

City Development

Activity: Long Term Strategy, Policy and Planning

Service: Area Plans

Total Spend: Made up of:

- South West Area	\$335,000
- Belfast	\$140,000
- Upper Styx Harewood	\$112,000
- Memorial Russley	\$130,000

Activity: Long Term Strategy, Policy and Planning

Service: Area Plans (Cont)

Service reduction: Postpone on the Upper Styx Harewood Area Plan.

Amount: \$112,000

Pros: Reduction in rates increase

Cons: Delay in completion of the area plan will impact negatively on:

- the implementation of rezoning and development in the Styx Harewood area,
- determining the effective urban boundary for the city in that area,
- completing infrastructure planning and provision in the area.

Place Council under renewed developer pressure to pursue adhoc rezoning and development in the absence of clear Council direction.

Note: other area plans are responding to pressing problems, or Environment Court directions

Implementation: Effective from 1 July 2006.

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

Internal target of completing 2 area plans per year not achieved

Policy Change:

None

Activity: Long Term Strategy, Policy and Planning

Service: Strategies

Total Spend: Made up of:

- Liveable City	\$550,000
- Strong Communities	\$220,000
- Healthy Environment	\$590,000
- Economic Prosperity	\$ 50,000

TOTAL **\$1,410,000**

Key Strategies for completion by end 06/07

Strong Communities; Housing, Community Development, Finish Aquatic Facilities, Events

Health Environment; Open Space, Surface water, NRRP, Biodiversity

Economic Prosperity; Visitors, Prosperous Christchurch

Liveable City; UDS, Transport, Urban Form,

Activity: Heritage Protection

Service: Heritage Grants & Covenants

Total Spend: Made up of:

- Historic Places Maintenance	\$75,000
- Character House Maintenance	\$75,000 (finishes 10/11)
- Historic Building Retention	\$320,000
- Historic Building Emergency	\$200,000
TOTAL	\$670,000

Activity: Heritage Protection

Service: Heritage Grants & Covenants (Cont)

Service reduction: All the above funding is discretionary. In particular the Character House Maintenance Grants is a programme that has not been implemented to date (\$75,000).

Amount: \$670,000

Pros: Reduction in rates increase

Cons: Reduces Council's capacity to intervene pro-actively to protect heritage items.

Reduces capacity at the same time as changes to the Building Act (seismic strengthening) and the likely Earthquake Prone, Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings Policy will both increase the risk of heritage building demolition.

Heritage is a clearly identified Community Outcome and has widespread community support. Changes may generate negative community response.

Implementation:

Existing grants for 05/06 need to be honoured.

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

Decrease in number of properties protected by covenants

Policy Change:

Heritage Conservation Policy

Heritage Grants Policy

Heritage Covenants Policy

Character House Maintenance Grants – only Council resolution

Activity: Long Term Strategy, Policy and Planning

Service: Strategies (Cont)

Service reduction: Slow down development of strategies and policies; reduce the number of strategies to be substantially completed by 30/6/07 by 3 and do not work on any overarching policies. Strategies that would not be worked on in 06/07 are Urban Form and Open Space. As a result strategies such as Democratic Participation which should be started in 06/07 would not commence .

Amount: \$310,000

Pros: Reduction in rates increase

Cons: Delays completion of Council Long Term Strategic policy framework.

Identified strategies will result in these strategies not being available to contribute towards other key strategies: eg. UDS, Community Development

Lack of comprehensive and up to date strategies will expose Council to greater adhoc planning, development and decision making.

Will delay Council's capacity to give direction to both the achievement of, and its contribution to the City's Community Outcomes.

