



# CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

THURSDAY 14 APRIL 2005

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 Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Sue Wells and Norm Withers.

PAGE NO	DESCRIPTION
1	APOLOGIES
3	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 7.4.2005
-	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
-	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
-	CORRESPONDENCE
9	MAYOR'S REPORT
11	FLAT WATER FACILITY
25	COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE ROAD SAFETY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE
43	AUDIT AND RISK MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT
47	SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD REPORT
-	NOTICES OF MOTION
-	QUESTIONS
51	RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

14. 4. 2005

- 2 -

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 7.4.2005**  
Attached.
3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
4. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
5. **CORRESPONDENCE**
6. **MAYOR'S REPORT**  
Attached.

## 7. FLAT WATER FACILITY

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	City Solutions Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Kevin Mara, DDI 941-6401

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a background of the work done with regard to a flat water facility and to describe the work done in assessing alternative sites as requested by a resolution of the Council in July 2004.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### Process and Council Resolutions

2. Since July 2004, Council staff have been working through a process of identifying potential sites for a flat water facility and assessing these sites in relation to their suitability as a venue for a flat water facility. The culmination of this work was a seminar to the Council on 22 March 2005. This report summarises the seminar presentation.
3. The Council has passed a number of resolutions in relation to a flat water facility. These resolutions have spanned a number of financial years as this issue has been progressed. There has been clear direction from the Council to not pursue any further action with regard to the Lake Isaac site. The Council has asked for further consideration of alternative sites to be made and in order to facilitate this a budget was allocated to allow this to happen. In summary these resolutions covered the following:
  4. A sum of \$200,000 be allowed for feasibility investigations on a preferred site for a flat water facility, not being Lake Isaac or any other site which would pose a risk to airport operations and that future provisions for funding for the Lake Isaac Watersports Trust be deleted. (NB The full resolutions are included in the background Item 19).
  5. In addition to this the Council allocated capital funding for a flat water facility over four financial years from 2005 through to 2009.
  6. More recently the Council has passed a resolution allocating \$600,000 for work at Kerrs Reach for the 2005/06 financial year.

#### Ecosure Report

7. A report was commissioned to investigate and report on the potential for birdstrike at Christchurch International Airport. The report concluded that the birdstrike risk at CIAL at present is significant and that all reasonable efforts should be taken to reduce that risk. Additionally the report stated that Amendment 5 of ICAO's International Standards and Recommended Practices, Aerodromes – Aerodrome Design and Operations should be taken into account when considering the construction of facilities at or near an airport. The report clearly states that authorities should take action where possible to reduce risk associated with birdstrike.
8. The report was independently assessed by Professor David Elms of Canterbury University. Professor Elms is a recognised risk expert. Professor Elms concluded that he concurs with the findings and recommendations of the Ecosure Report. In his opinion, the Lake Isaac proposal poses too great a risk of an unacceptable level of bird strike hazard, and it should not proceed.

**7 Cont'd**

9. The Ecosure report and the work carried out by Council staff clearly identifies that Christchurch and CIAL face a unique feature with regard to birds and bird movement. That feature is the hereditary flight paths that birds follow around Christchurch. This feature differentiates Christchurch and CIAL from other cities and other airports. It is not valid to compare the local situation to other sites unless the same conditions exist.

**Site Evaluation**

10. Site evaluation criteria were established at the very beginning of the process. These were developed in conjunction with Canterbury Rowing. The criteria that were used for the Lake Isaac proposal were also applied to the other sites that have been investigated as part of this process.

**Other Sites**

11. Other sites that have been investigated are:
  - Pegasus Bay Township. This was discounted mainly due to the space requirements for a flat water facility.
  - The adjoining Councils of Waimakariri and Selwyn were approached. The one site that was identified had similar problems to the Lake Isaac proposal.
  - Lake Crighton was considered but again due to space requirements was discounted.
  - Bottle Lake Plantation was considered but the Selwyn Plantation Board has no interest in relinquishing the required area for a lake. Relinquishing the land would totally compromise the operation of the forest.
  - Lake Forsyth was reviewed but the significant issue here is the quality of the water which has potentially fatal implications.

**Kerrs Reach**

12. Considerable work has been undertaken with user groups of Kerrs Reach in trying to identify ways in which to address the safety issues associated with Kerrs Reach. It is possible to improve the boat launching facilities. This will alleviate some of the safety issues and will also add value to the whole Kerrs Reach facility.
13. Additionally education with regard to river usage, water safety in relation to craft using the river will significantly improve the functionality of the river.

**Owles Terrace**

14. There is the possibility of establishing another river access point at Owles Terrace. The Council is considering development of the Owles Terrace site. Owles Terrace is bordered by the Avon River and presents an opportunity to establish an additional river access using floating pontoons the same as what is proposed for Kerrs Reach.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

15. The Council has a current budget of \$11M allocated for a flat water facility. The funding is allocated as detailed in item 18.
16. The current Council resolution passed in March 2005 is for the allocation of \$600,000 for improvements at Kerrs Reach.
17. The balance of the \$11M allocated to the flat water facility is to be reviewed.

**7 Cont'd**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Accept that there is no site suitable for a flat water facility that meets the criteria required to have such a facility, and that no further work be done by the Council on feasibility studies.
- (b) Request staff to develop detailed upgrade options for Kerrs Reach, in particular the following items:
  - Install pontoon launching facility at Kerrs Reach
  - Install signage at water access points
  - Assist with water education
- (c) Request staff to report back on options for a launching facility at Owles Terrace and incorporate that into the development plans for the site.
- (d) Request that a communication plan is developed which details the process, background information, includes earlier Council resolutions and the reasons why decisions were made. The plan to also include details on improvements to Kerrs Reach.
- (e) Decide whether to retain the balance of the \$11M currently in the LTCCP for a flat water facility.

