



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

FRIDAY 30 JUNE 2006

AT 9.30AM

IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES

Council: The Mayor, Garry Moore (Chairperson).
Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Graham Condon, Barry Corbett, David Cox, Anna Crighton, Carole Evans, Pat Harrow, Bob Parker, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Sue Wells and Norm Withers.

ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION
1.	APOLOGIES
2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 12 AND 14 JUNE 2006
3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
4.	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
5.	CORRESPONDENCE
6.	PROCESS FOR ADOPTING 2006-2016 LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN (LTCCP)
7.	ADOPTION OF AQUATIC FACILITIES PLAN 2006
8.	FEES AND CHARGES SUBJECT TO CONSULTATION – 2006/07 – ADOPTION OF CHARGES
9.	ADOPTION OF POLICY ON SIGNIFICANCE
10.	DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY – FURTHER CHANGES
11.	ADOPTION OF 2006-2016 LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN (LTCCP)
12.	DRAFT STATEMENT OF INTENT FOR TUAM LTD (PREVIOUSLY TRAVIS FINANCE LTD)
13.	NOTICES OF MOTION
14.	QUESTIONS

30. 6. 2006

- 2 -

- 1. APOLOGIES**
- 2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 12 AND 14 JUNE 2006**
Attached.
- 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
- 4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
- 5. CORRESPONDENCE**

6. PROCESS FOR ADOPTING 2006-2016 LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN (LTCCP)

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Corporate Services, DDI 941-8540
Officer responsible:	Organisational Performance Manager
Author:	Peter Ryan

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend the process to be used for adopting the final Long-Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) 2006-16.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Producing an amended version of the full LTCCP document between 22 June (the Council's last discussion of the document) and 30 June 2006 would have been desirable, but logistically impossible. Instead this report sets out a process for considering all amendments to the draft plan in a sequence that will satisfy transparency and legal requirements.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

3. Before consideration of the final LTCCP, the Council should first make resolutions on outstanding amendments to components of the draft plan, specifically today's Council agenda items:
 7. Adoption of Aquatic Facilities Plan 2006
 8. Fees and Charges Subject to Consultation – 2006/07 – Adoption of Charges
 9. Policy on Significance
 10. Development Contributions Policy – Further Changes
4. With those matters resolved, the Council is then able to consider the amendments to the draft plan in totality as listed in the Schedule of Changes (which is based on feedback from the Council's recent meetings) and to then adopt a final LTCCP 2006-16 (item 11 on the agenda).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council use the process set out above in order to adopt the final LTCCP 2006-16.

7. ADOPTION OF AQUATIC FACILITIES PLAN 2006

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8540
Officer responsible:	Recreation Facilities Manager
Author:	John Filsell

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend that the Council adopt the Aquatic Facilities Plan 2006 as circulated with the agenda.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Aquatic Facilities Plan arose in response to the Council's request for a city-wide planning framework to assist the provision of aquatic facilities to meet current and future needs. The Aquatic Facility Plan is a city-wide plan setting out how the city's pools and associated facilities can be provided over the next 30 years. This plan recognises existing Council and provision by others.
3. The Plan, if adopted, will:
 - Determine the future number and location of aquatic facilities
 - Outline the type, size and priority order of facilities to be developed
 - Include plans for dealing with aging facilities.
4. Christchurch City already has a network of aquatic facilities. The plan shows how this network can be developed to meet current and future community demand. By identifying gaps in today's network, the plan should ensure that, as far as possible, the city will have a relatively uniform spread of core aquatic facilities. It also considers facilities that, in time, are no longer required to serve the Council's aims.
5. To ensure the plan remains current and reflects community changes and city growth, it will be reviewed every five years and, if necessary, updated.
6. All changes to the levels of service proposed by the plan were included in the Council's draft 2006-2016 LTCCP. The Council considered many submissions. The resulting Council decisions on 14 June 2006 amended the Aquatic Facilities Plan as follows:
 - The construction of a indoor pool and sports hall at Papanui High school.
 - The provision of support to keep school pools open.
 - Continue to operate Templeton Pool, review in five years.
 - Continue to operate Belfast Pool until Papanui Pool is complete.
 - Continue to operate Woolston Pool as a schools only pool.
 - Close Edgware Pool.
 - Close the Sockburn Pool and Recreation Centre.
 - Sell the land occupied by the closed pools at Edgware and Papanui.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. All levels of service and budget implications are included in the 2006-2016 LTCCP. The plan contains estimates of the capital cost (in today's dollars) of proposed development options into the future. The costs are a contractor estimate with a number of qualifications, the sums will be finalised as the planning process proceeds.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Adopt the 2006 Aquatic facilities Plan as amended by 2006-2016 LTCCP decisions.
- (b) Note that this plan will be reviewed every five years.

