



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

THURSDAY 30 NOVEMBER 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 23.11.2006
3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
4.	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
5.	CORRESPONDENCE
6.	REPORT OF THE COUNCIL HEARINGS PANEL REGARDING TRADE WASTES BYLAW 2000, AND RELATED POLICIES AND CHARGES
7.	CHRISTCHURCH CITY: PROPOSED NEW SPEED LIMITS
8.	MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AND KEEP CHRISTCHURCH BEAUTIFUL
9.	ANNUAL PLAN/AMENDED LTCCP PROCESS 2007/08
10.	LTCCP MONITORING REPORT AS AT 31 OCTOBER 2006
11.	RUAPUNA PARK RACEWAY
12.	REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 1 NOVEMBER 2006
13.	REPORT OF THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 10 OCTOBER 2006
14.	REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 25 OCTOBER 2006
15.	REPORT OF THE LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 18 OCTOBER 2006
16.	REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD: HALSWELL JUNCTION ROAD NEW ALIGNMENT

We're on the Web!

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

30. 11. 2006

- 2 -

ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION
17.	REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 6 SEPTEMBER 2006
18.	REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 17 OCTOBER 2006
19.	NOTICES OF MOTION
20.	QUESTIONS
21.	RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

30. 11. 2006

- 3 -

1. APOLOGIES

Councillor Gail Sheriff.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 23.11.2006

Attached.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

5. CORRESPONDENCE

**6. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL HEARINGS PANEL REGARDING TRADE WASTES BYLAW 2000,
AND RELATED POLICIES AND CHARGES**

Attached.

7. CHRISTCHURCH CITY: PROPOSED NEW SPEED LIMITS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Michael Atiken, Manager Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Malcolm Taylor, Traffic Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Council's approval to set new speed limits on the section of road as shown in Appendix 2 numbers 1 to 14 and include them in the Christchurch City Speed Limits Register.

BACKGROUND

2. At the Council meeting on 21 September 2006 it was resolved to undertake the consultation required in order to set new speed limits on the roads as listed in the report. (Appendix 2 numbers 1 to 16)
3. At the Council seminar on 1 August 2006 Councillors were briefed on proposals to change certain speed limits on roads within the city. These changes are considered necessary because of new subdivision developments and the changing use and environment of other roads within the Christchurch City Urban Traffic Area.
4. The Council is responsible for setting speed limits on those roads within its district in respect of which it is the road controlling authority. The authority for the Council to do this is contained in the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003, Rule 5004 ("the Rule") and the Christchurch City Speed Limit Bylaw 2005 ("the Bylaw").
5. In setting speed limits the Council must comply with the requirements of the Rule. It requires the Council to apply "Speed Limits New Zealand" for the setting of speed limits. "Speed Limits New Zealand" contains guidelines for setting speed limits and procedures for calculating speed limits. They are set out in Schedule 1 of the Rule. The Rule also prescribes the consultation that is required to be carried out for any proposed speed limit change.
6. The Council may set a speed limit that differs from the calculated speed limit under Speed Limits New Zealand. However, if it proposes to do so then it must comply with Rule 3.2(5)(a) or (b), whichever is applicable. In this situation, Rule 3.2(5)(a) applies in most of the cases. This states that a new speed limit can be set if: "A speed limit different from the calculated speed limit is the safe and appropriate speed limit for a road with regard to the function, nature and use of the road, its environment, land use patterns and whether the road is an urban traffic area or a rural area".
7. However, Rule 3.2(5)(b) is also relevant in the proposed speed limit change for Brighton Mall and Oxford Terrace.
8. 3.2(6) covers speed limits less than 50 km/h and states:

"A road controlling authority may propose to set a speed limit of less than 50 km/h but, unless section 4 applies, may only set the proposed speed limit if:

- (a) *the calculated speed limit for the relevant road is 50 km/h; and*
- (b) *the proposed speed limit would be likely to increase the safety of pedestrians, cyclists or other road users; and*
- (c) *safe and appropriate traffic engineering measures are installed so that the measured mean operating speed is within 5 km/h of the proposed speed limit."*

7 Cont'd

9. In respect of each proposed speed limit, the calculation prescribed by Speed Limits New Zealand has been carried out by consultant Antoni Facey of Facey Consultants. This work also included a comprehensive discussion document which provides all the relevant inputs into the calculations together with recommendations. Where the recommendations differ from Speed Limits New Zealand calculations, the consultant's report has covered the relevant assessments in terms of Rule 3.2(5) in relation to each proposed change. The consultant's report contains some 175 pages and is available for Councillors to review and will be tabled at the meeting.
10. Once the provisions of the Rule have been complied with in relation to determining an appropriate speed and undertaking the necessary consultation, the Council may set that speed limit by passing a resolution under Clause 5 of the Bylaw. The new speed limit will then be recorded in the Council's Speed Limit Register.
11. The particular roads in respect of which it is now proposed that new speed limits be set are defined in the staff recommendations.
12. The need to set new speed limits on the roads referred to in the schedule came to the attention of staff during the preparation of the Christchurch City Speed Limit Bylaw 2005. These proposed changes are due to new subdivision developments, and the changing use and environment of other roads.
13. Before a speed limit is set or changed Section 7.1(2) of the Rule requires that consultation is carried out with the following persons that may be affected by the proposed speed limit:
 - Commissioner of NZ Police
 - Director Land Transport New Zealand
 - CEO NZ Automobile Association Incorporated
 - CEO Road Transport Forum NZ
 - Any local community that the Council considers to be affected by the proposed speed limit
 - Adjoining road controlling authorities
 - Any other organisation or road user groups that the Council considers may be affected by the proposed speed limit
 - A territorial authority that is affected by the existing or proposed speed limit.
14. The Rule requires the Council to consult each of the persons listed above in writing, advising them of the proposed speed limit and giving them a reasonable time in which to make submissions on the proposal. Consultation was carried out between 22 September and 27 October 2006. The Shirley/Papanui Community Board's final resolution on speed limit changes within the Shirley/Papanui area, was made at their meeting on 1 November 2006.
15. The term "Any Local Community" is not defined for the purposes of Section 7.1(2)(c) of the Rule. However, in respect of the roads referred to below it is considered that the appropriate persons to consult are the occupiers of those properties which adjoin those parts of the roads upon which it is proposed that the speed limits be changed and each Community Board in respect of whose area the roads lie.
16. In respect of the proposed new speed limits it is not considered that there is any other organisation or road user group that would be affected by those speed limits.
17. The consultation has been completed in accordance with the above requirements and a summary of all the responses to the proposed speed limit changes is outlined in appendix 2.
18. As a result of the consultation on the sixteen different sites put to the Council at the seminar and approved for consultation on 21 September 2006, the staff are no longer recommending an increase in the speed limit from 50 to 60 km/h in Deans Avenue from Riccarton Avenue to Harper Avenue nor in Riccarton Avenue from Riccarton Road to west of the signals at the Christchurch Public Hospital.
19. The reason for this is due to the feedback from the consultation and is explained in the "Conclusion" under each site in the following discussion section.

7 Cont'd

DISCUSSION

Burwood Road/Preston Road

Proposal:

20. To relocate the existing 50/80 km/h speed limit change south of Waitikiri Drive to the culvert west of Waitikiri Drive.

Reasons:

- (a) To extend the existing 50 km/h speed limit on Burwood/Preston Road to accommodate the recent residential developments in this area.
- (b) The advisory speed on the bend is 45 km/h in one direction and 55 km/h in the other direction.
- (c) The number of cyclists using the intersection of Waitikiri Drive to access Bottle Lake plantation.
- (d) The many requests from residents of Waitikiri Drive to reduce the speed limit because of their concern for safety when negotiating this intersection.

Responses:

21. There was good support for this change with 88% of responses in favour. The Police, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association and the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board supported or had no issues with this proposal.
22. However, Land Transport NZ does not support the proposal and suggest that the best option would be to install larger signs at the current location.

Conclusion:

23. Although the Speed Limit NZ rating for this section of road is 100 km/h and the LTNZ does not support the change to 50 km/h, the fact that the area concerned has an advisory speed of 45 km/h in one direction and 55 km/h in the other, together with the many turning movements including cycles at the intersection with Landfill Avenue, it is considered that a 50 km/h is justified.

Gardiners Road

Proposal:

24. To relocate the existing 50/80 km/h speed limit on Gardiners Road at Johns Road (State Highway 1) to a point 150 metres south of Johns Road.

Reasons:

- (a) To shift the speed limit change to the rural/residential boundary.
- (b) To shift the speed limit signs further away from the intersection so that they are more easily seen by motorists when they enter from Johns Road.
- (c) Because Johns Road is 80 km/h it is not appropriate to introduce a short length of 70 km/h in isolation. To be consistent with the speed limit in Johns Road an 80 km/h speed limit is proposed.
- (d) A request was received from the Police to relocate the signs because they are close to Johns Road and motorists were not seeing them.