7 Cont'd

**BACKGROUND ON FLAT WATER FACILITY**

**Council Resolutions**

18. This matter has been considered by the Council at a number of different meetings and seminars. There has been clear direction from the Council to not pursue any further action with regard to the Lake Isaac site. The Council has asked for further consideration of alternative sites to be made and in order to facilitate this a budget was allocated to allow this to happen. The following resolutions have been passed by the Council in relation to a flat water facility:

2003/04 Annual Plan Process resolved:

- That a sum of \$150,000 be included in 2003/04 for the investigations to be undertaken on the provision of a Christchurch flat water sports facility.
- That the investigation include an independently reviewed business case which establishes a demand for such a facility in Christchurch, its operational viability, available land options (including all aspects of environmental, transport and other impacts) and the construction costs.
- Having regard to the increasing concerns relating to the risk of aircraft birdstrike, that the officers report to the Parks, Gardens and Waterways Committee on a strategy for minimising such risks, and in the preparation of such strategy, the Chief Executive be requested to establish a project team that would include representation from Christchurch International Airport Limited, Environment Canterbury and Fish and Game Council.
- That future budget provisions for the Lake Isaac Watersports Trust be deleted.

2004/05 LTCCP

The following recommendations were made for a flat water facility:

1. That the Council provide \$200,000 in 2004/05 for feasibility investigations on a preferred site for a flat water facility, not being Lake Isaac or any other site which would pose a risk to airport operations.
2. That the following capital funding provision be made for this facility:

2005/06	\$600,000
2006/07	\$3,000,000
2007/08	\$3,600,000
2008/09	\$3,800,000

**Ecosure Report**

19. The Ecosure report covered an extensive review of birdstrike at CIAL. Ecosure Pty Limited were approved by both CIAL and Christchurch International Rowing Centre Charitable Trust as being an appropriate expert to carry out the investigations and produce a report. Ecosure Pty Limited is an Australian based consultancy specialising in advising airports about birds and birdstrike risk. Base data was provided from surveys that had been undertaken by Council staff over a number of years.
20. Ecosure Pty Limited were engaged to specifically comment on:
- International standards which pertain to circumstances where land use changes near an airport and may create a bird hazard.
  - Review a previous report prepared by Ecosure in 2002 and indicate how current information changes the findings if there is any change at all.
  - Recommend a course of action for the Council.
21. The Ecosure report was presented to a Council seminar on 16 June 2004.

7 Cont'd

22. The following recommendation was made (NB direct extract from Section 7 of the Ecosure report):

*The bird strike risk at CIAL at present is significant. Various estimates range from low but significant to high and in the range where action needs to be taken to reduce it (ie it's in the ALARP region). The implication for CIAL, as the airport's operator, is that all reasonable efforts must be made to reduce risk from current levels and that no additional risk within their control should be added.*

*The analysis of the effects of the Lake Isaac proposal indicate that in the most optimistic case of area-wide and also facility-bird management methods, some small reduction in risk would be possible. A worst-case scenario with poor or non-existent management methods would lead to a very significant increase in bird strike risk. The reality would be somewhere between the two. Given that risk estimates must take into account all relevant sources of uncertainty, the conclusion must be that the bird strike risk would be increased significantly if Lake Isaac were to be constructed.*

*It certainly cannot be said that the Lake Isaac proposal is unlikely to create conditions conducive to a bird hazard problem. We must then take into account Amendment 5 of ICAO's International Standards and Recommended Practices, Aerodromes – Aerodrome Design and Operations and recommend that the proposal to build a water sports facility in this location not proceed.*

23. The report was independently assessed by Professor David Elms of Canterbury University. Professor Elms is a recognised risk expert. Professor Elms makes the following statement:

*"I have reviewed both the Ecosure Report in detail, and have worked with its author to make sure that we both agree on its recommendations.*

*In essence, the report does three things. It:*

- identifies relevant international standards and recommendations that should be taken into account in any decision.*
- carries out a detailed comparative analysis to estimate the change in bird hazard risk which would be expected to eventuate if the Lake Isaac proposal were to proceed for two scenarios involving, first, the best possible area-wide bird management program both at the facility and area wide, and secondly, a poor bird management program.*
- makes an assessment of the current level of bird strike risk at Christchurch International Airport, using a number of different ways of looking at the issue.*

*Thus, I concur with the findings and recommendations of the Ecosure Report. In my opinion, the Lake Isaac proposal poses too great a risk of an unacceptable level of bird strike hazard, and it should not proceed.*

24. Christchurch and the Port Hills are the foundation of a significant hereditary bird migration path. Birds migrate from the Waimakariri River to the Estuary and from the Estuary to Lake Ellesmere. The path from the Waimakariri River to the Estuary cuts right across the flight path of planes at the northern end of the airport runway. CIAL has been compared to other airports which are adjacent to large bodies of water and/or the sea when the issue of birdstrike was being assessed. Direct comparison with other locations/facilities is not valid, unless similar hereditary migration paths intersect aircraft flight paths. A copy of these hereditary migration paths is attached.

## 7 Cont'd

25. The hypothetical airport risk may almost entirely be derived from bird movements and will be dependent on a whole range of factors mainly related to what other habitats and land uses can attract birds and how these are positioned in relation to the airport, coastlines and bird migratory paths. Of course, it will also depend on the types and numbers of bird present.
26. Where the risk is considered too great, such as on the Hoo Peninsula (proposed airport at Cliff Marshes in the UK), a strong case was argued for not placing the airport there. It was found that despite all mitigation options available, the risk would still be too high. Had the same tests been applied to a range of existing airports before they were built, they may well have been built in a different location. Today, risk assessment plays a part in the approvals processes; in the past it didn't.
27. In Christchurch Airport's case, the existing risk from birdstrike is significant by almost any measure that is adopted. This is primarily due to the Waimakariri River, its Black Backed Gull and Canada Goose breeding grounds, and the available food attractions surrounding the airport and the city. In addition the river is a major flyway for birds moving between the coast/city and the mountains. With risk at this level, any prudent risk management strategy would insist that any unnecessary increases in risk are avoided, and that current risk is managed to as low as is reasonably practicable.
28. The Ecosure report provided information on international standards relating to construction of facilities adjacent or near an airport. In summary the standards clearly state that no facility should be constructed which will increase the risk of birdstrike and that all effort should be made to reduce the risk.

