

**Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community
Board Submissions Committee
AGENDA**

Notice of Meeting:

A meeting of the Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Submissions Committee will be held on:

Date: Tuesday 19 March 2019
Time: 4pm
Venue: Koaro Room, Te Hāpua: Halswell Centre
341 Halswell Road

Membership

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Chairperson | Debbie Mora |
| Deputy Chairperson | Ross McFarlane |
| Members | Helen Broughton Natalie Bryden Catherine Chu Mike Mora |

13 March 2019

Matthew Pratt
Manager Community Governance, Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton
941 5428
matthew.pratt@ccc.govt.nz
www.ccc.govt.nz

Note: The reports contained within this agenda are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. If you require further information relating to any reports, please contact the person named on the report.

To view copies of Agendas and Minutes, visit:
<https://www.ccc.govt.nz/the-council/meetings-agendas-and-minutes/>

Strategic Framework

The Council’s Vision – Christchurch is a city of opportunity for all.
 Open to new ideas, new people and new ways of doing things – a city where anything is possible.

**Whiria ngā whenu o ngā papa
 Honoa ki te maurua tāukiuki**

Bind together the strands of each mat
 And join together with the seams of respect
 and reciprocity.

The partnership with Papatipu Rūnanga
 reflects mutual understanding and respect,
 and a goal of improving the economic,
 cultural, environmental and social
 wellbeing for all.

Overarching Principle

Partnership – Our
 people are our taonga
 – to be treasured and
 encouraged. By working
 together we can create
 a city that uses their
 skill and talent, where
 we can all participate,
 and be valued.

Supporting Principles

| | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| Accountability | Collaboration |
| Affordability | Prudent Financial Management |
| Agility | Stewardship |
| Equity | Wellbeing and resilience |
| Innovation | Trust |

Community Outcomes

What we want to achieve together as our city evolves

Strong communities

Strong sense of
 community

Active participation in
 civic life

Safe and healthy
 communities

Celebration of our
 identity through arts,
 culture, heritage and
 sport

Valuing the voices of
 children and young
 people

Liveable city

Vibrant and thriving
 central city, suburban
 and rural centres

A well connected and
 accessible city

Sufficient supply of, and
 access to, a range of
 housing

21st century garden city
 we are proud to live in

Healthy environment

Healthy waterways

High quality drinking
 water

Unique landscapes and
 indigenous biodiversity
 are valued

Sustainable use of
 resources

Prosperous economy

Great place for people,
 business and investment

An inclusive, equitable
 economy with broad-
 based prosperity for all

A productive, adaptive
 and resilient economic
 base

Modern and robust
 city infrastructure and
 community facilities

Strategic Priorities

Our focus for improvement over the next three years and beyond

Enabling active citizenship and connected
 communities

Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant,
 prosperous and sustainable 21st century city

Climate change
 leadership

Informed and proactive
 approaches to natural
 hazard risks

Increasing active, public
 and shared transport
 opportunities and use

Safe and sustainable
 water supply and
 improved waterways

- Part A Matters Requiring a Council Decision
Part B Reports for Information
Part C Decisions Under Delegation
-

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | | |
|---|----|--------------------------------|---|
| C | 1. | Apologies..... | 4 |
| B | 2. | Declarations of Interest | 4 |

STAFF REPORTS

| | | | |
|---|----|---|---|
| C | 3. | Christchurch City Council Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 - Board Submission..... | 5 |
|---|----|---|---|

1. Apologies

An apology for absence has been received from Catherine Chu.

2. Declarations of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

3. Christchurch City Council Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 - Board Submission

Reference: 19/244705

Presenters: Matthew Pratt, Community Governance Manager, and Peter Dow, Community Board Advisor

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board's Submissions Committee to undertake the preparation of a Board submission to the Council on its Draft Annual Plan 2019-20.

2. Staff Recommendations

That the Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Submissions Committee:

1. Complete the preparation of a Board submission to the Council on the Draft Annual Plan 2019-20.
2. Note that given the consultation timetable, the Submissions Committee will exercise its delegated authority to complete and lodge a submission on behalf of the Board.