Implementation: Effective from 1 July 2006

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

As strategy/policy development is an input to other activities/units lack of strategic direction will impact on their ability to deliver projects and manage their assets

Policy Change:

None

Community Support

Activity: Community Support

Total Spend: \$8.2 Million

Service reduction: reduce total community grant funds available for distribution

Amount: (Up to \$2 million)

Pros: reduce dependence on Council grants, more targeted spending, incentive to be more effective

Cons: some community groups currently receiving funding would miss out or would receive less, public reaction

Implementation: staged from 1st July 2006 – reduction would be permanent, some existing commitments would mean a greater impact initially on some recipients

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: An assumed impact on level of service, however may not directly correlate to 25% reduction.

Policy Change: Community Grants and level of funding options developed waiting Council approval

Activity: Community Support

Total Spend: \$1,985K

Service reduction: rationalise community hall numbers by 20%

Amount: (\$ 397k operational maintenance plus possible capital money if sold)

Pros: Community Halls where needed, less halls to manage, occupancy levels of retained halls may increase

Cons: public reaction, some community groups would need to be housed elsewhere

Implementation: staged after community facilities plan finalised - savings not immediate, years 2 - 3

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: Occupancy levels of retained halls may increase

Policy Change: Community facilities plan currently being developed

Activity: Community Support

Total Spend: \$0

Service reduction: exit 3 early learning centres

Amount: (\$ minor – currently self funding in 2006 because of increased central govt funding)

Pros: not core business, other providers have expertise, could be contracted/leased

Cons: customer reaction, users of QEII and Pioneer Leisure Centre, users may not have access to convenient child care facilities

Implementation: commence early 2007 and is permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: Service no longer provided may be filled by the market

Policy Change: Council would need to approve decision to exit. Currently awaiting report from external adviser.

Culture and Learning

Activity: Cultural and Learning

Total Spend: (Business as usual \$357k for this activity)

Service reduction: exit provision of mobile library

Amount: (\$80k)

Pros: focus service to fixed service points and online services, operational efficiency

Cons: no access to Library Services by those unable to travel

Implementation: 1st July 2006 – reduction would be permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: possibly a small reduction in book issues

Policy Change: Council decision required as part of LTCCP process

Activity: Cultural and Learning

Total Spend: (Business as usual \$588K for this activity)

Service reduction: rationalise provision of libraries in the city. Exit service provided at e.g. Redwood, Bishopdale, Spreydon

Amount: (up to \$450k operational)

Pros: Rationalisation of provision to medium to large sized libraries, service consolidation

Cons: community reaction, some people may have to travel further to a library

Implementation: Possibly start 2007 and would be staged – reduction would be permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: Less service points, but respreading of business to offer service points. May affect book issues and visitation.

Policy Change: Libraries 2025 strategy currently being developed and rationalisation envisaged with the opening of new libraries at South, Upper Riccarton, Parklands

Activity: Cultural and Learning

Total Spend: (Business as usual \$421K for this activity)

Service reduction: contract out bindery operations

Amount: (up to \$50K)

Pros: operational efficiency

Cons: Market may not deliver savings, market hasn't been tested

Implementation: process would start once decision was made and would be permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: No impact, level of service specified in contract

Policy Change: nil

Activity: Cultural and Learning

Total Spend: (Business as usual \$172K for this activity)

Service reduction: reduce library opening hours

Amount: (\$80K)

Pros: Libraries opened based on community need

Cons: Adverse customer reaction, people would have to travel further to access libraries

Implementation: process would start once decision was made and would be permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: Depending on how the change was implemented issues may decline, access reduced.

Policy Change: Council decision required

Activity: Cultural and Learning

Total Spend: (Business as usual \$380K for this activity includes MOE Funding)

Service reduction: stop provision of learning centres at South once MOE Funding ceases

Amount: (\$20K)

Pros: operational efficiency

Cons: community reaction, Council's contribution to lifelong learning Community outcomes reduced. Loss of service for schools and community programmes.

Implementation: process would start once decision was made and would be permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: community reaction, Council's contribution to lifelong learning Community outcomes reduced. Loss of service for schools and community programmes.

