avenue	2M Waipapa Avenue	Whero Avenue
Legal Address	Part Lot 5 DP 14050	Lot 6 DP 304811	Lot 56-59 DP 9607
Estate	Fee Simple	Fee Simple	Fee Simple
Approximate Area Required	3000 m ²	2705 m ²	3125 m ²
Controlling Unit	Transport & Greenspace	Transport & Greenspace	Corporate Support
District Plan Status	Recreation Reserve	Recreation Reserve	Residential
Current Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This parcel of land is at the bottom of Stoddarts Point Reserve. • The land was surveyed and subdivided in August 2002. • The adjoining sections were classified as local purpose community and recreation reserves. • The land is currently used for passive recreational purposes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This parcel of land was once part of the larger Stoddarts Point development. • The land was surveyed and subdivided and a new title issued in August 2002. • It holds no classification. • The land is currently used as an informal entrance to the neighbouring properties on Purau Avenue. • It is prone to use as an area for illegal dumping of rubbish. • Vegetation on the site is overgrown and the land has not been maintained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thirteen sections of land have been surveyed and separate titles exist for these properties. The land was acquired through the Lyttelton Borough Extension Act 1911. • The land is currently grazed in conjunction with the 38ha block in Diamond Harbour.

5. Cont'd

25. Advantages/Disadvantages

Preference	A	B	C
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to town centre • Proximity to ferry service, could encourage more public transport users • Sunny location • Well planted and good shelter • Close to medical centre • Adjacent to Library and sports grounds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to town centre • Proximity to ferry service, could encourage more public transport users • Well planted and good shelter • Away from busy traffic • Sewer and Water reticulation in close proximity to potential building site • Close to medical centre • Adjacent to Library and sports grounds • Separate title • Good size • "Buy in"/support from DHCECC • No impact on Council's planning processes eg strategic, annual plan, LTCCP. • Greatest flexibility, easy to achieve outcome. Likely to have least impact on future planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area is subdivided and has separate title • Wide open spaces with good views • Level sites • Closer for Church and Charteris Bay residents • Close proximity to school • Access to sewer and water reticulation.
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires survey and subdivision • To be classified as local purpose reserve • Road safety issues at top of Purau Road • Require removal of extensive vegetation • Difficult access to water reticulation. • Main sewer pumping line running behind desired area • Requires resource consent as is it a discretionary activity in the district plan. This could be overcome by designating the area a local purpose community reserve. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise could be problem as located in an amphitheatre and close to residential developments on Waipapa Avenue and Purau Avenue. . (Most childhood centres are located in residential developments.) • Requires resource consent as it is a discretionary activity in the district plan. This could be overcome by designating the area a local purpose community reserve. • The site is located in a small valley, away from any main roads which could lead to potential vandalism. Crime prevention design of the site could address these risks. • The land is currently held in Fee Simple and if the zoning were changed to residential, Council could realise a potential sale of 3 residential lots for an indicated total current market value of \$232,000. • Aspect not ideal, limited amount of sunlight being lower than surrounding residential developments and bordered by mature poplar trees.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road safety • May hinder future sale of the other sections and 38ha development • Lack of trees and shelter. • Requires resource consent as it is a discretionary activity in the district plan.

5. Cont'd

Preferred Location

26. The preferred location for the establishment of the early childhood centre is Site B - the land adjacent to the medical centre, Lot 6 DP 304811. It is the preferred location of the DHCECC and is supported by the Council's controlling unit, Transport and Greenspace.

COUNCIL SUPPORT

27. This project is not provided for in the LTCCP or Council's Annual Plan. In actual fact, further support for this form of activity is specifically precluded until further study and policy is adopted. As such support for this project could not be recommended by staff. However there would be no impact on the LTCCP or Annual Plan in providing the DHCECC a long term lease of the site other than a nominal amount of unbudgeted revenue. Accordingly it is recommended that Council support to the DHCECC be limited solely to a lease of the land and the costs to put that in place, including consultation.

