

13. 9. 2011



# LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

**TUESDAY 13 SEPTEMBER 2011**

**AT 1.30PM**

**IN THE MEETING ROOM  
LYTTELTON RECREATION CENTRE,  
25 WINCHESTER STREET, LYTTELTON**

**Community Board:** Paula Smith (Chairperson), Jeremy Agar (Deputy Chairperson), Ann Jolliffe, Claudia Reid, Adrian Te Patu and Andrew Turner.

**Community Board Adviser**  
Liz Carter  
Phone: 941 5682 DDI  
Email: [liz.carter@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:liz.carter@ccc.govt.nz)

- PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**
- PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**
- PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

## INDEX

### KARAKIA

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES**
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 30 AUGUST 2011**
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
- PART B 4. CORRESPONDENCE**
  - 4.1 Rob Angelo**
- PART B 5. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
- PART B 6. NOTICES OF MOTION**
- PART A 7. REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS TO COMMUNITY BOARDS**
- PART C 8. EXETER STREET – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION**
- PART C 9. RAPAKI SETTLEMENT – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTIONS**
- PART B 10. BRIEFINGS**
  - 10.1 Charteris Bay Water Supply Upgrade**

13. 9. 2011

|               |            |   |           |
|---------------|------------|---|-----------|
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>11.</b> | <b>COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE</b>               | <b>27</b> |
|               | 11.1       | Board Funding Balances                                |           |
|               | 11.2       | Customer Service Requests – 1 May 2011 – 31 July 2011 |           |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>12.</b> | <b>BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE</b>            | <b>34</b> |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>13.</b> | <b>QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS</b>                | <b>34</b> |

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 30 AUGUST 2011**

The minutes of the Board's meeting of 30 August 2011 will be separately circulated.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Minutes of the Board's meeting held on Tuesday 30 August 2011 be confirmed.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **CORRESPONDENCE**

4.1 **ROB ANGELO**

**Attached** is correspondence from Mr Rob Angelo regarding the manner in which the rebuild of Lyttelton planning is being undertaken.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the correspondence be received and that the Board consider the request therein.

13. 9. 2011

5. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

6. NOTICES OF MOTION

## 7. REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS TO COMMUNITY BOARDS

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>General Manager responsible:</b> | General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549           |
| <b>Officer responsible:</b>         | Legal Services Manager  |
| <b>Author:</b>                      | Vivienne Wilson, Solicitor and Chris Gilbert, Legal Services Unit Manager |

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to submit to each Community Board, for review, the current delegations from the Council. The current delegations are set out in **Attachment A and Attachment B**.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. On 9 June 2011, the Council resolved to delegate to Community Boards the matters set out in Attachment A. However, the Council also resolved that the Community Boards be asked to review the delegations and bring them back to the Council by November 2011.
3. This report sets out the terms of the current delegations to Community Boards. Each Community Board is asked to review the current delegations and identify any issues they may have with the current provisions.

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. The Local Government Act 2002 provides that “... *for the purposes of efficiency and effectiveness in the conduct of a local authority's business, a local authority may delegate to a committee or other subordinate decision-making body, community board, or member or officer of the local authority any of its responsibilities, duties, or powers*” except for certain specified responsibilities, duties and powers. The Council is also able to impose any conditions, limitations or prohibitions on any delegations it may make.
5. The Local Government Act 2002 also provides that the Council must consider whether or not to delegate to a Community Board if the delegation would enable the Community Board to best achieve its role.
6. Section 52 of the Act defines the role of Community Boards as follows:
  - (a) *represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of its community; and*
  - (b) *consider and report on all matters referred to it by the territorial authority, or any matter of interest or concern to the community board; and*
  - (c) *maintain an overview of services provided by the territorial authority within the community; and*
  - (d) *prepare an annual submission to the territorial authority for expenditure within the community; and*
  - (e) *communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community; and*
  - (f) *undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to it by the territorial authority.*
7. The Act provides that once a delegation has been made by the Council to a Community Board then that Board is legally able to make a decision within the delegations as if it were the Council itself. This means that decisions made by a Community Board within the delegations legally bind the Council. If a matter or issue does not fall within these delegations, as a default position, a decision on that matter or issue is one for the Council itself.