Policy Change: Council's lifelong learning strategy yet to be prepared, report currently being prepared for Portfolio Group on future direction.

Democracy and Governance

Activity: Democracy & Governance

Service: Elected Member Representation, Public Participation, Decision Making, Elections

Total Spend (Net Cost of Service): Made up of:

- Elected Member Representation	\$5,734,735
- Decision Making	\$3,728,865
- Elections	\$ 57,072
TOTAL	\$9,520,671

Activity: Democracy & Governance

Service: Elected Member Representation, Public Participation, Decision Making, Elections

Service reduction: Democracy & Governance as a Group of Activity is provided by the Secretariat, it however also includes some Media Relations and External Communications costs from the Communications Unit.

The majority of costs in this Activity relate to the provision of support to Elected Members, Remuneration and other costs associated with Elected Members as set by the Remuneration Authority, costs involved in obtaining public participation and costs of managing the Elections. Community Board funding (\$2,340k) also sits within this activity, any savings associated with Community Funding would include this amount and is covered in the Community Services presentation.

Amount: \$0

Pros: -

Cons: -

Implementation:

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: No change to existing levels of services

Policy Change:

N/A

Economic Development

Activity: Visitor Promotions

Service: Delivered by Christchurch & Canterbury Marketing

Total Spend: Made up of:

- Visitor Marketing

\$1,367,000

Activity: Visitor Promotions

Service: Delivered by Christchurch & Canterbury Marketing (Cont)

Service reduction: Reduction in marketing spend or withdrawal from some target markets

Reduction in service at the Information Centre

Reduction in trade and overseas media hosting

Amount: \$70,000 to \$140,000

Pros: - Reduction in rates

Cons: - Inability to meet day to day operational expenditure e.g. Rent, Utilities, Salaries

- Economic impact of less visitors from target markets.

- Shorter visitor stays in Christchurch with flow on effect to business and accommodation providers.

- Reduction in profile of Christchurch.

Implementation: 1 July 2006

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

Reduced visitor numbers and market share. Reduced international and domestic length of stay and spend.

Policy Change:

N/A

Activity: Business Support , Regional Economic Development, & Employment Support

Service: Delivered by Canterbury Development Corporation

Total Spend: Made up of:

- Business Support	\$ 460,000
- Regional Economic Development	\$ 857,000
- Employment Support	\$2,270,000
TOTAL	\$3,587,000

Activity: Business Support , Regional Economic Development, & Employment Support

Service: Delivered by Canterbury Development Corporation (Cont)

Service reduction: Reduced service delivery in employment development area.

Amount: \$180,000 to \$360,000

Pros: - Reduction in rates increase

Cons: - Service cuts not well received by community employment sector.

- Reduced service delivery in CDC Employment Development Area..

- Less emphasis on insuring skills available to meet Christchurch business needs

- Less emphasis on youth and at risk employment opportunities.

Implementation: Effective from 1 July 2006.

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

Reduced capability to meet stretch targets e.g Number of youth on unemployment benefits, number of people who access employment training and education.

Policy Change:

N/A

Parks and Open Spaces

Activity: Cemeteries

Total Revenue: \$630k

Service reduction: Increase cemetery charges 10%

Amount: \$63k

Pros: Increased revenue

Reduction in rates.

Cons: Affordability for customers/perceived high increase

Shift to cremation/less customers

Implementation: Notify in public notices.

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

AMP – Number of internments managed per year - >850

Policy Change: Change to notified fee schedule

Activity: Regional Parks - Biodiversity

Total Spend: \$400k on weed & pest control

Service reduction: Reduce weed & pest control, planting and revegetation

Amount: \$200k

Pros: Reduction of consumable costs

Reduction in rates

Cons: Garden City image reduced

ECAN compliance issues will likely arise

Customer complaints likely to increase

Much harder to restore if left out of control for any length of time

Implementation: Immediate.