Memorandum of Understanding

28. It is proposed that the DHCECC and the Council enter into a memorandum of understanding, or similar such document, that sets out the processes, rules and respective responsibilities to follow over the following months for the process as contained in this report. In general that memorandum should include:
- The process to be undertaken
 - The extent of Council's commitment to support this project
 - Timeframes
 - Ground rules
 - Obligations and conditions to be met by both parties
 - DHCECC requirements in terms of satisfying the Council that it is a suitable tenant, e.g. provision of business plans, funding methods MOE approval, plans specifications etc.

Proposed Process

29. A process and time line for attending to the issues associated with this project is **appended**.

6. PURAU BAY FORESHORE DEVELOPMENT PLAN – REQUEST FOR FUNDING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport & Greenspace Manager
Author:	Ann Liggett, Consultation Leader – Greenspace

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to request funding for the implementation of a Development Plan for Purau Bay foreshore and associated reserves from the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board Reserves Discretionary fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In June 2007 consultation was carried out with the community of Purau regarding a landscape concept for an area of foreshore (purpose being road reserve). This followed concerns raised by members of the local community regarding landscape enhancement work which had taken place.
3. At the Board meeting of Wednesday 15 August 2007, the landscape plan was approved with the additional recommendation of:
 - *“Board members noted that the residents of Purau had for some time been asking for an overall landscape plan so that the area could be considered as a whole, rather than projects being undertaken in isolation. The Board indicated that it would be willing to allocate some of its Project Reserves Funding towards the preparation of such a plan. Staff undertook to present a report, requesting funding, to the next Board meeting.”*
4. This development plan will enable staff to then schedule works and associated funding for the next 5-10 years.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. Funding is being requested from the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert reserves discretionary fund which has a current balance of \$20,000.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

6. As per above.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. None identified.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

8. As per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

9. LTCCP – Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways, Page 123
10. Environment – By offering opportunities for people to contribute to projects that improve our city's environment.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

11. As per above.

6. Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

- 12. Parks Access Policy
 - (a) Open Space Strategy
 - (b) Natural Asset Management Strategy

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

- 12. As per above

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

- 13. This request for funding will allow ongoing consultation with the Purau community for the wider foreshore area and associated reserves within Purau and to follow on from the initial consultation already undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board allocate \$5,000 from their reserve discretionary fund for the implementation of a development plan for the Purau Bay foreshore and associated reserves.

7. NORWICH QUAY PROPOSED 60 MINUTE PARKING RESTRICTIONS

General Manager responsible:	Jane Parfitt, General Manager City Environment DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Jeff Owen, Consultant

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the approval of the Board to install 60 minute parking restrictions on the north and south side of Norwich Quay near the intersection of Oxford Street, Lyttelton.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Currently on-street parking on the north and south side of Norwich Quay at Oxford Street is unrestricted. This is resulting in all day commuter parking with very limited or no turnover of parking spaces. It is suspected that commuters and contractors are leaving their vehicles parked kerb side while commuting to Diamond Harbour via the ferry service.
3. Business proprietors have expressed concern over the availability of on-street parking for their customers and as such have requested that a P60 parking restriction be installed immediately outside their businesses (see **attached** plan). The affected businesses comprise of; Video Ezy, Harbour Master Café, Lyttelton Times Café, a dairy and take away. Due to the older style construction none of these businesses have off street parking and rely heavily on the availability of kerbside parking for their business to function successfully.
4. Norwich Quay is a "State Highway" in the Banks Peninsula District Plan and is located in the commercial/retail area of Lyttelton with conflicting demands for on-street parking. The Christchurch City Council's Parking Strategy ranks short stay private vehicle parking for business and retail needs as a higher priority than commuter parking in these situations.
5. All above mentioned proprietors support the proposed restriction, however another business Black Cat Charters do not. They believe that their customers will be affected by the proposal as all day parking will be limited. It must be noted that no parking is provided for their customers on the wharf area at the ferry jetty. However it is their customers that are causing the all day parking issues outside other businesses. The lack of customer parking for ferry users on the wharf needs to be addressed in another forum.
6. It is likely that the economic vitality of these businesses is being adversely affected by the lack of available on-street car parking on Norwich Quay. The situation can be overcome through the installation of short term (sixty minute) parking restrictions as shown on the **attached** plan.
7. Transit New Zealand, the road controlling authority has been advised of the businesses requests for time restricted parking and has supported this proposal. Transit New Zealand has delegated the installation of parking restrictions on State Highways to the Council.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. An estimated cost for this work is \$1000.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

9. The installation of parking signs is within the LTCCP Street and Transport Operational budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. The Land Transport Rules provide for the installation of parking restrictions.