8. FEES AND CHARGES SUBJECT TO CONSULTATION – 2006/07 – ADOPTION OF CHARGES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Corporate Services, DDI 941 8540
Officer responsible:	Funds and Financial Policy Manager
Authors:	Geoff Barnes Funds & Financial Policy Manager & Jason Rivett, Finance Manager, Regulation & Democracy Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Council of the results of the special consultative procedure regarding fees & charges and to recommend adoption of a schedule of charges. Included in the recommendations are amendments to the Fees and Charges 2006/07 schedule to reflect feedback from submissions, clarify fee explanations and to correct fee changes that were not captured in the draft fees and charges schedule.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At the Council meeting on 30 March 2006, the Council resolved:
 - (a) That the schedule of fees listed in Appendix A, set by the Council under Section 12 of the Local Government Act 2002, be deferred, to enable a further review of any equity issues to take place.
 - (b) That the fees, included in Appendix B, the Statement of Proposal, and Summary of Information be approved in draft and that these be released for consultation, including:

Statement of Proposal, including Appendix B, the fees schedule
Summary of the Statement of Proposal
 - (c) That the Council consider the submissions from the public in relation to Appendix B fees at the same time as the LTCCP submissions and that the fees scheduled together with any changes arising from the submissions, be adopted at a Council meeting in June 2006 (or later).
 - (d) That delegated authority be granted to the relevant General Manager to:
 - Set the prices for all retail sales items;
 - Determine the charge where the charge is for actual cost recovery;
 - Set prices for hire of venues and equipment where these are not scheduled;
 - Set prices for recreation programmes and events tailored to the customer needs; and
 - Adjust limits, if any, as noted for each charge in the schedule (Appendix A);
 - Remit any charge, where in the opinion of a General Manager, they consider it is fair to do so, subject to:
 - Where the intention to apply delegated authority is noted on the schedule (Appendix A)
 - (other than for retail prices) the delegation being restricted to that charge type.
 - Where reference is made to actual costs recovered, this is to include any normal internally generated costs.
 - Remission of charges not being granted to a class of applicant (eg charities generally) as this should be taken into account in setting the scale of fees.

The resolutions (b), (c) & (d) are relevant to this report.

3. The Council considered submissions from the public in relation to fees and charges at the same time as the 2006-16 LTCCP submissions, and resolved that the schedule of fees and charges together with any changes arising from the submissions, be adopted at a Council meeting in June 2006.

8 Cont'd

4. This report proposes some amendments to the draft fees and charges schedule for the Regulatory Services area following public submissions and the withdrawal of the Waste Minimisation levy following the recent Court decision.
5. The revised schedule including the recommended changes is attached as Appendix B.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. The schedule of charges gives effect to the revenue budgeted in the 2006-16 LTCCP. There are three financial considerations to note:
 - 6.1 The resource consent section has been reworded to provide greater clarity, there are no financial impacts as a result of this.
 - 6.2 The change to the minimum fee for processing notified resource consent applications from \$8,000 to \$5,000 has no financial implications as it is the minimum fee payable. The Council can still recover additional processing fees over and above this amount.
 - 6.3 The other amendments proposed include fee increases and the addition of fees not previously included in the draft fees and charges schedule. The revenue budgeted in the 2006-16 LTCCP is based on the increased fee levels. If these amendments are not adopted, approximately \$200,000 of revenue will need to be reduced from the LTCCP.
 - 6.4 The removal of the Waste Minimisation Levy reduced budgeted revenue by \$2.683m.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the fees and charges detailed in the schedule Appendix B including all the amendments mentioned above be adopted.