7 Cont'd

8. The Act provides that the Council itself cannot rescind or amend a decision made by a Community Board made under delegated authority. However, the Council can at any time amend or revoke a delegation so as to apply any future decisions.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

9. Yes. The delegations comply with the Local Government Act 2002.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

10. Staff from the Legal Services Unit discussed the delegations with the chairs of each Community Board on 22 July 2011 at the Community Board Chairpersons Forum. The Chairs raised a number of issues in relation to delegations set out below. Comments on those issues follow immediately after:

- (a) *From time to time, Community Boards would like the opportunity to make, on their own account, submissions on notified resource consent hearings.* **Comment:** Following legal advice, the Council's position is that Community Boards are not able to make submissions on notified resource consent hearings on their own account unless this power has been delegated to them. The delegations currently provide that Community Boards have the power to make submissions on behalf of the Council, on applications for resource consents, to other territorial authorities or the Canterbury Regional Council, where the application is of particular concern to the local community.
- (b) *Thought needs to be given to the role of Community Boards following the earthquakes, ie Suburban Recovery Planning.* **Comment:** At the 23 June meeting of Council, the Council considered a report outlining a proposed Suburban Centres programme. The aim of the Suburban Centres programme of work is to assist in the recovery and rebuild of earthquake damaged commercial centres through: assisting with planning, design and transport related matters; facilitating discussions with property owners and commercial ventures; and providing contact details for other agencies. The work programme consists of two streams of work:
- masterplans for the larger, more damaged centres; and
  - case management for smaller centres

Prior to taking the 23 June report to Council, the Community Boards were individually consulted on the proposed work to ensure they were aware of this initiative and to provide an opportunity for discussion. Their feedback was sought on whether the centres identified in their area should be treated as masterplans or through case management.

There will be further opportunities for community involvement in the masterplan process. Each masterplan will have an approximately five month project design phase involving community and stakeholder engagement. The project aims to provide the stakeholders (including businesses, community groups and local residents) with information and an opportunity to engage and partake in the rebuild of centres. The process for developing each masterplan includes focus group discussions with key stakeholders, technical workshops, public meetings and elected member presentations. The outputs include an agreed vision and masterplan for each centre, together with an implementation plan.

## 7 Cont'd

- (c) *With respect to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board, could there be some explanation / justification for the approach of not permitting the Board to exercise its delegated functions in the Central City Area.* **Comment:** the Community Board delegations under the heading of "Roads, Parks and Leases" do not apply to that part of the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board area situated within the "Central City Area" marked on the plan (Plan A) attached. Delegations for those "Roading and Parks issues" in that "Central City Area" are to be exercised by the Council with reports on those matters coming directly to the Council. Prior to the earthquakes in 2010 and 2011, the rationale for this approach was that the central city area was of metropolitan significance to the well-being and growth of the city as a whole. (This is currently recognised in the City Plan, the Central City Revitalisation Strategy and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy.) There was therefore a need to both consider issues within this area on a city-wide basis and to be able to respond without undue delay. It was considered that it would quicken the process for dealing with central city issues if matters went directly to the Council without first proceeding to the Board.
- (d) *The Community Boards would like to be involved at much earlier stage with respect to proposed Council works in reserves in their local areas. This relates to maintenance, renewals and capital projects.* **Comment:** The delegations currently provide that Community Boards have the powers of the Council (except the hearing of submissions/objections) in relation to preparation, review and change of management plans for reserves. Under section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977, management plans are to provide for and ensure the use, enjoyment, maintenance, protection, and preservation, as the case may require, and, to the extent that the administering body's resources permit, the development, as appropriate, of the reserve for the purposes for which it is classified. Management plans must also incorporate and ensure compliance with the principles set out in section 17, section 18, section 19, section 20, section 21, section 22, or section 23, as the case may be, of the Reserves Act for a reserve of that classification. .
- At present, reserve management plans are not in place for all reserves in the district, or some reserve management plans are at a high level. As reserve management plans are prepared or reviewed, there is scope for the plans to provide in more detail for proposed works. However, capex and opex expenditure are considered as part of the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes. Recent management plans have indicated that developments mentioned in the plans are dependent on the Long Term Plan process.
- (e) *Boards have the responsibility to make submissions on the Annual Plan. Six years ago, it was the practice for Boards to have input into the draft of the Annual Plan before it was consulted on. Can that be specified in the delegations?* **Comment:** There is a very tight timeframe each year for the preparation of the Annual Plan. It would be difficult to build in extra time for Community Boards to comment on the draft Annual Plan before it is signed off by the Council to start the formal consultation process. Once the special consultative procedure starts, Community Boards are able to participate fully in making a submission and providing quality feedback to the Council on the draft Annual Plan. It is acknowledged that under section 52(d) of the Local Government Act 2002, the role of Community Boards includes preparing an annual submission to the Council for expenditure within the community. However, it is considered that this role is ordinarily provided for in the current Annual Plan process.
- (f) *With abundance of local Reserve Management Committee on the peninsula, there is the opportunity when reserve planning takes place to involve all stakeholders – the Council, the Community Board and land owners. In general a clearer pathway is needed for consultation.* **Comment:** The Community Boards have specific delegated powers for local projects but not all local projects. This means that not all local projects will be referred to Community Boards for a decision. However, there is scope within the current delegations dealing with reserves and reserve management plans for discussions about reserve planning in the future, as discussed at paragraph (d) above.