## Site Evaluation

29. The initial site evaluation criteria were developed in conjunction with representatives of the Lake Isaac Trust. In summary the criteria are as follows:
  - Close to population and amenities
  - Capital cost (engineering feasibility)
  - Ongoing operational costs
  - Existence of natural hazards
  - Meets criteria for international events
  - Constant water flow to ensure water quality
  - Environmental management and maintenance
  - Suitable lake size
  - Sufficient total area for ancillary facilities
  - Correct wind alignment
  - Constant ground water
  - Land available
  - Ease of obtaining planning approvals

## Other Sites

30. A number of other sites were considered for a flat water facility. None of the sites identified progressed to the detailed analysis stage. Each site was discounted on a fundamental issue as described below:
  - **Pegasus Bay Township**
    - The rowing lake requirements are five times larger than the lake they propose for their development.
    - Well down the track with design, resource consent and planning issues.
    - They were building a model for marketing when we approached them.
    - The lake alignment was not suitable.
    - The area required for the lake would make the development unviable.



7 Cont'd

• **Adjoining Councils**

- Enquiries were made of Waimakariri and Selwyn District Council.
- Selwyn could not identify any options that might possibly meet the criteria.
- Waimakariri identified one block of land in their ownership between Eyreton and Swannanoa of approx 250ha.
- Wrong alignment.
- Directly opposite the "Isaac" proposed site ie on the north bank of the Waimakariri, therefore same airport issues would exist.
- Relatively expensive.

• **Lake Crighton**

- Lake Crighton is sited on a block of land comprising 100 ha incl. the area of the lake therefore does not meet our size requirements.

• **Bottle Lake**

- The Selwyn Plantation Board has no interest in relinquishing the required area for a lake. The required 170ha ties strategically into their overall sustainable harvest programme across their entire forest estate, in addition Bottle Lake provides specific log qualities not easily replaced in other areas of their estate. Removal of such an area would put the long term financial viability of Bottle Lake Plantation as a commercial plantation forest block in jeopardy.

• **Lake Forsyth**

- Lake is 5.6k<sup>2</sup> in area.
- Average water depth 1-2m (4m near mouth).
- Water is brackish, salinity content 3-30% of sea salinity level.
- Water quality impacted by toxic blue green bacteria (nodularia) bloom.
- Drinking water from the lake has been fatal for sheep, cattle and dogs.
- No remedy expected soon as the bloom issue is largely a natural issue.

**Kerrs Reach**

31. Considerable work has been undertaken with user groups of Kerrs Reach in trying to identify ways in which to address the safety issues associated with Kerrs Reach. Consideration has been given to try and improve the launching facilities and eliminate some of the specific safety issues around accessing the river.
32. Additionally Council staff have been working closely with user groups to try and generate some rules of use/code of conduct for the river. Significant progress has been made with this. It is proposed that signage be installed to inform users of the requirements as well as providing ongoing education.
33. The following are indicative costs for upgrading and signage:
  - Install a floating pontoon for launching boats
    - Costs: approx. \$250,000
  - Signage
    - Additional signage detailing "rules" should be installed.
    - Approx. 4 signs - 1 each at launching sites.
    - Costs: \$2,500 x 4 = \$10,000
  - Ongoing Education. CCC to facilitate ongoing education on river usage, safety, interaction with other users.
    - Costs: approx \$10,000 (staff time)

7 Cont'd

**Owles Terrace**

34. The Council has been giving consideration to development of the site known as Owles Terrace. Owles Terrace is located on the Avon River just south of the New Brighton bridge. The Owles Terrace site consists of an old Council works yard and a large area of open space. Work is currently under way to define the extent of contamination on the site. The intent is to eventually define a redevelopment option for the site.
35. One of the elements that has been considered is how best to make uses of the adjacent Avon River. There exists an opportunity to provide an new structured river access point for river users such as rowers, canoeists, etc. Waka Ama users already gain access to the river at this location.
36. Provision of an alternative staging point for access to the river may help to alleviate the pressure on Kerrs Reach. Suitable management of user groups and appropriate education can all work towards making this happen.
37. It is proposed that further consideration be given to this site as a secondary river access point and that river access facilities such as that proposed for Kerrs Reach be installed at Owles Terrace.

**OPTIONS**

38. Provision of flat water facility

**Option 1: Continue to search for a site**

Considerable effort has already been expended in searching for a site. All of the possible available options have been reviewed and subsequently discounted for specific reasons. Committing additional funding and resources to the search for a site that meets the criteria is futile.

**Option 2: Do not put any more resources into looking for an alternative site. Do nothing about upgrading Kerrs Reach**

This is not really a viable option, given that inaction will not help resolve any of the current issues. The issues of congestion, safety and education still exist for the Kerrs Reach facility. The same comments re looking for a site from Option 1 apply to this option.

**Option 3: Do not put any more resources into looking for an alternative site. Spend some funds on upgrading Kerrs Reach and carry out further work on the Owles Terrace opportunity.**

Upgrading of Kerrs Reach and carrying out further work on Owles Terrace will address some of the fundamental issues of safety, ease of access to the river and congestion. In conjunction with this work, education on river use is paramount. Doing this work will improve the current facility. It does not alleviate the issue of having a facility which can accommodate international events, but given the lack of a suitable site for a flat water facility it makes good sense to do whatever is practically possible to improve what facilities the Council does already have.