3. Key Points

- 3.1 The following links and attachments are provided to assist the Submissions Committee in its deliberations:
 - 3.1.1 Council/Community Boards Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 Workshop on 4 December 2018 - Board Comments
Circulated separately to Committee members.
 - 3.1.2 Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board - Submission on Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028
Refer **Attachment A**.
 - 3.1.3 **Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 - Consultation Document**
<https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/The-Council/Plans-Strategies-Policies-Bylaws/Plans/annual-plan/2019-2020/Annual-Plan-2019-20-consultation-document-WEB.PDF>
 - 3.1.4 **Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020**
<https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/The-Council/Plans-Strategies-Policies-Bylaws/Plans/annual-plan/2019-2020/Draft-Annual-Plan-2019-20.pdf>
 - 3.1.5 **Council Long Term Plan 2018-28 - Capital Works Programme by Ward**
Circulated separately to Committee members.

4. Submissions Process

- 4.1 The consultation period for submissions runs from 1 March 2019 until 1 April 2019.
- 4.2 Details of the regular community events held throughout the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton wards during March were advised to Board members so as to enable attendances and engagement to take occur on the Draft Annual Plan.

Attachments

| No. | Title | Page |
|---------------------|---|------|
| A ↓ | Waipuna/Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Draft Long Term Plan 2018-28 - Board Submission | 7 |

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:

- (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
- (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.

(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council's significance and engagement policy.

Signatories

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Authors | Cindy Sheppard - Governance Support Officer Peter Dow - Community Board Advisor |
| Approved By | Matthew Pratt - Manager Community Governance, Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton |

SUBMISSION TO: Christchurch City Council
ON: Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028
BY: Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board
CONTACT: Mike Mora
Chairperson
C/- PO Box 73021
CHRISTCHURCH 8022
027 4303 132
mike.mora@ccc.govt.nz

| Council Key Issues/Topics | Board Submission |
|---|---|
| <p>The big question</p> <p>Our overarching proposal is to prioritise some areas over others to enable us to keep our proposed average rates as low as possible, at 5.5 per cent.</p> <p>Have we got the balance right?</p> <p>Looking across all the services, projects and activities that Council delivers, have we prioritised the right things?</p> <p>Do you have a project or programme that you think should be prioritised?</p> | <p>The Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board (the Board) appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the Council's proposed long term budget.</p> <p>The Board considers the Council's approach to be pragmatic in its goal of seeking to strike a balance between the many competing demands and funding pressures that the city faces certainly over the first three years of this Plan, and for the many years to come.</p> <p>The Board acknowledges the big issues for the Council over the period of this Plan around addressing the impacts of climate change and sea level rise, an early return to supplying potable (untreated) drinking water, contributing towards healthy local environments, and continuing to deliver its core infrastructure programmes.</p> <p>The focus taken by the Council in generally adopting a 'Medium' approach in forming its budget for key infrastructure projects is understandable. Balancing the demands of planned growth, earthquake recovery, maintaining services against rates affordability is certainly challenging.</p> <p>In regard to the extent of the capital programme proposed across the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton wards, the Board is pleased with the levels of intended investment as recognition of the intensification and growth occurring in the south west areas of the city.</p> <p>Some examples of the varied projects proposed to happen in the Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton wards over the earlier years of the Plan are worth highlighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hornby Library, Customer Services and South West Leisure Centre • Riccarton Community Centre • Ilam/Middleton/Riccarton - Intersection Safety |

- Shands Road - Network Management Improvements
- Marshs/Springs - Intersection Safety
- Dunbars/Wigram and Wigram/Hayton - Intersection Improvements
- Major Cycle Routes – Quarrymans Trail and Nor'West Arc
- Riccarton Road (Harakeke to Matipo) - wastewater and water supply renewals
- Riccarton Interchange and Bus Priority
- Eastman Wetlands

The Board seeks the Council's confirmation of the funding and the scheduled timeframes for these and the other local projects in its adopted Long Term Plan.

Bradshaw Terrace (ID #34303)

The Board is however extremely disappointed to note that the renewal of Bradshaw Terrace has slipped outside the first three years of the proposed programme.

Bradshaw Terrace has been the subject of repeated delay and deferment over recent years.

In the 2013-16 Council term, street residents met with elected members and were assured the project would occur during that period. The timing of the work was subsequently moved out to 2017-18 which the local residents accepted at the time.

In the adopted Annual Plan 2017-18, the project was subsequently rescheduled however for completion in 2018-19 being categorised as '*Holding Renewals 1*' - a renewal that is essential because there is a significant increase in opex and capex costs later if not renewed....'

The Board understands that the wastewater and watermain pipework in the street was replaced in 2017 as a precursor to the approved street renewal in 2018-19.

Through this Draft Long Term Plan however, street residents are being told that the project is now not even in the first three years of the Plan.