8 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON FEES AND CHARGES SUBJECT TO CONSULTATION – 2006/07 – ADOPTION OF CHARGES

7. The proposed changes to the schedule of fees, following public submissions and officer review, under the business areas of the Council, comprise:
 - Resource consent fees
 - Building control fees
 - Waste minimisation levies
 - Car parking fees
 - Rubbish bags
 - Water charges
 - Taylors Mistake ground rents
8. All other fees and charges in Appendix B are recommended to be confirmed.

RESOURCE CONSENT FEES

Submissions Received and Officer Recommendations to Clarify the Amounts Charged

9. A joint submission was received from a number of private companies that submit resource consent applications into the Council for processing. They submitted:
 - 9.1 That the draft fees and charges for publicly notified resource consent applications are set at a level that may disadvantage some applicants and discourage participation in the planning process.
 - 9.2 There were also concerns around the clarity of the presentation of the Resource Management Act fees and charges.

Changes in Amounts

10. The proposed higher minimum fee for processing notified resource consent applications was based on an analysis of the actual costs of processing notified applications for a 12 month period. This period was prior to amalgamation with Banks Peninsula District. It showed that more than 72% of notified resource consents cost more than \$8,000 to process. The proposed \$8,000 minimum fee was based on these figures. An analysis of the cost of processing Banks Peninsula resource consent applications for the last 12 months however, shows that only 40% cost more than \$8,000. The combined figures for the City and Banks Peninsula show that only 57% of notified resource consent applications cost more than \$8,000 to process.
11. The figures from Banks Peninsula suggest that the proposed minimum fee of \$8,000 is too high and ought to be reduced. In this regard it is noted that more than 80% of notified resource consents processed in both the City and Banks Peninsula cost more than \$5,000 to process and in the staff's view \$5,000 would be a more appropriate level for the minimum fee.
12. It is therefore recommended that the minimum application fee for publicly notified resource consents be reduced from \$8,000 to \$5,000. This has no financial implication as it is the minimum fee payable, additional processing fees over and above this amount can still be recovered from applicants.

Fees Missing from Previous Schedules

13. In addition, there are two new fees which were excluded from the draft schedule of fees and charges, it is recommended that these be included in the new schedule of fees and charges:

S139A (RMA 1991)	Existing Use Certificate	Minimum Application Fee \$400
S176A(2)(c) (RMA 1991)	Waiver of Outline Plan	Minimum Application Fee \$180

8 Cont'd

Re-ordering and Clarification of Fee Description

14. In relation to the concerns raised around the clarity of the presentation of the fees and charges information for resource consents, it is recommended that the schedule of fees and charges (attached as Appendix C) replace the draft version of fees and charges for resource consents as shown on Appendix B – Regulatory Services, Resource Consents, parts 1 through 6. This section has been reworded to provide greater clarity, and the only changes to fees are those identified above. The variances from draft fees schedule is highlighted in Appendix C.

BUILDING CONTROL FEES**Changes in Amount – Project Information Memoranda**

15. Further analysis has been undertaken since the draft schedule of fees and charges was released and it has been identified that the Project Information Memoranda (PIM) fee needs to be increased to recover sufficient revenue to cover 2006/07 expenditure levels. It is recommended that each PIM fee be increased by \$25 per PIM and that the following be reflected in the final fees and charges schedule.

	Draft Fee	New Fee
Minor Works <\$10,000	\$75.00	\$100.00
Additions \$10,000 to \$50,000	\$110.00	\$135.00
Additions >\$50,000	\$170.00	\$195.00
Dwellings	\$170.00	\$195.00
Apartments	\$210.00	\$235.00
Commercial/industrial	\$240.00	\$265.00

Building Control Fees – Changes in Amount – Other Fees

16. At the time the draft schedule of fees and charges was prepared it was identified that the marquee fee needed to be increased to recover sufficient revenue to cover 2006/07 expenditure levels, this change was however not included in the draft schedule. It is recommended that the fee for processing marquee applications be increased by \$20 and that the following be reflected in the final schedule of fees and charges.