**PREFERRED OPTION**

39. The preferred option is Option 3 – upgrade Kerrs Reach, look at Owles Terrace, but do nothing further on looking for a site for a flat water facility

7 Cont'd

**ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**

**The Preferred Option**

Upgrade Kerrs Reach, look at Owles Terrace, but do nothing further on looking for a site for a flat water facility.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Improved recreation facility	User groups have better utilisation of an existing asset
<b>Cultural</b>	None	None identified
<b>Environmental</b>	None	None identified
<b>Economic</b>	Improve an existing asset	Capital funding to carry out improvements. Future maintenance costs.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b> Primary alignment with community outcome for a liveable City.</p> <p>Also contributes to creating strong communities.</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b> Minimal impact on rates.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b> No known.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b> Consistent with Council policy to provide safe facilities.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b> User groups have already identified the need to improve the Kerrs Reach facility</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		

## 7 Cont'd

**Maintain The Status Quo (If Not Preferred Option)**

Do not put any more resources into looking for an alternative site. Do nothing about upgrading Kerrs Reach.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	None	Negative impact on Council complete inaction.
<b>Cultural</b>	None	None
<b>Environmental</b>	None	Possible damage to existing facility through over use and no refurbishment.
<b>Economic</b>	None	None identified
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b>            Poor alignment with community outcome for well governed City and liveable City and creating sharing communities.</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b>            Not consistent with Council's responsibilities.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b>            Not known.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b>            Contrary to Council policy to provide appropriate, safe recreation facilities.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b>            Certain to be apposition with user groups.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		

## 7 Cont'd

**Option 3**

Continue to search for a site.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Creation of a new recreation facility.	User groups could get a new facility.
<b>Cultural</b>	None	None
<b>Environmental</b>	None identified.	None
<b>Economic</b>	Creation of a future asset.	Capital funding for new asset.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b>            Primary alignment with community outcome for a Liveable City.</p> <p>Also contributes to creating strong communities</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b>            Capital funding for facilities has an impact on rates.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b>            Not known.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b>            Consistent with Council's policy on providing recreational facilities.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b>            User groups will support this.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		

**8. COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE ROAD SAFETY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport & City Streets Manager
<b>Authors:</b>	Stuart Woods, DDI 941-8615

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to consider the future of the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee (RSCC), seek Council support for and involvement with its continuation, as well as providing the background to the committee's history, role and operations.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The committee was established in 1989 as a means of exchanging information, ensuring efficient use of road safety resources in the city, encouraging road safety organisations to work together and contribute resources to projects, and allowing an overview of what was happening in the road safety community in Christchurch. This report outlines the committee's background, purpose, objectives and sought outcomes, as well as canvassing a range of options for its future operation.
3. The committee has operated successfully throughout its existence with good support from a wide range of organisations with a road safety interest in the city. Members of the committee are very keen to see its continuation.
4. The preferred option for the continuation of the committee from consideration of various options is essentially to continue the current arrangements, with minor modifications to its objectives to strengthen networking, liaison, co-ordination and support aspects, and clarifying its role in terms of decision-making.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

5. The Council's support for the administration of the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee is able to be accommodated within current budgetary allowances.
6. There are no legal considerations regarding the operation and support of this (liaison) committee.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Support the continuation of the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee, with its purpose, objectives and outcomes as follows:

***PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE***

*To improve road safety through co-ordination, co-operation, support and information dissemination amongst road safety organisations in Christchurch.*

***OBJECTIVES***

*The objectives of the committee are:*

- a. To provide a forum for information exchange, liaison, networking, and team building between members of the road safety community in Christchurch.*
- b. To encourage commitment to road safety as a priority in the activities of member organisations.*
- c. To increase the public perception of the importance of road safety and to promote a "road safety culture" in the community.*
- d. To encourage community engagement in road safety and inform the community so they can participate in road safety issues and actions.*

8 Cont'd

- e. *To receive regular reports from members on their activities and monitor (and when appropriate provide feedback to) inter-sectoral groups which plan and manage road safety education, awareness and community development projects.*
- f. *To inform the Council and policy makers of member organisations about community road safety issues both for the organisations and for the citizens of Christchurch.*
- g. *To discuss priorities and encourage member organisations and their community networks to contribute funding and resources to community road safety projects.*
- h. *To encourage an agreed strategic direction and facilitate strategic alignment for road safety in Christchurch agreed to by all member participants and documented in the Christchurch Road Safety Strategy, but not make decisions about activities of member organisations nor enter into final decision making about engineering details at specific sites, or specific details of education and awareness projects. (Feedback on strategic implications of engineering details at specific sites, or specific details of education and awareness projects could be provided to project groups and working parties, as committee responses to consultation and project review processes.)*
- i. *To review and support progress on the implementation of the Christchurch Road Safety Strategy.*
- j. *To make recommendations to the Christchurch City Council on co-ordinated proposals for Safety Administration Programme and Community Road Safety Programme funding.*
- k. *To provide transparent reporting to partner organisations and the community of the achievements of the approved Community Road Safety Programme funding and associated developments, and of the achievements and progress of the Safety Administration Programme.*
- l. *To contribute to the council's LTCCP obligations and the community consultation requirements of member organisations through the links this committee provides between the organisations and the Christchurch community.*
- m. *To be effective in lobbying locally and nationally for improved road safety.*

**DESIRED OUTCOMES**

*The desired outcomes for the committee are:*

- (i) *A reduction in the number and severity of road injury collisions in Christchurch.*
  - (ii) *More effective road safety programmes through co-ordination of resources and timing.*
  - (iii) *Reduced duplication of effort.*
  - (iv) *A high level of information flow between all groups with interests in road safety, leading to an improved level of understanding of road safety issues and inter-relationships amongst those organisations.*
  - (v) *Successful and integrated applications for the Safety Administration Programme and the Community Road Safety Programme funding for Christchurch, enabled through committee co-ordination and information sharing.*
  - (vi) *Provide useful input to the Council's LTCCP processes, and member organisations are better able to fulfil their obligations of community consultation.*
  - (vii) *An increased level of enthusiasm in the community for road safety, and the growth of a "road safety culture" in the community.*
  - (viii) *An effective and unified approach to securing additional sources of funding or sponsorship for road safety initiatives.*
  - (ix) *An effective and unified voice for lobbying on road safety issues.*
  - (x) *An increased level of co-operation between road safety groups and more effective community development.*
- (b) Nominate two Councillors to be the Council's elected representatives on the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee for this term of Council (2004-2007).