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

AMP: Number of animal pest monitoring programmes undertaken per year – 8

AMP: Number of Notices of Direction served by ECAN regarding plant pest control – Nil

AMP: Amount of restoration planting undertaken per year – 9,000 sq metres

Policy Change: (draft) Biodiversity Strategy

Activity: Urban Parks

Total Spend: \$9.2m

Service reduction: Reduce maintenance – mowing, irrigation, facilities

Amount: \$1.0m

Pros: Reduction in operating costs – contracts, agrichemicals, water

Naturalised habitat, savings in water. Reduction in rates.

Cons: Increased complaints from public

Brown-off on sports fields/restoration costs increase

Longer grass – fire risk, vermin

Trees/planting die-off

Implementation: Immediate for some (e.g. stopping irrigation). Need to renegotiate contracts for others (e.g. grass length/mowing regimes).

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

AMP – Proportion of customers satisfied with appearance of parks - 90%

AMP – Proportion of customers satisfied with recreational opportunities available in parks – 85%

AMP – Proportion of users satisfied with toilet facilities on sports parks - >65%

Policy Change: N/A

Activity: Urban Parks

Total Spend:

Service reduction: Charge clubs for use of sports grounds

Amount: \$200k

Pros: Increased revenue. Reduction in rates.
Reduced number of clubs/less sports ground maintenance

Cons: Some poorer clubs would not be financially viable
Reduced access to sports for ratepayers

Implementation: Notify via LTCCP; public consultation – likely to be controversial

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

AMP: Proportion of customers satisfied with range of recreation opportunities available on parks – 85%

AMP: Proportion of users satisfied with changing facilities on sports parks - >55%

Policy Change: Recreation & Sports Policy; Social well-being policy; Youth policy.

Recreation and Leisure

Activity: Recreation and Leisure

Total Spend: (Business as usual \$15K for this activity)

Service reduction: shorten summer pool season by 2 weeks

Amount: (\$15K)

Pros: operational efficiency

Cons: None – current weather patterns show pools not being used at this time

Implementation: November 2006 and would be permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: Nil. Customers likely to use other pools

Policy Change: Council decision required

Activity: Recreation and Leisure

Total Spend: (Business as usual \$70k for this activity)

Service reduction: close Sockburn recreation centre or lease out squash/function rooms

Amount: (\$70/\$50k)

Pros: operational efficiency

Cons: public reaction, but low usage

Implementation: as soon as decision is made and would be permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: Minor impact, current users would transfer to other facilities, e.g. Jellie Park, Squashways, Pioneer, etc.

Policy Change: Issue being considered by Portfolio Group on March 2nd. Report being prepared for Council decision.

Activity: Recreation and Leisure

Total Spend: (Business as usual \$130k for this activity)

Service reduction: close Sockburn pool

Amount: (\$130k)

Pros: operational efficiency, Jellie Park used more, end of life asset retired

Cons: public reaction but low usage

Implementation: November 2006 and would be permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: No impact. Users will transfer to other facilities

Policy Change: Draft Aquatic Facilities Plan recommends closure when the redeveloped Jellie Park Facility reopens

Activity: Recreation and Leisure

Total Spend: \$640K

Service reduction: exit provision of out of school programmes either run by CCC or funded through grants

Amount: (\$640k)

Pros: operational efficiency

Cons: community reaction, most funded by Community Boards therefore funds could be directed elsewhere by CB and may not reflect real savings

Implementation:

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

Policy Change: Council decision required. This relates to the review of Community Grants funding.

Activity: Recreation and Leisure

Total Spend: \$200K

Service reduction: reduction in community recreation programmes (excluding those in pools which generate a profit)

Amount: (\$200k)

Pros: operational efficiency

Cons: less community based recreation programmes, Council's active living objectives may be compromised. Running programmes in a variety of existing facilities and locations reduces demand for new facilities.