	Draft Fee	New Fee
Option 1	\$100.00	\$120.00
Option 2 (Pre-approved hire company)	\$55.00	\$75.00

OTHER CHARGES

17. The following charges are amended:

Waste Minimisation Levies

18. The levy was estimated to yield \$2.683m. The recent High Court case (Carter Holt Harvey v North Shore City Council 2006) ruled that the bylaw and the levy was ultra vires. The CCC levy has therefore been withdrawn.
19. The following charges were the subject of submissions, but changes are not recommended:
- **Car parking fees**
 - There were several submissions requesting the increases be withdrawn to encourage use of the inner city. On balance the recommendation is to confirm the revised charges as scheduled but to review the charges next year.

8 Cont'd

- **Rubbish bags**
 - One submission requested the 'free' issue of 26 bags be stopped and that all bags be paid for in an attempt to reduce the volume of refuse.
 - The recommendation is that this issue is part of a wider strategy for refuse collection and disposal. The fee of \$1.20 per bag should be confirmed as it reflects the appropriate charge irrespective of the volume.
- **Water charges**
 - One submitter requested the Council move to universal billing. This move requires a full study of the options and impacts.
 - The fee schedule includes a charge for supply to properties not paying rates (e.g. over boundary to Selwyn District, or to road reserves) and secondly for rural restricted supplies. These charges are long standing and should have the unit charge revised as scheduled.
- **Taylor's Mistake ground rents**
 - One submitter requested the Council charge market rents for land occupied. The occupation will be the subject of a separate report to the Council and therefore it is inappropriate to take any action at this stage.

THE REVISED SCHEDULE OF FEES AND CHARGES

20. Attached as Appendix A is the Statement of Proposal as issued and as Appendix B a revised schedule of fees and charges reflecting the amendments recommended. The Council is asked to adopt the amended schedule, Appendix B.

9. ADOPTION OF POLICY ON SIGNIFICANCE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategic Development, DDI 941-8177
Officer responsible:	Strategy Support Manager
Author:	Jane Cartwright

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend adoption of an updated version of the Policy on Significance as it appears in the draft Long-Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) 2006-16.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This Policy on Significance has been amended as attached to incorporate typographical changes, printing omissions and clarification of 'significant decisions that may impact on land or water of importance to Maori' (section 77(1)(c)).
3. The amended version would appear in the final LTCCP 2006-16.

CONSIDERATIONS

4. The amendments to the policy cover the following:
 - Typographical changes and changes to the notations (eg Roman numerals to numbers).
 - Addition of a sentence on housing missed off by the printer in producing the draft LTCCP. This was in the draft policy adopted by the Council in January 2006.
 - Revision of the piece on 'significant decisions that may impact on land or water of importance to Maori' (section 77(1)(c)). We do not have a Maori Liaison Subcommittee and at least one submission on the draft LTCCP noted this. The wording here has been amended to indicate the process to be used when discussing significant decisions that may impact on land or water of importance to Maori.
 - Reintroduction of City Care and Red Bus Ltd in the Strategic Assets list based on submissions to the LTCCP 2006-16 and resulting from the Council decisions on 22 June 2006.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council adopt the amended version of the Policy on Significance as attached.

10. DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY – FURTHER CHANGES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy & Planning, DDI 941-8177
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Liveable Cities
Author:	Dave Hinman

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Council of some further detailed changes to the draft 2006-16 Development Contributions Policy and to recommend their adoption.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. These changes arise from the recent LTCCP hearings and give effect to a range of additional matters which have been identified as requiring amendment ahead of the major revision which may follow the work of the working party proposed for post 1 July. They are additional to a raft of detailed changes already agreed to by the Council at its meeting on 12 June 2006.
3. The changes include:
 - Clarification of the timing of the application of the new policy, the timing of payments and that no charge will apply to subsequent unit or strata titling of existing developments
 - An improved definition of “developed and “undeveloped” in relation to land
 - Corrected non-residential HUE equivalences for water supply and conservation, wastewater collection and disposal, and transport
 - Updated financial figures for Ten Year DC Summary, and Appendices 3 & 4
 - Wording to link related documents with the DC Policy
 - Wording to acknowledge potential economic effects of significantly greater charges being immediately applied
 - Wording to explain that transitional discounted charges will apply, pending working party review, plus an additional appendix comprising the discount table
 - Updating of Reserves Funding Schedule in Part B (Banks Peninsula)

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. The main financial impact of these changes will be to give effect to the earlier resolution of the Council to provide for a transitional remission to reduce the charges for development contributions to levels close to those which would have been recovered under the Development Contributions Policy 2004. As previously advised to the Council this is estimated to cost \$247,000 in year 1.
5. Submitters to the draft 2006-16 policy have raised issues about the legality of elements of the document. While the Council does not accept that the document as drafted is legally flawed, the changes it is proposing, including these additional changes do clarify some of the points of concern.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council adopt the additional changes to the LTCCP 2006-16 (Volume 2 – Development Contributions Policy) as shown in Attachment 1.