Bradshaw Terrace is the sole remaining street in a cluster of local renewal projects completed before the earthquakes.

The Board submits the street's high priority for completion is totally justified, being fully in line with the Council's criteria for renewals around poor kerb and channel and pavement condition, safety issues and the prior upgrading of water and wastewater assets as completed in 2017.

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>The Board considers that the Council cannot give these assurances that do not get acted on, and that there needs to be moral integrity in the framework in which we operate under.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Board strongly requests that Bradshaw Terrace be reinstated into the renewal programme in the financial year 2018-19 at an indicative total cost of \$638,000.</p> |
| <p>We're making progress</p> <p>In 2018/19 ChristchurchNZ will receive \$10.2 million from the Council, to enable it to carry out a range of activities including attracting major events, economic development and promoting the city. To fulfil this role they are seeking additional funding of \$1.4 million. The rates impact of the additional seed fund activities would be 0.31 per cent in 2018/19 on top of the 5.5 per cent average rates increase.</p> <p>What do you think of the Council providing additional funding to ChristchurchNZ so that it can bid for major events on behalf of the city, support new events through sponsorship and test the feasibility of new concepts?</p> | <p>The Board notes that in 2018-19, ChristchurchNZ Limited is set to receive \$10.2 million from the Council towards carrying out its core activities of economic development, promoting Christchurch and attracting major events.</p> <p>The Board believes this intended level of ratepayer investment is reasonable relative to the other pressures and competing demands that sit across the wide range of Council activities.</p> <p>The Board therefore cannot support the additional funding of \$1.4 million as requested by the company.</p> |
| <p>Our rates proposal</p> <p>We propose an average rates increase of 5.5 per cent in 2018/19, with the increase tracking down over subsequent years of the LTP to settle at a level in line with local government inflation.</p> <p>We propose continuing to prioritise our work on horizontal infrastructure (roads, pipes etc) so that the most urgent work is done first, based on the condition of the asset, its importance and weighing the benefits gained in doing the work against the consequences of not doing the work.</p> <p>What do you think of this plan for an average rates increase of no more than 5.5 per cent, reducing over the next 10 years?</p> | <p>Residential Rates</p> <p>The Board acknowledges with some reluctance, the 5.5 per cent average rate increase proposed for residential property owners.</p> <p>The Board is concerned though to note the compounding effect of the projected rate increases over the coming decade of the Long Term Plan.</p> <p>While the rate increase projections for the later years are more indicative, it represents a similar pattern of accumulated increases that have been evident in previous budgets.</p> <p>Out in our communities there are concerns being expressed about the level of rate increases. The Board too considers that any increase(s) should be approximate to the Construction Price Index.</p> <p>The Board has detailed since 2014-2015 the impact of rates on a two storied older character house with a rateable value of \$970,000.</p> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------------------------|---------|---------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------------------|-----------|-------|-----------------------------------|-----------|------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----|-----------------------------------|-----------|------|-----------------------------------|-----------|------|-----------------------------------|
| | <p>In 2014-2015, the rates were \$4,795 (inclusive of Environment Canterbury rates).</p> <p>The rates proposed for 2018-2019 would now be \$5,986, climbing to \$7,241 in 2022-2023 (inclusive of Environment Canterbury rates).</p> <p>Taking the projected rate rises in the Long Term Plan, the cumulative rate growth over five years is 28 per cent. Over a nine year period from 2014-2015, the combined increase is 51 per cent.</p> <p>These annual compounding increases are shown in the table below.</p> <p>The Board's view is that when setting rates, the Council needs to be cognisant of the resulting impacts especially for those ratepayers on fixed incomes and who own properties similar to those described above.</p> <p>The Board has taken this example of an above average valued home as this is where the increase is larger than that generally outlined in the media.</p> <p>The Board fully appreciates that there are no easy solutions to limit the levels of rate increases and is pleased to see mention made in the Plan to exploring alternative revenue sources.