



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

THURSDAY 23 MARCH 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 16.3.2006
3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
4.	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
5.	CORRESPONDENCE
6.	HARDSHIP ASSISTANCE FOR DOMESTIC REFUSE DISPOSAL
7.	ADOPTION OF BANKS PENINSULA RURAL FIRE AUTHORITY FIRE PLAN FOR ENLARGED CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
8.	UNDERGROUNDING OF SERVICES ON THORNYCROFT STREET
9.	DELEGATIONS
10.	SUBMISSION ON TRANSIT NZ DRAFT 10-YEAR STATE HIGHWAY FORECAST
11.	REPORT OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL/ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING OF 28 FEBRUARY 2006
12.	NOTICES OF MOTION
13.	QUESTIONS

23. 3. 2006

- 2 -

- 1. APOLOGIES**

- 2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 16.3.2006**
Attached.

- 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

- 4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

- 5. CORRESPONDENCE**

6. HARDSHIP ASSISTANCE FOR DOMESTIC REFUSE DISPOSAL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	City Water and Waste Manager
Author:	Diane Shelander, Senior Resource Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to review hardship assistance for domestic refuse disposal, via the mechanism of a targeted free refuse bag supply.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Over the past four years the Council has considered the issue of hardship assistance for domestic refuse disposal a number of times. When discussed by the Council in September and November 2002, no decision was reached and the matter was referred for further review. In November 2003, the matter was brought to the Council again after further review by Council staff. The Council voted against the provision of hardship assistance for domestic refuse disposal.
3. In December 2005, the Liveable City Portfolio Group considered a staff presentation on the matter, the issue having arisen from consideration of a related matter. Staff recommended confirmation of the November 2003 Council decision. However, the Portfolio Group requested that the issue of hardship assistance for domestic refuse disposal be brought to the Council for further consideration.
4. A number of options have been reviewed, ranging from no hardship assistance for domestic refuse disposal to allocating refuse bags based on "special needs":
 - Option 1 - Maintain status quo - provide no assistance
 - Option 2 - Provide assistance through the Mayor's Welfare Fund
 - Option 3 - Provide assistance through the Mayor's Welfare Fund and Council Service Centres
 - Option 4 - Provide assistance through existing community support networks
 - Option 5 - Provide allocation to "special needs" groups only
 - Option 6 - Provide metered assistance through specified community support networks
 - Option 7 - Provide refuse bags to low-income tenants
5. Options 1 through 5 were considered previously at the Council's 23 November 2003 meeting. Option 6 was proposed at the 15 December 2005 meeting of the Liveable City Portfolio Group, and also arising from that meeting, Option 5 has been re-examined in more detail. Option 7 was identified subsequent to the December 2005 Portfolio group meeting.
6. All options have focused on the domestic situation only.
7. Significant issues exist for any approaches to the provision of hardship assistance for domestic refuse disposal, including the difficulty in many instances in determining the recipients and in implementing and monitoring the programme.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. There will be no financial impact for option 1.
9. Annual costs to provide hardship assistance for domestic refuse disposal could range from \$25,000 to \$900,000 or more for options 2 through 7, depending upon how the assistance was implemented, and the demand for the service.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council retain the current policy of providing no special assistance for domestic refuse disposal.

6 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON HARDSHIP ASSISTANCE FOR REFUSE BAGS

10. Occasionally, residents contact Council staff and Councillors inquiring about the provision of official Council refuse bags above the allocation of 26 bags funded through rates. Requests may be made by households in which incontinence products are used, dialysis products, and other requests related to household conditions which may result in larger quantities of refuse being generated by the household (eg large households).
11. Over the last four years, the Council has considered hardship assistance for domestic refuse. At its 12 September 2002 and 21 November 2002 meetings, the Council discussed the issue. A decision was not reached at that time, with the Council resolving on 21 November 2002 to further review the matter.
12. A subsequent review of options for provision of hardship assistance for domestic refuse was considered at the 23 November 2003 Council meeting. Five options for hardship refuse disposal assistance were reviewed. At that meeting the Council resolved to provide no additional hardship assistance for domestic refuse disposal.
13. The Liveable City Portfolio Group, at its 15 December 2005 meeting, discussed hardship assistance, the issue having arisen from consideration of a related matter. Staff recommended continuance of the Council's 23 November 2003 decision, but the Portfolio Group decided to refer the matter to the Council for further consideration.

EXISTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMMES

14. There are existing programmes which can provide some assistance to those on limited or fixed incomes and those with health problems or disabilities. Organisations such as Work and Income New Zealand, Age Concern, and Nurse Maude all provide forms of assistance to their clients (see Attachment 1).

OPTIONS FOR HARDSHIP ASSISTANCE

15. Five options were considered at the Council's 23 November 2003 meeting. These same options were discussed at the 15 December 2005 Liveable City Portfolio Group meeting. A sixth option arose at the December 2005 Liveable City Portfolio Group meeting, while a seventh approach was identified subsequent to that meeting.
16. A summary of each of the seven options, with advantages and disadvantages for each, is provided in Table 1. A more complete discussion of these options is provided in Attachment 1.

Table 1. Summary of Options

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Costs
1. Status Quo - Provide no assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level playing field; all residents treated the same ▪ Avoids creation of black market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reluctance by the Council to be seen to be "doing nothing" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No additional cost
2. Provide assistance through the Mayor's Welfare Fund (MWF), as part of any overall assistance provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Established programme ▪ Established system for eligibility ▪ Relatively constant number of participants in MWF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May face marked increase in demand for MWF ▪ Assistance only through MWF Office. ▪ MWF not intended for long-term assistance ▪ Existing MWF staffing may be insufficient to handle demand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual costs of \$78,000 in lost revenue

6 Cont'd

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Costs
3. Provide assistance through the Mayor's Welfare Fund and Council Service Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some oversight of process, as Council operation ▪ Greater accessibility than Option 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unknown level of demand ▪ Council infrastructure may not be adequate to handle demand ▪ Unknown level of demand creates uncertainty for budget planning ▪ Lack of control: who determines eligibility and how it is verified; ▪ Auditing of the RFS system would be needed to avoid potential for "double-dipping" ▪ Potential for black market in refuse bag sales ▪ Current staffing may be inadequate to handle demand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual costs from this "on demand" service could range from \$245,000 to over \$900,000 or more in lost refuse bag revenue
4. Provide assistance through existing community support networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wide range of outlets for public to utilise, depending on the number of organisations included in the programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for even-handedness in distributing refuse bags; would need to provide to wide and diverse range of community support organisations ▪ Lack of co-ordinated tracking, with potential for "double-dipping" ▪ This "on demand" service the programme would severely limit ability to plan and budget ▪ Need for Council infrastructure to administer and audit programme ▪ Not all community organisations may favour this option, since they could be overwhelmed ▪ Potential for black market in refuse bag sales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual costs could be expected to be similar to option 3.

6 Cont'd

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Costs
<p>5. Provide allocation to "special needs" groups. Only domestic situation considered. Assumed that businesses eg rest homes and the like would not be eligible, (see further information Attachment 1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council seen to be responding to a demand ▪ If criteria developed, could be relatively objective determination of eligibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Definition of "special needs" problematic ▪ Identification of those who fall into category of special needs also challenging ▪ Likelihood that other groups may seek "special needs" status in order to gain access to free refuse bags ▪ Potential for abuse of system. Need to create Council infrastructure to administer and monitor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual costs difficult to estimate until "special needs" defined. Upper limit of costs could be expected to be similar to option 3.
<p>6. Provide metered assistance through specified community support networks. (ie allocate a fixed number of bags per organisation per annum)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compared to options 3 and 4, this approach could allow for better planning due to a specified number of bags to be distributed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Like option 4, need for even-handedness, to provide to wide and diverse range of community support organisations ▪ With limited number of bags, participating organisations would need to develop system for free bags ▪ Need for Council infrastructure to administer and audit programme ▪ Like option 4, lack of coordinated tracking could allow "double-dipping" ▪ Community support organisations may not favour this option, since they could be overwhelmed by requests for refuse bags ▪ Could lead to inequities, since large organisations would receive the same number of bags as smaller ones ▪ Potential for black market in refuse bag sales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual costs would depend on number of specified organisations and number of bags allocated to each; at least \$25,000 in lost revenue expected
<p>7. Provide refuse bags to low-income tenants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By distributing through existing housing office, no need for new infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demand uncertain ▪ Not all low income tenants in state housing ▪ Little or no control, other than by limiting to those receiving housing assistance ▪ Potential for abuse, due to lack on controls ▪ Potential that other groups of residents would request similar service based on financial, social, medical or other need 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual costs would be approximately \$245,000 in lost revenue if all of state sector housing households requested the service