7. Cont'd

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

11. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community outcomes - Safety

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

13. This contributes to improve the level of service for safety.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. The recommendations align with the Council's Parking Strategy 2007.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

15. As above

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. Consultation has been carried out with the businesses adjacent to the three areas and support has been forthcoming.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board approve:

- (a) The parking of vehicles is limited to a maximum of 60 minutes on the south side of Norwich Quay from a point 8 metres east of the Oxford Street intersection and extending 20 metres in an easterly direction.
- (b) The parking of vehicles is limited to a maximum of 60 minutes on the north side of Norwich Quay from a point 8 metres east of the Oxford Street intersection and extending 21.5 metres in an easterly direction.
- (c) The parking of vehicles is limited to a maximum of 60 minutes on the north side of Norwich Quay from a point 11 metres west of the Oxford Street intersection and extending 35 metres in a westerly direction.

8. LYTTTELTON SCHOOLS VARIABLE SPEED LIMIT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Mike Thomson, Sr. Traffic Engineer, Community

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is that the Board endorse the installation of a new variable speed limit (40 km /hr school zone) in Winchester Street at St. Josephs school & Oxford Street at Lyttelton Main school and that the Board recommend to Council that it approve a new variable speed limit and include it in the Christchurch City Speed Limits Register.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council has a programme of installing 40 km/h variable speed limits (known as "school zones") outside schools according to a prioritisation process. To date eighteen schools have benefited from this treatment. The "school zone" will operate on school days, for no more than thirty minutes in the morning at a time between 8.30 a.m. and 9.00 a.m. and for no more than thirty minutes in the afternoon at a time between 3:00 p.m. and 3.30 p.m.
3. Now that the Council has formalised the Christchurch City Council Speed Limits Bylaw 2005, it can resolve to make these new variable speed limits. Accordingly infrastructure for these variable speed limits cannot be commissioned until they have been formally resolved by the Council.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The estimated cost for the school zone (separate from the Oxford Street Zebra crossing relocation) is \$40,000. The funding for this project will be managed out of the original BPDC allocated budget for Lyttelton schools and a surplus from other projects completed in the Lyttelton Harbour basin.
5. The recommendations of this report align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. The proposed variable speed limit complies with the conditions specified and published by the Director of Land Transport New Zealand in the *New Zealand Gazette* (2/6/2005, No. 86, p. 2051) approving a variable speed limit of 40 km/h in school zones and setting out conditions for those speed limits. A copy of that notice is **attached**. Council resolution is required to implement the speed limit restrictions and traffic management changes.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

7. This report's recommendations support the project objectives as outlined in the 2006-16 LTCCP.
8. This project aligns with the Transport and Greenspace Unit's Our Community Plan 2006-2016.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

9. This project is consistent with key Council strategies including the Road Safety Strategy, Pedestrian Strategy and Safe Routes to School Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

10. Both Lyttelton school's Board of Trustees have been informed of the proposed variable speed limits and have expressed support for the installation of variable speed limits at their school. Information newsletters will be made available to all the families of children attending the schools. Property owners and residents will receive a newsletter about the signage to be installed outside their properties and these property owners will be spoken to in person, and given a minimum of 14 days to make submissions about these.