10 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY SUBMISSIONS AND CHANGES

6. A detailed 94 page report was presented to the Council for consideration as part of the public submission process during the week 6-9 June 2006, and included at the end of the document Our Community Plan Christchurch O-Tautahi Long Term Council Community Plan 2006 – Submissions and Officer Report - Volume 9 – Development Contributions. That report set out the background to the draft policy as well as summarising the issues raised by submitters, the decisions they were seeking from the Council and a conclusion with general and specific recommendations. The general and specific recommendations have already been adopted by the Council (12 June 2006 meeting) and the matters in this report are additional matters previously agreed to in general terms but now include, in the attachment, the actual wording changes required for the draft document, plus minor consequential changes and corrections.
7. The attachment also incorporates changes to the tables in Appendix 1 (Schedule of Charges), Appendix 3 (Schedule of Past Projects with Residual Capacity) and Appendix 4 (Schedule of Capital Expenditure Related to Growth) that have been made resulting from changes that have now been made to the Capital Programme in the LTCCP, continued evaluation of the growth portion on certain projects and other corrections.

11. ADOPTION OF 2006-2016 LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN (LTCCP)

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Corporate Services, DDI 941-8540
Officer responsible:	Organisational Performance Manager
Author:	Peter Ryan

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend the adoption of a Long-Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) for the period 2006-16.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council has met or exceeded all statutory requirements throughout the process of creating the LTCCP. The remaining tasks largely consist of resolving to accept changes the Council has made to the document in recent meetings.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

3. Failure to adopt an LTCCP at the meeting of 30 June 2006 would place the Council in contravention of the Local Government Act 2002.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Adopt amendments to the draft LTCCP based on the Schedule of Changes (Appendix 1 attached). This includes amendments to:
 - ❖ Introduction from the Mayor
 - ❖ The Council's Vision
 - ❖ Introduction from the Chief Executive
 - ❖ We Have Listened
 - ❖ Changes from Draft to Final
 - ❖ Overview of the Plan
 - ❖ How the Council Works
 - ❖ Capital Works Programme
 - ❖ Community Board Funding
 - ❖ A complete set of new financial tables reflecting the Council's resolutions on libraries, pools etc.
- (b) Set rates under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 on rating units for the financial year commencing on 1 July 2006 and ending on 30 June 2007 as per Appendix 2 ("Setting of Rates") (attached).
- (c) Adopt the LTCCP 2006-16, comprising the Draft Plan, plus any amendments resolved by the Council on 30 June 2006 to the:
 - (a) Aquatic Facilities Plan 2006
 - (b) Schedule of Fees and Charges
 - (c) Policy on Significance
 - (d) Development Contributions Policy (including changes to the DCP of 12 June and 30 June 2006)
 - (e) Schedule of Changes
 - (f) Setting of Rates
- (d) Authorise the General Manager Corporate Services to make any necessary amendments required after 1 July 2006 to ensure that the final published LTCCP 2006-16 is in accordance with the Council's resolutions of 30 June 2006.
- (e) Resolve to accept the opinion of Audit New Zealand (to be tabled).

11 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON ADOPTION OF 2006-2016 LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLAN (LTCCP)