6 Cont'd

17. Significant issues exist with these approaches:
- Defining hardship. There is no single definition of hardship. Some of the approaches described here consider financial factors, others consider health factors, and some may consider both.
 - Defining special needs. This term also has no single definition. Any programme using "special needs" status as the basis for provision of a service must define what the term means.
 - How will the programme be managed and monitored? Each option would require some degree of monitoring of the programme, while three of the options would require management by Council units.
 - Where is the line drawn for "special needs"? Assuming that a class or classes of those with special needs are identified, it is likely that residents with other needs will come forward to request similar assistance.
 - What will be the impact to the Council's waste minimisation goals? Some of the options could result in the provision of a significant quantity of free refuse bags.
18. These issues are discussed in greater detail in Attachment 1.

SUMMARY

19. The Council has considered this matter of domestic refuse disposal hardship assistance several times over the last four years, resolving in November 2003 to provide no special assistance for domestic refuse disposal. In this latest examination of the issue it is clear that the practicalities involved in setting up a programme for the allocation of refuse bags remain problematic due to several factors, not the least of which is the determination of who would be eligible for such a programme.

7. ADOPTION OF BANKS PENINSULA RURAL FIRE AUTHORITY FIRE PLAN FOR ENLARGED CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Greenspace Manager
Author:	Keith Marshall, Risk Management Adviser and Principal Rural Fire Officer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to request the Council to consider and adopt the Banks Peninsula District Council Rural Fire Authority Fire Plan to cover that part of the Christchurch City comprising the former Banks Peninsula District.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Banks Peninsula District Council Rural Fire Authority was legally obliged to produce and adopt its own fire plan by 1 October 2005. However, in order to avoid as much duplication as possible and introduce as many common policies and procedures as possible, the Christchurch City Council Rural Fire Authority Fire Plan was used as the base model. The difference was predominantly in the contact names and obviously listing local resources for the Peninsula. As a result of the merger the Christchurch City Council Rural Fire Authority Fire Plan will have to reflect the total land area and total resources within its territorial area. As a short-term expediency the Council is requested to adopt the current Banks Peninsula District Council Rural Fire Authority Fire Plan to give legal cover until the two plans are merged and adopted by 1 October 2006.
3. This process of adoption of the Banks Peninsula District Council Rural Fire Authority Fire Plan is to give the Christchurch City Council an adopted operative Fire Plan to cover the former Banks Peninsula District Council Rural Fire Authority area of jurisdiction. It is mainly in the area of specific contacts and resources on the Peninsula that this plan differs from the Christchurch City Council Rural Fire Authority Plan as the two were written from one original Christchurch Plan.
4. Between now and 1 October 2006 staff will combine the two documents so that there is one Fire Plan covering the combined land area of Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula. This will of course necessitate the Council formally adopting the new plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council as the Christchurch City Council Rural Fire Authority adopt the Banks Peninsula District Council Rural Fire Authority Fire Plan to cover the Banks Peninsula area of Christchurch City Council as required by Regulation 39(1) of the Forest and Rural Fires Regulations 2005.

7 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON ADOPTION OF BANKS PENINSULA RURAL FIRE AUTHORITY FIRE PLAN FOR ENLARGED CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

5. The Christchurch City Council Principal Rural Fire Officer consulted the National Rural Fire Authority to clarify the legal requirements for the Christchurch City Council RFA to have an approved operative Fire Plan for the recently merged geographic area of Banks Peninsula.
6. The response from the National Rural fire Authority was:
 - “(a) That after the merger occurs a new Fire Plan for the Christchurch City Council Rural Fire Authority for its territorial area (that excludes any Rural Fire District, Urban Fire District and any State Area as defined by the Forest and Rural Fires Act 1977) is in place by 1 October 2006; and*
 - (b) The Christchurch City Council adopts the current Banks Peninsula District Council Fire Plan as its adopted Fire Plan.”*
7. This latter process will cover the legal necessity to have an operative Fire Plan for the Christchurch City Council for the geographic region of Banks Peninsula until such time as a rewritten plan covering the total territorial area can be produced and adopted by 1 October 2006.

8. UNDERGROUNDING OF SERVICES ON THORNYCROFT STREET

	Chief Executive Officer, 941-8553
Officer responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Author:	Jane Parfitt, DDI 941-8656

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to clarify an ambiguity that has arisen as a result of the Council's resolutions on undergrounding.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At its meeting on Thursday 1 December 2005, the Council resolved to:

“(a) Rescind the 1993 policy that refers to the strong statement to be included in the City Plan that all city streets to be undergrounded within 40 years (by 2033).