8. Cont'd

11. Before the Council can set a variable speed limit pursuant to Clause 5(1) of the Christchurch City Speed Limits Bylaw 2005, the public consultation requirements set out in Section 7.1 of the Land Transport Rule Setting of Speed Limits 2003 Rule 54001 must be complied with. Section 7.1(2) provides that the persons that must be consulted before the Council sets a speed limit are:
- (a) *Road controlling authorities that are responsible for roads that join, or are near, the road on which the speed limit is to be set or changed; and*
 - (b) *A territorial authority that is affected by the existing or proposed speed limit; and*
 - (c) *Any local community that the road controlling authority considers to be affected by the proposed speed limit; and*
 - (d) *The Commissioner of Police, and*
 - (e) *The Chief Executive Officer of the New Zealand Automobile Association Incorporated, and*
 - (f) *The Chief Executive Officer of the Road Transport Forum New Zealand; and*
 - (g) *Other organisation or road user group that the road controlling authority considers to be affected by the proposed speed limit; and*
 - (h) *The Director of Land Transport New Zealand.*
12. Section 7.1(3) of the Rule provides:
A road controlling authority must consult by writing to the persons in 7.1(2) advising them of the proposed speed limit and giving them a reasonable time, which must be specified in the letter, to make submissions on the proposal. In terms of Section 7.1(2)(a) and 7.1(2)(b) there are no road controlling authorities or territorial authorities that are required to be consulted in respect of any of the proposed variable speed limits.
13. The representatives of the Commissioner of Police, the Director of Land Transport New Zealand, the Chief Executive Officer of the New Zealand Automobile Association Incorporated and the Chief Executive Officer of the Road Transport Forum of New Zealand will receive written advice of the proposed new variable speed limit in accordance with Section 7.1(2) (d), (e), (f) and (h). No other organisation or road user group is considered affected by the proposed speed limits. No neighbouring road controlling authority is affected. Support for the proposed variable speed limits will be sought in writing from the New Zealand Police and from Land Transport New Zealand.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board recommends to the Council:

- (a) The installation of a variable speed limit on Winchester Street and Oxford Street (school zone) subject to a satisfactory outcome of any issues raised by the community during consultation undertaken by the Council in respect of the proposals to set the new variable speed limit of 40 km/h specified below meets the requirements of Section 7.1 of the Land Transport Setting of Speed Limits Rule 2003.
- (b) That pursuant of Clause 5(1) of the Christchurch City Speed Limits Bylaw 2005 a variable speed limit of 40 km/h apply on 1): Winchester Street, commencing at the Oxford Street intersection and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 145 meters. And (2) Oxford Street commencing at a point 30 meters south westerly of the Exeter Street intersection and extending in a south westerly direction for a distance of 157 meters

8. Cont'd

- (c) That the steady state LED display 40 km/h legend in the variable speed limit sign is illuminated on any school day during the following times:
 - (i) 30 minutes before the start of school until the start of school, and
 - (ii) 30 minutes at the end of school, beginning no earlier than five minutes before the end of school; and
 - (iii) 10 minutes at any other time when at least 50 children cross the road or enter or leave vehicles at the roadside.
- (d) That the abovementioned variable speed limits shall come into force on the date of adoption of this resolution.

8. Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON THE 2 LYTTTELTON SCHOOLS SPEED ZONE14. (a) **Brief History:**

Banks Peninsula District Council initiated a budget for safety works at the Lyttelton Main school on Oxford Street and St Josephs school on Winchester St. A report was submitted to the Lyttelton /Mt Herbert Community Board in December 2006 and there is a high expectation that remedial work will commence shortly. The Oxford Street project at Lyttelton Main school is underway.

(b) **Winchester Street Issue:**

Following a number of discussions with the St Josephs school Board of Trustees chairperson, it is agreed that the problem is that vehicles on Winchester street, travelling eastwards from the Canterbury Street intersection are travelling too fast for the conditions. This combined with the total lack of approach visibility of the school gate /crossing point ,creates an unsafe situation for children needing to cross Winchester Street. If a school zone is installed now instead of , say 3 or 4 years time- as per its relative priority (8th equal) on our list for 165 schools, would this undermine the priority process developed to install the many zone requests received? In my opinion, the answer is no. Reasons:

- (i) There is no practical civil engineering solution for this issue.
- (ii) Banks Peninsula District Council specifically set aside money to resolve the issue at Winchester street and there is a high expectation that a solution will be implemented.
- (iii) The school zone priority process was developed prior to the merger with BPDC and was developed specifically for schools in the former CCC area.
- (iv) The available funds are outside the available funding specifically set aside for school zones and the implementation of a zone in Lyttelton will not affect the relative priority of any other schools in the CCC area.