7 Cont'd

(g) *When matters are considered in public excluded before the Community Board, Board members are subsequently excluded from the public excluded part of the meeting when the matter comes before Council. Could this be clarified? Comment:* As you will be aware, under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the Council (and Community Boards) may by resolution exclude the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting only on one a number of specified grounds. Under section 48(5), any such resolution may provide for one or more specified persons to remain after the public has been excluded if that person, or persons, has or have, in the opinion of the local authority, knowledge that will assist the authority. Section 48(6) states that the resolution must state the knowledge possessed by that person or those persons which will be of assistance in relation to the matter to be discussed and how it is relevant to that matter. It would be open to the Council to resolve that members of a Community Board may stay in the public excluded part of the meeting if this is appropriate.

11. The comments from each Community Board will in due course be reported back to the Council. It is anticipated that before the Council considers the report with the Community Board comments there will be a workshop between the Councillors and Community Board members.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Community Board:

- (a) Consider each of its current delegations and indicate whether it would like to see any amendments.

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

12. After each local authority election, it is the practice of the Council to reconsider and resolve the delegations it makes to the Community Boards. Following the disruption caused by the earthquakes on 4 September 2010 and 22 February 2011, the Council delegated various responsibilities, duties and powers to the Community Boards on 9 June 2011. However, the Council also resolved that the Community Boards be asked to review the delegations and bring them back to the Council by November 2011.
13. It should be noted that even though the Council did not resolve the delegations until 9 June 2011, the previous delegations continued in force over that period. There was no question that, in the interim, the Boards acted without delegated authority.
14. The current delegations, as set out in **Attachment A**, cover a wide range of matters, including financial delegations, roads, sale of liquor, resource management, parks, leases and other miscellaneous matters. There are some specific provisions relating to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board, the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board, and the Akaroa/Wairewa Community Board.
15. It should be noted that it has been the Council's procedure for many years that any exercise of the Board delegations must be within any policies or standards set by the Council. So if the Council has resolved a particular position then it is not open to a Community Board to make a decision which conflicts with that Council position.
16. Experience has also shown it is not feasible to write delegations which cover every permutation of a subject. The question may arise as of whether a matter falls within a Board's delegated authority.
17. To assist in these situations a decision on whether or not a Board has delegated authority on a particular matter will be a matter for joint decision by the General Manager, City Environment (as most matters are considered to be delegated are operational issues that fall within that group) and the General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services Manager. This is provided for in **Attachment A**.