7 Cont'd

Responses:

25. There was good support for this change with 79% of responses in favour. The Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association and the Shirley/Papanui Community Board supported or had no issues with the proposal. However, the Police have concern for the proposed change in Gardiners Road by shortening the length of the 50 km/h zone which will create enforcement issues.

Conclusion:

26. The Speed limit NZ rating for this section of Gardiners Road is 70 km/h. It is not appropriate to install a short length of 70 km/h.
27. As motorists are not seeing the existing speed limit signs, it is appropriate to relocate the signs to a position further south along Gardiners Road from Johns Road to a position nearer to the rural/residential boundary. Due to comments received through the consultation process, a further site inspection has concluded in recommending a position at the speed limit change closer to Johns Road than originally proposal.

Jones Road

Proposal:

28. To relocate the existing 50/100 km/h speed limit change on Jones Road to a new position 150 metres west of the existing position.

Reasons:

- (a) A previous assessment of the speed limit of Jones Road in 2003 resulted in a rural speed threshold being constructed at the present location of the speed limit change. 600 metres from Kirk Road to slow drivers as they enter Templeton from the west along Jones Road.
- (b) To relocate the existing rural speed threshold on Jones Road to a point west of the new subdivision entranceway which has been constructed since 2003.
- (c) This is a boundary road with Selwyn District Council.

Responses:

29. There was good support for this change with 96% of response in favour. The Police, Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association, the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board and the Selwyn District Council supported or had no issues with the proposal.

Conclusion:

30. The Speed Limit NZ rating of 50 km/h past the entrance to the new subdivision supports the relocation of the 50/100 km/h signs. The subdivider has constructed a new rural speed threshold under instructions from staff in anticipation of Council approving this change. On approval, the signs will be moved to the new rural speed threshold position.

Innes Road

Proposal:

31. To relocate the existing 50/80 km/h speed limit on Innes Road east of Briggs Road, to a new position east of the new subdivision road.

7 Cont'd

Reasons:

- (a) To improve the safety of students being dropped off and picked up at the Mairehau High School.
- (b) New subdivision being developed on the northern side of Innes Road east of Briggs Road.

Responses:

32. There was good support for this change with 87% of response in favour. The Police, Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association and the Shirley/Papanui Community Board supported or had no issues with the proposal.

Conclusion:

33. The Speed Limit NZ rating of 50 km/h supports the relocation of the 50/80 km/h speed limit change. The relocation will improve the safety of student movements in this area and it is also appropriate to sign the speed limit change east of the new subdivision entrance.

Hayton Road and Wigram Road

Proposal:

34. To change the speed on Hayton Road and on Wigram Road from Hayton Road to Treffers Road from 80 to 50 km/h.

Reasons:

- (a) The intersection of Hayton Road with Wigram Road forms an effective urban/rural boundary.
- (b) There is a clear change of development density and the speed limit should reflect this.
- (c) There is a demand for building in this area and both roads may soon have fully developed industrial frontages.

Responses:

35. There was good support for this change with 72% of response in favour. The Police, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association and the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board supported or had no issues with the proposal. However, Land Transport NZ had a query about the lack of development on one side of the road.

Conclusion:

36. The Speed Limit NZ rating for Hayton and Wigram Roads is 70 km/h. However, due to the demand for building in this area and that both roads may soon have fully developed industrial frontages albeit on one side only, the reduction from 80 km/h to 70 km/h will not provide the safety for the number of longer vehicles and traffic movements in this area. It is therefore appropriate to consider a change in the speed limit from 80 to 50 km/h on both these sections of roads. There is general support for these changes.

John Paterson Drive

Proposal:

37. That the speed limit be set at 80 km/h.

7 Cont'd

Reasons:

- (a) Recent rural residential subdivision with a small number of established properties.
- (b) The default speed limit for the Drive is 50 km/h, which does not meet the Speed Limit New Zealand requirements.
- (c) If further subdivision development occurs on John Paterson Drive that results in more access, the speed limit will be reviewed.

Responses:

38. There was good support for this change with 82% of response in favour. The Police, Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association and the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board supported or had no issues with the proposal.

Conclusion:

39. The Speed Limit NZ rating for John Paterson Drive is 80 km/h. It is a recent rural subdivision with a small numbers of established lifestyle blocks set well back from the road. The default speed limit of 50 km/h is not appropriate and enforcement is unlikely. The current environment supports an 80 km/h speed limit.

New Brighton Mall

Proposal:

40. To set a speed limit of 30 km/h.

Reasons:

- (a) The new road has been designed and constructed to have a slow road environment.
- (b) The design guidelines in Austroads 2005 part 10, were used to determine an appropriate speed limit for such a commercial/pedestrian environment.
- (c) The recommended speed limit was 30 km/h.

Responses:

41. There was good support for this change with 96% of response in favour. The Police, Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association and the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board supported or had no issues with the proposal.

Conclusion:

42. Speed Limit NZ calculations gives ratings for speed limits of 50 km/h and above. However, where engineering to control speed has been installed then speed limits of 10, 20, 30, and 40 km/h can be considered. New Brighton Mall was constructed using Austroads Design standards, which are used in New Zealand as current best practice. Using Austroads "Local Area Traffic Management" Table A3 of Appendix A, a speed limit of 30 km/h has been determined. This complies with Section 3.2(6) of the Rule where (a) the calculated speed limit for the current road is (not greater than) 50 km/h and (b) the proposed speed limit would be likely to increase the safety of pedestrians, cyclists or other road users, and (c) safe and appropriate traffic engineering measures are installed so that the measured means operating speed is within 5 km/h of the proposed speed limit. (in this case 17 km/h)

7 Cont'd

Oxford Terrace

Proposal:

43. To reduce the speed limit on Oxford Terrace between Lichfield Street and Gloucester Street from 50 to 30 km/h.

Reasons:

- (a) Commercial road with significant pedestrian orientation.
- (b) The number of cafes fronting sections of Oxford Terrace.
- (c) To reduce the speed limit to reinforce the slow road environment along Oxford Terrace.
- (d) Speed limit assessed from the operating speed, adjacent speed limit of 30 km/h in Cathedral Square and the general utilization of the roadway in general.

Responses:

44. There was good support for this change with 90% of response in favour. The Police, Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, and NZ Automobile Association supported or had no issues with the proposal.

Conclusion:

45. Because it is proposed to install a speed limit less than 50 km/h in Oxford Terrace, a similar process to New Brighton Mall was followed. However, in this case there is a variation of traffic environments and therefore a more subjective approach involving an assessment of the speeds valves of each section was used. The consultant's report calculates speed limits of 20 km/h by the Bridge of Remembrance with all the rest of the proposed speed limit change being 30 km/h. It is not appropriate to have short lengths of different speed limits and therefore for consistency 30 km/h has been chosen. This complies with section 3.2(6) of the Rule as set out in para 41 above.

Quaifes Road

Proposal:

46. To reduce the speed limit from 100 to 80 km/h on Quaifes Road for 600 metres west from Sabys Road.

Reasons:

- (a) Residential development at the south east end of Quaifes Road.
- (b) Grassed shoulders used for recreation purposes, especially by horse riders.
- (c) Street lighting exists in this area.

Responses:

47. There was good support for this change with 87% of response in favour. The Police, Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association and the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board supported or had no issues with the proposal.

Conclusion:

48. The Speed Limit NZ rating of 80 km/h supports the lowering of the existing 100 km/h speed limit along this section of Quaifes Road. There is street lighting along this section of road which is also used for recreational purposes. A change in speed limit from 100 to 80 km/h along Quaifes Road for 600 metres west of Sabys Road is recommended.

7 Cont'd

Old Tai Tapu Road and Early Valley Road

Proposal:

49. To reduce the speed limit from 100 to 80 km/h on Old Tai Tapu Road from State Highway 75 to the boundary with Selwyn District Council and including Early Valley Road.

Reasons:

- (a) To reflect the road side development and recreation use of both these roads including cyclists, and horse riders.
- (b) There are a number of significant developments along Old Tai Tapu Road including a restaurant, vineyards and commercial glasshouses.
- (c) Early Valley Road has a number of properties fronting the road and appears to be a lifestyle area with fruit stalls.

Responses:

50. There was good support for this change with 87% of response in favour. The Police, Land Transport NZ, Transit NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association, the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board and the Selwyn District Council supported or had no issues with the proposal.

Conclusion:

51. The Speed Limit NZ rating of 80 km/h along Old Tai Tapu Road and Early Valley Road, support a reduction from the existing 100 km/h speed limit. These are boundary roads with Selwyn District Council who are also proposing to reduce the speed limit to 80 km/h on their section of Old Tai Tapu Road and their side roads. Several residents of Early Valley Road expressed a wish for this road to have a lower speed limit than 80 km/h. However, both these rural roads rated at 80 km/h and a lower posted limit would be unreasonable.

Foremans Road

Proposal:

52. To reduce the speed limit on the western end of Foremans Road from 80 to 50 km/h.

Reasons:

- (a) Due to the industrial development along Foremans Road.
- (b) Recent speed limit change on the adjoining Main South Road (State Highway 1) from 80 to 70 km/h.