(c) **Oxford Street Issue:**

While the project is underway to relocate the zebra pedestrian crossing, to better align with the school's and the wider community's needs, the Lyttelton Main school Board of Trustees has requested a 40 km /hr zone.

THE OBJECTIVES

15. The objectives of a school zone are to:

- (a) Slow approaching motorists, who are driving too fast for the conditions (pedestrians hit by a vehicle travelling at 70 km/hr have a 95 % risk of death, whereas this risk decreases dramatically at lower speeds i.e. 5% risk at 30 km/hr)
- (b) Raise awareness of the approaching motorist (a motorist, in an alert state, can potentially react up to 1 second faster than, when not in an alert state. For example, at 65 km/hr, vehicles are travelling at 18 metres per second-a distance that may be critical to saving a pedestrian casualty).
- (c) Creating a safer environment for children, needing to cross a roadway at the school.

16. There is a need to establish a set of selection criteria so that each school can be compared and prioritised. The criteria have been established as:

Road Environment

17. Issues to be addressed are land use, road engineering, approach visibility, traffic growth potential, and urban fringe and alignment issues. Sites are scored according to the following, where zero is considered an ideal environment, and ranging to four being considered a difficult road environment.

8. Cont'd

18. An example of an ideal road environment can be:
- (i) A roadway with good approach visibility i.e. visibility not obstructed by horizontal or vertical alignment changes.
 - (ii) Zero distractions created by advertising clutter on the roadside.
 - (iii) No land uses which generate activity such as entering or exiting traffic from sites or heavy parking demand, not associated with the school.
19. Where the ideal road environment does not exist, school frontage roads will be assessed for a school zone, based on the following scoring rational:
- 0 = ideal road environment
 - 1 = low level of distractions, low level of other land use traffic generation, and average approach visibility.
 - 2 = medium level of distractions, medium level of other land use traffic generation, and low approach visibility
 - 3 = high level of distractions, high level of other land use traffic generation. And poor approach visibility
 - 4 = Very high level of distractions, very high level of other land use traffic generation, and very poor approach visibility.
20. While it may be debated that an ideal road environment, is conducive to a higher speed environment, and therefore should be scored high, rather than low, the ideal road environment reduces the potential for approaching vehicles, to be operated by unaware motorists. The scoring for other criteria accounts for speed and other issues.

Kerbside Activity

21. Consideration of activity outside the school.
- 0 = A minimal problem.
 - 1 = low/median activity, i.e. activity is similar to surrounding land use parking activity.
 - 2 = full demand i.e. all available kerbside occupied.
 - 3 = full demand with some parking disturbance i.e. double parking, reversing.
 - 4 = a situation of chronic parking congestion and manoeuvring. Roadway may effectively be narrowed to one lane.
22. The degree of parking activity may create a situation whereby the approaching motorist is distracted by this activity. Children may attempt crossing the roadway by walking out, between parked cars. Double parking further compromises the inter visibility, by the physical obstruction to sight lines. While not a desirable activity, the reality is that children may be on the roadway, when getting into / out of cars, on the driver's (road side) of the vehicle.

Number of Heavy Vehicles (Trucks, Buses etc)

23. Assessment of the number of Heavy Vehicles passing the school gate where
- 0 = virtually none
 - 1 = low
 - 2 = low/medium
 - 3 = medium/high
 - 4 = very high
24. Where heavy vehicles are present, the potential risk to child safety increases. There have been a number of child fatalities, where the child has collided with a heavy vehicle. While the vehicle operator is not necessarily at fault, the fact is that, heavy vehicles are unforgiving, when colliding with a person.

8. Cont'd**Cyclists**

25. Assessment of cyclist activity within the zones, where
- 0 = indicates very few cyclists
 - 1 = low level
 - 2 = medium level
 - 3 = high level
 - 4 = very high level, at locations with Intermediate / Secondary schools adjacent
26. Where a greater number of cyclists occur, travelling to and from school, children tend to bunch (riding 2, sometimes, 3 abreast). Also, in greater numbers, the probability of unexpected manoeuvres (sudden changes of direction / road crossings etc), can increase.