8 Cont'd

**BACKGROUND ON ROAD SAFETY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

7. The committee was established in 1989 as a means of exchanging information, ensuring efficient use of road safety resources in the city, encouraging road safety organisations to work together and contribute resources to projects, and allowing an overview of what was happening in the road safety community in Christchurch.
8. The committee was used as a model for other committees with similar responsibilities that were set up around the country and is still used as a model for road safety and injury prevention groups.
9. The Christchurch Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee has been part of a system that operated on two levels. The committee itself was essentially a steering committee and a forum for information exchange between the organisations making up the road safety community in Christchurch. Reporting to that were working groups that planned and managed the awareness, education and community development projects for the Community Road Safety Programme (see attached diagram).
10. These working groups were inter-sectoral with members mainly from the organisations represented on the committee, but other community organisations joined groups where they could contribute. For example, Fire Service and St John were on the Speed Safety Group, Plunket was on the Safekids Group. The working groups considered and developed project programmes and projects in some detail, and enabled detailed co-ordination to be arranged between agencies.
11. The working groups reported to the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee on their activities. The committee provided overall direction for road safety activities in the city including developing and monitoring the implementation of the Christchurch Road Safety Strategy.
12. The bulk of the funding for these projects comes from Land Transport NZ (formally the Land Transport Safety Authority) and from the Christchurch City Council. The other road safety organisations contribute funding and resources to specific projects.
13. The committee made recommendations on projects and funding priorities to its member organisations, including on drafting of annual programme proposals to the Safety (Administration) Programme and Community Road Safety Programme funding, to the mutual benefit of all groups concerned.
14. The numbers attending the monthly meetings of the committee have remained stable over the 15 years of its life, suggesting that members found it useful. Land Transport NZ requires a community forum of this kind to ensure community involvement in the projects funded under the Community Road Safety Programme. The committee's direction has been dictated by the needs of the Christchurch community as interpreted by the organisations represented on the committee.
15. Throughout its existence, the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee has been domiciled in and administered by the Christchurch City Council. The committee was based in the Council on the understanding that the Council was the leader in Christchurch's community road safety activity, and that such a base would provide stability and a firm base in the community.
16. New Zealand has used for many years the model of setting up road safety committees in local authorities, and influencing and co-ordinating road safety funding through those authorities. Victoria, Australia used a different model of stand-alone community committees. They have indicated that their model does not work as well as the New Zealand one. New Zealand is the envy of other countries for the way in which our road safety committees are set up inside local authorities. It is held up as a best-practice model to follow.



**8 Cont'd**

**PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE**

17. The purpose of the committee was "To improve road safety through co-ordination, co-operation, support and information dissemination amongst road safety organisations in Christchurch."

**OBJECTIVES**

18. The objectives of the committee were:
- a. To provide a forum for information exchange between members of the road safety community in Christchurch.
  - b. To receive regular reports from members on their activities.
  - c. To inform the Council and policy makers of member organisations about community road safety issues both for organisations and for the citizens of Christchurch.
  - d. To encourage commitment to road safety as a priority in the activities of member organisations.
  - e. To establish priorities and encourage member organisations and their community networks to contribute funding and resources to community road safety projects.
  - f. To provide opportunities for liaison, networking, and team building for member representatives.
  - g. To set strategic direction for road safety in Christchurch.
  - h. To provide an umbrella group for strategic direction and monitoring of inter-sectoral groups which plan and manage road safety education, awareness and community development projects.
  - i. To provide strategic direction for road safety in Christchurch agreed to by all member participants and documented in the Christchurch Road Safety Strategy.
  - j. To review, maintain, and monitor implementation of the Christchurch Road Safety Strategy.
  - k. To make recommendations to the Christchurch City Council on co-ordinated proposals for Safety Administration Programme and Community Road Safety Programme funding.
  - l. To provide transparent reporting to partner organisations and the community of the spending of the Community Road Safety Programme funding and the implementation of the Safety Administration Programme.
  - m. To increase the public perception of the importance of road safety and to promote a "road safety culture" in the community.
  - n. To encourage community engagement in road safety and inform the community so they can participate in road safety issues and actions.
  - o. To contribute to the council's LTCCP obligations and the community consultation requirements of member organisations through the links this committee provides between the organisations and the Christchurch community.
  - p. To be effective in lobbying locally and nationally for improved road safety.
  - q. To develop an annual road safety plan for Christchurch.

**DESIRED OUTCOMES**

19. The desired outcomes for the committee related to the achievement of the objectives, and were identified as:
- (i) A reduction in the number and severity of road injury collisions in Christchurch.
  - (ii) More effective road safety programmes through co-ordination of efforts and timing.
  - (iii) Reduced duplication of effort.

**8 Cont'd**

- (iv) A high level of information flow between all groups with interests in road safety, leading to an improved level of understanding of road safety issues and inter-relationships amongst those organisations.
- (v) Co-ordination and consultation in the recommendations for the Safety Administration Programme and the Community Road Safety Programme funding for Christchurch.
- (vi) The Council better able to fulfil its LTCCP obligations and member organisations better able to fulfil their obligations of community consultation.
- (vii) An increased level of enthusiasm in the community for road safety, and the growth of a "road safety culture" in the community.
- (viii) An effective and unified approach to securing additional sources of funding or sponsorship for road safety initiatives.
- (ix) An effective and unified strategy for lobbying on road safety issues.
- (x) An increased level of co-operation between road safety groups and more effective community development.
- (xi) An annual report summarising road safety activities in the city,

**MEMBERSHIP**

20. Membership of the committee last year was as follows:

- Land Transport New Zealand (previously the Land Transport Safety Authority - LTSA) – Regional Manager, Regional Education Adviser, Regional Engineer
- Christchurch City Council – elected members, Road Safety Co-ordinator, City Streets staff
- Ministry of Transport
- New Zealand Police
- New Zealand Police Education
- Nga Maata Waka
- Pacific Peoples
- Environment Canterbury– Regional Road Safety Co-ordinator
- Justice Department
- Community and Public Health Canterbury District Health Board
- Parking Unit
- Automobile Association
- ACC
- Transit New Zealand
- District Council Road Safety Co-ordinators
- NZ Road Transport Association
- Students Against Driving Drunk (SADD)
- NZ Roadshow Trust
- Mike Gadd

**CONTINUATION OF THE COMMITTEE**

21. At the last meeting of the committee prior to last year's elections, the representatives on the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee from organisations other than the Christchurch City Council expressed a desire for it to continue, and the belief that it should continue to be led by the Council. Reasons given for ongoing Council leadership included:

- The activities of the committee are closely aligned with the Council's work on traffic engineering and planning in the city.
- The Road Safety Strategy developed in conjunction with the committee is a Council document.
- Many of the staff who implement the Road Safety Strategy are Council employees.