(b) Maintain the current level of expenditure (approximately \$1.6M pa) on undergrounding until the arterial/collector programme is complete (approximately five years) noting that subsequent expenditure levels will be determined on policy reviews at that time, and if the expenditure is less, it will potentially free up operating funds.

(c) Rescind the 2000 policy allowing cost sharing with the residents.

(d) Request staff to provide a report on a new residents' contribution policy that ranges from:

(i) 100% Council funding

(ii) resident funding of up to 100% by way of either:

- *a targeted rate, or*
- *other means*

and which does not preclude innovative one-off solutions from the community.

(e) Request officers to refine and clarify the Council's policies in relation to undergrounding on the basis of safety and tourist routes (arterials and collectors), and amenity improvements, including narrow streets, for adoption by the Council before the commencement of the 2006/07 financial year.”

3. During the discussion in the early part of the meeting, the issue of Thornycroft Street was raised because discussions were already under way with residents. However, there was no reference to the way ahead for Thornycroft Street in the resolution. Staff understanding of the intent behind the resolution is that while there was some discussion of various streets that might receive a 50% contribution, the difficulties of agreeing on these streets, and disagreements that would inevitably ensue, led to a clear and unconditional rescinding of the old policy. Otherwise an amendment from Councillors itemising exempt streets would have been expected.
4. Thornycroft Street is currently in the planning phase. The initial consultation phase has been completed. This phase asked street residents about their likes, dislikes, needs and wants for their street. From this initial 'issues' consultation, the next phase is to move into objective setting and then drafting options for road layout configurations that achieve the project objectives. To this point, undergrounding has not been mentioned in the initial consultation documentation, and if the current situation concerning undergrounding remains, all street options will consider the overhead wiring to remain as a matter of default.
5. The operational undergrounding budget for 2006/07 is shown in the LTCCP as \$1,040,000. This budget has been allocated to an approximately even split between Wairakei and Blighs Roads undergrounding. The Wairakei Road project has been completed in this financial year, and its required funding has effectively been brought forward. Thus, there is a remaining budget of approximately \$500,000 in 2006/07, which is fully committed to the Blighs Road project. Thus there is no available operational budget for the undergrounding of Thornycroft Street in either the 2005/06 nor 2006/07 financial year.

8 Cont'd

6. The anticipated total Council operational cost for undergrounding Thornycroft Street (360m long) would be approximately \$270,000, based on the current estimate of \$750/m. Under the old 2000 policy of a 50/50 cost share arrangement, this would equate to \$135,000 per party.
7. It should be noted, however, that these costs are estimates, and cannot be confirmed until contract tenders are received. Both the Council and residents would need to be aware of the risk of actual costs being higher than the estimate and that no certainty for costs can be achieved until tenders are in. Typically, the Council bears the cost of the design and tender process, which may be \$10,000.
8. Current project planning has the preferred option being available to residents in June 2006. If this is considered a design with low risk of changes, it is possible that the undergrounding component could proceed to design and tender at that point. Design and tender usually takes approximately four months, so tender acceptance could possibly occur around October, with work ideally occurring before Christmas. Street reconstruction could occur early in calendar year 2007. Note that this is an optimistic timeframe, relying on the street planning and undergrounding development process proceeding smoothly. There is therefore a strong risk that including undergrounding will impact on the delivery of the capital programme.
9. Based on these timelines, and if the 50/50 process was to proceed, the Council would need a strong commitment from residents that they would be able to participate in the 50/50 share by mid-June 2006 - including an acknowledgement of the risks of higher costs.
10. As no provision has been made for this expenditure in the draft LTCCP, the Council would also need to determine and provide the funding for its 50% share. Then, both Council and residents would need to confirm their capability to meet tender costs by October 2006.
11. The options available to Council are therefore:
 - (a) To decline to participate in the undergrounding of Thornycroft Street:
 - (i) This option will have no impact on the Council's operational budget, and will remain consistent with the recently adopted policy to terminate the 50/50 cost share policy.
 - (ii) It will also mean that street reconstruction can proceed as planned.
 - (iii) This option will not please the Thornycroft Street residents who have been anticipating participating in the 50/50 cost share policy for several years.
 - (b) To accept a 50/50 cost share arrangement with Thornycroft Street residents to underground their street:
 - (i) This option will require the Council to determine a source of operational budget of approximately \$135,000 (possibly more due to tender/contract uncertainties). If directly funded from rates, this will impose an additional 0.05%.
 - (ii) This option carries a risk that the residents may not be able to financially participate to this level and the Council will carry the costs of the design and tender process.
 - (iii) This option is in breach of recently established Council policy.
 - (iv) Unless the most beneficial of timelines is able to be adhered to, the street reconstruction will be delayed until the latter half of the 2006/07 financial year - there is no financial disadvantage to this unless delayed further into the next financial year.
 - (c) To wait until a new residents' contribution policy is determined, and offer participation in street undergrounding based on that policy.
 - (i) At this stage it is unknown what a resident/Council split might be under this policy, nor what conditions (such as required participation levels) might be associated with it, thus there is financial risk to both the Council and residents. There remains no available operational funding for undergrounding in 2006/07.

8 Cont'd

- (ii) Waiting for these issues to be resolved, then seeking confirmation of participation will mean it would be unlikely that undergrounding could be completed before the end of the calendar year. There is a moderate risk that this process would delay street renewal until into the new (2007/08) financial year. Potentially this could mean increased costs to the Council.
- 12. To decline participation in undergrounding is the lowest financial risk option for the Council, and remains consistent with recently adopted policy. It does, however, open the Council to criticism of failure to live up to perceived promises and commitments, although none of these are documented as such in available Council records.
- 13. To participate in the 50/50 policy is contrary to recently adopted policy, and may be seen as precedent setting. As there are no documentary records of commitments to undergrounding, there would therefore be no solid grounds to refuse any other party seeking 50/50 contributions for undergrounding for other streets. There is financial risk to the Council in this option, and no current budget to meet requirements.
- 14. Option (c) is fully consistent with policy - ie to wait until a resident's policy is determined, but has financial risk and timeline concerns for the street reconstruction process.
- 15. Regardless of the option chosen, it is necessary to have an accepted street scheme plan for reconstruction before undergrounding design can begin. Hence the planning process for the street should continue unabated.
- 16. Given the dangers of precedent setting, it is recommended that the Council decide between either non-participation in any cost sharing for undergrounding, or agree to participate in the appropriate policy when determined. The 50/50 participation option is not recommended.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 17. The foregoing details the financial considerations of the options available. Of the options between which determination should be made, the former (no undergrounding) has no financial implications for the Council. The participation levels in a residents' cost share policy have yet to be determined, which have risks for the Council. The precise costs of the Council's contribution in a 50/50 cost share is not known but is likely to be \$135,000 for which no provision is made in the draft LTCCP.
- 18. There are no legal implications for the Council in respect of any option, apart from the already mentioned issues arising from potential precedent-setting and legal challenges.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council reaches a decision as to which of the three following options it wishes to adopt:

- (a) Decline to participate in the undergrounding of Thornycroft Street or;
- (b) Agree to offer a 50/50 cost share for the undergrounding of Thornycroft Street in terms of the previous policy rescinded by the Council in December 2005.
- (c) Offer future participation in the new residents' contribution policy which has yet to be determined, accepting that the associated conditions and participation levels have yet to be determined, creating some associated financial risks for both the Council and residents.

9. DELEGATIONS

A report by the General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services will be separately circulated.

10. SUBMISSION ON TRANSIT NZ DRAFT 10-YEAR STATE HIGHWAY FORECAST

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment 941 8656
Officer responsible:	Transport and City Streets Manager
Author:	Stuart Woods, Principal Transport Planner Team Leader

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek adoption of a proposed submission (attached) on the Transit NZ draft 2006/2007 - 2015/2016 10-Year State Highway Forecast, on which Transit New Zealand are currently consulting, and to approve attendance at a subsequent hearing for submitters offered by Transit. This consultation is an annual requirement under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 as part of Transit's land transport programme formulation. The due date of the submissions is 24 March 2005.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Under legislation, each year Transit New Zealand is required to consult on its forward work programme. The draft forecast proposes a 10-year forward programme for large projects which cost in excess of \$3.4M, and a three-year forward programme for other projects estimated to cost less than \$3.4M. It shows a major lift in the total expenditure on state highways, with over \$12B over 10 years proposed. The draft forecast was released for consultation on 22 February 2006.
3. The value of the State Highway Forecast has increased by some 40% since 2003/04, during which time the construction price index increased by about 20%. For 2006/07, Transit are proposing an annual programme expenditure of some \$1.1B on capital and maintenance projects.
4. With lower projected funding (from LTNZ) and sharply increasing construction costs, there are significant financial pressures on the Transit programme. This is resulting in significant changes to the current 2005/06 forecast. Emphasis is made by Transit that the forecast is indicative only, due to inherent uncertainty in estimating costs, project scopes up to a decade in advance, future funding revenue streams and cost escalations. It also may change depending upon the availability of various funding sources (such as higher proportions of R funding going to state highway projects, additional Government contributions, or tolling) and feedback on issues surrounding this draft programme.
5. Transit is working with Land Transport NZ and the Government on matters of funding levels and programme delivery, as well as seeking ways to retain and extend efficiencies in their contracting processes and supply chain. Notwithstanding this work, the forecast is based on current indicative funding for State Highways, and has resulted amongst other things in deferral of timelines for a large number of major projects across the country.
6. The Council has an important opportunity through this mechanism to influence and contribute to the finalisation of this year's Transit 10-year State Highway Forecast. It is important therefore to compile the Council's views into a submission to respond to Transit's draft proposals. The Council could also choose to communicate with central Government and Land Transport New Zealand on the need for adequate funding to meet the justifiable needs of the transport system and which clearly is lacking.

10 Cont'd

7. Staff consider that the Council should express its views on the following key issues:
- That transport planning in Christchurch should be based on our philosophy that **prevention is better than cure**. Therefore the urgent demands in Auckland and Wellington should not unnecessarily detract from our ability to continue with good planning and implementation. The assumed use of 65% of the regionally allocated funds (from Land Transport New Zealand) on Transit projects is acceptable. However, the level of proposed national (N) funding allocated to Canterbury (and Christchurch) is completely unacceptable. R funding was never intended as simple substitution funding for N funding in a region; it was expected that Canterbury and Christchurch would continue to have received generally historical levels of N funding, with R funding added to “purchase additional outputs” in our region.
 - **The Southern Motorway**, which is the key major project in Canterbury for the next 10 years (and one of only two now proposed in the draft forecast for funding), has had its **construction start deferred three years** to 2012/13, but shortened to four years construction. Its design funding is deferred from 2005/06 until 2010/11. (The other project being proposed for funding is a Christchurch TDM (Travel Demand Management) project in 2009/10-10/11).
 - Concern should be strongly expressed about the **much reduced number of Large Projects** proposed for Canterbury over the next 10 years (**down to two from nine** proposed last year), despite the proposed use of 65% of regional funding. The deferred large projects are proposed for funding somewhere beyond 10 years, including construction of the north Christchurch roading projects and the Russley-Johns bypass widening
 - In addition, there is **no funding shown for planning work** in the next 10 years for the other identified large projects. The need for planning certainty and investigations for future transport network improvements in the city should be stressed. Support should be given for the re-introduction of planning funding for at least the next stages of the north Christchurch projects (from NROSS), namely the rural Northern Arterial, QEII four laning and the Western Belfast Bypass.
8. A copy of the proposed City Council submission is attached for discussion, amendment if necessary, and adoption.
9. In the consultation material, Transit has asked as to whether the Council wishes to take an opportunity to present its submission to a hearing panel. Officers believe that this is a key mechanism to promote and optimise the chances of success in addressing our issues. Therefore officers intend to accept the opportunity, and are recommending that the presentation be delegated to the General Manager City Environment and the Transport and City Streets Manager. Should Councillors wish to participate, then the recommendation (b) below should be modified and Councillors nominated to do so. Information to date regarding these hearings is only that they will be regionally-held and will occur sometime between 3 and 13 April 2006 inclusive. Following release of the confirmed forecast around the turn of the new financial year, all submitters will be informed of the decisions, along with reasons, made by the Transit Board.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. There are no direct financial implications related to this submission.
11. The Council is not under any legal obligations in relation to this submission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Adopt the attached submission, subject to any agreed amendments, for forwarding to Transit New Zealand as its views on the Transit NZ draft 2006/07-2015/16 10-Year State Highway Forecast.

10 Cont'd

- (b) Grant approval for the General Manager City Environment and the Transport and City Streets Manager to represent the Council's submission to the regional hearings.
- (c) Communicates its concerns about the lack of adequate funding for the land transport system to central government and Land Transport New Zealand.
- (d) Supports the preparation of a submission from the RLTC which reinforces a united regional approach to meeting the challenges of the future.

23. 3. 2006

- 16 -

11. REPORT OF CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL/ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING OF 28 FEBRUARY 2006

Attached.

12. NOTICES OF MOTION

13. QUESTIONS