Responses:

53. There was good support for this change with 81% of response in favour. The Police, Land Transport NZ, Transit NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association, and the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board supported or had no issues with the proposal.

Conclusion:

54. The Speed Limit NZ rating of 50 km/h supports the lowering of the existing 80 km/h to 50 km/h on the western end of Foremans Road to reflect the industrial use of this area and the recent speed limit change from 80 to 70 km/h on the adjacent Main South Road. (State Highway 1)

7 Cont'd

Springs Road

Proposal:

55. To reduce the speed limit from 100 to 80 km/h from Marshs Road to the Selwyn District Council boundary.

Reasons:

- (a) To extend the existing 80 km/h speed limit on Springs Road from Halswell Junction Road to the 50 km/h speed limit change at Prebbleton.
- (b) The section of Springs Road from Halswell Junction Road to Marshs Road was changed to 80 km/h on 1 February 2004. (Christchurch City road)
- (c) The section of Springs Road from Marshs Road to Hodgens Road is a boundary road with Selwyn District Council.

Responses:

56. There was good support for this change with 78% of response in favour. The Police, Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association, the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board and the Selwyn District Council supported or had no issues with the proposal.

Conclusion:

57. The Speed Limit NZ rating of 80 km/h assessed in 2003 supports the speed limit change. The proposed speed limit change from 100 to 80 km/h on this boundary road with Selwyn District Council will complete the speed limit change on Springs Road from Halswell Junction Road to Prebbleton.

Blenheim Road Deviation And Moorhouse Avenue

Proposal:

58. To set a speed limit of 60 km/h on the Blenheim Road Deviation and Moorhouse Avenue to Lincoln Road.

Reasons:

- (a) To set a speed limit on Blenheim Road Deviation to be consistent with the existing section of Blenheim Road.
- (b) The design speed for the Blenheim Road Deviation is 60 km/h.
- (c) The existing section of Moorhouse Ave west of Lincoln Road (Speed Limits NZ) rating is for a speed limit of 70 km/h.
- (d) It is suggested that the speed limit on Moorhouse Avenue from Deans Avenue to Lincoln Road be made 60 km/h to maintain the consistency along this route.

Responses:

59. There was good support for this change with 71% of response in favour. The Police, Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association, and the Riccarton/Wigram, Hagley/Ferrymead, and Spreydon/Heathcote Community Boards supported or had no issues with the proposal.

7 Cont'd

Conclusion:

60. The designed speed limit for Blenheim Road Deviation is 60 km/h. It is appropriate to extend the existing speed limit of 60 km/h on Blenheim Road over the deviation and along Moorhouse Avenue to Lincoln Road. This will create a consistent 60 km/h speed limit all the way from Hornby to the intersection of Moorhouse/Lincoln/Hagley. The change will take effect on completion of the construction work on the deviation in approximately March 2007.

Harper Avenue

Proposal:

61. To change the speed limit on Harper Avenue from Deans Avenue to Park Terrace from 50 km/h to 60 km/h.

Reasons:

- (a) To clarify the arterial nature of this road.
- (b) Harper Avenue is a four lane median divided road.
- (c) The recommended rated speed limit of 80 km/h is a rural speed limit and a maximum speed limit of 60 km/h is suggested for Harper Avenue in an urban environment.
- (d) To be consistent with other four laned median divided roads.

Responses:

62. There was medium support for this change with 57% of response in favour. The Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association, and the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board supported or had no issues with the proposal.
63. However, the Police are concerned at the proposed changes surrounding Hagley Park in general. The comparatively short distances will promote a level of confusion and they oppose these specific speed limit changes. Also the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board do not support the setting of a 60 km/h speed limit.

Conclusion:

64. The Speed Limit NZ rating of 80 km/h is a rural speed limit and a speed limit of 60 km/h is recommended. It is a four laned median divided arterial road where motorist expect to be able to travel at 60 km/h. The existing average speed of 59 km/h supports this proposed change. It is understood that the medium support of 57% could be attributed by a campaign conducted through the cycling fraternity and had this not accrued the support could have been quite different. Considering that there is adequate space on Harper Avenue for cyclists and that there is good off road cycle and pedestrian facilities then cyclists are not being disadvantaged. There are also signalised crossing facilities at desire lines both at each end and in the middle. The issue raised by Councillors about parked vehicles has been investigated and does accrue at specific locations. However, being park users, these vehicles tend to be parked for long periods and do not create a problem. Where parking accrues it does so in an orderly fashion in a marked parking lane.

Deans Avenue

Proposal:

65. To change the speed limit on Deans Avenue from Riccarton Road to Harper Avenue from 50 km/h to 60 km/h.

7 Cont'd

Reasons:

- (a) To clarify the arterial nature of this road.
- (b) Deans Avenue between Harper Avenue and Riccarton Road is a four lane median divided road.
- (c) The recommended rated speed limit of 80 km/h is a rural speed limit and a maximum speed limit of 60 km/h is suggested for Deans Avenue in an urban environment.
- (d) To be consistent with other four laned median divided roads.

Responses:

- 66. There was medium support for this change with 51% of response in favour. The Land Transport NZ, Road Transport Forum, NZ Automobile Association, and the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board supported or had no issues with the proposal.
- 67. However, the Police are concerned at the proposed changes surrounding Hagley Park. The comparatively short distances will promote a level of confusion and the oppose these specific speed limit changes. Also the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board do not support the setting of a 60 km/h speed limit.

Conclusion:

- 68. Given the lower response to the proposal and the slightly different nature to Harper Avenue, it would seem appropriate to leave the speed limit in this section of Deans Avenue at 50 km/h at this time. This will also give time for any changing traffic patterns due to the Blenheim Road Deviation to be taken into account before making a decision.

Riccarton Avenue

Proposal:

- 69. To change the speed limit on Riccarton Avenue from 50 km/h to 60 km/h, from Riccarton Road to west of the traffic signals at the Christchurch Public Hospital entrance.

Reasons:

- (a) To clarify the arterial nature of this road.
- (b) Riccarton Avenue has limited frontage access to off street car parks for recreation use along its length.
- (c) There is significant demand for long term on street car parking with a minimum parking turnover. The recommended rated speed limit of 80 km/h is a rural speed limit and it would be inappropriate for Riccarton Avenue. The rating shows that the speed limit of 50 km/h is also inappropriate.

Responses:

- 70. There was medium support for this change with 50% of response in favour. The Road Transport Forum NZ, NZ Automobile Association, supported or had no issues with the proposal.
- 71. However, the Police are concerned at the proposed changes surrounding Hagley Park. The comparatively short distances will promote a level of confusion and they oppose these specific speed limit changes. Land Transport NZ suggested it was ok, but there is plenty of parking and no solid median so 50 km/h may be better, and the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board do not support the setting of a 60 km/h speed limit.

7 Cont'd

Conclusion:

72. Given the lower response to the proposal and the Hagley Park Management Plan currently being considered, it would seem appropriate to leave the speed limit in Riccarton Avenue at 50 km/h at this time.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

73. The cost of new signs and the relocation of existing speed limit signs are within existing budgets.
73. The relevant legal considerations are set out above.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council resolve:

- (a) That it is satisfied that the consultation undertaken by the Council in respect of the proposals to set new speed limits on the roads specified below meets the requirements of Section 7.1 (2) of the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits Rule 2003.
- (b) That pursuant to Clause 5 (1) of the Christchurch City Speed Limits Bylaw 2005 speed limits be set as listed below:
- (i) That the speed limit on Prestons Road easterly, generally, along Prestons Road from a point measured 500 metres east from Grimseys Road to a point measured 200 metres west, generally, from Burwood Road, remain at 80 km/h.
 - (ii) That the speed limit of 80 km/h on Prestons Road and Burwood Road measured along Prestons Road from a point 200 metres westerly, generally, from Burwood Road, and along Burwood Road, to a point measured 180 metres south generally, from Waitikiri Drive, be uplifted.
 - (iii) That the speed limit on Gardiners Road from Johns Road (State Highway 1) southerly, generally, along Gardiners Road to a point measured 150 metres south from the intersection, be set at 80 km/h.
 - (iv) That the speed limit on Gardiners Road, from a point measured 150 metres from Johns Road (State Highway 1) southerly, generally, to a point measured 50 metres southerly generally from Wilkinsons Road, remain at 50 km/h.
 - (v) That the speed limit on Jones Road on the city side of the centreline from a point measured 750 metres from Kirk Road, westerly generally, to Dawsons Road (boundary with Selwyn District Council) remain at 100 km/h.
 - (vi) That the speed limit of 100 km/h on the city side of Jones Road from a point 600 metres from Kirk Road to a point 750 metres, be uplifted.
 - (vii) That the speed limit on Innes Road from a point 175 metres measured north easterly, generally, along Innes Road from Briggs Road to Queen Elizabeth II Drive, remain at 80 km/h.
 - (viii) That the 80 km/h speed limit on Innes Road commencing at a point 50 metres from Briggs Road and extending in a north easterly direction to a point 125 metres from Briggs Road, be uplifted.
 - (ix) That the 80 km/h speed limit on Hayton Road from Parkhouse Road, south easterly generally, to Wigram Road, be uplifted.
 - (x) That the 80 km/h speed limit on Wigram Road from Treffers Road, south westerly generally, to a point measured 50 metres south westerly generally from Hayton Road, be uplifted.