Implementation: Early 2007, would be permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: Other providers may offer programmes, but at a higher cost for users

Policy Change: Council decision required

Activity: Recreation and Leisure

Total Spend: (Business as usual \$130k for this activity)

Service reduction: rationalise outdoor pool facilities e.g. Edgware, Belfast, Templeton and Woolston outdoor pools

Amount: (\$130k)

Pros: operational efficiency, end of life assets retired

Cons: public reaction, but low usage

Implementation: Staged closures as soon as decision is made and would be permanent

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: How impact on low usage and customers likely to transfer to other facilities

Policy Change: Draft Aquatic Facilities Plan recommends closure

Activity: Recreation and Leisure

Total Spend: (Business as usual \$Nil now closed. for this activity)

Service reduction: sell land decommissioned Papanui pool located on

Amount: (\$400k)

Pros: land currently not used or expected to be used, revenue from asset sale available for other use

Cons: None pool already decommissioned

Implementation: 1 – 2 years, change in reserve status required before sale process could begin

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

No

Policy Change: Change in reserve status required

Regulatory Services

Activity: Regulatory Services

Service: Animal Control, Enforcing Legislation & Investigating Nuisances, Licencing & Registration of Premises, Maintaining & Reviewing the City Plan, Processing Applications

Total Spend (Net Cost of Service): Made up of:

- Animal Control	\$ 305,407
- Enforcing Legislation & Investigating Nuisances	\$2,171,832
- Licencing & Registration of Premises	(\$ 351,672)
- Maintaining & Reviewing the City Plan	\$1,623,526
- Processing Applications	\$3,395,582
TOTAL	\$7,144,675

Activity: Regulatory Services

Service: Animal Control, Enforcing Legislation & Investigating Nuisances, Licencing & Registration of Premises, Maintaining & Reviewing the City Plan, Processing Applications

Service reduction: Regulatory Services as a Group of Activity is provided solely by the Environmental Services Unit (ESU). ESU as a Regulatory Unit complies with and operates in accordance with legislation, there are no discretionary parts of the business that we could cease to perform. Therefore we cannot reduce levels of service in this area.

The Regulatory Services budget has been overhauled to ensure that sufficient fees and charges are being charged to recover costs to the Council. Regulations state that the Regulatory Services activities of a Council should be cost recovery rather than profit generating.

The Regulatory Services budget has an overall lower Net Cost of Service than 2005/06 due to higher revenue from fees and charges.

Amount: \$0

Pros: -

Cons: -

Implementation:

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: No change to existing levels of services

Policy Change:

N/A

Streets and Transport

Activity: Free Central City Shuttle

Total Spend: **\$800k p.a.**

Service reduction: **Reduced public transport.**

Amount: **\$800k from year 4 on.**

Pros: **Reduction in rates.**

Cons: - **The Shuttle has a high profile – both utility and city image**
There is likely to be customer resistance from retailers and public
Contract termination has “buy-out” costs = minimal savings for first 3 years.

Implementation:

Either immediately or in year 3; financial benefits would be the same (due to buy-out costs)

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

The Activity Management Plan has a measure for Shuttle Passenger trips per year. This would need to be removed.

Policy Change: **N/A**

Activity: Tram

Total Spend: **\$600k p.a. (incl \$335k in debt servicing and depreciation)**

Service reduction: **Reduced tourist opportunities.**

Amount: **Little opportunity for savings.**

Pros: **Reduction in rates**

Cons: **The tram produces approximately \$150,000 revenue to offset costs**

Debt servicing would continue.

Cancellation would have high negative public & tourist profile.

Little opportunity for savings – no opex gain.

Further costs with either lifting track or maintaining an unused asset.

Implementation: **2-3 years**

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

The T&CS Unit Management Plan does not include levels of service for the Tram.