Motor Vehicle Operating Speeds

27. Assessment of the 85th percentile speed of vehicles at the school crossing at peak times, where
- 0 = below 45 km/h school zone not warranted below 45 km/h in L.T.S.A. Note 37.
 - 1 = 45-49 km/h
 - 2 = 50-54 km/h
 - 3 = 55-60 km/h
 - 4 = 60-69 km/h
 - 5 = 70-79 km/h
 - 6 = 80 km/h, and above
28. The stopping distance increases exponentially, with an increase in vehicle speed. This creates a potential safety risk to the cyclist or pedestrian, as identified in the opening statement of objectives, and the comment relating to alertness /reaction time.

Motor Vehicle Volume

29. Assessment of the average daily total, where
- 0 = below 3,000 vehicles
 - 1 = 3,000-4,000 vehicles
 - 2 = 4,000-6,000 vehicles
 - 3 = 6,000-8,000 vehicles
 - 4 = 8,000+ vehicles
30. In Christchurch, the traffic volume during the morning peak traffic hour, when school children are arriving at school, is typically 10% of the daily traffic volume. For example, a road with 6,000 vehicles per day, will have about 600 vehicles per peak morning hour, or 1 vehicle every 6 seconds, on average, passing the school when children are arriving. These volume rates give an indication of the level of road use activity at the critical time and the relative difficulty of gap selection etc.

Level of Crossing Activity

31. Assessment of school related road crossing activity, numbers and duration, where:
- 0 = usually zero pedestrians i.e. dropped off by car or do not need to cross the roadway.
 - 1 = low 1-19 school pedestrians
 - 2 = medium 20-50 school pedestrians
 - 3 = high above 50 school pedestrians
32. Where there is relatively low activity, school staff can generally manage children crossing the roadway.

8. Cont'd

Road Status

33. Assessment of the road network classifications, where
- 1 = Local
 - 2 = Collector
 - 3 = Minor Arterial
 - 4 = Major Arterial
34. The status of the road provides an indication of the general awareness of passing motorists. For example, a local road generally has motorists who live locally with a high awareness of the road environment outside the school. A major arterial road may have a significant number of motorists passing, who are on a longer journey, with no local knowledge of the road environment.

Community Interest

35. An issue to be addressed is the level of community involvement and sensitivity, where a score of zero indicates no community concern raised to Council, to a score of 4 which reflects substantial community lobbying, i.e. political involvement and meetings held.

THE OPTIONS

36. The preferred option is to install a temporary 40 kph speed limit using electronic and static signage that operates during the daily opening and closing periods of the two schools on Oxford Street and Winchester Street. Other Options are described....

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option**

37. Lyttelton Main and St. Josephs school using the above criteria ranks =8 in the present school prioritisation.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Improved pedestrian safety for school children.	Nil.
Cultural	Nil.	Nil.
Environmental	Nil.	Additional roadside signage.
Economic	Nil	Capital expenditure and maintenance.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Primary alignment with community outcome *"Our City provides a choice of housing, easy mobility and access to open spaces, and a range of utilities that allow people to enjoy an acceptable quality of life"* by providing a safe transportation network.

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

No impact

Effects on Maori:

It is considered that there are no effects on Maori.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Consistent with the Road Safety Strategy particularly in respect to designing and managing roads with appropriate speed environments and providing safe facilities for pedestrians.

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

All affected parties have been contacted and all responses indicated support of the proposal.

Other relevant matters:

Nil.

8. Cont'd

Maintain the Status Quo.

38. Maintaining the status quo or doing nothing will achieve nothing for the community. The two schools on Oxford Street and Winchester Street have requested that something be done to improve safety for children on these two frontage roads when school children are crossing the road. To do nothing will maintain a possibly hazardous situation.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Nil	Potential for pedestrian crossing crashes with time.
Cultural	Nil	Nil
Environmental	Nil	Nil
Economic	No capital expenditure or on going maintenance costs.	Nil
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Maintaining the status quo is not aligned to any Community Outcomes.</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: No impact</p> <p>Effects on Maori: It is considered that there are no effects on Maori.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Maintaining the status quo is not consistent with the Road Safety Strategy or the CCC Financial Plan and Programme 2004 and conflicts with the objectives of the asset management plan.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Given that feedback in support was received for the option distributed for public consultation it is considered that there is some support for not maintaining the status quo.</p> <p>Other relevant matters: Nil.</p>		