7 Cont'd

- (xi) That the speed limit on Wigram Road, from a point 50 metres measured south westerly generally from Hayton Road, south westerly, generally, to a point measured 100 metres north easterly, generally from Dunbars Road, remain at 80 km/h.
 - (xii) That the speed limit on John Paterson Drive from Springs Road south easterly, generally along John Paterson Drive to end, be set at 80 km/h.
 - (xiii) That the speed limit on Seaview Road from Union Street east generally, to Oram Avenue, (New Brighton Mall), be set at 30 km/h.
 - (xiv) That the speed limit on Oram Avenue from Seaview Road south generally, to Beresford Street, (New Brighton Mall), be set at 30 km/h.
 - (xv) That the speed limit on Oxford Terrace from Lichfield Street north generally, to Gloucester Street, be set at 30 km/h.
 - (xvi) That the speed limit on Quaifes Road from Whincops Road/Marshs Road south easterly, generally, to a point measured 600 metres north westerly generally, from Sabys Road, remain at 100 km/h.
 - (xvii) That the speed limit on Quaifes Road from Sabys Road north westerly generally, to a point measured 600 metres north westerly from Sabys Road, be set at 80 km/h.
 - (xviii) That the speed limit on Old Tai Tapu Road from State Highway 75, along Old Tai Tapu Road south easterly generally, to Early Valley Road, (boundary with Selwyn District Council) be set at 80 km/h.
 - (xix) That the speed limit on Early Valley Road on the city side of the centre line from Old Tai Tapu Road north easterly generally, to end, (boundary road with Selwyn District Council) be set at 80 km/h.
 - (xx) That the 80 km/h speed limit on Foremans Road from Halswell Junction Road westerly generally, along Foremans Road to the end, and to the Main South Road, (State Highway 1) be uplifted.
 - (xxi) That the speed limit on Spring Road on the city side of the centre line from Marshs Road south westerly, generally to Hodgens Road, (boundary road with Selwyn District Council) be set at 80 km/h.
 - (xxii) That the speed limit on Blenheim Road from Moorhouse Avenue westerly, generally, along Blenheim Road to Curletts Road, be set at 60 km/h on the completion of the Blenheim Road Deviation construction work. (expected March 2007).
 - (xxiii) That the 60 km/h speed limit on Blenheim Road from Deans Avenue to Mandeville Street be uplifted on the completion of the Blenheim Road Deviation construction work. (expected March 2007).
 - (xxiv) That the speed limit on Moorhouse Avenue from Blenheim Road easterly, generally, along Moorhouse Avenue to a point measured 90 metres westerly generally from Lincoln Road, be set at 60 km/h on the completion of the Blenheim Road Deviation construction work. (expected March 2007).
 - (xxv) That the speed limit on Deans Avenue from Moorhouse Avenue northerly generally to a point measured 50 metres be set at 60 km/h on the completion of the Blenheim Road Deviation construction work. (expected March 2007).
 - (xxvi) That the speed limit on Harper Avenue from a point measured 40 metres south westerly generally from Park Terrace, south westerly generally, to a point measured 50 metres north easterly generally from Deans Avenue, be set at 60 km/h.
- (c) That the above mentioned speed limits come into force on the date of adoption of this resolution being 30 November 2006, except for xxii, xxiii and xxiv which will come into effect on the date the Blenheim Road Deviation is opened to traffic (expected March 2007).

8. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AND KEEP CHRISTCHURCH BEAUTIFUL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	John Revell, Senior Contract Manager Parks
Author:	Stephen Hill, General Manager Public Affairs

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of a Memorandum of Understanding between Christchurch City Council and Keep Christchurch Beautiful Incorporated.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At its July 2004 meeting, the Council adopted a litter strategy based on the goal of:

“Christchurch is New Zealand’s cleanest city, with citizens who are responsible for their own litter and do not tolerate others littering.”
3. A cross-organisational staff group subsequently undertook primary and secondary research, pilot activities and development of an implementation plan. The implementation plan was approved by the Council in June 2005.
4. A range of activities has been undertaken under the strategy including:
 - Introduction of the “Don’t be a tosser” campaign
 - Introduction of the Clean City Partners programme in the Central City
 - Introduction of infrastructure for cigarette butt disposal
 - Proactive response to illegal dumping of rubbish
 - Successful “Clean up the World” campaigns with extensive volunteer support
5. Progress against the aims of the litter strategy has been regularly reported to the Environmental Diversity and Liveable City portfolio groups, most recently on 13 October 2006.
6. Following the Council’s adoption of the implementation plan, and discussions with the Environmental Diversity portfolio group in October 2005, discussions were initiated with Keep Christchurch Beautiful (KCB) towards development of a Memorandum of Understanding. A draft MOU was considered by the Environmental Diversity portfolio group in June 2006. Over the course of this period some changes have occurred in the governance of KCB. In addition, staff have been working to resolve the question of relationship management with KCB, to ensure there is an appropriate single point of contact between KCB and the Council. These issues have now been resolved and the MOU is presented for approval by the Council.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. There are no financial considerations. The MOU does not commit the Council to specific funding. Instead, KCB will now work through the appropriate community funding processes to access funding for projects. The Council may also contract KCB to undertake projects aligned to operational services, through operational funds. It is an appropriate document to enter into as a record of the “relationship” rather than a binding contract.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council authorise the Chief Executive to sign the Memorandum of Understanding on behalf of the Council.

8 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN COUNCIL AND KEEP CHRISTCHURCH BEAUTIFUL

8. At its July 2004 meeting, the Council adopted a litter strategy based on the goal of:
"Christchurch is New Zealand's cleanest city, with citizens who are responsible for their own litter and do not tolerate others littering."
9. The implementation plan proposed a range of actions across various Council activity areas including:
 - Social marketing campaigns
 - Education and promotion to increase awareness of litter
 - Providing infrastructure for cigarette butt disposal
 - 'Hot spots' cleaning
 - Partnership with Keep Christchurch Beautiful to engender community support
 - Working with other community organisations
 - Integrating the Clean up the World campaign into the overall litter strategy
 - Gaining the support of business that generate packaging which is prevalent in Christchurch litter
 - Enforcement
 - Managing litter reduction from rubbish/recycling
 - Measurement and evaluation
10. A cross-organisational staff group subsequently undertook primary and secondary research, pilot activities and development of an implementation plan. The implementation plan was approved by the Council in June 2005.
11. A range of activities has been undertaken under the strategy including:
 - Introduction of the "Don't be a tosser" campaign
 - Introduction of the Clean City Partners programme in the Central City
 - Introduction of infrastructure for cigarette butt disposal
 - Proactive response to illegal dumping of rubbish
 - Successful "Clean up the World" campaigns with extensive volunteer support
12. Keep Christchurch Beautiful has a long history of community-based activity in litter reduction and city beautification. Among the programmes independently delivered by KCB are:
 - Litter Awards
 - Schools Environmental Enhancement Programme (SEEP)
 - Enviro Action (schools projects)
 - Litter counts
13. Over the past two years the Council has reviewed the relationship between KCB and Christchurch City Council. Previously the Council employed a coordinator for KCB; from the start of the 2004/05 year the Council no longer provided a coordinator. Funding for KCB has been moved to community funding streams, in line with arrangements for other community organisations. Currently KCB retains access to funding through community funding streams
14. Through the Litter Strategy and Implementation Plan, the Council confirmed that it recognises the significant community-based role of KCB in litter reduction, and its intention to work in partnership with KCB in achieving the goals of the litter strategy. In particular:
 - The Council and KCB would work to conclude a Memorandum of Understanding or similar relationship agreement.
 - KCB would develop a work programme to detail the initiatives it proposes to deliver, to support KCB funding applications through appropriate community funding streams.
 - The Council would discuss with KCB the possibility of KCB carrying out a revised litter count programme which is linked to the litter strategy, and subject to specific work programme and performance targets.
 - Other opportunities for KCB to deliver specific campaigns or projects in support of the goals of the litter strategy will be discussed on a case by case basis.

8 Cont'd

15. In discussions with the portfolio group on the Litter Strategy Implementation Plan in October 2005 it was agreed that the partnership with KCB was a significant relationship and that work would be undertaken to formalise a relationship agreement. A draft MOU was considered by the Environmental Diversity portfolio group in June 2006. Over the course of this period some changes occurred in the governance of KCB, necessitating additional discussion to clarify and document the relationship. In addition, Council staff have been working to resolve the question of relationship management with KCB, to ensure there is an appropriate single point of contact between KCB and the Council.
16. This issue has now been resolved, with the decision that the relationship with KCB will be primarily managed within Council through the Senior Contract Manager Parks, in the Transport and Greenspace Unit. This recognises the primary area of operational responsibility for litter and beautification. This position will also liaise closely with staff in other related areas including, for example, amenity maintenance, marketing, community development and enforcement.
17. The attached Draft Memorandum of Understanding thus recognises that Council and KCB wish to continue to work together to meet their shared objectives of litter reduction and prevention.
18. The MOU does not commit the Council to specific funding. Instead, KCB will work through the appropriate community funding processes to access funding for projects and programmes. Staff have been providing advice and assistance to KCB on this process. The Council will also separately consider opportunities to involve KCB in projects which are part of the Council's service delivery.
19. It is proposed that the MOU is now formally approved by the Council.