Policy Change: N/A

Activity: Parking Fees – On-Street - Increase in fees On-Street Parking

Total Spend:

Service reduction: Nil

Amount: **Options in table (note no resistance factor included)**
Recommend increase to \$2.50ph
Income increase approx \$750,000 (opex)

Pros: - **Increase provides a clear delineation between on- and off- street parking charges.**
Reduction in rates

Cons: **Consumer resistance can be expected to increase with the level of increase proposed.**
May work against Central City revitalisation strategies

OIL-STREET PARKING FEES	Targeted Annual Savings
OPEX	
Fees inc to/per hour	
\$2.10	\$157,500
\$2.20	\$315,000
\$2.30	\$472,500
\$2.40	\$630,000
\$2.50	\$787,500
\$2.60	\$945,000
\$2.70	\$1,102,500
\$2.80	\$1,260,000
\$2.90	\$1,417,500
\$3.00	\$1,575,000

Implementation: **Immediate**

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

No change to parking enforcement levels of service.

Policy Change: **No policy change but would require a fee schedule change.**

Activity: Parking Fees – Off-Street – Increase Off-Street Parking Fees

Total Spend:

Service reduction: Nil

Amount: **Increase off-street parking fees by 10% (\$2.20ph)**

\$800k approx revenue increase

Pros: **Maintains differential between on- and off- street parking fees.**

Increased revenue. Reduction in rates.

Cons: - **May face resistance from public and central city retailers.**

May work against Central City revitalisation strategies.

Implementation: **Immediate**

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

No change to parking enforcement levels of service.

Policy Change: **No policy change but would require a fee schedule change.**

Activity: Parking Fees – Off-Street - Changes to “One Hour Free” Policy

Total Spend:

Service reduction: **Only cars parked for less than one hour receive free parking.
Any parking over one hour pays all costs.**

Amount: **\$800k approx income increase (opex)**

Pros: **Some parking will turn over faster. Reduction in rates.**

Cons: **May face resistance from public and central city retailers.
Existing one-hour-free policy is touted as drawcard to Central City
May work against Central City revitalisation strategies.**

Implementation: **Immediate**

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: **N/A**

Policy Change: **No policy change but would require a fee schedule change.**

Activity: Streetlighting – Switching off when low road use

Total Spend: \$4.2m

Service reduction: **No streetlights for 2 or 4 hour periods (between midnight & 4am)**

Amount: **4 hours switch off = \$260k reduction in opex**

2 hours switch off = \$130k reduction in opex

Pros: - **Energy cost savings. Reduction in rates.**

Cons: - **Adverse public reaction if street lights are not switched on when expected.**
- **Safety Implications – social cost of crashes and crime will rise.**
- **Fear of crime will increase.**

Implementation: **Immediate**

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

Streetlighting level of service would need to be changed to reflect new strategy.

Policy Change: **N/A**

Activity: Carriageway, Footpath, Kerb & Channel Maintenance

Total Spend: **\$5.35m**

Service reduction: **Lower standard of maintenance & safety**

Amount: **\$400-\$500k p.a. (after contract buy-out costs)**

Pros: **Reduction would give *short-term* cost savings after contract buy-out costs settled.
Reduction in rates.**

Cons: - **Any changes in levels of service would require contract re-negotiations.**

- **When the new contracts were set (late 2005) the levels of service included safety considerations – reductions in LOS would impact on road safety.**
Likely increase in safety maintenance call-out costs.
- **Reduction in LOS would result in increased public dissatisfaction.**

Implementation: **Approx 6 months**

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: **N/A**

Policy Change: **No change**

Activity: Street Cleaning (including Amenity Areas cleaning)

Total Spend: **\$3.85m**

Service reduction: **Lower Standard of Cleaning**

Amount: **\$300-\$400k (after contract buy-out costs)**

Pros: **If reduced, *short term* savings after contract buy-out costs settled.
Reduction in rates.**

Cons: **Any changes in LOS would result in the need for contract re-negotiations.
Reduction in cleaning LOS would result in significant negative public perceptions.
Currently recovering from previous lower performance standards.
Little or no opportunities for reduction in operation expenditure for the next 3 years.**

Implementation: **Approx 6 months**

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: **Nil**

Policy Change: **Nil**

Wastewater Collection & Treatment

Activity: Wastewater Collection – Maintenance of Sewer Laterals

Total Spend: \$560k per annum in maintenance costs. Depreciation on asset book value of \$ 61m as valued in 2003.

