

RICCARTON WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD

AGENDA

TUESDAY 1 DECEMBER 2009

AT 5PM

**IN THE BOARDROOM,
SOCKBURN SERVICE CENTRE
149 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, CHRISTCHURCH**

Community Board: Peter Laloli (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen, Beth Dunn, Judy Kirk, Mike Mora and Bob Shearing.

Community Board Adviser

Liz Beaven

Telephone: 941-6501

Email: liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

CLAUSE

PART B	1.	APOLOGIES
PART C	2.	CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 17 NOVEMBER 2009
PART B	3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
PART B	4.	PETITIONS
PART B	5.	NOTICE OF MOTION
PART B	6.	CORRESPONDENCE
PART B	7.	BRIEFINGS
PART A	8.	RICCARTON SERVICE CENTRE LEASE EXPIRING
PART A	9.	TEMPLETON/OLD TAI TAPU ROAD BOUNDARY ALTERATIONS
PART C	10.	APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – SAMUEL MICHAEL ANGELO
PART C	11.	RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD – 2010 MEETING DATES
PART C	12.	RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD - RECESS COMMITTEE

CLAUSE

- | | | |
|---------------|------------|---|
| PART C | 13. | RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT OF 17 NOVEMBER 2009 |
| PART C | 14. | RICCARTON/WIGRAM TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE COMMITTEE REPORT OF 23 NOVEMBER 2009 |
| PART B | 15. | COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE |
| PART B | 16. | ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE |
| PART B | 17. | MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS |

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 17 NOVEMBER 2009

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Tuesday 17 November 2009 are **attached**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 17 November 2009 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

4. PETITIONS

5. NOTICE OF MOTION

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. BRIEFINGS

8. RICcarton SERVICE CENTRE LEASE EXPIRING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Human Resources DDI 941- 8444
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Customer Services
Author:	David Dally, Unit Manager, Customer Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's recommendation to the Council on a reduction in the levels of service provided at the Riccarton Service Centre.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council currently operates a small service centre inside the New Zealand Post (NZ Post) shop on Riccarton Road. The lease agreement is a month by month arrangement, and NZ Post has given notice to the Council to vacate the area set aside for the service centre effective 1 February 2010 as the whole operation is being rebranded and renovated, requiring the space the Council currently occupies.
3. In order to minimise the impact on customers, the Council is negotiating with Kiwibank to provide a rates payments service at this location only, and a hot-line telephone to the Council Call Centre. Analysis of the transactions history over the last three years indicates that rates payments accounts for about 75 percent of the core council services provided. Hence the approximate reduction in the 2009-19 Long Term City Council Plan (LTCCP) Levels of Service would be 25 percent at that site. This reduction would be mitigated by the proximity of the Fendalton and Sockburn Service Centres, and by the provision of the "hot-line".
4. The current LTCCP makes provision for a new library and service centre at either Halswell or Hornby. Once this is in place the interim solution proposed at the Riccarton Service Centre would be discontinued.
5. The two affected staff members would be redeployed to the Civic offices, thereby reducing the need for casual staff to cover peak demand periods around the service centre network. The union have been advised.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6. The reduction in levels of service would result in significant annual net savings arising from the savings on the lease, and the saving of two full time employees. The savings would be off-set by the transaction costs charged and some one-off establishment charges and some technological work. The projected charges are commercial-in-confidence, but the net annual savings would be in the order of \$70,000.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

7. No. LTCCP budgets include the provision for full services at the Riccarton Service Centre.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. The effect of section 97 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA02) and the Council's Significance Policy.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?*Section 97*

9. Section 97(1)(a) and (2) of the LGA02 provides that "*a decision to alter significantly the intended level of service provision for any significant activity undertaken by or on behalf of the local authority, including a decision to commence or cease any such activity*" can only be taken by the Council if the decision is explicitly provided for in the Council's LTCCP and the statement of proposal for the LTCCP.

8 Cont'd

10. Although this decision involves the alteration of a level of service provision, it is not necessarily a "significant" alteration of a "significant activity" for the purposes of section 97 (although as noted below it is a matter the Council will treat as significant under its Significance Policy).
11. The Riccarton Service Centre, and service centres in general, are not listed as strategic assets of the Council in the Council's Significance Policy, and do not appear to be a "significant activity" of the Council.
12. The Council in relation to strategic assets notes that it is the assets in total not the separate elements of the assets that will trigger the section 97 provisions (as they concern strategic assets).
13. It is consistent to treat the significant alteration of a significant activity in the same way. If this proposal affected the level of service provision to all of the Council's service centres then it would likely be a significant alteration of a significant activity, but a reduction in level of service to one service centre will not trigger the requirement in section 97(1)(a), that the decision be provided for in the Council's LTCCP.