9. ANNUAL PLAN/AMENDED LTCCP PROCESS 2007/08

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To recommend a process for developing and approving the 2007/08 Annual Plan, as well as any amendments to be made to the current Long-Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) resulting from the new Development Contributions Policy (DCP).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council is required to publish an Annual Plan each year.
3. When the LTCCP was approved there were effectively two DCPs. One covered the "old" Christchurch City, the other covered the former Banks Peninsula District Council (BPDC). We commented that we would be working this year to incorporate the BPDC policy into our policy and that this would result in an amendment to the LTCCP. Both issues can be dealt with fairly simply and do not require elaborate processes.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. The process the Council follows must comply with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002. The recommended process is the result of input from Council Secretariat, Corporate Performance, Corporate Finance, Strategy and Policy and Legal Services.
5. The Local Government Act (LGA) 2002 only requires the Council to consider a single year's financials as part of an Annual Plan. Therefore, the Annual Plan will only address 2006/07 operating and capital expenditure.
6. The approach therefore will be as the Council actioned the 2004/05 Annual Plan:
 - (a) There have been no changes to LTCCP Levels of Service (LOS), therefore the Capex and Operating budgets in the 2006/16 LTCCP for 2006/07 are effectively set.
 - (b) What will be presented to the Council in March will be the 2006/07 budget adjusted to reflect:
 - (i) any timing changes to the capital programme
 - (ii) any cost changes to LOS that have not been able to be covered by either inflation provisions included in the 2006/07 LTCCP budget, or through efficiency savings.
 - (c) Any impact on the DCP resulting from the absorption of the BPDC DCP, or any changes to the DCP following the Council deliberations on the findings of the DCP Working Party.
7. Any changes to the LTCCP resulting from the DCP findings, or cost increases that cannot be covered by inflation or savings, or indeed any substitutions, can be addressed by including an updated list of financials for the 2007/16 years.
8. We will therefore need to produce an Annual Plan (including any updated financials as above) and a new DCP, both of which will be open to public consultation as per the timetable in Appendix 1.
9. Attached for Councillors' information is a copy of two slides presented to Councillors in November 2004 (Appendix 2) as part of their induction programme. They provide the legal context and framework for Councils to effectively adopt their Annual Plan. They highlight the legislative view that Annual Plans are **not** an opportunity to undertake significant change to an existing LTCCP.

9 Cont'd

10. It is appropriate that a moratorium be placed on significant formal consultation to the Council during the submission period for the Annual Plan/amended LTCCP. (This would not prevent operational consultations from occurring, but will reduce the burden on the Council during a busy period. It also minimises any confusion arising in the minds of stakeholders or the community.)

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Receive the report.
- (b) Adopt the timeline and process set out in Appendix 1.

10. LTCCP MONITORING REPORT AS AT 31 OCTOBER 2006

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Corporate Services, DDI 941-8540
Officer responsible:	General Manager Corporate Services
Author:	Roy Baker

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To update the Council on the LTCCP performance (including financials) of the 2006/07 financial year.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Attached are appendices showing:
 - LTCCP KPI's as at 31 October 2006 (Appendix 1)
 - Financial Performance as at 31 October 2006 (Appendix 2)
 - Significant Capital Projects as at 31 October 2006 (Appendix 3)
3. This is the second monitoring report for the 2006/07 financial year. The next report will be on the results as at the end of January and thereafter on a two monthly basis. At this stage of the fiscal year, it appears that overall we are generally on track to deliver at both an operating and capital level, and there has been an improved forecast since last month.

LTCCP KPIs

4. October output from the Horizon system that is designed to report our performance against delivery of the KPIs from the LTCCP is attached.
5. Performance at both an Opex and Capex level has improved in October. Details of those KPIs that will not meet the target or need corrective action are also identified in Appendix 1.

Operating Costs

6. Within the Streets and Transport activities, signs remain that contract costs will exceed budget significantly by year end (currently \$0.8m over budget). The activity is currently forecasting an overspend of at least \$2.1m and possibly as high as \$4m. Three elements appear to be one-off costs - storm damage (primarily in the Banks Peninsula area) of \$1.350k, \$500k for power charges and \$300k dump fee costs. The latter two charges relate to expenditure that should have been accounted for last year. We continue to investigate the remaining \$2m potential forecast over-run. If this proves to be a permanent cost increase, ie on-going, then this would have a 1% rate impact in 2007/08 and will be detailed in the draft Annual Plan due to be with the Council in March 2007.
7. Within the Solid Waste area, the negotiated META contract is producing savings helping to offset the above.
8. Total Opex expenditure is forecast to be \$1.5m under budget at year end.

Revenue

9. On-street parking fee income is currently behind budget by \$0.8m. October was the first month that all the new meters and parking bylaws were operational. At this stage the Unit is forecasting a year end shortfall of \$0.6m. This looks ambitious and we will look at this further.
10. Vesting of assets is behind budget by \$3m, principally owing to a recording delay. This is a non cash item. Development Contributions for reserves are ahead of budget, partly offset by contributions in other areas being behind. There is no rate impact as development contributions are reflected in the "surplus".
11. LTNZ subsidies are also behind budget by \$2.3m, which is largely an expenditure timing issue.
12. Currently there is a \$1m revenue shortfall forecast at year end.

10 Cont'd

Capex

13. Ocean Outfall: There is no change to the forecast to spend \$7.3m more than the 2006/07 budget, but we will be within the overall project budget.
14. Fifth and Sixth Digester: There is no change to the forecast to spend \$5.6m more than the 2006/07 budget, but again we will still be within the overall project budget.
15. Western Interceptor Stage I: This project, which has seen the work scope extended, is not expected to start construction until March 2007. This will see us only spending \$0.8m of the \$4.9m 2006/07 budget.
16. Strategic Land Purchases: These represent \$13.8m of our budget. While we are forecasting to spend the total amount, this remains a difficult area to predict and one of risk to us, regarding delivery of the capital programme.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council receive the report.

11. RUAPUNA PARK RACEWAY

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Inspections and Enforcement Manager
Author:	Klaus Prusas, Team Leader Environmental Effects

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to report on matters raised during a deputation to Council at its meeting on 24 August 2006 concerning motor sport "noise" generating activities at Ruapuna Park Raceway.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council at its meeting on 24 August 2006 received a deputation stating that noise generated from motor sports events and related activities held at the Ruapuna Park Raceway were excessive and were affecting members of the local community.
3. As a result of questions from Councillors the deputation listed a number of specific areas of concern (discussed later in this report), including the need for a change to the Christchurch City Plan. Reference was also made to the Ruapuna Park noise survey carried out by Council staff between November 2005 and March 2006. The survey report findings were reported to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board earlier this year. The report, "*Ruapuna Noise Survey - November 2005-March 2006*" is attached and is also discussed later in this report.
4. Ruapuna Park is located in the Templeton area of Christchurch City and is the main motor sport events centre for the City and the wider Canterbury region. It provides facilities for various types of motor sport (speedway and car racing), education and testing.
5. The park operates under Christchurch City Plan rules (operative from June 1999), and leases the land from Council. The venue has been established for over 50 years. The area is predominantly rural in nature, is located within the main flight path of Christchurch International Airport, and adjacent to quarrying activities.
6. Receipt of complaints intensified from November 2005 and continue to be received from some residents. Prior to November 2005 very few complaints were received. (1990-1999 - no complaints, 1999 to September 2005 - 10 complaints).
7. The results of the monitoring survey carried out between November 2005 and March 2006 were found to be complying when compared with the City Plan rules.
8. The matter has been discussed by the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board, and a facilitated meeting between residents and the raceway operators has taken place.
9. Ruapuna Park Raceway has existing use rights and holds a current lease(s) from the Council which do not expire for some years. It complies with the operative City Plan noise rules. The Raceway would under this set of circumstances appear to have a legitimate right to continue with its present operation.
10. Against this "right" to operate is the concern expressed by some members of the community that there should be a reduction in the level of noise generated and a reduction in the number of events held.
11. A multi-unit staff group led by the Strategic Support Unit has been investigating and discussing a number of options related to motor sport activities occurring in the peri-urban environment. It is anticipated that a detailed report to the Executive Team will be provided by the end of the year.

11 Cont'd

12. In considering this matter three options were identified. These are as follows:

Option 1

13. That this report be received and:

- (i) that the deputation members be advised that Council intends to take no further proceedings in this matter, other than to ensure that compliance with statutory obligations is maintained at the Ruapuna Park Raceway, and
- (ii) if the deputation members wish to initiate a City Plan change they have the option of implementing this themselves.

