

9. NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPROVEMENT WORKS PROGRAMMING

Officer responsible City Streets Manager	Author Barry Cook
Corporate Plan Output: Neighbourhood Improvements 9.5 text 69	

The purpose of this report is to inform the Board of the changes to the prioritisation process for Neighbourhood Improvement Works.

BACKGROUND

Originally, funding was allocated on the basis of one item per Local Area Traffic Management Scheme per year (LATMS). This generated a need to create LATMS. As more and more LATMS became approved, the cost of the projects became far in excess of the funds allocated. This led to a system of individual Boards setting their own priorities and having to push hard to achieve a reasonable outcome. In the “budget smoothing” process this often resulted in trading projects.

To overcome this cumbersome system, an initial priority ranking process was developed. This formalised a process where the limited amount of funds were allocated to the project with the greatest need first. This process received good feedback when explained to the Boards and City Services Committee. There were a number of suggested improvements such as taking into account the effects of heavy vehicles. This fine tuning resulted in an updated prioritisation process that has changed the list of proposed works already indicated in the 1999 Annual Plan. These changes commence in the 2001/02 year with work identified prior to this being fixed because of the lead time required for consultation.

At the current budget allocation, the existing list of identified projects will take many years to implement and there are new LATMS coming on stream which generate more projects. This makes the current process unsustainable. There is also a raising concern from the community that engineering treatment of the concerns identified, may not be the right solution to these problems.

In this respect the Traffic Calming Subcommittee of the City Services Committee is implementing a programme for “An Assessment of the Most Appropriate Traffic Calming Measures for Various Environments”. This is likely to affect the way funding is allocated in the future.

- Recommendation:**
1. That the information be received.
 2. That the Board support the current allocation for 2000/01 which is unchanged from the previous year.
 3. That any further recommendations from this Board be evaluated with comments from other Boards and these be reported back.

Chairman’s

- Recommendations:**
1. That the foregoing recommendations be adopted.
 2. That all Boards be invited to have input into the Traffic Calming Subcommittee’s assessment at the appropriate time.