Significance Policy

14. The decision being proposed in this report does not flow consequentially from a decision in the 2009-19 LTCCP (as that indicates the Riccarton Service Centre will be a walk-in customer service providing eight hour a day coverage by Council employees – see p178/9 of the LTCCP). Therefore, in accordance with the Significance Policy the Council will treat this decision as significant.
15. The Policy provides that the Council will consider undertaking a Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) on decisions to "change a level of service specified in the LTCCP or Annual Plan", so it must consider whether or not an SCP is appropriate before it adopts one or more of the recommendations contained in this report.
16. The Significance Policy also states that the Council will not consult, or will tailor its consultation to the circumstances, for situations where failure to make a decision urgently would result in the loss of opportunities which contribute to achieving the Council's strategic directions, or matters that are commercially sensitive. In such circumstances the Council will carry out as much evaluation and consultation as is practicable while either achieving the required timeline or maintaining the appropriate level of sensitivity.
17. There is no mandatory requirement to use an SCP simply because a matter has been identified as significant. However, the more significant a matter, the higher the level of compliance that will be expected in relation to sections 77 and 78 of the LGA02. Section 79 of the LGA02 states that it is the responsibility of a local authority to make, in its discretion, judgments about this and about:
 - (i) the extent to which different options are to be identified and assessed; and
 - (ii) the degree to which benefits and costs are to be quantified; and
 - (iii) the extent and detail of the information to be considered; and
 - (iv) the extent and nature of any written record to be kept of the manner in which it has complied with those sections".
18. Section 77 requires that the Council seek to identify all reasonably practicable options for the achievement of the objective of its decision, and assess those options. Section 78 requires that, at each of the four stages of its decision-making, the Council must consider the views and preferences of those likely to be affected by, or to have an interest in the matter. (See the tables at the end of this report which discuss those matters).

8 Cont'd

19. The High Court in the Whakatane District Council versus Bay of Plenty Regional Council case stated the Council was free to determine for itself whether the level of compliance with these sections was appropriate. The choice of what are reasonably practicable options for a decision is also for the Council to make.
20. In making a judgment about the level of compliance, and options, benefits and costs, etc, a local authority must consider the significance of all relevant matters, the principles relating to local authorities set out in section 14 of the LGA02, the extent of the Council's resources, and the nature of the decision or any special circumstances in which the decision is being taken that may limit the opportunities to comply to a higher standard.

Section 80

21. Section 80 of the LGA02 enables the Council to make a decision that is significantly inconsistent with any Council policy or plan required by the LGA. In this instance the LTCCP is clearly a plan required by the LGA02 for the purposes of section 80. The Council may make a decision reducing the level of service provision for the Riccarton Service Centre, but as that decision is inconsistent with the LTCCP "full service" intention for the Riccarton Service Centre it must:

"(1) ..., when making the decision, [the Council] clearly identify —
(a) the inconsistency; and
(b) the reasons for the inconsistency; and
(c) any intention of the local authority to amend the policy or plan to accommodate the decision.....".

22. If the Council does not reduce the levels of service then as that would not be a decision that is inconsistent with the LTCCP, section 80 would not apply. If the Council makes the decision to proceed with the option recommended in this report the Council would need to identify the following matters in its decision, in order to comply with section 80:
 - The inconsistency is with the proposal to reduce the levels of service at the Riccarton Service Centre to approximately 75 percent of the current service provision set out in the LTCCP.
 - The reasons for the inconsistent decision would need to be recorded by the Council.
 - The Council would also have to identify whether it has any intention to amend the LTCCP in the future, which staff suggest could be done next year, as part of the Annual Plan process.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

23. While the applicable Activity Management Plan in the current LTCCP does not specify the individual services provided at each service centre location, it is implicitly understood that each service centre provides the normal range of services. Accordingly, the ability to pay rates only in this location would be a reduction in the Levels of Service (LOS) – despite the provision of the hot-line connection to the call centre.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

24. Yes. They support the maintenance of a service point at the location specified in the LTCCP, albeit with a reduction in the range of services offered.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

25. While no formally approved service centre location strategy is in place, the model that is being followed is to have service centres co-located with libraries – the Beckenham model. Consequently, this interim solution would be overtaken once a new library and co-located service centre are constructed at either Halswell or Hornby. Provision for this is in the LTCCP in years 2016/17 and 2017/18.

8 Cont'd

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

26. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

27. While the Legal Considerations section above identifies that the proposed reduction in LOS is a significant matter, for which a Special Consultative Process may be indicated, it is submitted that in the specific circumstances of this proposal, an SCP is not required. In particular, the proposed reduction in LOS would be only about 25 percent at this service point – one of 11 service points across the city, 10 of which would continue to offer the full range of council services. There are two other service centres within relatively close proximity: Fendalton, a free trip for seniors on a number 19 bus – and Sockburn. Furthermore, a hot-line telephone connection to the Council's Call Centre would significantly mitigate the reduction in LOS and thus reduce the net impact on customers. Consultation would be conducted with the affected Community Board, and the Board invited to conduct its own consultation within its area. This approach could be supplemented by discussions with other interested community groups in order to gain fair view of the community's opinion on the proposal. Assuming the proposal is approved, a suitable brochure would be handed to all Riccarton Service Centre customers explaining the changes to the services and the options available for accessing the services that would no longer be provided at the Riccarton site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board recommend to the Council to:

- (a) Approve the reduction in Levels of Service at the Riccarton Service Centre.
- (b) Agree that no Special Consultative Procedure is required.
- (c) Approve the arrangement with Kiwibank to provide a rates payment service and telephone service as an interim solution until such time as the library and service centre community hub is established at Halswell/Hornby.