**7 Cont'd**

18. Where there is a matter outside a Board delegation, such as a metropolitan facility which has a city wide impact but is situated in a particular Community Board area, and where the Board historically has taken an interest in the activities on that facility within their community, the issue has been addressed in the following way: a report on a particular matter involving the metropolitan facility is forwarded to the Community Board for comment before referring the final report to Council.
19. Following the report to Council on 9 June 2011, it has come to the attention of staff that there are some further delegations that have been made by the Council to Community Boards that have not been reflected in **Attachment A**. These delegations relate to the Council's Road Stopping Policy and are set out in **Attachment B**. The road stopping delegations were made on 9 April 2009 and are still in force. However, it would be desirable for these delegations to be contained in the Council's Delegation Register with the other delegations.

**THE OBJECTIVES**

20. The purpose of the review is to provide an opportunity for each Community Board to consider and comment on their current set of delegations with respect to any issues that they may have.

**THE OPTIONS**

21. There are two options;

Option 1 – consider the current set of delegations but provide no comments.

Option 2 - consider the current set of delegations and provide comments to the Council with respect to any issues the Board may have.

**THE PREFERRED OPTION**

22. The preferred option is option 2. The Council has expressed a desire for the Community Boards to review their current delegations and provide feedback to the Council.

## 8. EXETER STREET – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>General Manager responsible:</b> | General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608 |
| <b>Officer responsible:</b>         | Acting Transport and Greenspace Manager        |
| <b>Author:</b>                      | Steve Hughes, Traffic Engineer - Community     |

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Exeter Street.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Council staff have received a request that a no stopping restriction be installed on Exeter Street between Canterbury and Oxford Streets. Please refer to the **attached** plan.
3. From the intersection with Canterbury Street a service lane commences and runs eastward above the roadway of Exeter Street for 105 metres before rejoining the roadway outside 18 Exeter Street. Yellow painted no stopping markings extend along the length of this service lane stopping at the eastern boundary of number 18.
4. From where the service lane rejoins the roadway, the road narrows to approximately 7 metres in width to pass a service lane providing access into 16, 16a and 16b Exeter Street. There are no restrictions on parking or stopping along this narrow section, but yellow painted no stopping markings recommence at the eastern end of the area across the service lane entrance. If vehicles are parked along the northern and southern sides of the narrow section of Exeter Street, the carriageway width can be reduced to less than three metres meaning that it becomes in effect a one lane section of roadway.
5. Exeter Street is part of the Lyttelton bus route. Should the road width be reduced to less than three metres in width, it can be difficult if not impossible for a bus to get through. Installing stopping restrictions for 33 metres along the northern side of Exeter Street at this location should ensure the safe movement of buses and other vehicles in both directions.
6. Consultation documents were distributed to residences fronting onto this section of Exeter Street. All respondents supported the installation of no stopping restrictions as proposed.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$100.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?**

8. The installation of signs and road markings is covered by Transport and Greenspace Operational budgets

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS****Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

9. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
10. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and traffic control devices.
11. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/ or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

8 Cont'd

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

12. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community Outcomes-Safety and Community.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?**

13. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

14. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?**

15. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

16. Consultation documents were distributed to twelve residences that fronted onto this section of Exeter Street.
17. Four or 33% responded. All supported the installation of the no stopping restrictions as proposed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board:

- (a) Revoke the existing stopping restrictions on the northern side of Exeter Street that applies at any time and commences at the intersection with Canterbury Street and extends east along the northern side of the service lane for 110 metres.
- (b) Revoke the existing stopping restrictions on the northern side of Exeter Street that applies at any time and commences 143 metres east of the intersection with Canterbury Street and extends east for ten metres.
- (c) Approve that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northern side of Exeter Street commencing at the intersection with Canterbury Street and extending in a easterly direction, initially along the service lane, and then along Exeter Street, for a distance of 153 metres.