4. The Council based much of its draft LTCCP 2006-16 on the results of a market research survey of Christchurch residents. This survey was conducted by an independent firm, taken across all areas and demographics of the city in February 2006. Results (which indicated community preferences and priorities) were further developed through a series of Council seminars.
5. At its meeting on 9 March 2005 the Council resolved that the draft LTCCP 2006-16 be released for public submission during the period Tuesday 28 March to Friday 5 May 2006.
6. Public notice of the availability of the plan for submissions was given in the Christchurch Star and Press newspapers on 27 March 2006 and in the April edition of City Scene (distributed 31 March–1 April 2006).
7. A total of 2,009 submissions were received on the plan, significantly more than the 320 submissions received for the 2004-14 long-term plan. Of that total, 449 submitters spoke to their submissions in person compared to the 2004-14 plan that had 141 submitters who asked to be heard.
8. Of the total, 26 submissions were received after midnight Friday 5 May 2006 and were considered late. Though accepted by the Secretariat, they were processed last. It was therefore not possible to schedule any requests to be heard though all the late written submissions were published and hard copies made available to the Council members and staff.
9. The following table provides a breakdown by topic over the last six years. The figures are simply a count of how many submitters made comment on a topic. The breakdown is intended to give a rough idea of the amount of interest in a particular topic over the period.

TOPIC	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Art Gallery	54	1	2	1	8	2
Central City	216	-	3	1	21	32
Christchurch Cathedral	1	-	9			
City Streets	368	69	113	99	204	196
Community/Social Issues	596	64	18	27	24	98
Economic Development	94	3	9	5	7	1
Environment	94	14	26	9	32	15
Financial/Rates/Council Spending	414	18	49	36	56	23
Flat Water Facility	74	11	30			
Grants	90	-	5	82	48	39
Heritage	50	3	11	8	6	12
Housing/Property/Urban Renewal	108	20	29	78	12	10
Leisure/Events	388	3	4	26	31	171
Libraries	1,104	4	7	6	8	68
Miscellaneous	553	10	6		18	12
New Civic Offices	113	1	17			
Parking	80	-	6	3	19	15
Parks/Waterways	516	41	36	26	227	89
Public Accountability	253	7	7	9		
Public Consultation	24	5	19	6		
Trading Activities	132	1	4	11		
Vision/Policy	68	1	41			
Waste/Sewerage	184	5	45	17	39	153
Water Services	110	3	9	4	2	3

	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Submissions received	2,009	198	320	308	687	802

12. DRAFT STATEMENT OF INTENT FOR TUAM LTD (PREVIOUSLY TRAVIS FINANCE LTD)

General Manager responsible:	Director Strategic Investment, DDI 941-8411
Officer responsible:	As above
Author:	Richard Simmonds

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend that the Council approve a draft Statement of Intent for Tuam Ltd (formerly Travis Finance Ltd) in respect of the 2005/06 financial year.

BACKGROUND ON DRAFT STATEMENT OF INTENT FOR TUAM LTD

2. At its meeting on 8 June 2006, the Council approved Travis Finance Ltd as the vehicle for the purchase of the existing Tuam Street property owned by the Council (including on the north side the land and buildings comprising the crèche, the old Millers building and the annex, and on the south side, the land and buildings comprising the café, parking unit building, Chequers, lean-to and the car park, but not the Peter Scoular reserve), and subsequent leaseback to the Council. It also approved Travis Finance Ltd as the entity responsible for the future construction and management of the proposed new civic building.
3. Travis Finance Ltd is wholly owned by the Council, and has been dormant since its last statement of intent was issued in 2000. In view of its new role, the name of the company has been changed to Tuam Ltd, and henceforth will be referred to in this report by that name. The directors of Tuam Ltd are currently Bob Lineham and Roy Baker.
4. It had been envisaged in the report provided to the 8 June meeting that new directors (from the Christchurch City Facilities Ltd board) would have been appointed to Tuam Ltd prior to 30 June 2006. However, time constraints and the demands of the Long-Term Council Community Plan have effectively made this impossible. Instead, the existing directors of Tuam Ltd will sign the required legal documentation to effect the sale and purchase of the Tuam Street properties by 30 June 2006, and a report will be brought to the Council early in 2006/07 recommending the appointment of new directors.
5. Given the new role of Tuam Ltd, a new statement of intent is necessary. The attached draft statement of intent is in respect of the 2005/06 financial year, and hence covers the period in which the company purchases the Tuam Street properties from the Council. The sale and purchase agreement has an effective date of 30 June 2006.
6. Once the new board of Tuam Ltd is in place early in the 2006/07 year, it is envisaged that a new statement of intent for 2006/07 will be submitted to the Council for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council approve the draft Statement of Intent for Tuam Ltd for the 2005/06 year.

13. NOTICES OF MOTION**14. QUESTIONS**