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

28. The Riccarton Service Centre has an interesting history that goes back to amalgamation in 1989, when it was established as an interim service centre and sub-service centre associated with Sockburn. The first significant hint at a rationalisation of service centres was the Councillor Close Report of the Organisational Development Working Party (17 July 1991). This proposed "*The existing temporary suburban service delivery structure should be permanently replaced...by a combination of 28 outlets, being Civic Offices, Sockburn, Linwood and Papanui, and a network of 24 basic-service agencies, with NZ Post adopted in principle as the external agency network*". An interesting and key research finding in the report that drove the report's main recommendation was that "*only a third of citizens ever visit any Council office, and about two-thirds of them do so only for simple cash transactions*". The report therefore concluded that the capital invested in the service centre network could not be justified. Despite this analysis, nothing happened, and the network of service centres has actually increased over the intervening years.
29. The next documented attempt at rationalisation occurred in 1996, with the report "Suburban Service Delivery Beyond 1996". In essence, this report set in motion the co-location of service centres with some libraries, and this model was supplemented by the Moen Report of 1999 that proposed the delivery of walk-in counter services by integrating the customer services staff within the libraries staffing structure. This was actually implemented in some locations, but over time the staffing model unwound, but the co-location concept continued, of which Beckenham is the classic example.

8 Cont'd

30. As part of the development of the 2006-16 LTCCP, it was proposed that NZ Post provide all financial transaction services carried out at service centres. As well as generating significant savings, this would have provided a more logical and demographically driven service point network, and would have resulted in the closure of all the suburban service centres, with the service point at Civic Offices retained.
31. Council endorsed this proposal in the draft LTCCP, but reversed it at the adoption stage. Council further resolved that the Riccarton sub agency be retained.
32. This brings the narrative to the present situation and circumstances of the Riccarton Service Centre, whereby the Council has given a very clear message that it wishes the service centre network to remain controlled by the Council and be staffed by Council officers. There was also endorsement of the co-located model that works so effectively at Beckenham, Papanui, Shirley and Fendalton.
33. The following points summarise the present situation at Riccarton:
 - A sub-service centre has operated from within the NZ Post Shop on Riccarton Road since amalgamation in 1989. It was intended to be a temporary arrangement. It offers the full range of Council services, processing about 17,000 financial transactions per annum. Of these, 57 percent are rates, nine percent parking tickets, nine percent dog registration payments, and 15 percent is revenue generated from photocopying services.
 - Council pays an annual lease, which has been on a month by month basis. Because of the uncertainty of continued occupation, significant staff effort has been expended in attempts to secure suitable alternative accommodation in the immediate area. This has included reviewing possibilities within Council-owned sites, including the former town hall and the Riccarton Library. These have proven unsatisfactory primarily on cost grounds in the case of the former town hall, and the lack of space (and no budget) to co-locate with the Riccarton Library. Leasing alternative commercial was discounted as being too expensive, given that this would be an interim arrangement.
 - NZ Post has now advised that the Council presence will terminate on 1 February 2010.
 - The nearest service centre to Riccarton is co-located with the Fendalton Library. This is a free trip for pensioners of about three kilometres on a number 19 bus.
 - It would be cost-effective to contract Kiwibank to provide payment services just at this location. A billpay proposal is being considered to provide a rates payments service and a telephone link to the call centre. Contracting out other financial services as part of this arrangement is not favoured due to their relative complexity (dogs registrations and infringement payments can be awkward) and relatively low volume.
 - There would be a staff saving of two full time employees. However, these staff members would be retained and work in the Civic Offices, with an equivalent saving in the casual staffing that would no longer be required.
 - There is a manual rates receipting service provided by Civic Video in the Hornby Mall. Last financial year Council paid \$2,650 for this service, representing about 3,500 rates payments. These are then processed by back-office. This service will be continued until such time as there is a service centre presence in either Halswell or Hornby.

THE OBJECTIVES

34. The objective is to retain a Council service outlet in the Riccarton area, albeit with a reduction in the range of services offered. The impact of this reduction would be mitigated by the provision of a hot-line phone to the Council Call Centre. This would be an interim solution until such time as there is a new library and service centre at either Halswell or Hornby.

8 Cont'd

THE OPTIONS

35. There are three options as follows:

1. Do nothing and accept the loss of all council services to the Riccarton community overall when the Riccarton Service Centre ceases to operate on 1 February 2010. This would mean the closest service points would be at the Sockburn Service Centre and the co-located Fendalton Library and Service Centre.
2. Continue to seek an alternative site in the area. As detailed above, this option appears to be unrealistic on space and cost grounds.
3. Negotiate a suitable agreement with Kiwibank for a rates payment service at the present site, complemented with a hot-line to the Council Call Centre. This would also have significant financial benefits as outlined above, as well as providing a satisfactory interim solution to the service need.