Option 2

14. The Council initiate a plan change to alter the City Plan rules with a view to reduce the level of activity and noise at Ruapuna Park Raceway. Such a plan change would have to weighed up against the other issues currently on the Council's city plan work programme. Any plan change would affect the existing use rights now held by the raceway and speedway as a result of the 1999 Council decision setting the existing planning rules.

Option 3

15. The Council at this time make no decision and await the outcome of the pending staff report on possible future development changes in the area that may affect motor sport activities.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 16. At this time the only financial and legal implications are those associated with the carrying out of the Council's statutory administrative functions.
- 17. The implications may nevertheless change depending upon yet undetermined possible future decisions. These could come from a variety of directions and include planning change implications, legal challenges and outcomes of future development proposals, if any. A plan change initiated by the council would be estimated to cost \$40,000 - \$60,000.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council adopt Option 3.

11 Cont'd

BACKGROUND

18. To provide background information, listed and discussed below are subject matters considered relevant to this issue. Included are the matters identified by the deputation as matters of concern (24 August 2006 meeting).

Ruapuna Park Noise Survey - November 2005 - March 2006

19. The survey was carried out during the period November 2005 to 13 March 2006. It involved some 624 hours of monitoring (automatic and attended, and involved 51 events/days). It is believed that the monitoring was comprehensive.
20. This report should be read in conjunction with the Ruapuna Park survey report (separately circulated) as it discusses and provides answers to some of the matters raised by Councillors at the 24 August 2006 Council meeting.
21. The survey result findings were that the motor sport activities complied with the City Plan rules.
22. The survey report provides information of the history of Ruapuna Park (the raceway/speedway/radio car control club); discusses zoning/development of the present City Plan rules; the monitoring programme/results; complaint history; 2005/06 events calendar and information on noise terminology.
23. A summary of the Ruapuna Park Noise Survey – November 2005 – March 2006 report is however, provided below.
- (a) Both Ruapuna Raceway and Speedway have existed in this locality for many years (over 50 years and 44 years respectively).
 - (b) The park was a remnant of the Templeton Domain. Control passed from the Domain Board to Paparua County Council in 1963. In 1979 it was classified as a recreation reserve under the Reserves Act 1977, and then later transferred from the Crown to the Christchurch City Council.
 - (c) The park is currently zoned under the City Plan as Open Space 3 (O3). It is surrounded to the north, west and south by Rural 5 and Rural 2 zoned land, to the east by Open Space 2 zoned land, and to the north-east the land is zoned Rural Quarry. It also sits directly within the 55dBA L_{dn} Airport Noise Contour with a portion also within the 65dBA L_{dn} Airport Noise Contour line. The City Plan also makes the erection of any residential building in the Rural 5 zone within 400 metres of the park boundary a non-complying use. This in effect was intended to provide an additional buffer from motor sport and quarrying activities.
 - (d) Open Space 3 zones (ie Ruapuna Park) are recognised in the City Plan as being important as a community facility. The zone description states:

“areas and facilities in the Open Space 3 zone are important physical resources for the city and may also be important regional and national resources”¹
 - (e) The 1995 proposed City Plan rules stated:

“In the case of motor racing events, not exceeding 120 days in any one calendar year, the steady sound level from activities on land measured or assessed on an hourly basis at the notational boundary of occupied dwelling houses shall not exceed 65dBA L_{10} between the hours of 0900 and 1900 on any occasion and the maximum sound level shall not exceed 85dBA L_{max} during such times.

Outside these days and times the levels shall meet those for the rest of the Open Space 3 Zone.”

¹ City Plan Volume 3, Part 6, Section 1.4

11 Cont'd

- (f) When the Plan was publicly notified in 1995, submissions were received from Ruapuna to extend the number of operating days from 120 to the current 200, and changes to the noise levels.

As with all other submissions this submission from Ruapuna was publicly advertised in April 1996 to enable any person to lodge a further submission opposing or supporting that submission, to extend the operating days. The Council did not receive a further submission from any person objecting to the extension of operating days by Ruapuna.

Ruapuna's submission was then considered by a Commissioner at a hearing in 1999. The Commissioner concluded that:

"From the evidence presented it is clear that the area is particularly suitable for a raceway. The activities are noisy, and cannot be made quieter to any significant degree. There are however few complaints about the noise and there were no submissions opposing the exception to the general noise standards put forward in the proposed plan."

- (h) The new Ruapuna Raceway rules as described below became operative in June 1999:

Operational noise levels of 90dBA L_{max} and 65dBA L_{10} (1 hour) to apply between the hours of 0900 and 2200 hours on any day of the calendar year, except that:

- *for up to 200 days in any calendar year, the permitted levels shall be 95dBA L_{max} and 80dBA L_{10} (1 hour), between the hours of 0900 and 2300;*
- *for up to 15 of those 200 days, these activities shall be permitted up to 2400 hours;*
- *on up to 5 of those 200 days, no L_{max} level shall be applied.*

All levels are to be applied at the boundaries of the Park. At all other times, the levels of the Open Space 3 Zone shall apply.

- (i) At all other times, that are not included in the specific Ruapuna rules, the noise levels for Open Space 3 (O3) Zone rules apply.
- (j) Noise monitoring to determine the nature and characteristics was planned during August/September 2005 to be carried out during the forthcoming summer racing season (November to March).
- (k) The monitoring was carried out in accordance with and within recognised procedures and followed the events calendar provided by the park lessees. Monitoring was also carried out during non-calendar event periods and when complaints were received.
- (l) In all some 624 hours of static automatic sound level monitoring and attended noise monitoring was involved. Attended monitoring involved 51 event/days and approximately 176 hours. The static automatic monitoring also included a continuous 26 day period between 17 January 2006 and 13 February 2006.
- (m) The total noise environment of the motor sport activity including ambient noise sources were recorded. The "sounds" measured included aircraft, road and rail traffic, public address systems, people, activity on neighbouring properties including motor sport.
- (n) The survey report provides detailed tables of the monitoring results.
- (o) The findings of the monitoring carried out were that the motor sport activities comply with the Christchurch City Plan Noise Rules.

11 Cont'd

Noise Survey Peer Review

25. A peer review of the Ruapuna Park noise survey was sought from Marshall Day Acoustics in September 2006. Marshall Day Acoustics are environmental consultants specialising in the field of noise management. The review concluded that: "based on our peer review, we conclude that noise from Ruapuna Park complies with City Plan rules at the monitored locations, and almost certainly complies at all other site boundary positions". A copy of the review report is attached.

Community Board Involvement

26. Ruapuna has been the subject of reports to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board. Representations by some members of the community to the Board have been made. An arranged facilitated meeting between residents and the raceway operators has also taken place (8 May 2006) from which agreed outcomes arose.
27. Key actions arising from the facilitated meeting between the two parties were that telephone contact be provided to residents; advance notification of major events (and events with fireworks) to occur, operators to be supportive of residents' suggestions to place speed restrictions on local roads; residents to itemise their concerns in writing directly to the operators; discussion on ability to reduce the frequency of events; any proposals related to City Plan changes not to be addressed as part of this dialogue.

Areas Of Concern Identified (at 24 August Council meeting)

Fireworks Displays

28. Council staff are aware of only one "fireworks display" in the post-October 2005 period (17 December 2005), not the numerous displays as claimed. The complaint was received and actioned. The display was alleged to have caused concern to the complainant's horses. The complainant suggested that being warned of the display would have been helpful. The Speedway was responsible for the display and apologised. It advised that they had neglected to advise neighbours as was their normal practice for such events and would do so in future. It is advised that for this year's event (17 November 2006) the Speedway have informed the nearby neighbouring residents.

Motor Vehicle Noise From Track Almost Every Day

29. The Ruapuna Park Raceway city plan rules specify noise criteria for certain number of days in any calendar year. They do not specify the number of events or usage.
30. The rules are described in Table 1 (page 9) of the Ruapuna Park Noise Survey report.
31. Park usage can be separated into two categories, "scheduled events" (major) and "other usage".
32. Appendix "A" of the survey report lists the events for the 2005/06 season.
33. Scheduled events occurred on approximately 50 occasions between November and March ie:
- raceway (race cars): 35
 - speedway (nights): 14
34. For the remainder of the "other usage" time, the usage is dictated by the need to comply with the City Plan rules. This "other usage" involves learning to drive/learning to drive a racing car/testing.
35. The noise survey results indicated that compliance was being achieved.

11 Cont'd

36. It is advised that the current range of activities have existed since about 1990. This has resulted from public demand/popularity, and within noise rule terms has not resulted in non compliance. The only new activity, some 14 months ago, has been the introduction of "drifting". Drifting is the controlled skidding/sliding of usually two cars in tandem. It is not a race. This activity has not resulted in non compliance of noise rules.

Motor Events Being Held Later Into The Evening

37. Subject to compliance with the City Plan rules the activities are permitted to be carried out .

Patronage Increase(more traffic/rubbish)

38. The popularity of the motor sport is a consequence for the increased patronage, and clearly along with that goes increased traffic.
39. The rubbish aspect might be able to be addressed by better management control. The major contributor to rubbish generation in the area however appears to be from "car hooning" occurring outside Ruapuna Park. This is another issue.