OTHER OPTIONS FOR WINCHESTER STREET

- (a) Install a school patrol (Kea crossing). The number of children crossing the roadway is less than the Land Transport Warrant for a school patrol. The school would have difficulty providing enough children /staff to operate a school patrol. A patrol would do nothing to resolve the safe sight stopping distance due to the acute vertical curve.
- (b) Install Kerb extensions (with or without a school patrol). While this would shorten the crossing distance and improve lateral visibility, it would do nothing to resolve the approach visibility due to the vertical curve.
- (c) Install Road humps on western approach. These slow traffic but are not a suitable for buses to negotiate. There are a significant number of buses using this road.
- (d) Install Speed Cushions on western approach. The objective of these is to slow cars but allow larger vehicles (buses) to traverse without having to negotiate the vertical elements of this type of traffic calming. At a site where these were installed however, the cushions have had no effect on slowing buses.

8. Cont'd

- (e) Install a crossing facility at the apex of the vertical curve. This would maximise the approach visibility from both directions. Experience has shown that where a facility is installed away from the desire line, then pedestrians cross at the location where they wish. In this case pedestrians would be required to walk uphill, cross and then back downhill. This is unlikely.
- (f) Install a zebra crossing. The numbers are well below the warrant for a zebra crossing.
- (g) Level the vertical curve. This would be major and is well outside the financial resources available. Such work is unlikely to be justified economically. It is doubtful whether levelling of the vertical curve would create ideal approach visibility.

9. CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANTS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941 8177
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Liveable City
Author:	Katie Smith, Neighbourhood Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To put before the Board those applications for Character Housing Maintenance Grants that have been received by Council for funding in the 2007/08 financial year for properties located within the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Ward.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At its meeting on 4 May 2006 the Council adopted guidelines and associated procedures for the processing and administration of applications for Character Housing Maintenance Grants.
3. Under the policy and guidelines approved by the Council applications for grants are to be reported back to the relevant Board, who will then make recommendations to the Character Housing Grants Panel who will make the final decision on grant applications.
4. The Character Housing Grants Panel will consist of a representative from each Board, and Strategy and Planning Group staff will provide specific heritage, urban design and neighbourhood planning advice to assist the panel in its decision making.
5. This report informs Board Members that those eligible applications received for Character Housing Maintenance Grants that fall within this Board will be discussed at this meeting. Given the limited time frame between application deadline and the Board meeting date full details are not available at time of report deadline therefore details and photographs as submitted in each application will be displayed at the Board meeting for discussion. However details of each proposal will be forwarded to each Board Member prior to the meeting to allow for each board member, should they so wish, to view the application properties prior to the Board meeting.
6. Boards Members are to assess applications with regard to their local knowledge and the criteria set out in the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy **attached** as Appendix A and recommend those applications they consider suitable for a grant to be forwarded to the Character Housing Grants Panel. To assist in the decision making process for each application a list of criteria together with a weighting structure has been **attached** as Appendix B. The Boards are to consider the merits of each application whilst the Character Grants Panel will consider the level of funding for each application.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. There are no financial implications as the funding for the Character Housing Maintenance Grants has already been approved by the Council and the funds set aside in the 2007-2008 Annual Plan.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

8. \$100,000 has been set aside in the 2007 -08 Annual Plan for this grant scheme.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. All legal considerations were considered as part of the policy formulation.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

10. As above

9. Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Yes, funding as set aside p97 of the LTCCP.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

12. Yes, as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants Scheme aligns with the Strong Communities Strategic Directions by protecting and promoting the Heritage character and history of the city. It aligns with the Liveable City Strategic Directions in protecting Christchurch's heritage buildings and neighbourhood character.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Receive this information.
- (b) Consider the Character Housing Maintenance Grant applications as displayed at the meeting.
- (c) Recommend those applications they wish the Character Housing Grants Panel to consider for a grant.