THE PREFERRED OPTION

36. Option 3 is the preferred option.

8 Cont'd

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option

37. Negotiate a suitable agreement with Kiwibank for a rates payment service at the present site, complemented with a hot-line to the Council Call Centre.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Maintains a service point in the current location, along with a phone link to the Council's Call Centre. The phone connection to the call centre would be a service not presently available.	There would be a reduction in the range of counter services offered, notably animals and infringement payments would not be available over the counter.
Cultural	Nil	Nil
Environmental	Nil	Nil
Economic	There would be a net saving in service delivery costs in the order of \$70,000 per year.	
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>No significant impact.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Nil.</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>Nil.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Some opposition is expected as there would be a reduction in the Levels of Service at this location.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>Nil.</p>		

8 Cont'd

Maintain the Status Quo (if not preferred option)

38. Do nothing and accept an even lower Level of Service to the Riccarton community overall when the Riccarton Service Centre ceases to operate on 1 February 2010. This would mean the closest service points would be at the Sockburn Service Centre and the co-located Fendalton Library and Service Centre.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Nil	Loss of all Council Services at this location.
Cultural	Nil	Nil
Environmental	Nil	Nil
Economic	\$93,000 being the lease and FTE savings.	Additional travel costs for customers.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>The loss of services at this location with no replacement plan may impact on the community outcome "A well-governed city".</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Nil.</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>Nil.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Inconsistent with the 2009-19 LTCCP, which specifies a Service Centre at Riccarton, implying a full range of Council services are available.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>The local community is likely to be very unhappy with the withdrawal of Council services from this location.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>Nil.</p>		

8 Cont'd

At Least one Other Option (or an explanation of why another option has not been considered)

39. Continue to seek an alternative site in the area.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Maintain the current Level of Service.	If the service centre is in a different location, this may upset and confuse customers.
Cultural	Nil	Nil
Environmental	Nil	Nil
Economic	Travel convenience for customers.	Refurbishment costs, lease costs. These are not precisely known, but high.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: No impact.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities: Nil.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Nil.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Yes.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: No opposition likely.</p> <p>Other relevant matters: Nil.</p>		

9. TEMPLETON/OLD TAI TAPU ROAD BOUNDARY ALTERATIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Strategy and Planning Group
Author:	Michael Annear, Assistant Policy Planner, Strategy and Planning Group

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's recommendation to the Council to submit two boundary alteration proposals to the Selwyn District Council for the areas of Templeton and Old Tai Tapu Road in accordance with Part 1, Schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 2002.
2. This report (the Templeton/Old Tai Tapu Road Boundary Alterations) and any decisions associated with this report do not initiate a boundary alteration. Rather, the filing of the proposals with Selwyn District Council enacts the statutory process for beginning a boundary alteration via the Local Government Act 2002.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. In February 2002, the Councillors adopted a report recommending a boundary alteration in the vicinity of Templeton and authorised staff to consult with affected land owners to ascertain their views on a proposed boundary alteration.
4. Staff have recently been asked to review existing work and advance the boundary alteration proposal to provide more certainty to land owners in the area and to create a more logical and coherent boundary in these areas.
5. Furthermore, since 2002, a new area has come to the attention of both the Christchurch City Council (CCC) and Selwyn District Council (SDC). This is the property situated at 280 Old Tai Tapu Road and has been identified as a high priority. The District Planning Team has considered this option in the second boundary alteration proposal (see **Attachment 2A and Attachment 2B**). An area immediately to the east of Templeton (see **Attachment 1A and Attachment 1B**) has also come to light as a potential location for a boundary alteration. This area includes approximately 3.6 hectares of residential land and up to nine households. Discussions with SDC staff and affected land owners are ongoing. These discussions are for the purpose of information gathering and are non statutory. There will be further opportunities for affected land owners to participate in a later statutory consultation process once a draft reorganisation scheme has been prepared.
6. The main reason for undertaking a boundary alteration is because the present location of the CCC territorial boundary bisects a number of properties, creating difficulties and uncertainties in relation to bylaw administration, rates collection, service provision, electoral and census activities. Furthermore, the existing boundary also bisects the Templeton community into western and eastern sections, creating problems for neighbourhood identity, electoral and census activities.
7. In order to begin the boundary alteration process, a *proposal* must be initiated by CCC under clause 1(1) of Schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 2002, as an affected local authority. The Council prepares the proposal and then files the proposal with any other affected local authorities. In this case, the Council would file the proposal with Selwyn District Council.
8. The proposals to alter the boundary between Christchurch and Selwyn has been formulated generally on the following basis:
 - (a) Meeting the requirements of Schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 2002.
 - (b) Creating greater coherence and rationality of the boundary in the areas of Templeton and Old Tai Tapu Road and improving local governance through the consolidation of distinct communities of interest.
 - (c) Aligning the boundary with existing cadastral boundaries and avoiding buildings and other major structures.
 - (d) Transferring the land in Templeton, which is currently in Selwyn and primarily developed for urban purposes into Christchurch.

9 Cont'd

- (e) Transferring the land in Templeton and Old Tai Tapu Road that is currently in Christchurch and primarily developed for rural purposes to Selwyn.
- 9. This report promotes a rational boundary for administrative purposes. It does not investigate the possible advantages or disadvantages to the property owners involved.
- 10. Should the proposals be implemented, then it is likely that land being transferred into Christchurch City would attract an urban zoning, with land transferring into Selwyn attracting an appropriate rural zoning.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 11. There are costs associated with staff time in preparation of the reorganisation proposals and reorganisation schemes. Staff time is funded via the 2009/10 District Plan work programme and in part from Legal Services Unit. At the completion of the boundary alteration process, which will be the subject of further Council deliberations, there will ultimately be some small costs associated with rezoning (and possible increases to service provision). It is expected rezoning costs will be funded via the 2010/11 or following year District Plan work programme. There would be a small increase in rate revenue to reflect the rezoning.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

- 12. Yes. Covered by existing unit budget.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 13. Legal advice has been sought, and the Legal Services Unit is reviewing all documents associated with the proposed boundary alteration.