Service reduction: May impact on inflow and infiltration programme which could increase the frequency of overflows into the rivers and breach resource consents.

Amount: Depreciation and maintenance – approx \$1.33m per annum. Write-off of asset value of \$ 61m.

Pros: Reduction in O&M costs of \$ 560k per annum and depreciation of approximately \$ 770k per annum. Reduction in rates.

Cons: - Chairman's report from the STU committee on 10 February 2004 recommended that the Council accept ownership of sewer laterals in the streets and thus associated maintenance and depreciation costs (approx \$770k per annum at this time). Council would have to rescind this previous resolution that accepted the report that gave effect to this item.

- Private landowners can not control traffic loadings, tree root migration and pavement construction damage in public land (roadways/footpaths) and this was a key driver for council accepting ownership.
- Council can control response to repairs and renewal programme for laterals (currently being considered as part of sewer renewals). To get timely response from landowners could be difficult and require more inspection and enforcement.
- Likely increase in infiltration into sewer networks if landowners repairing laterals as repair times will likely increase. Individual owners will not see global impact of the issue but the city will pay through loading on the local and trunk sewers.
- one of write off of book value of asset (book value at 2003 of \$ 61m).
- Audit NZ may challenge

Implementation: Approx 6 months

Impact on Level of Service KPIs: May impact on ability to achieve consent requirement of ≤ 4 wet weather overflows into rivers p.a.

Policy Change: Would be required.

Public Affairs Group

Activity: Customer Services – Suburban walk-in customer services

Total Spend: (\$3.1m)

Service reduction: (a) Remove current sub-agency locations ie. Riccarton (small sub-agency within Post Shop) and Hornby (sub-agency within retail store), which are outside the existing network of service centres.

(b) Consider option for customers to pay all financial transactions at NZ Post Shops, with consequent reduction in customer services presence at Service Centres.

Amount: (a) \$77k reduced by removing sub agencies. (b) Savings related to alternative payments difficult to quantify, but could be up to \$200-300k in salaries.

Pros: * Offers customers access to large network of agencies for payment of all Council transactions
 * NZ Post Shop network is well established and accepted for payments (Other councils use this)

Cons: * Need to still retain some counter presence at suburban locations
 * Initial customer response to different mode of delivery

Implementation: (a) ? (b) ?

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

Policy Change: Depending on decisions re (b), Rates Payment Policy would require review. Note: Review of payments would also be opportune to review the range of services delivered at all suburban locations, to ensure these are consistent across the city, and are meeting identified resident and customer needs.

Activity: Democracy & Governance/Public Participation – “City Scene”

Total Spend: (\$223k direct cost)

Service reduction: Reduce number of issues of “City Scene” published annually.

Amount: (\$22k - equivalent to one issue)

Pros: * Cost reduction

Cons: * Information is less current

* Diminishes Council’s ability to use the publication as an effective tool in consultation processes

* Public awareness and expectation of the publication will be reduced

Implementation: (which month and year does the reduction commence, plus its duration, if finite)

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

Current: Increase in % who read newsletter (proposed target 50%); **Impact:** Reduced frequency may have impact on readership due to lower awareness.

Current: Increase in satisfaction with newsletter (target 75%); **Impact:** Reduced frequency likely to reduce satisfaction.

Policy Change: No

Activity: Recreation and Leisure/Festivals and Events – Core funded events

Total Spend: (\$929k)

Service reduction: Reduce funding available for allocation to external festivals and events.