10. LYTTTELTON/MT HERBERT BOARD OBJECTIVES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Liz Carter, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present to the Board its draft objectives for the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert area, for consideration and adoption.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Several seminars have been held at which the Board has worked through the development of objectives; what it wants to achieve for its community, and how it will achieve those objectives. A set of joint objectives for the Banks Peninsula ward for the 2007-2009 period was developed last year in conjunction with the Akaroa-Wairewa Community Board, and it is those objectives which have now been further developed with a local focus upon the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert area.
3. The proposed local objectives for the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert area are attached to this report as Appendix A. These objectives have been developed for the 2007/08 year only. For some of the objectives, specifically numbers 6, 7 and 9, the Board has not set itself any specific Activity or Milestones for the current year. This was a conscious decision by the Board, as it was felt that there were sufficient activities under other objectives for the Board to address in the shortened term of its existence. The incoming Board may wish to address those issues when reviewing the objectives in the new term.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. There are no financial implications.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

5. Not applicable.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

6. There are no legal implications in adopting these objectives.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

7. The objectives are specifically linked to Community Outcomes from the Christchurch City Council LTCCP and also those developed in the 2004-14 Banks Peninsula District Council LTCCP.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

8. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

9. A link to the Council's Strategic Directions has been identified for each objective.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

10. Yes.

10. Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

11. Specific consultation is not required on this issue, as the objectives already align with the Long Term Council Community Plan, which includes the communities' desired outcomes for the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board consider the draft local objectives for the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert area, as attached in Appendix A, for adoption.

11. LYTTTELTON-MT HERBERT BOARD FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT – 2006/2007

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Liz Carter, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to submit, for the Board's information, accountability details for the end of year outcomes regarding the funding allocations of \$35,000 made by the Lyttelton-Mt Herbert Community Board in 2006/2007.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At various meeting throughout the year, the Board allocated its funding for 2006/07 as follows:

Project Reserves Funding	20,000
Discretionary Funding	<u>15,000</u>
	<u>\$35,000</u>

3. Staff, will be in attendance to respond to any questions of clarification and to elaborate on the outcomes achieved from the funding support provided by the Board.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The **attached** accountability matrix summarises the various project outcomes against the allocations made by the Board during the 2006/2007 period.
5. Details of the Board's project funding allocations are set out on Page 177 of the Council's Our Community Plan 2006-2016, Volume 1.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

6. Yes, as in 5. above.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. There are no direct legal considerations.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

8. As in 7. above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

9. **LTCCP
Democracy and Governance**

Yes, Pages 113 and 173, Volume 1 of Our Community Plan 2006/16 refer.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

10. As in 9. above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES/POLICIES

11. Social Wellbeing Strategy
Recreation and Sports Strategy
Natural Asset Management Strategy
Environmental Policy
Community Boards' Discretionary Funding Policy

12. NOTICES OF MOTION

Nil

13. CORRESPONDENCE

The **attached** items of correspondence have been received:

13.1 DIAMOND HARBOUR ROADS

John Riminton, with suggestions regarding roads in Diamond Harbour.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board receive this item of correspondence and forward it to staff for comment.

13.2 DIAMOND HARBOUR EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTRE

Karyn Davis of Port Levy has written to the Board regarding this issue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board receive this item of correspondence and forward it to staff for comment.

13.3 DIAMOND HARBOUR EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTRE

Proposed Diamond Harbour Early Childhood Centre – Nicola Green and H Laird

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board receive this item of correspondence and forward it to staff for comment.

14. BRIEFINGS

14.1 LYTTELTON TOWN CENTRE PLAN – JACK WORMALD, PROJECT MANAGER, CAPITAL PROGRAMME TEAM

Jack Wormald will attend the meeting to update to Board on the Lyttelton Town Centre Plan.

14.2 UPDATE ON ROADING ISSUES – DAVID MCNAUGHTON, ASSET ENGINEER

David McNaughton will attend the meeting to update to Board on roading issues.

15. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE

15.1 CUSTOMER SERVICES REQUEST – REPORT FROM 13 JUNE – 6 SEPTEMBER 2007

A Customer Services Request Report for the period 13 June – 6 September 2007 is **attached**.

16. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

17. MEMBERS QUESTIONS