8 Cont'd

- The Road Safety Strategy includes objectives relating to land use planning, resource consents, and other functions related to the work of the Council.
- The funding for much of the road safety work detailed in the Road Safety Strategy comes from the Council or is provided through the Council by Land Transport New Zealand.
- The Police hours for enforcement are funded by Land Transport New Zealand but the local authority is responsible for setting the outputs for those hours, in consultation with Police and other road safety organisations.

22. A few quotes from members provided below give a flavour to their views regarding the committee and its continuation:

**Automobile Association:** *A very valuable committee. The one opportunity that all the groups involved in road safety have to come together. It should be kept operative. It is important that the committee be chaired by a councillor.*

**Regional Co-ordinator:** *It was the first one in the country and has served as a model for all the others. Most local authorities now have them. Good numbers of people attend.*

**ACC:** *We need a forum so that all the groups in the community are included in projects. Without the committee we would lose some of them. The Council has a goal of injury prevention. The Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee is a valuable asset in achieving that.*

**Land Transport Safety Authority (now Land Transport NZ):** *It is a proactive committee. I would hate to see it go. It is a good way to provide road safety messages to the Council and the public. The council is concerned with physical things on the road so it is appropriate to have the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee as part of the council.*

**Community and Public Health:** *If it did fold we would set up another committee. It is a good model for other areas of injury prevention. There is enough interest and action in this committee for it to stand on its own. It is important to feed information into council and policy makers in the city.*

**NZ Road Transport Association:** *The association feels it is important to send someone along to committee meetings.*

23. Reasons considered by the committee for it to continue to exist in some form align with the original purpose and objectives of the committee and are considered to be still relevant. For example:

- Desire by member organisations for a forum for information exchange.

*Example: Information from Ministry of Transport about Government policies can be passed by other organisations to networks of community contacts. Provides an efficient and effective monitoring device to ensure fulfilment of the Christchurch City Council's and Land Transport New Zealand's contractual obligations under the CRSP.*

- Co-ordination of road safety activities in the city.

*Example: Enforcement can be co-ordinated with education. Educational activities may enhance engineering improvements. Christchurch projects can be co-ordinated with national events run by ACC or Police.*

**8 Cont'd**

- Umbrella group for strategic direction for inter-sectoral groups which plan and manage road safety education, awareness and community development projects.

*Example: Each key road safety issue has a working group to plan and implement activities. Reports from these groups allow the road safety community to monitor progress and contribute resources or offer support.*

*Supports the goals and objectives of the Community Road Safety Programme (CRSP) under which the funding is provided by Land Transport New Zealand*

- Encouragement of commitment to road safety as a priority in the activities of member organisations.

*Example: Involvement in developing the Road Safety Strategy helps this commitment. Information exchange also helps, as does the transparent reporting of what is being done by all road safety partners.*

**SAFER CHRISTCHURCH INTER AGENCY GROUP**

24. The Community and Recreation Unit is co-ordinating for the Safer Christchurch Inter Agency Group the preparation of a "Safety Strategy" for Christchurch in partnership with several government departments and other agencies with an interest. To achieve this, an Inter-Agency Group has been established to oversee the preparation of the Strategy and to address any gaps which may be evident once examination of who currently does what is completed and matched against Strategy outcomes.
25. There are three key areas becoming apparent from initial work on the Safety Strategy - road safety, injury prevention and crime prevention. The Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee will be a crucial mechanism for achieving a key component of the strategy. There could be advantages in this type of arrangement for the RSCC being part of Safer Christchurch, as work could be aligned with that of injury prevention and crime prevention. There are many issues and areas of work in common. The RSC Committee will act as a reference group under the Safer Christchurch umbrella.

**OPTIONS**

26. There would appear to be six options in relation to the future of the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee, namely:

Option 1. Status quo (as in previous term of Council).

Option 2. A forum or committee of the Council similar to the Safer Christchurch Committee and with amended objectives to explicitly exclude decision-making on project funding or programming.

Option 3. A forum or committee as a reference group of the Safer Christchurch Committee.

Option 4. A group convened by staff.

Option 5. Let the committee be hosted by another organisation.

Option 6. Let the committee become an independent trust.

**PREFERRED OPTION**

27. From the assessments below, the preferred option is option 2 – a forum or committee of the Council with amended objectives. This option would allow continuation of the committee essentially in its historically successful form, whilst clarifying its decision-making role and relationship to its member organisations. Establishing links with the Safer Christchurch Committee would also add value to the work of both groups.

8 Cont'd

**ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**

**The Preferred Option, Option 2: A forum or committee of the Council similar to the Safer Christchurch Committee**

This option is essentially continuing the previous committee role and structure, but recognising the new political structure of the City Council. In this light, modifications to the objectives and outcomes are proposed, to be more clear and explicit about its information sharing, advocacy and networking roles rather than having any governance role per se. It should report at least quarterly to the Council. The membership would be encouraged to remain the same as previously, including City Councillor representation nominated to the committee (suggested as two City Councillors). In addition and in the light of the work noted above of the Safer Christchurch Committee, it would also be valuable to establish links with that committee through some mutual or common members.

The following are the proposed purpose, objectives and outcomes of the committee modified in this light:

**PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE**

To improve road safety through co-ordination, co-operation, support and information dissemination amongst road safety organisations in Christchurch.

**OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of the committee are:

- a. To provide a forum for information exchange, liaison, networking, and team building between members of the road safety community in Christchurch.
- b. To encourage commitment to road safety as a priority in the activities of member organisations.
- c. To increase the public perception of the importance of road safety and to promote a "road safety culture" in the community.
- d. To encourage community engagement in road safety and inform the community so they can participate in road safety issues and actions.
- e. To receive regular reports from members on their activities and monitor (and when appropriate provide feedback to) inter-sectoral groups which plan and manage road safety education, awareness and community development projects.
- f. To inform the Council and policy makers of member organisations about community road safety issues both for the organisations and for the citizens of Christchurch.
- g. To discuss priorities and encourage member organisations and their community networks to contribute funding and resources to community road safety projects.
- h. To encourage an agreed strategic direction and facilitate strategic alignment for road safety in Christchurch agreed to by all member participants and documented in the Christchurch Road Safety Strategy, but not make decisions about activities of member organisations nor enter into final decision making about engineering details at specific sites, or specific details of education and awareness projects. (Feedback on strategic implications of engineering details at specific sites, or specific details of education and awareness projects could be provided to project groups and working parties, as committee responses to consultation and project review processes.)
- i. To review and support progress on the implementation of the Christchurch Road Safety Strategy.
- j. To make recommendations to the Christchurch City Council on co-ordinated proposals for Safety Administration Programme and Community Road Safety Programme funding.
- k. To provide transparent reporting to partner organisations and the community of the achievements of the approved Community Road Safety Programme funding and associated developments, and of the achievements and progress of the Safety Administration Programme.
- l. To contribute to the council's LTCCP obligations and the community consultation requirements of member organisations through the links this committee provides between the organisations and the Christchurch community.
- m. To be effective in lobbying locally and nationally for improved road safety.

8 Cont'd

**DESIRED OUTCOMES**

The desired outcomes for the committee are:

- (i) A reduction in the number and severity of road injury collisions in Christchurch.
- (ii) More effective road safety programmes through co-ordination of resources and timing.
- (iii) Reduced duplication of effort.
- (iv) A high level of information flow between all groups with interests in road safety, leading to an improved level of understanding of road safety issues and inter-relationships amongst those organisations.
- (v) Successful and integrated applications for the Safety Administration Programme and the Community Road Safety Programme funding for Christchurch, enabled through committee co-ordination and information sharing.
- (vi) Provide useful input to the Council's LTCCP processes, and member organisations are better able to fulfil their obligations of community consultation.
- (vii) An increased level of enthusiasm in the community for road safety, and the growth of a "road safety culture" in the community.
- (viii) An effective and unified approach to securing additional sources of funding or sponsorship for road safety initiatives.
- (ix) An effective and unified voice for lobbying on road safety issues.
- (x) An increased level of co-operation between road safety groups and more effective community development.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows the Council to be the lead organisation in road safety in the city.</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for Council politicians and staff to demonstrate commitment to road safety on the strategic level</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for Council to communicate with the community on road safety matters according to the Local Government Act.</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for community consultation as required by Land Transport NZ in their funding provisions.</li> <li>• Provides a steering group for the road safety project management groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be issues relating to how it fits in the Council structure.</li> <li>• Need minor modifications to governance role and practices of committee.</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural</b>	Includes cultural interest groups in membership	
<b>Environmental</b>		
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficient and effective use of resources of member organisations</li> <li>• Efficient and co-ordinated delivery of projects when overseen by the RSCC</li> </ul>	Requires administration from the Council.

**Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:**

Primary alignment with community outcome: " Our City's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability."  
 Also contributes to "Our City's urban form and infrastructure maximise safety and security for all people from crime, injury and hazards."

**Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:** Nominal

**Effects on Maori:** Positive, through membership on committee and information sharing

**Consistency with existing Council policies:** Strong

**Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:** Noted above in report

**Other relevant matters:**

## 8 Cont'd

**Option 1: Maintain The Status Quo (If Not Preferred Option)**

The status quo option would propose continuing to operate the committee as in the previous term of Council. This saw the committee reporting to a Council standing committee, with the same purpose, objectives and outcomes as outlined in paragraphs 17-19 in the report above. This option has two key issues. Firstly, there is no standing committee to which the committee could report (this effectively rules this option out, particularly in relation to option 2 – the preferred option). Secondly, there is a need for more clarity and explicit understanding of where the governance responsibilities lie, with the greater recent emphasis on this issue.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows the Council to be the lead organisation in road safety in the city.</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for Council politicians and staff to demonstrate commitment to road safety on the strategic level</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for Council to communicate with the community on road safety matters according to the Local Government Act.</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for community consultation as required by Land Transport NZ in their funding provisions.</li> <li>• Provides a steering group for the road safety project management groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It does not fit into the Council structure.</li> <li>• Conflict exists on governance role of committee in new Council governance model.</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural</b>	Includes cultural interest groups in membership	
<b>Environmental</b>		
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficient and effective use of resources of member organisations</li> <li>• Efficient and co-ordinated delivery of projects when overseen by the RSCC</li> </ul>	Requires administration from the Council.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b>            Primary alignment with community outcome: " Our City's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability."            Also contributes to "Our City's urban form and infrastructure maximise safety and security for all people from crime, injury and hazards."</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b> Nominal</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b> Positive, through membership on committee and information sharing</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b> Strong</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b> Noted above in report</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b>            This option does not provide strong clarity on governance and decision-making responsibilities in relation to expenditure and project programming, potentially resulting in uncertainty and unmet expectations regarding the delivery of the SAP projects.</p>		