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

- 14. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

- 15. Aligns with the District Plan Activity Management Plan.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

- 16. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

- 17. The boundary alteration aligns with the objectives of the South-West Area Plan; notably, the objective to visibly define and reinforce the urban limit. The boundary proposal also aligns with the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy, which seeks a well-defined district boundary, which creates a demarcation between urban and rural areas.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

- 18. Yes.

9 Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

19. This proposal has been discussed with the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board at its 3 November 2009 meeting. Face-to-face meetings with all directly affected land owners have been undertaken for the purposes of information gathering and obtaining feedback on the proposal. The proposed boundary alteration has also been discussed with staff from the Selwyn District Council, and representatives from Statistics New Zealand and the Local Government Commission, who have indicated their support for the proposed alteration.
20. Land owners were generally supportive of a boundary alteration; although some concerns were raised regarding possible rezoning (which is a secondary process following the boundary alteration), changes to rating arrangements and possible changes to service provision resulting from a boundary alteration.
21. Cookie Time Limited representatives indicated their desire to see all of their properties included within the Christchurch City boundary to facilitate future business expansion. One of the properties associated with Cookie Time Limited (19 Trents Road, Lot 1 DP 13960) however, has not been included within the proposed Christchurch City boundary because it has a separate title and has currently not been developed beyond a rural land use, which is inconsistent with the surrounding land uses.
22. The residents of 845 Main South Road would like their property, particularly the area surrounding the house, included within Christchurch due to existing water connections. Further discussions would need to be undertaken with SDC to determine whether all services would be transferred to Selwyn or whether the CCC would continue to provide access to water reticulation. The property in question is currently on tank supply; however, the owners have indicated their desire to retain the option of moving to CCC supply in the future.
23. Discussions with affected land owners to the east of Templeton are ongoing. These discussions are for the purpose of informing and are non statutory. There will be further opportunities for affected land owners to participate in a later statutory consultation process once a draft reorganisation scheme has been prepared.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board recommend to the Council:

- (a) That the Council approve the two boundary alteration proposals for filing with the Selwyn District Council in accordance with Part 1, Schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 2002, to start the formal boundary alteration process.
- (b) That the Council approve staff, in conjunction with the Legal Services Unit, to prepare a draft reorganisation scheme in the likely event that the Christchurch City Council become the appointed local authority for the boundary alteration process (as indicated in early discussions with the Selwyn District Council).

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

24. The main driver for the proposed boundary alteration is to create a more rational and coherent boundary between Christchurch and Selwyn in the vicinity of Templeton and Old Tai Tapu Road. At present, the current boundary bisects a number of properties. Specific issues include the following:
 - (a) The existing boundary bisects the bar area of the Golden Mile Tavern (10 Trents Road);
 - (b) The shop at the Cookie Time Factory is in Christchurch City while the factory is primarily within Selwyn District (789 Main South Road);
 - (c) Cookie Time Factory access, car parks and other facilities associated with the existing operation are also located outside the current Christchurch territorial boundary at 7 Trents Road, while some of the factory and shop are located within the boundary;
 - (d) The current Christchurch territorial boundary bisects a property and buildings at 785 Main South Road;

9 Cont'd

- (e) The boundary bisects a rural property and associated farm buildings at 845 Main South Road on the edge of Templeton; and
 - (f) The boundary bisects a rural property at 280 Old Tai Tapu Road.
 - (g) A small grouping of residential properties immediately to the east of Templeton and north of Main South Road are currently within Selwyn District despite being inconsistent with Selwyn District Council zoning in the surrounding area and having a close association with Templeton.
25. Two proposals have been developed, one for Templeton and one for Old Tai Tapu Road. The alteration of the boundary at 280 Old Tai Tapu Road is relatively straight forward and involves only one property owner. The alteration of the boundary at Templeton involves more properties and is likely to be the subject of more discussion throughout the process. The two proposals will require the development of two separate reorganisation schemes. However, it is anticipated that the first steps in the boundary alteration process for both proposals can be undertaken at the same time.
26. Both proposals will promote good local government in both Christchurch City and Selwyn District. They relate to very small boundary alterations and both Christchurch City Council and Selwyn District Council will continue to:
- (a) have the resources necessary to enable them to carry out their responsibilities, duties and powers;
 - (b) have districts that are appropriate for the efficient and effective performance of their roles as specified in Section 11 of the Local Government Act, 2002;
 - (c) contain within their districts sufficiently distinct communities of interest; and
 - (d) be able to meet the requirements of Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002.
27. Under the Local Government Act 2002, decision making criteria for determining the position of a boundary include statistical meshblock boundaries (important for electoral purposes), regional boundaries and catchment boundaries. Also of importance is the need to promote good local government as a consequence of a boundary alteration, which entails ensuring that each local government has sufficient resources to carry out its duties, responsibilities and powers, and contain a sufficiently distinct community of interest.
28. Should the Council approve the lodging of the boundary alteration proposals with the Selwyn District Council the following next steps would occur:
- (a) Selwyn District Council has 60 days to review the proposals and decide whether the boundary alteration will be led by an appointed local authority, a joint committee (comprising equal numbers of persons from each affected territorial authority), or whether the Local Government Commission will oversee the boundary alteration.
 - (b) The appointed local authority or the joint committee prepare the draft reorganisation schemes for public consultation. Copies of the schemes are sent to relevant parties including the Local Government Commission and affected local authorities as specified in clause 12 of Schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 2002.
 - (c) A territorial authority has two years within which to make changes to its district plan to accommodate any new land areas included within its boundary once the reorganisation scheme has been formally adopted.