More Loud Speaker Noise

40. This matter has been the subject of discussion with the park management and they have agreed to attempt to address the matter. This was one of the matters discussed at the facilitation meeting.

Increase In "Party" Type Activities (music and drinking)

41. Two Club Licences under the Sale of Liquor Act exist on Ruapuna Park:
- (a) Christchurch Speedway Association Inc. with liquor able to be sold Monday to Sunday 3.00pm to 1.00am the following day, and
 - (b) Canterbury Car Club Inc. with liquor able to be sold:
 - Monday to Friday 3.00pm to 11.00pm
 - Saturday 12 noon to 12 midnight
 - Sunday and public holidays 12 noon to 11.00pm
42. Until the advent of the recent noise complaints this matter has never been raised as an issue. Within sale of liquor abuse terms the Sale of Liquor Inspectors have had no problems with the operation of the clubs. No specific complaints have been received. The premises are monitored and have had their licences renewed without objection.
43. In terms of noise the survey monitoring results indicate compliance at the times of such alleged events.

The Resource Management Act 1991 – Section 16/17 Implications

This section (clauses 40 to 57 inclusive) has been prepared by the Legal Services Unit.

44. The principal purpose of the RMA is to achieve sustainable management of resources. The principle of sustainable management acknowledges that there are activities with adverse effects on the environment and requires the **effects** of those activities to be managed. The emphasis in the Act is the **control** of effects, not restriction of activities. Sections 16 and 17 of the Act impose duties to ensure this aim is achieved. Therefore, sections 16 and 17 cannot be considered in isolation to the rest of the Act - they must be interpreted in light of the purpose Act and the context of the City Plan (Powell v Dunedin City Council [2005] NZRMA 174, Section 5 Interpretation Act 1999).

11 Cont'd

Duty Pursuant to Section 16 of the Resource Management Act 1991

45. Section 16(1) of the Act states:

“Every occupier of land ... shall adopt the best practicable option to ensure that the emission of noise from land ... does not exceed a reasonable level;”

46. It is important to note that the duty in section 16 is not to ensure compliance with a specific noise standard, but to ensure that the best practicable option for controlling noise emissions is employed.

47. The “best practicable option” is defined as:

“**Best practicable option**, - ... means the best method for preventing or minimising the adverse effects on the environment having regard, among other things, to —

- (a) The nature of the discharge or emission and the sensitivity of the receiving environment to adverse effects; and
- (b) The financial implications, and the effects on the environment, of that option when compared with other options; and
- (c) The current state of technical knowledge and the likelihood that the option can be successfully applied:

48. Currently the Ruapuna Raceway has a 3m – 4m high earth bund to reduce noise emissions. In addition, the speedway has stopped use of the loud speaker system to broadcast music, and reduced the time used for practice/warm-up sessions. The result of these measures is that the noise emissions fall below the standards specified in the City Plan.

49. The section 16 duty also requires that noise reduction measures result in noise emissions that do not exceed “...reasonable levels..”.

50. A “reasonable” level of noise is a noise emission which is consistent with principles of sustainable management and the purpose of the Act. This is a question of fact and degree to be determined in the circumstances of each case.

51. In formulating the City Plan, the Act required the Council to determine what City Plan rules were necessary to achieve sustainable management of the surrounding environment of the Ruapuna Raceway.

52. As a result of that process, rules that were specific to the use of the Ruapuna Raceway were developed. The rules set a noise level threshold, and noise emissions falling below that level are deemed to achieve sustainable management and be consistent with the purpose of the Act.

53. Therefore, noise emissions which fall below the thresholds specified in the City Plan are “reasonable levels” for the purpose of section 16 of the Act.

54. It can therefore be concluded that because the measures undertaken by the Ruapuna Raceway result in noise emissions that are below the thresholds specified in the City Plan, the current use of the speedway does not contravene the duty under section 16 of the Act.

Duty Pursuant to Section 17 of the Resource Management Act 1991

55. Section 17(1) of the Act states:

“17(1) - every person has a duty to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effect on the environment arising from an activity carried on by or behalf of that person, whether or not the activity is in accordance with a rule in a plan, a resource consent, a designation, section 10, section 10A, or section 20A.”

11 Cont'd

56. This duty is not contravened where the effects of the activity are the same as one which complies with the district plan rules (*Cooke v Auckland City Council* A063/96). As the noise from the Ruapuna site is a permitted activity in the district plan, this duty has not been contravened.
57. Further, it should be noted that because the noise emissions are permitted activities pursuant to the City Plan, the Council is unable to obtain an enforcement order as section 319(2) of the Act expressly prohibits the Court from making enforcement orders where the activity complies with the City Plan. This is a further indication that the clear intention of the Act is that activities which comply with the City Plan achieve sustainable management.

Sections 326, 327 and 328 of the Resource Management Act 1991

58. Sections 326-328 of the Act provide measures for controlling “excessive noise”, and empower the Council or the Police to issue an excessive noise direction requiring the noise to be reduced to a reasonable level immediately.
59. Excessive noise is defined by section 326 of the Act to mean:
“...any noise under human control and of such a nature to **unreasonably** interfere with the peace, comfort, and convenience of any person...” (emphasis added).
60. The focus of this section is to control noise which is “unreasonable”. It is commonly invoked to deal with complaints about stereo levels.
61. These sections must be interpreted in light of the other sections of the Act, in particular section 16. As the noise emissions do not exceed “reasonable levels” for the purpose of section 16, the Council would be unlikely to succeed in establishing that the use of the raceway constituted “excessive” noise under section 326.

Western Springs Stadium - Auckland City Council

62. Comparisons between Western Springs Stadium and Ruapuna Park have been raised at times since November 2005. The prime similarity between the two venues is that of noise issues. In most other respects the circumstances are nevertheless different. Western Springs is sited in a predominantly residential environment with the racetrack very close to the residential properties. From a motor sport perspective it is speedway that has been the issue. Outdoor concerts are also held. The criticism was that the speedway operation was not meeting Auckland City Plan noise rules and that no monitoring had been undertaken to establish compliance.
63. Ruapuna on the other hand is sited in a predominantly “rural” environment. The racetrack(s) are some distance from residential properties. Speedway and car racing occur. Monitoring has been undertaken that shows compliance with the Christchurch City Plan rules. An additional 400 metre “no new residential building” restriction from the raceway boundary also exists. There are six existing houses within the 400 metre area. The Council has received complaints from all of these residents.

Implications of a Plan Change

64. Comments on these aspects (clauses 61 to 65 inclusive) have been prepared by the Environmental Policy and Approvals Unit, City Plan Team and are provided as follows:

11 Cont'd

65. A Plan Change to the noise provisions for Ruapuna may be undertaken to lower the permitted noise levels, and change the number of days of operation. Any change to the existing noise provisions requires a full technical assessment of the existing noise environment. This will establish whether the noise levels provided for are “reasonable” and further to this, what the long term effects of future noise will be should noise levels reach the levels permitted by the Plan. The results of a technical assessment may provide the justification for changing the Plan. Should the assessment find that the noise environment produced by these rules are exceeding a ‘reasonable level’, then a plan change may be undertaken. The Plan Change could potentially seek to remove the exception provided for Ruapuna (Volume 3, Part 11, Rule 1.3.4). This would require noise levels to meet the standards for the Open Space Zone. Alternatively, the noise standards may be changed to a level appropriate to the surrounding noise environment, to make changes to the operational hours, and/or to create a new set of noise standards.
66. However, it is important to note that a Plan Change to the noise rules in the Plan will not extinguish the “existing use rights” held by Ruapuna Raceway.
67. Section 10 of the Act allows for existing use rights by stating that “land may be used in a manner that contravenes a rule in the district plan if it was lawfully established before the rule become operative”. Should the Plan be changed to limit the permitted noise levels, the Raceway could continue to function under existing use rights. The recent Noise Survey affirmed that the Raceway is functioning lawfully, within the Plan rules. The existing noise environment would therefore be protected by Section 10 if the noise standards were lowered below the existing noise environment.
68. Any Plan Change that reduced the noise standards to the Raceway’s existing use rights could prevent the noise levels increasing.
69. Section 10(2) allows for the removal of existing use rights should the activities be discontinued for a continuous period of more than 12 months. Unless that happens the Raceway would retain these existing use rights as long as the character, scale and intensity of the effects of the activities are maintained. A Plan Change that lowered the permitted noise levels would only lower the existing noise levels at the raceway if the Raceway fail to continue to maintain the noise environment at the current levels. In the long term, it is possible that a Plan Change may provide for a decrease in the noise environment. However, this would only occur should the Raceway fail to maintain the current levels of use for a continuous period of more than 12 months.