## 8 Cont'd

**Option 3: A forum or committee as a reference group of the Safer Christchurch Committee**

The option is similar to option 2, the preferred option, but brings the committee under the umbrella of the Safer Christchurch Committee. Therefore, it would report to the Safer Christchurch Committee rather than directly to Council. The priorities and practices of the Safer Christchurch Committee would also likely be a strong, perhaps over-riding influence on the activities of the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee. Nevertheless, there should be integration and recognition of the work between both committees to avoid duplication or disjointedness of activities.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows the Council to be the lead organisation in road safety in the city.</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for Council politicians and staff to demonstrate commitment to road safety on the strategic level</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for Council to integrate communication and consultation with the community on safety matters generally, including road safety.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be issues relating to committee ownership within the Council structure.</li> <li>• Committee members and their organisations may have difficulty being held accountable by another committee</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes cultural interest groups in membership</li> <li>• Provides a steering group for the road safety project management groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Losses direct link to the Council</li> <li>• Need clarity on governance role of each committee.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental</b>		
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficient and co-ordinated delivery of projects when overseen by the SCC</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for community consultation as required by Land Transport NZ in their funding provisions.</li> </ul>	Requires administration from the Council.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b>            Primary alignment with community outcome: " Our City's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability."            Also contributes to "Our City's urban form and infrastructure maximise safety and security for all people from crime, injury and hazards."</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b> Nominal</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b> Positive, through membership on committee and information sharing</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b> Strong</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b> Noted above in report</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		



8 Cont'd

**Option 4: A group convened by staff**

This option would be essentially a multi-organisation staff liaison group, which could operate as a standing team of road safety experts and professionals meeting for the purpose of networking, information sharing and project co-ordination. The standing of the group would be reduced in terms of political buy-in and status, and hence may experience difficulties in retaining membership and impetus.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for leadership from Council staff in road safety in the City.</li> <li>• Provides a vehicle for co-ordination of road safety resources in the City.</li> <li>• May provide an overview group for the road safety project management groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No strategic overview of the Christchurch Road Safety Strategy.</li> <li>• Risk of lower level of commitment from other organisations than in the past.</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural</b>	Potentially retains cultural interest groups in membership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removes committee from previous governance role.</li> <li>• Difficult to attract decision makers from other organisations to a staff group rather than a decision-makers networking group.</li> <li>• Loss of group status</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental</b>		
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council does not have administrative costs.</li> <li>• May provide a vehicle for community consultation as required by Land Transport NZ in their funding provisions.</li> </ul>	Loss of effectiveness in lobbying for funding and programmes
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b>                      Primary alignment with community outcome: " Our City's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability."                      Also contributes to "Our City's urban form and infrastructure maximise safety and security for all people from crime, injury and hazards."</p> <p><b>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b> Nominal</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b> Positive, through membership on committee and information sharing</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b> Strong</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b> Noted above in report</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		

8 Cont'd

**Option 5: Let the committee be hosted by another organisation**

This option would see the committee hosted by another organisation, mostly likely one of the committee member organisations. Since the last election, Land Transport NZ has stepped in as a temporary host in a similar fashion to this proposal. This would take away some of the costs and responsibility from the Council, to be taken up by the host organisation. Council membership should still be maintained in a similar fashion to the previous situation.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removes strong connection between Christchurch Road Safety Strategy which is a Council document, and Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee.</li> <li>• Reduced opportunities for the Council to demonstrate leadership and commitment to road safety</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removes any confusion about Council's role being governance or action.</li> <li>• Removes expectation of other organisations that Council will act on submissions from the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee.</li> <li>• Includes cultural interest groups in membership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council may not have lead role in road safety in the City.</li> <li>• Risk that Council staff and politicians will have less commitment to road safety.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental</b>		
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council does not have administrative costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Road Safety Programme (CRSP) funding from Land Transport New Zealand may go to the other organisation rather than through Council. Net cost of projects may increase marginally to the Council.</li> </ul>

**Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:**

Primary alignment with community outcome: " Our City's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability."  
 Also contributes to "Our City's urban form and infrastructure maximise safety and security for all people from crime, injury and hazards."

**Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:** Nominal

**Effects on Maori:** Positive, through membership on committee and information sharing

**Consistency with existing Council policies:** Consistent if participation continued

**Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:** Noted in report above

**Other relevant matters:**

8 Cont'd

**Option 6:** Let the committee become an independent trust

Under this option the committee could set itself up as an independent trust, to be a focus for the co-operation and co-ordination of road safety activities in Christchurch as well as for networking and liaison between road safety organisations. The trust could apply to Land Transport New Zealand for project funding, as can other organisations and individuals currently. The trust could provide for its own administration and operations through project funding from Land Transport New Zealand. This option already occurs in some parts of New Zealand where more than one TLA area is covered by a Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee and Road Safety Co-ordinator (to better allow sharing of costs and resources).

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Trust would have clear and unambiguous role in leading road safety in the City.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removes strong connection between Christchurch Road Safety Strategy which is a Council document, and Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee.</li> <li>Reduced opportunities for the Council to demonstrate leadership and commitment to road safety</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removes any confusion about Council's role being governance or action.</li> <li>Removes expectation of other organisations that Council will act on submissions from the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee.</li> <li>Includes cultural interest groups in membership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council may not have lead role in road safety in the City.</li> <li>Risk that Council staff and politicians will have less commitment to road safety.</li> <li>Reduce direct linkages between operation of the trust and the implementation of TLA projects</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental</b>		
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council does not have administrative costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Road Safety Programme (CRSP) funding for Christchurch from Land Transport NZ would probably go to the trust.</li> <li>Some of the road safety funding would be used on costs of the trust such as setting up a separate financial function.</li> </ul>

**Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:**

Primary alignment with community outcome: " Our City's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability."  
 Also contributes to "Our City's urban form and infrastructure maximise safety and security for all people from crime, injury and hazards."

**Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:** Nominal

**Effects on Maori:** Positive, through membership on committee and information sharing

**Consistency with existing Council policies:** Consistent if participation continues

**Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:** Noted in report above

**Other relevant matters:**

**9. AUDIT AND RISK MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Attached.

**10. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD REPORT**

Attached.

**11. NOTICES OF MOTION**

**(a) CHRISTCHURCH ROAD SAFETY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

To consider the following motion, notice of which has been given by Councillor Bob Shearing pursuant to Standing Order 2.16:

*“That the Council continue its support for the Christchurch Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee by appointing two Councillors to serve on the Committee, and providing appropriate Council staff support and financial support where accepted under the LTCCP, the two Council representatives to be Councillor Bob Shearing and one other Councillor to be appointed at the meeting.”*

**12. QUESTIONS**

**13. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

Attached.