THE OBJECTIVES

29. To create a rational and coherent territorial boundary in the vicinity of Templeton and Old Tai Tapu Road that meets Local Government Act conditions for the alterations of boundaries.

9 Cont'd

THE OPTIONS

30. The Council may

- (a) Confirm the boundary alteration proposals for lodgement with the Selwyn District Council for the initiation of the formal boundary alteration process.

OR

- (b) Maintain the status quo (i.e. no change to the existing boundary).

OR

- (c) Direct Council staff to consider a different boundary alteration option.

THE PREFERRED OPTION

31. Council confirms the current proposals for lodgement with the Selwyn District Council.

9 Cont'd

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option

33. Option 1: Approve the boundary alteration proposals for lodgement with the Selwyn District Council for the initiation of the formal boundary change process.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Improves local governance and creates a coherent community of interest.	Nil.
Cultural	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Environmental	Creates a more rational, western boundary for Christchurch.	Nil.
Economic	Creates certainty for land owners regarding bylaws, rates collection and land zoning.	Small increase in costs associated with increased levels of service provision. In many cases however, CCC already provides water and waste services to properties along the boundary.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Primary alignment with the LTCCP community outcome <i>a well governed city</i>.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Small increase in service provision is likely in the vicinity of Templeton.</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>Nil.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Supports the Council's 2009-19 LTCCP.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken with affected property owners, the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board and officers from the Selwyn District Council to inform the proposed boundary alteration.</p> <p>Land owners were supportive of boundary alteration; although some concerns were raised regarding possible rezoning, changes to rating arrangements and possible changes to service provision.</p> <p>Cookie Time Limited representatives indicated their desire that all properties owned by Cookie Time Limited and its associates be included within the Christchurch City boundary to facilitate future business expansion. One of the properties associated with Cookie Time Limited (19 Trents Road) however, has not been included within the proposed Christchurch City boundary because it has a separate title and has currently not been developed beyond a rural land use. That is, it is more consistent with land uses in Selwyn than land uses in Christchurch.</p> <p>The residents of 845 Main South Road would like their property, specifically the area surrounding the house, included within Christchurch due to existing water connections. Further discussions would need to be undertaken with the Selwyn District Council to determine whether all services would be transferred to Selwyn or whether the Christchurch City Council would continue to provide access to water services. The property in question is currently on tank supply; however, the owners have indicated their desire to retain the option of moving to Council supply in the future.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>Nil.</p>		

9 Cont'd

34. Option 2: Maintain the status quo (no change to the existing boundary).
35. Option 3: Direct Council staff to consider a different boundary alteration option.

10. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – SAMUEL MICHAEL ANGELO

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Recreation and Sports Unit
Author:	Lisa Gregory, Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval for an application for funding from the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant, Samuel Michael Angelo, is a 17 year old who lives in Templeton and is seeking Community Board support to travel to the North Island to attend a week long Swimming New Zealand Youth and Development training camp. This trip will take place from 25 – 31 January 2010.
3. Sam has been involved in swimming for six years and currently trains in the pool up to nine times a week and up to four sessions a week in the gym. The camp that Sam has been selected for aims to prepare swimmers for national selection for future national and international events.
4. Sam's achievements include a 12th placing at the Olympic trials for the 1500m as a 15 year old. He was also the Canterbury Open Champion for this distance as a 15 year old. At 16, Sam was the 50m and 100m freestyle champion and has held several South Island and Canterbury age group records.
5. Sam is currently a member of the Canterbury open relay team and Canterbury open record holder. At the 2009 National Spring meet, Sam swam the fastest 100m freestyle for the 17 year age group.
6. This trip will be of personal benefit to Sam as it will assist to develop his competitive and technical skills in the water that will hopefully lead to future team selections.
7. Individually Sam has been seeking sponsorship for his trip, with no success at present. He works a part time job and earnings from this will go towards his trip.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The following table provides a breakdown of funding requested:

SAMUEL MICHAEL ANGELO	
EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
Transport and Pool Costs	\$225
Accommodation and Meals	\$497
Miscellaneous	\$132
Airfares	\$258
Total Cost	\$1,112

9. This is the first time the applicant has applied for funding from the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board.
10. At the time of writing this report there is an unallocated balance of \$1,600.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

11. Yes, see page 172, Strengthening Communities.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

12. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. Aligns with page 184 in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

14. Yes, see page 172, Strengthening Communities.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

15. Application aligns with the Council's Youth Strategy and local Community Board objectives.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

16. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve the funding application and allocate \$300 to Samuel Michael Angelo as a contribution for his Swimming New Zealand Development Camp expenses from the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme.

11. RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD – 2010 MEETING DATES

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To seek the adoption by the Board of its ordinary meeting dates from February to September 2010 inclusive.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In order that the business of the Board can be conducted in an orderly manner, and to allow public notification to be given of those meetings in compliance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, it is necessary for the Board to adopt a schedule of ordinary meetings for 2010.
3. The next triennial Christchurch City elections will be held on Saturday 9 October 2010, and the schedule of dates therefore lists meetings from February to September inclusive. It will be for the incoming Board to decide on its governance and meeting arrangements, following the elections.
4. The dates proposed assume that meetings of the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board will continue to be held in the Boardroom, Sockburn Service Centre, 149 Main South Road, Christchurch as follows:
 - **Board meetings** to be held on the first Tuesday of each month (5.30pm) and the third Tuesday of each month (4.30pm). The third Tuesday of the month Board meeting is to focus on adopting the previous Board minutes and consider any urgent issues that can not wait until the next Board meeting.
 - **Community Services Committee** to be held on the third Tuesday of each month commencing after the Board meeting.
 - **Transport and Greenspace Committee** to be held on the Monday of each month following "community week".
5. The proposed meeting schedule is **attached**.
6. The schedule also includes the allocation of the Board's Strengthening Communities Funding Decision meeting prior to its Transport and Greenspace meeting on 19 July 2010 and also the setting of a date for the Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee.
7. The Board will also recall that Week 3 of each calendar month is "community week" for Councillors; where as far as possible Council meetings are not scheduled during that week so that Councillors have the opportunity to be active in the community in their representation role, including for Community Board business and activities. By agreeing to the dates for its 2010 meetings as proposed in this report, the Board will greatly assist with achieving the aim of keeping Week 3 as a "community week".

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?**

8. Yes. Provision is made in the 2009-19 LTCCP on pages 154 to 159, for elected member representation and governance.

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

9. Yes. In respect of Schedule 7, Clause 19 of the Local Government Act 2002, community boards may adopt a schedule of ordinary meetings that are also required to be publicly notified in accordance with Section 46 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

11 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

10. Yes. Pages 156 to 159 of the LTCCP regarding levels of service for democracy and governance.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- (a) It is recommended that the Board consider adopting the meeting schedule for 2010 as set out in **Attachment 1** of this report.
- (b) It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee meeting be held on Wednesday 11 August 2010 at 4pm.

12. RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD - RECESS COMMITTEE

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to put in place delegation arrangements for matters of a routine nature (including applications for funding) normally dealt with by the Board, to cover the period following its last scheduled meeting for 2009 (being 15 December 2009) until the Board resumes its ordinary meetings in February 2010.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In past years it has been practice for the Board to give delegated authority to a Recess Committee to make decisions, if required, on its behalf over the Christmas/New Year period.
3. During the same period in 2008/09, the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board delegated its authority to make decisions to a Recess Committee comprising either the Board Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson and two Board members.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- (a) That a Board Recess Committee comprising of the Board Chairperson/Deputy Chairperson and two Board members be authorised to exercise the delegated powers of the Community Board for the period following its 15 December 2009 meeting until the Board resumes its scheduled business in February 2010.
- (b) That the application of any such delegation be reported back to the Board for record purposes.

13. RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE – REPORT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE – 17 NOVEMBER 2009

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser
Author:	Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the Community Services Committee meeting held on Tuesday 17 November 2009.

The meeting was attended by Judy Kirk (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen, Beth Dunn, Peter Laloli, Mike Mora and Bob Shearing.

1. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

Nil.

2. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

3. BRIEFINGS

Nil.

4. APPLICATION TO THE RICcarton/WIGRAM 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – LUKE COSSEY

The Committee considered a report seeking funding from the Community Board's 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme for Luke Cossey to participate in an exchange programme with the University of Kunming in Yunnan, China.

The Committee's decision on this matter is recorded under clause 9 of this report.

5. APPLICATION TO THE RICcarton/WIGRAM 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME - JONATHON WARD

The Committee considered a report seeking funding from the Community Board's 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme for Jonathon Ward to participate in a trip as a member of the school's Edmund Rice Group, to Brisbane.

The Committee's decision on this matter is recorded under clause 9 of this report.

6. APPLICATION TO THE RICcarton/WIGRAM 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – RICcarton, HALSWELL AND HORNBY COMMUNITY DIRECTORIES

The Committee considered a report seeking funding from the Community Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund for \$507 for the printing costs of 100 Community Directories each for Riccarton, Halswell and Hornby, i.e. 300 directories in total.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 10 of this report.

13 Cont'd

7. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – ANZAC WREATHS AND PUBLICATION OF COMMUNITY BOARD MEDIA ARTICLES

The Committee considered a report seeking funding from the Community Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund for:

- (a) To purchase five wreaths for ANZAC Day 2010 at a total cost of \$500; and
- (b) To publish two Community Board articles in local community newspapers during the 2009/10 year at a cost of up to \$2,500.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 10 of this report.

8. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – HALSWELL RUGBY LEAGUE FOOTBALL CLUB

The Committee considered a report seeking funding from the Community Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund for \$4,992.75 for the installation of security grills at the Halswell Rugby League Football Clubrooms at Halswell Domain.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 10 of this report.

9. COMMITTEE DECISIONS

9.1 APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – LUKE COSSEY

The Committee **resolved** to support the funding application and allocate \$400 from the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme to Luke Cossey as a contribution towards the costs of attending a Chinese Language Exchange programme in November 2009.

9.2 APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – JONATHON WARD

The Committee resolved to support the funding application and allocate \$250 from the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme to Jonathon Ward as a contribution towards costs associated with participating in his trip to Brisbane as part of the Edmund Rice Group of St Thomas of Canterbury College.