## 9. RAPAKI SETTLEMENT – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTIONS

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>General Manager responsible:</b> | General Manager City Environment DDI 941-8608 |
| <b>Officer responsible:</b>         | Transport and Greenspace Manager,             |
| <b>Author:</b>                      | Mark Millar, Traffic Operations               |

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board's approval that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on both sides on Korora Tahī Road and Kina Road in the Rapaki Settlement.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Traffic Operations Team have received a request from the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board to investigate the installation of No Stopping restrictions on Korora Tahī Road and Kina Road in the Rapaki Settlement. Please refer to the **attached** plan.
3. Korora Tahī Road and Kina Road are both narrow roads in the Rapaki Settlement. The carriageway width of both roads is approximately four metres. When visitors to the church, beach or neighbouring properties park on these roads, the road becomes blocked to through traffic. This can particularly be a problem in the event of a large funeral at the church or on hot summer weekends.
4. The Lyttelton Volunteer Fire Brigade sometimes carry out training exercises in the Rapaki Settlement and have advised Rapaki Settlement authorities that there are safety issues when Fire Brigade and other emergency service vehicles are blocked from accessing parts of the Rapaki settlement by inappropriately parked cars.
5. It is proposed that No Stopping restrictions in the form of broken yellow lines are installed on both sides of Korora Tahī Road for 160 metres north from its intersection with Kina Road and on both sides of Kina Road for 40 metres west from its intersection with Korora Tahī Road. Staff believe that broken yellow lines marked on the road will be more effective in this situation than the installation of No Stopping signage.
6. The installation of No Stopping restrictions on Korora Tahī Road and Kina Road will improve the movement of traffic in this part of Rapaki Settlement for both residents and visitors. Providing unimpeded access for emergency services vehicles will increase the level of safety for people and buildings in Rapaki Settlement.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$800.

### Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

8. The installation of road markings and signs is within the LTCCP Streets and Transport Operational Budgets.

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
10. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions.
11. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/ or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

9 Cont'd

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

12. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

13. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community Outcomes-Safety and Community.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?**

14. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

15. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?**

16. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

17. Consultation was carried out with the Rapaki Settlement residents by Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke Inc., the settlement's administrative body. There are approximately 22 residential properties in the Rapaki Settlement.
18. Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke advised that the people at the top half of the settlement declined to comment as they felt it did not concern them. Five responses were received from people closest to the effected area.
19. Of the five responses received, one was in support and four against the proposal. Comments against the proposal included:
- (a) Road markings would be contrary to the character of Rapaki.
  - (b) Would be a waste of time as they will not be enforced by Council.
  - (c) Rapaki Settlement should offer a solution to the parking issues.
  - (d) Revive a Bank Peninsula District Council plan for wider roads, paths and parking.
20. Despite some of the comments that do not support the proposal, there is an over-riding safety issue for emergency services that needs to be addressed thus staff wish to proceed with proposed restrictions.

Details of all comments received are included as **Attachment 2**.

21. The Chief Fire Officer of the Lyttelton Volunteer Fire Brigade supports this proposal.
22. The Officer in Charge - Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.

**9 Cont'd**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Board approve:

**Revocations**

- (a) That any existing No Stopping Restrictions on Korora Tahī Road be revoked.
- (b) That any existing No Stopping Restrictions on Kina Road be revoked.

**No Stopping Restriction**

- (c) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the eastern side of Korora Tahī Road commencing at its intersection with the southern edge of seal of Kina Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 164 metres.
- (d) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the western side of Korora Tahī Road commencing at its intersection with Kina Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 160 metres.
- (e) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northern side of Kina Road commencing at its intersection with Korora Tahī Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 40 metres.
- (f) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southern side of Kina Road commencing at its intersection with Korora Tahī Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 40 metres.

## **10. BRIEFINGS**

### **10.1 CHARTERIS BAY WATER SUPPLY UPGRADE**

Peter Brocklehurst (Senior Projects Manager) and Philippa Upton (Consultation Leader) will brief the Board on this project.

## **11. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**

### **11.1 BOARD FUNDING BALANCES – 2011/12 FINANCIAL YEAR**

A copy of the Board's funding balances as at 31 August 2011 is **attached** for members' information.

### **11.2 CUSTOMER SERVICE REQUESTS – 1 MAY 2011 – 31 JULY 2011**

**Attached** for member's information.

13. 9. 2011

12. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

13. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS