



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

THURSDAY 23 JUNE 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
-	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 16.6.2005
3	MAYOR'S REPORT
-	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
-	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
-	CORRESPONDENCE
5	CHARGING FOR ACCESS FOR NON-RESIDENTS TO THE ART GALLERY AND MUSEUM
43	DRAFT BANKS PENINSULA REORGANISATION SCHEME - ADOPTION OF SUBMISSIONS
65	COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE ROAD SAFETY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE
71	REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD
-	NOTICES OF MOTION
-	QUESTIONS
75	RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

23. 6. 2005

- 2 -

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES - COUNCIL MEETING OF 16.6.2005

To be separately circulated.

3. MAYOR'S REPORT

Attached.

4. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

5. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. CHARGING FOR ACCESS FOR NON-RESIDENTS TO THE ART GALLERY AND MUSEUM

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services
Officer responsible:	Art Gallery Director
Author:	Catherine McDonald, DDI 941-6387

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to review the current charging regime against national and international trends and make recommendations on the user charge option for non-residents and the likely impact of charging access for non-residents to the Christchurch Art Gallery Te Puna o Waiwhetu (gallery) and the Canterbury Museum. This was requested by the Council in 2004.

Background Material

- User Charge Options Canterbury Museum paper 11 March 1998 (tabled)
- Museum of NZ – Te Papa Tongarewa Admission Charges Report 1994 (tabled)
- Various excerpts from Museum News and BBC news articles (attached)
- Copy of PowerPoint presentation to Council seminar 26 April 2005 (attached)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The new gallery opened in May 2003 and the Council's intention was to review its revenue after one year of operation (July 2004). At this time the Council asked for a report on the possible introduction of admission charges for non-residents to both the gallery and the Canterbury Museum. As a result the Community Services Group review team was established to report to the Council.

2.1 Canterbury Museum

The Council currently gives the Canterbury Museum Trust Board an annual grant of \$4.2M to help run the museum. The Canterbury Museum is run under the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993 and not the Local Government Act. The Christchurch City Council does not have the authority to set charges for the museum, they can only look at changing their discretionary funding to the museum. Any decision to charge for access to the museum has to be considered by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board. This paper will concentrate primarily on the gallery, although similar arguments for and against charging would apply also to the Canterbury Museum.

2.2 Christchurch Art Gallery

The Christchurch City Council built the gallery to:

- help make Christchurch a vibrant, attractive and fun city
- foster and promote the cultural diversity of the city
- provide all Cantabrians with access to international and national exhibitions and education programmes
- foster and encourage local artists
- act as custodian of cultural property for the community now and in the future

All but the custodial role are dependent on visitor numbers and participation. As a result we looked at the impact on visitor numbers if we introduced admission charges for non-residents.

2.3 National and International Experience

Visitor perception of public museums and art galleries is that access should be free (eg Te Papa). Where admission charges have been introduced visitor numbers have dropped between 40-70% (eg Dunedin Art Gallery introduced a \$4 door charge for non-residents which was later dropped owing to reduced visitors and poor public relations). In 2001 the UK Government rescinded admission charges for their art galleries and museums and visitor numbers increased by up to 70% and have continued to rise. To introduce a door charge at the Christchurch Art Gallery would go against all national and international trends

7 Cont'd

2.4 Art Gallery Part of Cultural Precinct

The gallery is a key element of the cultural precinct which includes the Centre of Contemporary Art, Our City, Arts Centre, Canterbury Museum and the Botanic Gardens. These combine to form a major cultural tourism destination, and are all free of charge. If the gallery charged, this would be inconsistent with the rest of the precinct, and given that visitors have discretionary time and money, the proven impact would be a choice not to go to the gallery.

2.5 Art Gallery v other activities in Canterbury

The gallery competes with other Canterbury tourist attractions. Depending on demographics and interest visitors will, of course, make choices about how they use their discretionary time and money eg other attractions, uniquely local experiences, significant sites, etc. These are a mix of activities that are free in some cases, and admission charged in others.

2.6 Current Practice at Art Gallery

Currently the gallery does not charge admission unless it is a value-added experience such as an international exhibition. The gallery relies on visitors enjoying the experience and making a donation towards it. In the last year, greater emphasis has been placed by the gallery staff on attracting donations from visitors. This has included putting a suggested contribution of \$5 on the donation box and approaching all visitors to the gallery, telling them about the gallery and the opportunity to contribute via a donation. As a result there has been an increase in revenue from last year's total of \$13,500 to \$28,000 this current year to date.

2.7 Impact on Visitor Numbers as a Result of Charging

International and national research has shown that there is a dramatic drop in visitor numbers to galleries and museums once they start charging for access. The gallery attracted an estimated 650,000 visitors in its first 15 months of operation. As expected this was going to drop in its second year owing to the novelty factor for locals abating. The target set for year 2 was 400,000 and they are currently behind this target by 30%, ie the gallery is now expecting approximately 300,000 visitors this year. Therefore based on a drop in visitor numbers by at least 50%, it is estimated visitor numbers would drop to 150,000 visitors a year.

Conversely, recent data from the UK has shown spectacular increases in attendance result from removing an admission charge.

Therefore the Christchurch City Council would be going against both national and international trends if it decided to set an admission charge for non-residents. This would be inconsistent with almost all other galleries and museums throughout Australasia and may see visitors choosing to bypass the Christchurch Gallery and go to the free art galleries in other centres.

Non-residents make up 52% of visitors to the gallery. Most of these visitors come in the high season from November through to March. The gallery relies on local residents to make up visitor numbers in the low winter season.

2.8 Method of Charging for Non-Residents if Implemented

There is a cost to implementing charging for access for non-residents to the gallery. This involves adding a counter across the front of the main exhibition halls, cash registers, design and building, which would be one off capital costs, as well as costs of staffing the counters and printing and advertising associated with advising the change in admission status, on an ongoing basis. These costs would offset any increase in revenue.

7 Cont'd

To introduce admission charges for non-residents, every visitor to the gallery would be questioned whether they were a resident or not. They would be charged for access if they did not have proof available. Therefore, a decision would need to be made on how we would distinguish a visitor to the city from a resident. This could be in the form of a library card but this assumes all residents would have library cards which is not necessarily the case. There needs to be some form of determinant to ensure residents are not charged, and that it is easy to distinguish a non-resident without embarrassment to any party.

2.9 Portfolio Group and Council Seminar

The result of the presentation to the Creating Strong Communities Portfolio Group on 14 April 2005 was in favour of the staff recommendation of not charging admission for non-residents to the gallery and Canterbury Museum.

The Council seminar on this presentation and report was held on 26 April 2005. After lengthy discussion on costs and visitor numbers there appeared to be a lack of support for charging admission for non-residents to the gallery. Further to this, questions were raised for staff to report back to the Council before a decision is made.

2.9.1 Questions directly related to the Gallery

- *Cost of a major international exhibition*
 - Last year the Dunedin Art Gallery had a \$1.06M budget to stage the Pre-Raphaelites exhibition. They charged \$10 per adult with some concessions and attracted 48,000 visitors. Other revenue was gained through sponsorship and in total achieved \$0.9M revenue towards the exhibition.
 - The gallery's most expensive international exhibition to date has been 'The Allure of Light' at \$132,000. This was an opening exhibition not charged for as part of the condition of a Community Trust Grant to cover some costs. The cost did not include a hire fee for the exhibition from the National Gallery of Victoria only because it was the opening of the new gallery.
- *The challenge is to increase revenue opportunities through increasing visitor numbers by:*
 - *Developing partnerships with Council and non-Council groups.* For example:
 - Cultural precinct now launched bringing 11 sites together within the tram route
 - Applaud – Christchurch Arts Festival 2005 – several events being held at the gallery
 - KidsFest – events being held at the gallery including Ape to Zip exhibition
 - Friends of the gallery
 - Major events in the city and New Zealand supported by gallery events wherever possible eg British and Irish Lions Tour photo exhibition currently in the gallery
 - *Proactive, targeted programming*
 - Peter Bush rugby photographic exhibition coinciding with the British and Irish Lions Tour in NZ particularly in Christchurch
 - Ansel Adams – high profile exhibition
 - Cecil Beaton – high profile exhibition
 - Ape to Zip – special children's exhibition
 - Programming based on events through partnerships listed above
 - *Charge admission for high profile and international exhibitions*
 - \$5 entry was charged for Japonism in Fashion or gold coin donations sought within exhibition area
 - Future entry fees would be determined according to cost and profile of the exhibition eg Pre-Raphaelites was \$10 in Dunedin

7 Cont'd

- *Increase venue hire and shop profit through:*
 - Increased visitor numbers
 - Better stock purchasing and control
 - Developing partnerships for venue hire
 - Proactive marketing of the gallery as a venue for functions, seminars etc
 - Acoustic Guide hire was currently \$3 charge which has been increased to \$5 per hire.
- *Increase donations and sponsorship*
 - Increased visitor numbers
 - Targeted high profile exhibitions
 - Developing partnerships

2.9.2 Wider Council questions raised

- *Room Tax on visitors*
 - Under the Local Government Rating Act 2002 it is not lawful to implement a room tax on visitors. This was debated by central government when drafting the 2002 LGR Act and was rejected. A targeted rate would need to consider what constitutes a room ie in a hotel, motel, bed and breakfast, home-stay. To implement this mechanism considerable research, consultation and debate would be required under the LTCCP.
- *Charging for access to other Council Services*
 - The question of appropriate revenue targets for all Council services will be reviewed as part of the LTCCP 2006/16 process and during the development of the Activity Management Plans. As requested by the Council, this report focuses specifically on whether a door charge into the gallery should be introduced for non-residents. It is considered that this report provides the Council with enough information to make a decision on this issue now.
- *Discussions with Tour Operators on paying for admission*
 - Arrangements will be put in place for this meeting, which will be hosted by the Mayor. The outcome of this is not essential to the decision on this report which focuses on an entry charge. If this was achieved any additional revenue would reduce net costs.
- *Metro Card*
 - This type of card would see a visitor pay a sum which would give access to all Council facilities (eg) pools, gallery, buses, etc. This raises issues on appropriate pricing with different service parameters. A lot more research would need to be done on this regarding practical application, its impact on the city overall and where it fits under the LTCCP.
- *Signage in the gallery (and other Council facilities) stating cost of subsidy from ratepayer.*
 - This type of signage would need to be considered across all Council services requiring subsidy. There may be other options for conveying this message to customers and ratepayers. Further advice should be sought from the Council's Marketing Team before this is implemented.

7 Cont'd

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

Revenue and Financing Policy S101.3 (a) Local Government Act

3. The policy is adopted as part of the LTCCP and can only be amended by an amended LTCCP. Policy states that **for each activity to be funded the Council must consider:**
- The community outcomes to which the activity primarily contributes
 - The distribution of benefits between the community as a whole, any identifiable part of the community, and individuals
 - The period in or over which those benefits are expected to occur
 - The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity
 - The costs and benefits, including consequences for transparency and accountability, of funding the activity distinctly from other activities
 - 101.3 (b) the overall impact of an allocation of liability for revenue needs on the current and future social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of the community
4. Annually the Art Gallery is expected to meet 17% of its cost via revenue gathering in some form. Currently it is returning 16%. This compares with other similar galleries eg, Auckland, Dunedin.
5. The question of appropriate revenue targets for all Council services will be reviewed as part of the LTCCP 2006/16 process and during the development of the Activity Management Plans. As requested by the Council, this report focuses specifically on whether a door charge into the gallery should be introduced for non-residents. It is considered that this report provides the Council with enough information to make a decision on this issue now.

Financial

6. The Art Gallery is currently financed by the Christchurch City Council, and supplemented by a range of sponsorships and grants. There is free access for all people.
7. Operational **budget** for the current 04/05 Financial Year :

Total revenue	=	(\$1,261,950)
Total expenses	=	\$7,282,812
Total internal	=	<u>\$ 637,989</u>
Net Cost of Service	=	\$6,658,851
Plus 'in kind' sponsorship		<u>317,000</u>

Actual Net cost of service \$6,975,851

Number of visitors = 300,000 (estimate for 04/05)

Cost per visit \$23.06 (peer average for museums is \$25 per visit)

Sponsorship

8. The Friends of the Gallery, with a membership approximately 1,200, is an independent organisation which raises money specifically for the purchase of art, encouraging people to attend the gallery and helping to promote an enjoyment of the visual arts. Friends is a significant community support group which is committed to the concept of free access to the gallery.
9. Other sponsorship is 'in kind' sponsorship which is by way of discounts, use of goods or pro bono (donation of product) to assist the gallery in running its business. There is a clear link between sponsorship levels and visitor numbers. The gallery has received \$317,000 'in kind' sponsorship this year.

7 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Not proceed with charging admission for non residents (Option 1) to the gallery owing to:
 - Adverse impact on international/national reputation, visitor perception and experience
 - Adverse impact on visitor numbers after introducing entry charges (based on international/national experience)
 - Long term viability of the gallery threatened (inability to attract major exhibitions owing to visitor numbers)
 - Financial disadvantage from introducing entry charges
 - Adverse local and tourist market reaction
- (b) Endorse Option 2 to maintain the status quo of not charging admission for non-residents, noting a stronger management focus on increased visitor numbers, increased revenue opportunities and cost effective service delivery.
- (c) Undertake consultation for the 2006/2016 LTCCP **only** if it decides to proceed with charging admission for non-residents to the gallery.
- (d) Note that it does not have any authority to set admission charges for entry to the Canterbury Museum.

7 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON CHARGING FOR ACCESS FOR NON-RESIDENTS TO THE ART GALLERY AND MUSEUM

Process followed in undertaking the review

10. The process used before making recommendations to the Council included:
 - Several meetings were held with the parties concerned, ie, the gallery staff, Canterbury Museum Director, other Community Services Managers.
 - Researched various national and internal documents with an international and national perspective.
 - Consideration of the gallery's place in Christchurch and its global attraction.
 - Financial analysis of costs and revenues
 - Rigorous assessment of the above, with a consequent recommendation made.
 - Portfolio Group consideration and feedback
 - Council seminar discussion and feedback

Purpose of the Gallery

11. Visitors come for leisure and education purposes either individually or as part of groups eg, school groups, bus tours etc. There are a variety of programmes and services available to appeal to different sectors of the community. These range from formal education classes, exhibitions, tours and publications through to the gallery shop, a decorative arts retail outlet, café and wine bar, and car parking. People come to the gallery because it is an impressive place to visit, and already a major tourist attraction for the city. International visitors come to the gallery to learn about NZ art as well as enjoying the building and its services.
12. Another important role of the gallery is that of custodian of cultural property for the community good. The gallery has a permanent collection of historical and contemporary NZ art, in particular works by Canterbury artists, which it is preserving for future generations.

Impact on visitor numbers as a result of charging

13. Traditionally in Australasia and in the United Kingdom, visitor perception of museums and art galleries is that they are free of charge as they are a public good to be enjoyed by all.
14. Both internationally and nationally, various museums and galleries have introduced admission charges in differing forms over the last 25 years. The impacts of these admission charges has seen visitor numbers drop dramatically in each case.
15. The Sergeant Art Gallery in Wanganui introduced a \$2 charge which saw attendance drop by 50%.
16. When the Otago Museum introduced a \$2 door charge in 1987 donations and attendances dropped by 80%. This charge was revoked four months later but it was many years before attendances recovered to pre-charging levels.
17. Te Awamutu District Museum dropped a \$1 door charge and saw attendances rise by 109%.
18. Dunedin Public Art Gallery introduced a \$4 admission charge for non-residents only, which was later dropped owing to decreasing attendances and resulting poor public relations.
19. The introduction of an entry charge for adults at Lake Taupo Museum and Gallery saw patronage drop 49%.
20. Wellington Museum of City and Sea opened with a \$5 admission charge but has since abandoned that owing to low visitor numbers. Since it has been dropped there has been a large increase in visitor numbers.

7 Cont'd

21. The Auckland Museum which introduced a \$5 admission by donation fee in January 1999 saw a drop in visitor numbers from being the most visited museum in New Zealand with one million visitors, to 447,215 visitors in 2004. Their revenue targets have never since been met.
22. Some international institutions that have introduced admission charges in some form are the Victoria and Albert Museum, Royal Armouries in Leeds, Natural History Museum, London's Science Museum and more. They have all experienced a drop of at least 40% in visitor numbers.
23. In 2001 the United Kingdom Government decided to rescind admission charges in its art galleries and museums. This has resulted in an average visitor number increase of 70% after charges were removed.

Visitors' Discretionary Time and Money

24. The gallery is part of the cultural precinct in Christchurch. This includes the Centre of Contemporary Art, Our City, Arts Centre, and the Botanic Gardens. These combine to form a major cultural tourism destination and are currently all free of charge. If the gallery implemented admission charges for non-residents this would be inconsistent with the rest of the cultural precinct. The likely impact would be visitors choosing not to go to the gallery.
25. All visitors to Christchurch City have a certain amount of discretionary spend and time. They will make decisions on where to spend this time and money based on the cost of various attractions. If we do not charge for admission to the gallery then it is only discretionary time the gallery is competing for, but if we do charge then it is both discretionary time and money for which the gallery is competing.
26. The Canterbury Museum is a slightly different situation to the gallery at present. It is poised to undergo a major (\$34 million) revitalisation project, throughout which it intends to remain open to the public. Despite best endeavours to minimise and mitigate negative effects, it is inevitable that visitors will encounter some disruption, and the publicly available areas will be somewhat reduced. Therefore the museum strongly feels that this is not the time or environment in which we would consider introducing a charge at the museum.
27. Further, the museum's business planning to date has shown that post-revitalisation, more income can be gained from visitors by charging for a range of specific activities and successful retail, food and beverage businesses than could be gained from a door charge.
28. This strategy maintains the existing high foot traffic into the museum ensuring retail and food and beverage outlets contribute increased revenue.
29. This strategy is also employed by the national museum, Te Papa, one of the most aggressively (and successfully) commercially-orientated museums in the world. The original strategy was arrived at after extensive research (published in 1994) and has subsequently been revalidated as the optimal revenue-generation model from Te Papa.
30. The Canterbury Museum plans its commercial planning in the coming financial year to ensure that it continues to target maximum revenue-generation opportunities.

Estimated Cost of implementing charging for non-residents

31. Estimates are based on staffing and physical alterations to the building. To implement charging for non-residents there would need to be a counter built with turnstiles, cash registers etc to enable staff to monitor each visitor to ascertain whether they were a non-resident. This would need to be appropriately designed and built to align with the present architectural environment. Staff would need to be trained and assessed for cash handling duties. Marketing would need to be undertaken to educate people locally, nationally and internationally that charges will apply for non-residents only. Estimated costs are:

7 Cont'd

	Estimate One off cost	Estimate Annual cost
Building issues		
Design and consultant cost	20,000	
Add additional counter/choke point	88,500	
Wiring etc	35,000	
Escalation and contingency	26,249	
Equipment		
Cash register (existing)		2,400
EFT pos line		
Banking costs (courier)		2,000
Staff		
Extra staff (x3 to cover a 5/7 roster)		159,178
Cash handling allowance all visitor services staff		3,500
Training	1,000	
Marketing		
Advertising , PR campaign	20,000	5,000
Direct mail drop	1,000	
Change to signage	15,000	
	<hr/> 206,749	<hr/> 172,078
Year one	\$378,827	
Year two and annual ongoing cost	\$172,078	

Note: to reassign existing Visitor Services staff would compromise current security coverage and increase risk

Current Revenue Opportunities

32. The gallery gets its revenue from a variety of sources. There are admission charges or gold coin donations for value-added exhibitions and programmes, eg, Japonism, art advice, class room activities. There is revenue from the gallery shop with a wide range of products, as well as sponsorship from the Friends of the Gallery for capital works and 'in kind' sponsorship from businesses and others (eg, free legal advice, discounted products etc.)
33. The gallery earns rental revenue from Alchemy Wine Bar and Café, the Form Gallery and the gallery car park.
34. Voluntary visitor donations have increased significantly this year from \$13,500 per annum to \$28,000 year to date. This has been due to a proactive engagement with visitors by gallery staff.

7 Cont'd

35. The makeup of the current revenue budget is:

80110 Sale Of Services -SD	
80130 Fees Income	5,000-
* Service Revenues	5,000-
85110 Capital Asset Sales	
81110 Shop Sales	906,000-
* Product Sale Revenue	906,000-
82110 Commercial Rent Revenue	175,000-
82130 Hire Equipment	
82200 Facility Hire	66,700-
82210 Admittances	
82220 Subscriptions	
* Usage Revenues	241,700-
83120 Fees Revenue	
83125 Fines Contra	
83150 General Revenue	25,000-
83155 General Recoveries	4,250-
* General Revenues	29,250-
84110 Sponsorship Revenue	55,000-
84120 Donations Revenue (No GST)	5,000-
84130 Grants Revenue	10,000-
84140 Grants Revenue (No GST)	10,000-
* Grants and Subsidies Revenues	80,000-
** External Revenue	1,261,950-

OPTIONS

Option 1

36. Admission Charges for non-residents only

Non Christchurch residents = 52% of the 300,000 visitors

Financial Summary

Total revenue	\$1,261,950
Plus door charge	\$ 390,000 (0.52*150,000*\$5)
Less other revenue	<u>\$ 479,000</u> (car parking, shop, café, donations)
	\$1,172,950

Expenses	\$7,282,812
Total internal	\$ 637,989
+ extra opex	\$ 172,078 (additional staff costs)
+ sponsor loss	\$ 158,500 (50% of current)
Total cost	\$8,251,479
Actual Net Cost	\$7,078,529 NET EFFECT LOSS (\$102,678)

Cost per visitor = \$47.19 (peer average = \$25)

Effects:

- Adverse effect on international/national reputation, visitor perception and experience.
- 50% reduction in visitor numbers to 150,000 (projected patronage) for 2004/05 based on actual experience elsewhere.
- Reduced visitor numbers jeopardise ability to attract future quality exhibitions and programmes and hence sponsorship.
- All visitors pay for entry (unless proof of residence could be established) through a "choke point".
- Reduced shop and café revenue and reduced sponsorship - increases costs.
- Increased annual operating expenditure costs and one off capital cost.

7 Cont'd

If a decision is made to proceed with admission charges for non-residents then the following process would need to be followed:

- Local market research is undertaken to define what the gallery's market place is, as well as the perceived value of a visit, the impact of charging, the local and visitor perceptions, and effects on charging for access as well as other opportunities for revenue. This would be funded by the Council.
- The above research would allow the Council to gather the appropriate information together before the 2006/07 LTCCP consultation process.
- The prerequisite consultation with the community on whether to charge for access or not under the proposed LTCCP 2006/07.
- If after the prerequisite consultation was undertaken, and it was still decided to proceed, then detailed design and capital work would need to be done to implement the necessary changes to collect the charges.

Option 2

37. **Maintain the status quo – not charging admission for non-residents, but a stronger management focus on increased visitor numbers, increased revenue opportunities and cost effective service delivery**

The gallery is expected to meet 17% of its cost by revenue gathering in some form - currently achieving 16% from a range of initiatives

Financial Summary

Total revenue	\$1,261,950
Total expenses	\$7,282,812
Total internal	<u>\$ 637,989</u>
Net cost to CCC	\$6,658,851
Plus sponsorship	<u>\$ 317,000</u>
Actual Net Cost	\$6,975,851

2004/05 Visitor target 400,000, projected actual 300,000 therefore cost per visitor = \$23.25 (peer average = \$25)

Effects:

- All visitors continue to enjoy free access to view and enjoy world class art by local, national and international artists.
- International/national reputation, visitor perception and experience maintained.
- Maintains cultural precinct status quo.
- No increased ongoing operating costs or one off capital costs - cost containment and efficiency.
- With higher visitation, there are increased revenue opportunities
 - shop and café
 - donations
 - car parking
 - sponsorship
 - major exhibitions

7 Cont'd

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option**

Maintain the status quo – not charging admission for non-residents, but a stronger management focus on increased visitor numbers, increased revenue opportunities and cost effective service delivery

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social A cultural and Fun City	People can enjoy art by local, national and international artists; they can view travelling exhibitions of world class standard Local artists have an opportunity to exhibit, and so increase their profile and potential to sell their work;	None identified in addition to current cost of running the gallery
Cultural A Learning City	Our people can enjoy and learn more about art through enhanced programmes at the gallery.	As above
Environmental	None identified	None identified
Economic Strong and inclusive communities	Everyone, regardless of their socio economic position, has access to the collections at the gallery and have the opportunity to enjoy and learn about art through the gallery programmes Gallery Shop, Form Gallery and Alchemy Café make up the gallery experience	None identified
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome a cultural and fun city Also contributes to a learning city, a prosperous city, a city of inclusive and diverse communities, and a liveable city</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Effects on Maori: N/A</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Revenue and Financing Policy S101.3 (a) Local Government Act</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Visitor perception is that art galleries and museums should be free eg Te Papa</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

7 Cont'd

Other option. Charge admission to the Gallery for non-residents

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social A cultural and Fun City	Christchurch people can enjoy art by local, national and international artists; they can view travelling exhibitions of world class standard Local artists have an opportunity to exhibit, and so increase their profile and potential to sell their work	Embarrassment to the Council from identifying who is a resident of the city Capital cost to install 'choke point' Ongoing annual operational costs to administer 'choke point' Jeopardise ability to attract future quality exhibitions and programmes and therefore sponsorship
Cultural A Learning City	Our people can enjoy and learn more about art through enhanced programmes at the gallery.	Programmes may be limited in scope due to less visitation
Environmental	None identified	None identified
Economic Strong and inclusive communities	Everyone, regardless of their socio economic position, has access to the collections at the gallery and have the opportunity to enjoy and learn about art through the gallery programmes Gallery Shop, Form Gallery and Alchemy Café make up the gallery experience	Not everyone can visit the gallery owing to charge imposed Reduced revenue from these areas due to less visitation
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome a cultural and fun city Also contributes to a learning city, a prosperous city, a city of inclusive and diverse communities, and a liveable city</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Effects on Maori: N/A</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Revenue and Financing Policy S101.3 (a) Local Government Act</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Visitor perception is that art galleries and museums should be free eg Te Papa</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

8. DRAFT BANKS PENINSULA REORGANISATION SCHEME - ADOPTION OF SUBMISSIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services
Author:	Peter Mitchell, DDI 941-8549

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Council to adopt submissions on the April 2005 Draft Reorganisation Scheme to be forwarded to the Local Government Commission by 30 June 2005.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Council adopt the following recommendations as the basis for the Council's submission:

- (a) That subject to the Council's decision on recommendations (b) and (c), the Council advise the Local Government Commission that it supports the Commission's April 2005 Draft Reorganisation Scheme attached as **Appendix 1**.
- (b) That the Council decide whether or not to include reference to the matter of there being one community board or two community boards on the Peninsula in its submission.
- (c) That if the Council decides to refer in its submission to there being one community board on the Peninsula, that the Council record its reasons for that decision so these may be forwarded to the Commission and can be spoken to by the Council's representatives when addressing the Commission at public hearings to be held in July 2005.
- (d) That the Council record that it agrees to the status quo of the current boundary between Banks Peninsula District and Selwyn District in Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora), as proposed by the Local Government Commission in its Draft Reorganisation Scheme, being the boundary between Christchurch City and Selwyn District if the Reorganisation Proposal proceeds.
- (e) That the Council note that in the Draft Reorganisation Scheme the Local Government Commission has proposed an election date of 25 February 2006.
- (f) That the Council advise the Local Government Commission that the Council would be prepared to have the election held on a date between 25 February 2006 and 31 March 2006.
- (g) That the Council note that there are three current City Council projects; viz:
 - (i) Long Term Council Community Plan 2006-2016
 - (ii) Application of accreditation by the City Council under the Building Act 2004 to be filed by 31 May 2006
 - (iii) The adoption of an earthquake-prone, insanitary and dangerous buildings policy (through the special consultative procedure) under the Building Act 2004 by 31 May 2006

where the Council will need to carry out planning for those three matters from July this year on the basis that the reorganisation will go ahead, and such planning will include Banks Peninsula District.

- (h) That the Council in practical terms support the ring-fencing of levels of service at Banks Peninsula District for a period of up to five years commencing on the date of the Order in Council giving effect to any reorganisation proposal.
- (i) That any proposals put forward by Banks Peninsula District Council before the date of that Order in Council which have not been identified in its 2004 Long Term Council Community Plan or identified in the operational and financial report prepared by Capital Strategy Ltd, be considered by the City Council in the development of the 2009-2016 Long Term Council Community Plan.

8 Cont'd

PREVIOUS CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

2. At its meeting on 22 April 2004 the Council passed the following resolutions:
 1. *That the Christchurch City Council actively support the reorganisation proposal filed with the Local Government Commission for Banks Peninsula District Council to become part of Christchurch City.*
 2. *That the Christchurch City Council support this reorganisation proposal on the basis that it is for the abolition of Banks Peninsula District and its inclusion with Christchurch City recognising that this means that a binding poll will only be held in Banks Peninsula District on the reorganisation proposal.*
 3. *That there be one additional ward for the whole of the current Banks Peninsula District electing one Councillor to the Christchurch City Council.*
 4. *That there be one community board established for the Peninsula, comprising seven elected members and one appointed member (eight members in total).*
 5. *That the Local Government Commission be advised that the City Council would be willing to confer the same delegations on the Banks Peninsula Community Board as it confers on the city community boards.*
 6. *That the City Council enter into discussions with the Selwyn District Council and the Banks Peninsula District Council regarding the new boundaries between Banks Peninsula District, Selwyn District and Christchurch City.*
 7. *That the Council in practical terms support the "ring-fencing" of the levels of service for Banks Peninsula District for a period of up to five years commencing on the date of the Order in Council giving effect to any reorganisation proposal.*
3. At its meeting on 7 April 2005 the Council passed the following resolutions:
 - (a) *Supports option 1 of the Commission's October 2004 Terms of Reference, providing for the inclusion of the whole of Banks Peninsula District in Christchurch City.*
 - (b) *Supports the establishment of one community board for the Peninsula (as previously resolved by the Council on 22 April 2004).*
 - (c) *Supports the introduction of the capital value rating system for Banks Peninsula.*
 - (d) *Sees substantive changes to service levels on the Peninsula (other than statutory compliance issues) being matters to be dealt with through the Long-Term Council Community Plan.*
 - (e) *In addition to the delegations given to the city's community boards, at the time reorganisation takes place, will provide a delegation to the Peninsula community board as follows:*
"That the Peninsula community board recommend to the Council proposed expenditure from its reserve contributions account."
 - (f) *Will provide discretionary funding of \$20,000 per annum for the Peninsula Community Board.*
 - (g) *Supports retention of the three service centres at Lyttelton, Akaroa and Little River for a period of five years commencing on the date of the Order in Council giving effect to the reorganisation proposal and based on the levels of service provided by Banks Peninsula District Council at those service centres at that date.*
 - (h) *Will give priority upon reorganisation to the statutory compliance issues listed in (i) to (v) of 19(b) of this report, and any other statutory compliance issues that may arise.*

8 Cont'd

4. At its meeting on 26 May 2005 the Council passed the following resolutions:
 - (a) *Notes that a substantive response to the Draft Reorganisation Scheme will be progressed at a Council Seminar on Tuesday 14 June 2005 and decided at the Council meeting on Thursday 23 June 2005.*
 - (b) *Appoint under clause 30 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 the CCC/BPDC Transitional Joint Committee as a joint committee with the Banks Peninsula District Council.*
 - (c) *Appoint four City Council members to the Joint Committee.*
 - (d) *Notes that the Joint Committee appoints its Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson.*
 - (e) *Agrees to the terms of reference of the Joint Committee as:*
 - (i) *undertaking preparatory work relating to the Banks Peninsula area for the 2006/07 draft annual plan for the enlarged Council;*
 - (ii) *making recommendations to the Christchurch City Council on incorporating elements of the Long-Term Council Community Plan of the Banks Peninsula District into the Long-Term Council Community Plan of Christchurch City.*
 - (iii) *considering any ongoing requirement, in the context of the rating policies for the enlarged Christchurch City Council, for loans raised for water and sewerage in Governors Bay under the Banks Peninsula District Council (Rates Validation, Empowering, and Trust Removal) Act 1994; and*
 - (iv) *making recommendations to the Christchurch City Council on such other administrative matters of a governance nature as are required to ensure that the Council is able to effectively carry out its functions in the Banks Peninsula area from the date that the reorganisation scheme comes into effect.*
 - (f) *Notes that the Joint Committee has a power to recommend only to both Councils.*

**BACKGROUND ON DRAFT BANKS PENINSULA REORGANISATION SCHEME -
ADOPTION OF SUBMISSIONS**

5. In the Explanatory Statement which accompanied the Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the abolition of Banks Peninsula District and its inclusion in Christchurch City released by the Local Government Commission in April 2005, the Commission stated:

“What Happens Next ?

The procedure from now on is as follows—

- *the Draft Reorganisation Scheme is open to submissions until Thursday 30 June 2005;*
- *the Commission meets with those who make submissions;*
- *the Commission considers the submissions and makes any other investigations or enquiries it considers necessary;*
- *the Commission decides whether to—*
 - *issue a Final Reorganisation Scheme based on the Draft Reorganisation Scheme; or*
 - *issue a Final Reorganisation Scheme, based on modifications to the Draft Reorganisation Scheme; or*
 - *not issue any Final Reorganisation Scheme if it considers that the proposal does not meet the Local Government Act's criteria.*
- *if the Commission issues a Final Reorganisation Scheme, then a poll of electors of Banks Peninsula District will be held – for the Final Reorganisation Scheme to be successful more than 50% of the votes cast by the electors of Banks Peninsula District must be in favour of the proposal;*
- *if the poll votes in favour of the proposal, the Final Reorganisation Scheme is implemented by Order in Council.”*

6. This report is to enable the Council to formulate a submission as requested by the Local Government Commission.
7. Attached as Appendix 1 to this report is the Draft Reorganisation Scheme released by the Commission.

8 Cont'd

8. Based on previous Council resolutions it is considered that the Council would be prepared to agree to the Draft Reorganisation Scheme subject to discussion by the Council as to whether or not it wishes to make a submission to the Commission on the issue of community boards.

COMMUNITY BOARDS

9. At the seminar held on Tuesday 14 June 2005 the Council was briefed by staff on the matter of the number of community boards. That briefing advised that there were currently two community boards in Banks Peninsula District, each having five elected members and two appointed Councillors. Those two community boards are the Lyttelton-Mt Herbert Community Board, and the Akaroa-Wairewa Community Board.
10. In its explanation attached to the Draft Reorganisation Scheme the Commission noted that the Local Government Act 2002 requires that in establishing community boards the Commission must ensure that the election of members to the community board will "...provide effective representation of communities of interest within the community and fair representation of electors."
11. In its explanation to the Draft Reorganisation Scheme the Commission made the following comments regarding community of interest considerations for the Banks Peninsula Proposal:

"7.9 Christchurch City is primarily a densely populated urban district, although it contains areas of rural and semi-rural land on its periphery. The city has experienced rapid housing expansion to the north and southwest in recent years.

7.10 In contrast, Banks Peninsula is primarily a rural or semi-rural district, with its main centres being Lyttelton and Akaroa, and Little River to a lesser extent. New developments have occurred in recent years focused on the Lyttelton Harbour Basin, being within a reasonable commuting distance of Christchurch City, and around Akaroa Harbour, with a focus on leisure and tourism-related activities. Akaroa is the centre of an increasingly diverse range of tourism activities available on Banks Peninsula. Visitor numbers to Akaroa are approaching 100,000 annually.

7.11 The Taylor Baines study of communities of interest in Banks Peninsula generally confirmed the key findings of a similar 1998 study undertaken for the Commission by Martin Ward, while emphasising that linkages with Christchurch City have developed to a significant degree since 1998. The development of tourism-related activities and associated developments on Banks Peninsula have been significant drivers for the enhanced linkages.

7.12 The Taylor Baines study confirms Ward's view that there are three distinct communities of interest in Banks Peninsula – Lyttelton Harbour Basin, Little River, and the Outer Peninsula. However, Taylor Baines is of the view that significant shifts and balances have occurred since the Ward report was published:

It is evident that for the communities of Lyttelton Harbour Basin, there are several important aspects – school and work – where the "shared interest and identity" may now be greater with the adjacent communities of Christchurch City than within the district itself; the balance may have shifted far enough for community of interest distinctions with the city to have become blurred for the resident community. Put another way, while at the local community level, they may still associate strongly with the place they have chosen to live, at the higher levels of territorial association, more of them will connect more strongly to the city than to Banks Peninsula District.

For the Little River and for the Outer Peninsula, there have been shifts in the balance as well, but not to the same extent. They still comprise distinct communities and sets of communities, albeit with a greater external orientation, and this external orientation is for the very large majority in the direction of Christchurch, whether they are involved in the farming sector or the tourism sector.

8 Cont'd

- 7.13 *In 2001, fewer than half (47%) of all workers resident in the Banks Peninsula District actually worked in the District – this compares with 55% in 1991. Work opportunities for more than half (51%) of the District's resident working population were found in Christchurch City (1991: 43%). In 2001 fewer than two thirds (64%) of the District's workforce actually lived in the District (1991: 67%), while 33% of the District's workforce lived in Christchurch City (1991: 31%).*
- 7.14 *The workflows between the Lyttelton Harbour Basin area and Christchurch City have been well developed for many years. In most respects the Lyttelton Harbour Basin could be considered to be a suburb of Christchurch. This relationship was noted by the Commission when it issued its Draft Reorganisation Scheme for the Canterbury Region in 1988, at which time it also noted that the economies of Lyttelton and Christchurch were interdependent for commercial and financial purposes. In 2001 67% of the Lyttelton Harbour Basin workforce was employed in Christchurch City, compared with 61% in 1991. In 2001 50% of persons working in the Lyttelton Harbour Basin area were Christchurch residents, a similar level as in 1991.*
- 7.15 *Ward's 1998 study noted that the workforce in the Little River and Outer Peninsula areas was almost exclusively locally sourced. In recent years the number of Christchurch residents working in Little River and in the Outer Peninsula has become statistically significant, reflecting the significant development of tourism activities across Banks Peninsula.*
- 7.16 *As the Commission has noted in other determinations involving districts bordering on large metropolitan areas, the dependency of district residents on employment opportunities in a nearby metropolitan labour market is not unusual. However, in terms of the three districts that adjoin Christchurch City, Banks Peninsula District has the highest percentage (51%) of its resident workers working in Christchurch City, compared with Selwyn District (43%) and Waimakariri District (48%).*
- 7.17 *In the view of the Commission, Banks Peninsula District and Christchurch City share well-developed linkages, which are continuing to strengthen over time. While Banks Peninsula District continues to contain three distinct communities of interest, each of these areas has significant and further developing links with Christchurch City. The significant growth of tourism-related activities on the Peninsula and the developments that tie in with such activities will, in the view of the Commission, further strengthen the links between the Christchurch and Banks Peninsula areas over time.*
12. With regard to the community board structure in the proposed Banks Peninsula Ward, the Commission stated in the same explanation:
- “12.1 *The Banks Peninsula District has two community boards – the Lyttelton-Mount Herbert Community Board and the Akaroa-Wairewa Community Board. Each board has four elected members and two councillors appointed to the board.*
- 12.2 *Of those submitters who supported the proposal and expressed a view on community boards, there was strong support for the retention of a community board structure in the Banks Peninsula. Some considered that one board for the area would be appropriate, while others supported the retention of two boards. On 7 April 2005 the Christchurch City Council resolved to support the establishment of one community board in the Banks Peninsula area if the proposal were put into effect.*
- 12.3 *The Commission is of the view that, at this time, a structure of two community boards in the Banks Peninsula area should be retained to reflect the communities of interest in the Banks Peninsula area. This structure will enable local issues to be appropriately discussed and dealt with at the local level. Consistent with the elected membership of each existing Christchurch City community board, the Lyttelton-Mount Herbert Community Board and the Akaroa-Wairewa Community Board would each have five elected members. Additionally, the member of the Christchurch City Council for the Banks Peninsula Ward would be appointed to each of the Banks Peninsula community boards.*

8 Cont'd

12.4 *The Commission considered whether either community should be divided for electoral purposes. It came to the view that the division of the Akaroa-Wairewa Community into two subdivisions would provide effective representation of communities of interest located in the community. The two subdivisions are:*

- *the Akaroa Subdivision – covering the area of the current Akaroa Ward; and*
- *the Wairewa Subdivision – covering the area of the current Wairewa Ward.*

12.5 *The 2001 Census usually resident population for the Akaroa Ward was 1,671 persons, and 960 persons for the Wairewa Ward. Applying the population per elected member requirements of section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 enables fair representation to be achieved with an allocation of three members for the Akaroa Subdivision, and two members for the Wairewa Subdivision. “*

13. With regard to its submission to the Commission on this issue, the Council has three options:

- (a) That it makes no comment at all on this topic in its submission and effectively remains with its resolutions of 7 April 2005 and 22 April 2004 that it support the establishment of one community board for the Peninsula, comprising seven elected members and one appointed member from that ward; or
- (b) That the Council confirm that decision in its submission and record its reasons in writing for supporting one community board, such reasons to be forwarded to the Commission as part of its submission; or
- (c) That the Council alter its position regarding the number of community boards on the Peninsula.

LAKE ELLESMERE (TE WAIHORA) BOUNDARY

14. Since 1989 Lake Ellesmere has been divided between Selwyn District and Banks Peninsula. In its Findings and Decisions attached to the April 2005 Draft Reorganisation Scheme the Commission is proposing that the boundary remain as it has been since 1989. The Commission noted:

“The existing territorial authority boundary at Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) is a long-standing boundary, which pre-dates the 1989 reorganisation of local government. The Commission is of the general view that boundaries should not be changed unless sound reasons come forward, providing justification for such a change. At this time the Commission is not convinced that a change to the boundary in this area is warranted. By running across the lake the current boundary would appear to minimise territorial cross-boundary issues for the Selwyn District Council and Banks Peninsula District Council, compared with a boundary at a lake-land interface. In terms of the draft reorganisation scheme that the Commission is issuing on the proposal, it would welcome further submissions from the parties and interested persons on this matter.

15. The consensus at the seminar was that the Council should advise the Commission that it is satisfied with this position and should resolve accordingly to include this decision in its submission.

CURRENT CCC STATUTORY PROJECTS

16. There are three statutory requirements which apply to all territorial authorities and planning for which would cross across the Commission's proposed election date whether that is in February or March 2006 if the proposal proceeds.

17. Those statutory requirements, and their statutory completion dates, are:

- Adoption of a 2006-2016 Long Term Council Community Plan – 30 June 2006
- Application for accreditation under the Building Act 2004 – 31 May 2006
- Adoption of a policy for earthquake-prone, insanitary and dangerous buildings under the Building Act 2004 – 31 May 2006

8 Cont'd

18. As was advised at the seminar, City Council staff are planning for the last two projects on the basis that Banks Peninsula District will be included with Christchurch City in February or March 2006. Should the poll result in late November or early December 2005 not support the reorganisation proposal, then the planning work carried out by Christchurch City Council for these two projects to that time can be handed over to Banks Peninsula District Council for completion of statutory processes to enable that council to comply with the statutory dates referred to above for these three projects.
19. As was noted in its report to the Council at its 26 May 2005 meeting, in the context of the Council's decision to appoint a joint committee to manage transitional issues, this position by the Council to carry out this planning by including Banks Peninsula District for these three statutory projects should not be seen by the public as this Council assuming that the poll result will be in favour of the Final Reorganisation Scheme if one is issued by the Commission. It is entirely a matter for the residents of Banks Peninsula as to whether they support the reorganisation proposal or not.
20. The practical situation is that the planning issues involved in these three statutory projects could not be dealt with by Christchurch City starting after the poll result in late November or early December if that result was to favour the reorganisation proposal. The Long-Term Council Community Plan process and the adoption of the policy on earthquake-prone, insanitary and dangerous buildings must be carried out through the special consultative procedure which would take most of the first half of 2006 to complete on its own. The application for accreditation under the Building Act, while not requiring the special consultative procedure, nevertheless requires a great deal of preparatory work of a technical nature to prepare this application and it is considered appropriate that this planning work incorporating Banks Peninsula District commence now. I understand that Banks Peninsula District Council management supports this approach. Clearly, such planning work would need to be in liaison with Banks Peninsula District Council.

RING-FENCING OF LEVELS OF SERVICE

21. This issue was raised at the 14 June 2005 seminar, and it is considered appropriate for the Council to update a previous April 2004 resolution regarding the ring-fencing of levels of service at Banks Peninsula District.
22. At its 22 April 2004 meeting, the Council resolved:

"That the Council in practical terms support the ring-fencing of the levels of service at Banks Peninsula District for a period of up to five years commencing on the date of the Order in Council giving effect to any reorganisation proposal."
23. The background to that resolution at that April 2004 meeting in the report was stated to be:

"With regards to the comments above about the development of a new funding policy to enable the Council to assess priorities between Banks Peninsula District and the rest of Christchurch City, the seminar held on 15 April 2004 considered that it was appropriate for the Council to indicate at this point in time that it would recommend to the next Council that that Council (except for statutory compliance issues) "ring-fence" Banks Peninsula District to current levels of service as provided by the Banks Peninsula District Council for a period of five years to enable the next Council to fully understand the issues involved in the district and to enable the Council to develop a new funding policy through public consultation processes. This would enable any additional expenditure (other than statutory compliance expenditure) to be addressed through the Council's Long-Term Council Community Plan for the 2006/07 year, assuming that the reorganisation proposal is given effect to in time for work to be incorporated into that Long-Term Council Community Plan. An issue to be considered regarding capital expenditure is whether items already in the BPDC 10-year forecast should be considered within the "ring-fence". This would seem to be a reasonable approach."

8 Cont'd

24. The 2004 report referred to the matter being considered by this Council which was elected in October 2004 and it has now become apparent to officers that it is not practicable, as was suggested in the 2004 report, for the Banks Peninsula work regarding the Long Term Council Community Plan for 2006 to be effectively incorporated into the 2006-2016 Long Term Council Community Plan of an enlarged Christchurch City.
25. As was noted at the 14 June 2005 seminar, the reality would be for matters proposed by Banks Peninsula District Council which are not currently listed in that Council's 2004-2010 Long Term Council Community Plan, nor in the Capital Strategy Ltd April 2005 Report entitled "*Study on Operational and Financial Issues Associated with the Reorganisation Proposal for the Abolition of Banks Peninsula District and its Inclusion in Christchurch City*" that these would be considered by the enlarged City Council as part of its 2009-2016 Long Term Council Community Plan, which would then enable those matters to be researched and also to be balanced against other priorities across the new enlarged district.
26. We need to recognise that like us, Banks Peninsula District Council's 2004-2014 Long Term Council Community Plan will need updating to reflect increased capital costs etc. They are also likely to want to "reprioritise" a number of projects. It is important from an amalgamation perspective that the Banks Peninsula District Council's financial projections remain within the fiscal envelope that the Local Government Commission has used for its deliberations.
27. For this reason it is considered appropriate that the resolution of April 2004 be updated as follows:

"That the Council in practical terms support the ring-fencing of levels of service at Banks Peninsula District for a period of up to five years commencing on the date of the Order in Council giving effect to any reorganisation proposal.

That any proposals put forward by Banks Peninsula District Council before the date of that Order in Council which have not been identified in its 2004 Long Term Council Community Plan or identified in the operational and financial report prepared by Capital Strategy Limited, be considered by the City Council in the development of the 2009-2016 Long Term Council Community Plan."

9. COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT WITH THE ROAD SAFETY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Transport and City Streets Manager
Authors:	Stuart Woods, DDI 941-8615, Susan Cambridge, DDI 332-2722

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to outline the developments since the last report on the Council's involvement and relationship with the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee (RSCC) was considered by the Council on 14 April 2005, particularly in line with the recommendations of that Council meeting.
2. At the 14 April 2005 Council meeting, the Council resolved:
 - (a) That the Council support the continuation of the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee.
 - (b) That Councillors Bob Shearing and Carole Evans be appointed as the Council's representatives on the Committee for the balance of the current term of Council.
 - (c) That the Committee be requested to review its present purpose, objectives and outcomes, and report back to the Council on the alterations to these proposed in the staff report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. The Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee met following the 14 April Council meeting on 27 April 2005, and discussed at length the Council's resolutions and the Committee's desired relationship with the Council in the context of the proposed amendments to the Committee's purpose, objectives and outcomes.
4. The RSCC appreciated the Council's resolution to support the continuation of the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee, and welcomed the two nominated Councillors. It also considered that it would accept the opportunity to be domiciled at the Council's offices with associated secretarial support.
5. In discussing the proposed amendments to the Committee's purpose, objectives and outcomes, the Committee considered that with some minor modifications, the Council's proposed amendments were acceptable. These minor modifications are noted in the Purpose, Objectives and Outcomes below, with strikethrough text being proposed deletions and underlined text as proposed additions by the Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee:

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.*

9 Cont'd

- 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~~ a 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~~ advocacy 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~~ advocacy on road safety issues.
 - (x) An increased level of co-operation between road safety groups and more effective community development.
6. During the RSCC discussions, the question of responsibility for funding and programme expenditure was discussed. It was pointed out that the contract for the Land Transport NZ funding is between the contracted providers, such as the Council, and Land Transport NZ. Thus the Council is responsible for its spending, not the RSCC. The Committee can provide advocacy for its spending but the final decision will be through Council processes. The Committee can therefore provide guidance but not final decision making. The point was made in relation to Objective h. that the project groups make decisions about the details of education and awareness projects, and report them to the Committee. The project groups are essentially project teams for each initiative or programme activity, made up of representatives of the relevant organisations represented in that activity, and is separate from the Committee. The project group members would be responsible for their organisation's expenditure on the project.

9 Cont'd

7. The RSCC also considered the 14 April Council meeting discussion on the issue of potentially combining the Committee and the Cycle Steering Group. RSCC members felt that the focus of the two groups was different and they should remain separate, but the Committee could invite representation from the Cycle Steering Group.
8. The RSCC also discussed options for reporting back to the Council, given the history of previously reporting back to a Council committee, but reached little by way of conclusive views. The discussion expanded to note that it is the responsibility of each Committee member to report back and liaise with their constituent organisation or agency. As quarterly progress reports are compiled as part of the Safety Administration Programme (SAP) contractual arrangements with Land Transport New Zealand and are also received by the RSCC, it would appear that this process would be a good option to generate a related update report to the Council on both progress of the SAP projects and any meetings of the RSCC.
9. The RSCC resolved at its 27 April meeting:
 - That the modifications and amendments to the Purpose and Objectives of the Committee as discussed be reported back to the Christchurch City Council.
 - That the Committee be domiciled at the Council with secretarial support.
 - That the reporting mechanism for the Committee to the Christchurch City Council be supported as part of the six monthly review of the Council.
 - That the Cycle Steering Group not be merged with the Committee but that the Group be invited to have a member on the Committee, and that the terms of reference for membership of the committee be reviewed.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended:

- (a) That the Council confirm support for 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.*
- 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.*

9 Cont'd

- 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 a 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 advocacy 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 advocacy on road safety issues.*
 - (x) *An increased level of co-operation between road safety groups and more effective community development.*
- (b) That the Council support the RSCC being domiciled at the Council with secretarial support.
 - (c) That the RSCC initially report to the Council quarterly in alignment with quarterly Safety Administration Programme reporting to Land Transport New Zealand, and that the reporting mechanism for the committee to the Council be reviewed as part of the six monthly review of the Council structure.

10. REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD

Attached.

11. NOTICES OF MOTION

12. QUESTIONS

13. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.