(Peter Laloli abstained from discussion or voting therein on this matter. Mike Mora declared a conflict of interest on this matter and took no part in the discussion or voting therein).

10. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – RICCARTON, HALSWELL AND HORNBY COMMUNITY DIRECTORIES

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Committee recommend to the Board to approve the funding application and allocate \$507 from the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund towards the printing costs associated with producing 100 Community Directories each for Riccarton, Halswell and Hornby, (i.e. 300 directories in total).

Staff advised that the total cost to produce the directories has been amended to \$338.

13 Cont'd

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the Board allocate \$338 from the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund towards the printing costs associated with producing 100 Community Directories each for Riccarton and Hornby, (i.e. 200 directories in total).

10.2 APPLICATION TO THE RICcarton/WIGRAM 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – ANZAC WREATHS AND PUBLICATION OF COMMUNITY BOARD MEDIA ARTICLES

That the Board allocate from the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund:

- (a) \$500 for the purchase of five wreaths for ANZAC Day 2010.
- (b) \$2,500 for the publishing of two Community Board articles in local community media.

10.3 APPLICATION TO THE RICcarton/WIGRAM 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – HALSWELL RUGBY LEAGUE FOOTBALL CLUB

That the Board allocate \$3,500 from the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to the Halswell Rugby League Football Club as a contribution to install security grills at the Halswell Rugby League Clubrooms.

The meeting concluded at 6.10pm.

14. RICcarton/WIGRAM TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE COMMITTEE – REPORT OF TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE COMMITTEE – 23 NOVEMBER 2009

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser
Author:	Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the Transport and Greenspace Committee meeting held on Monday 23 November 2009.

The meeting was attended by Mike Mora (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen, Beth Dunn, Judy Kirk, Peter Laloli and Bob Shearing.

1. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

- 1.1 Tony Milne, Chairperson of the Central Riccarton Residents' Association, discussed with the Committee the Residents Association consideration of installing traffic calming on Dilworth Street between Division Street and Rotherham Street to aid pedestrian safety.

The Committee requested staff advice on the need and possible options for further pedestrian facilities on Dilworth Street between Division Street and Rotherham Street.

- 1.2 Darcy Brittliff, Chartered Professional Engineer, and Ray O'Callaghan, New Zealand Divisional Manager, of Cardno TCB, and Richard Smith, Manager of Shopping Centre Investments discussed with the Committee the Hornby Mall Roading Infrastructure proposal to realign Chalmers Street and to facilitate expansion of the Hub.

The Committee thanked the presenters for their work to date on the project and suggest they make contact with the Council staff to further the project.

2. CORRESPONDENCE

- 2.1 A letter was received from Kathy Hill of Marsack Crescent on safety concerns within the vicinity of Milns and Halswell Roads Intersection.

The Committee requested that the staff update the Committee on the project for the footpath in Halswell from Dunbars Road to Templeton Road.

3. BRIEFINGS

- 3.1 Tony Spowart, Regional Traffic and Safety Manager, New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) discussed with the Committee matters in relation to New Zealand Transport Agency matters within the Riccarton/Wigram Ward.

Specific mention was made of the following matters:

- 3.1.1 **Yaldhurst Road/Racecourse Road Intersection** – The safety work that was started recently is on hold until a landowner's concern about the safety works have been addressed.

- 3.1.2 **Lowther Street/Main South Road Intersection** – New Zealand Transport Authority are now proceeding with looking at options of keeping two lanes coming out of Lowther Street on to Main South Road after the recent site visit with elected members, staff and NZTA.

14 Cont'd

- 3.1.3 **Marsham/Carmen Roads Upgrade** – The Committee was informed of the timeline for the four laning of Carmen Road from Waterloo Road to Main South Road. Design plans should be available before Christmas. Construction is planned for 2013.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 5.1 of this report.

- 3.1.4 **Southern Motorway** – Tenders for the construction of the Southern Motorway are being looked at and could be awarded by Christmas. Construction could start as early as March but more likely to begin around September 2010.

- 3.1.5 **Main South Road Bus Priority** – Consultant should hopefully be appointed by Christmas.

- 3.1.6 **Pound Road Heavy Transport Bypass** – the project is ongoing.

- 3.1.7 **Barthers Road/Main South Road** – The Committee was advised that there is no definite timeline for a new traffic management system for this intersection until the former Islington Freezing Works site consent has been confirmed.

The Committee requested a staff update on the proposed subdivision on the site.

4. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Committee members held a general discussion on the following matter:

- 4.1 **Rotherham Street/Westfield Mall Entrance** – The Committee was advised that the Residents' Association still have concerns on the conflict between pedestrians and the entrance of the Westfields Mall carpark on Rotherham Street. The Association have suggested that a flashing warning light be put there to warn drivers/pedestrians. The Committee asked that the suggestion made by the Residents' Association be included in staff advice on the pedestrians facilities on Dilworth Street between Division and Rotherham Streets.

5. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 **Marsham/Carmen Roads Upgrade** - That the Community Board Chairperson write to the New Zealand Transport Agency indicating their support for the Carmen Road Four Laning Project.

The meeting concluded at 11.05am.

1. 12. 2009

- 30 -

15. **COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
16. **ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
17. **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**