Lease

70. This section (clauses 66 to 68 inclusive) have been prepared by the Legal Services Unit.

The Council owns the land on which the Raceway is situated. The Raceway operators have leases under section 54 of the Reserves Act 1977. The existing lease(s) expire:
 - (a) Speedway – 1 February 2020; and
 - (b) Car Club - 30 December 2016.
71. Changing the terms of the lease can be achieved at any time, by agreement with the Raceway operators (section 114 Reserves Act 1977).
72. However, it would be unnecessary to change the terms of the lease unless there were clear and demonstrably significant adverse environmental effects of the noise emissions. As the duty under sections 16 and 17 of the Resource Management Act 1991 are being met, there are currently no significant adverse effects of the activity, and therefore, it is unnecessary to change the terms of the lease agreement at this time.

11 Cont'd

Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB)

73. A letter dated 4 October 2006 has been received (attached) from a clinical co-ordinator at the CDHB advocating on behalf of some residents. The letter refers to distress being caused from the constant and excessive noise generated by the nearby Ruapuna Raceway track affecting family and Community.
74. The co-ordinator states that while "we" have had contact with a small number of members of the community, it indicates that there is an issue which needs to be addressed.
75. The co-ordinator has been advised that the matter was being considered by Council shortly and that no comment could be made until after that meeting.
76. The matters raised in this letter touch upon aspects of nuisance conditions within terms of the Health Act 1956. The Legal Services Unit was again requested to provide an opinion and advise as follows (clauses 73 to 78 inclusive):
77. The Health Act 1956 applies to activities which result in a nuisance which is "...likely to be injurious to health". It provides for activities to be abated, or a recurrence of a nuisance to be prohibited. Further, the Act provides that it is an offence to cause a nuisance or permit a nuisance to be caused.
78. Noise is defined as a nuisance under section 29(ka) of the Act. However, the provisions of this Act only apply in the rare circumstances where it can be demonstrated that noise is likely to be injurious to health.
79. Measured noise levels are not necessarily determinative of whether or not noise emissions are injurious to health. The applicable standard is whether the noise is likely to be injurious to the health of an ordinary reasonable person, "...as opposed to the individual who may be particularly affected by the noise and who on occasions could become hypersensitive" *Edwards v Manukau City Council*, Hillyer J, HC AP197/92.
80. The residents in the vicinity of the Ruapuna Raceway are able to apply to the District Court for appropriate orders, if the Court accepts there is sufficient evidence from a medical practitioner to establish and demonstrate that the noise emissions from the Ruapuna Raceway would be injurious to the health of the "ordinary reasonable person". There is insufficient information at this time to conclude whether such action is likely to be successful.

Civil Action in Nuisance

81. It is possible for the residents to bring a civil action in nuisance where it can be proved that:
 - (a) There has been a quantifiable and tangible damage/loss (eg financial); and
 - (b) The damage/loss has arisen from the noise emissions of the Ruapuna Raceway; and
 - (c) Such damage/loss was foreseeable.
82. There is no suggestion that the residents have experienced a financial (or other) form of damage/loss as a result of the noise emissions from the Ruapuna Raceway. Even if such damage/loss was established, there is no evidence to suggest that such damage/loss was foreseeable. Therefore it is unlikely that such a claim would succeed.

Car Hooning

83. This activity that occurs on the roads outside Ruapuna Park has largely been separated out from the Ruapuna Park Raceway noise discussion. Both the residents and raceway management are nevertheless in total agreement that they do not want "hooning" in the Templeton area.
84. This activity it is believed indirectly, just adds to the overall aggravation felt by the residents when discussing the Ruapuna noise issue.

11 Cont'd

85. The Council and Police are dealing with this aspect.

Possible Future Development Proposals

86. A number of options are currently being investigated and discussed by Council staff related to motor-sport activities occurring in the peri-urban environment. A multi-unit group within Council led by the Strategic Support Unit is exploring the issues and options and strategic contexts related to the future of motor-sport activities in Christchurch. The motor-sport activities being discussed include the tracks and facilities of the Christchurch Kart Club, Canterbury Car Club and Ruapuna Speedway. It is anticipated that a detailed report will be provided to the Executive Team by the end of the year.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option (Option 3)

87. Council at this time make no decision and await the outcome of the pending staff report on possible future development changes in the area that may affect motor sport activities.

88. This option does not bring any quick finite closure to this issue but it may provide a way forward. The staff report will bring a greater depth of knowledge to allow the ability for long term planning in an area that for some has growth potential.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Will provide better background and knowledge for decision making.	Outcomes unknown.
Cultural	Will provide better background and knowledge for decision making.	Outcomes unknown.
Environmental	Will provide better background and knowledge for decision making.	Outcomes unknown.
Economic	Will provide better background and knowledge for decision making.	Outcomes unknown.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Primary alignment with community outcome a safe City, an attractive and well designed City, valuing and protecting the natural environment. Also contributes to a healthy environment and liveable City.

Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:

Little impact on capacity as this work underway.

Effects on Maori:

Consistency with existing Council policies:

To ensure all relevant information is available for decision making.

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

Both raceway operators and residents may initially view this a delay in decision making but may also cautiously see the wisdom in this option.

Other relevant matters:

11 Cont'd

Option 1

89. That this report be received and

- (a) that the deputation members be advised that Council intends to take no further proceedings in this matter, other than to ensure compliance with its statutory obligations are maintained at the Ruapuna Park Raceway, and
- (b) if the deputation members wish to initiate a City Plan scheme change proposal they have the option of implementing this themselves.

90. This option would not satisfy some members of the community. It is anticipated complaints will continue to be received. Seeking a scheme change would be costly for the residents with no assurance of the outcome. Even if successful a Plan Change may not necessarily bring about any reduction in activity or noise, as existing use rights would apply. The Raceway operators would also probably sternly oppose any change. This decision is however consistent with Council's obligations in that it has monitored the raceway activities and found them to be operating within the rules, as determined in June 1999 under the City Plan process.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Raceway operators satisfied. Motor sport enthusiasts continued ability to view and participate in their sport.	Some residents continue to be unhappy.
Cultural	Raceway operators satisfied. Motor sport enthusiasts continued ability to view and participate in their sport.	Some residents continue to be unhappy.
Environmental	City Plan criteria and process confirmed.	Complaints continue to be received and on-going monitoring necessary.
Economic	No remediation costs incurred.	Cost of on-going monitoring.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Primary alignment with community outcome a safe City, an attractive and well designed City, valuing and protecting the natural environment. Also contributes to a healthy environment and liveable City.

Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:

Meets its statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act 1991.

Effects on Maori:

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Meets its obligations in that it has met statutory obligations.

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

Residents unhappy that no changes are proposed. A scheme change would be costly for residents. Ruapuna Raceway operators are likely to be satisfied with this option.

Other relevant matters:

11 Cont'd

Option 2

- 91. Council initiate a plan change to alter the City Plan rules with the view to reduce the level of activity and noise at Ruapuna Park Raceway.
- 92. The cost of this option would be borne by the Council. There is no guaranteed outcome. The scheme change proposal would probably be contested by the raceway operators. Again, as with Option 1, even if successful, there may in reality be no effect, as existing use rights may apply.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	May bring about changes to satisfy residents.	May restrict use of Ruapuna Raceway.
Cultural	May bring about changes to satisfy residents.	May restrict use of Ruapuna Raceway.
Environmental	May bring about changes to satisfy residents.	May restrict use of Ruapuna Raceway.
Economic	May bring about changes to satisfy residents.	May restrict use of Ruapuna Raceway and possibly impose costly changes.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:
 Primary alignment with community outcome a safe City, an attractive and well designed City, valuing and protecting the natural environment. Also contributes to a healthy environment and liveable City.

Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:
 Meets its statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act 1991.

Effects on Maori:

Consistency with existing Council policies:
 Community expectations being reviewed.

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:
 Residents happy that change proposals are instigated. Raceway operators unhappy as may incur changes and incur costs.

Other relevant matters:

12. REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 1 NOVEMBER 2006

Attached.

13. REPORT OF THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 10 OCTOBER 2006

Attached.

14. REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 25 OCTOBER 2006

Attached.

15. REPORT OF THE LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 18 OCTOBER 2006

Attached.

16. REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD: HALSWELL JUNCTION ROAD NEW ALIGNMENT

Attached.

17. REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 6 SEPTEMBER 2006

Attached.

18. REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 17 OCTOBER 2006

Attached.

19. NOTICES OF MOTION

Upgrading of Hussey Road

To consider the following motion, notice of which has been given by Councillor Norm Withers pursuant to Standing Order 2.16

“That the upgrading of Hussey Road (including the installation of footpaths) be reprioritised as an urgent work within the Council’s road reconstruction programme, and that the General Manager Corporate Services be requested to report back to the Council at its meeting on Thursday 7 December on possible sources of funding within existing budgets, including the possible substitution/ reprioritisation of other programmed roading projects.”

Councillor Withers advises that this motion reflects submissions made by Mrs Yvonne Palmer to the 5 October 2006 Council meeting, when the Council was advised that Hussey Road, formerly a rural cul-de-sac, is now an open road carrying at least 500% more traffic, resulting largely from the Northwood and Styx Mill Country Club developments.

20. QUESTIONS

21. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.