Amount: (dependant on festival(s) chosen to discontinue funding – see schedule slide 5)

Pros: * Could encourage greater self-sufficiency for events organisers
 * Council could focus more on high level/icon events

Cons: * Fewer festivals and events able to be funded
 * Reduces the city’s overall events landscape
 * Diminishes Council’s ability to deliver on event strategy outcomes
 * Cumulative impacts: Other sources of funding (eg gaming) are also declining

Implementation: 2006/07 or 2007/08

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

Current: 80% or more of residents are satisfied with quality of events; **Impact:** Need to review ability to achieve target levels of satisfaction with fewer events

Policy Change: Would need to incorporate this into the events strategy review, currently under way.

Activity: Recreation and Leisure/Festivals and Events – In-house events

Total Spend: (\$694k direct funding -net of revenue)

Service reduction: Reduce funding available for allocation to festivals and events delivered by Council
(eg SummerTimes, KidsFest)

Amount: (dependant on event(s) chosen to discontinue funding – see schedule slide 5)

Pros: * Cost reductions

Cons: * Fewer events able to be funded (would need to reduce events delivered)
* Reduces community access to free city events
* Diminishes Council’s ability to deliver on event strategy outcomes

Implementation: 2006/07 or 2007/08

Impact on Level of Service KPIs:

Current: Residents consider that festivals and events contribute to enjoyment of living in Christchurch (target 95%);

Impact: Reduced ability to achieve target levels of satisfaction with fewer events

Policy Change: Would need to incorporate this into the events strategy review, currently under way.

Core Funded Events – Funding allocations 06/07 (based on confirmed 05/06 payments):

▷ 341/120/1	Christchurch Arts Festival	113,000
▷ 341/120/12	Coca Cola Christmas in the Park	51,500
▷ 341/120/13	Jazz Festival	70,000
▷ 341/120/17/1	Town Hall Fund Primary Schools	12,000
▷ 341/120/18	Cello Festival	11,000
▷ 341/120/20	New Garden Festival	15,000
▷ 341/120/21	Carols By Candlelight	13,000
▷ 341/120/22	Banner / Promotional Material	5,000
▷ 341/120/23	Savour New Zealand	30,000
▷ 341/120/24	New Core Funded Festivals	30,000
▷ 341/120/28	Young Inventionz	20,000
▷ 341/120/29	Toru	25,000
▷ 341/120/30	Primary Schools Cultural Festival	10,000
▷ 341/120/31	Waitaha Cultural Festival	10,000
▷ 341/120/32	Art & Industry	40,000
▷ 341/120/33	The Body	50,000
▷ 341/120/35	Canterbury Fashion Week	85,000
▷ 341/120/4	World Buskers Festival	200,000
▷ 341/120/7	Festival Brochures	7,000
▷ 341/120/8	Festival of Flowers and Romance	120,000
▷ 341/120/9	Book Festival	11,000

**Heart of the City funding ex
Central City funds**

In-house & Summertime Events – Funding allocations 06/07 (based on confirmed 05/06 payments):

Overall Result		693,595
▽ 34101	Events - Inhouse	374,430
▷ 341/101	Showtime Canterbury	71,300
▷ 341/102	Kidsfest	70,000
▷ 341/103	Meridian Energy Fireworks	42,000
▷ 341/104	Cathedral Square Concerts	56,000
▷ 341/105	Special Projects	24,130
▷ 341/106	Municipal Bands	15,000
▷ 341/116	Kids In Town	16,000
▷ 341/117/1	Antarctic Festival - Event Production	60,000
▷ 341/118	Clean Up the World	20,000
▽ 34102	Summertime	319,165
▷ 341/109	Summertime Marketing	88,143
▷ 341/110	New Years Eve	29,126
▷ 341/111	Summer Theatre	31,796
▷ 341/112	Starry Nights	81,459
▷ 341/113	Classical Sparks	88,641