</p> <p>Table</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2014-2015</td> <td>\$4,795</td> <td>(inclusive of ECan rates)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015-2016</td> <td>\$5,176</td> <td>(inclusive of ECan rates)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016-2017</td> <td>\$5,434</td> <td>(inclusive of ECan rates)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018/2019</td> <td>5.72%</td> <td>\$5,986 (inclusive of ECan rates)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019/2020</td> <td>5.5%</td> <td>\$6,315 (inclusive of ECan rates)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020/2021</td> <td>5%</td> <td>\$6,631 (inclusive of ECan rates)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2021/2022</td> <td>4.5%</td> <td>\$6,929 (inclusive of ECan rates)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2022/2023</td> <td>4.5%</td> <td>\$7,241 (inclusive of ECan rates)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Note: If the level of ECan rates comes in lower, the above figures would be adjusted slightly downwards.</p> <p>Rates Policy re Rural Rates</p> <p>In formulating this submission, the Board has reflected on the inconsistencies evident in applying the remote rural rates component of the Council's current policy.</p> | 2014-2015 | \$4,795 | (inclusive of ECan rates) | 2015-2016 | \$5,176 | (inclusive of ECan rates) | 2016-2017 | \$5,434 | (inclusive of ECan rates) | 2018/2019 | 5.72% | \$5,986 (inclusive of ECan rates) | 2019/2020 | 5.5% | \$6,315 (inclusive of ECan rates) | 2020/2021 | 5% | \$6,631 (inclusive of ECan rates) | 2021/2022 | 4.5% | \$6,929 (inclusive of ECan rates) | 2022/2023 | 4.5% | \$7,241 (inclusive of ECan rates) |
| 2014-2015 | \$4,795 | (inclusive of ECan rates) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | \$5,176 | (inclusive of ECan rates) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2016-2017 | \$5,434 | (inclusive of ECan rates) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018/2019 | 5.72% | \$5,986 (inclusive of ECan rates) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019/2020 | 5.5% | \$6,315 (inclusive of ECan rates) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2020/2021 | 5% | \$6,631 (inclusive of ECan rates) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2021/2022 | 4.5% | \$6,929 (inclusive of ECan rates) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2022/2023 | 4.5% | \$7,241 (inclusive of ECan rates) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>The Board considers that the relevant sections of the business/residential policy should be similarly aligned into the remote rural/residential policy.</p> <p>The relevant section (in bold), states:</p> <p>Business <i>Any rating unit which is:</i></p> <p><i>(a) used for a commercial or industrial purpose....., or;</i></p> <p><i>(b) land zoned Business, Central City, Commercial, Industrial or Rural-Industrial (or equivalent zoning) in the City Plan administered by the Council, situated anywhere in the city, except where the predominant use is residential.</i></p> <p>Part (b) is of interest as in this situation, the zoning of the property is the parameter that sets whether it attracts the business rate premium or the base residential rate.</p> <p>The inconsistencies of applying the remote rural discount could be more subjective if the District Plan zoning could become the base template similarly as is the case for business rates.</p> <p>Generally, any property outside greenfield developable areas would not have the amenity levels provided by residential street lighting, footpaths, street cleaning etc.</p> <p>Any rural zoned property that had the benefit of water or sewer services connected or not, would already be attracting these additional rates as they are targeted rates.</p> <p>Conversely, any undeveloped land zoned residential in the District Plan can now be subdivided and is able to be, as a component of subdivision, connected to applicable infrastructure.</p> <p>The Board therefore respectfully requests that the Council initiate a review of its present Rates Policy with the aim being to achieve clearer transparency and consistency.</p> |
| <p>Alternative sources of funding An issue we think may be important to you is identifying alternative means of funding the Council's activities. At the moment we meet most of our costs from rates, borrowing, and dividends from our trading organisations. Do you think we should investigate other ways to raise funding?</p> | <p>Alternative forms of local government funding have been in the mix and discussed for many years.</p> <p>The Council's messaging in this Draft Long Term Plan is that the city faces major challenges in the years to come and therefore feels the time is right to invite ideas on other sources of funding so that the Council's wide range of activities, projects and programmes can continue to be delivered.</p> |

A local fuel tax could help us to reduce rates. Would you support us exploring this option to generate more money for transport-related projects?

The Board agrees that the traditional property-based rates system is just not sustainable for our ratepayers in the years covered by this Plan.

The Board offers these ideas for consideration:

- Tourist Bed Tax
- Christchurch Art Gallery, Canterbury Museum and other key city attractions - entry fees for international visitors
- Airport Landing Charges - review

The Board understands that the Council charges the Selwyn District Council to take some of its wastewater from adjoining areas. Is the level of the current charge still appropriate, can it be reviewed?

The Board notes the Government's announced proposal for a Capital Acceleration Fund of \$300 million towards the Multi-Purpose Arena, land drainage projects and the Residential Red Zone. Hopefully, this revenue will be confirmed in the forthcoming Budget in May 2018.

The Board offers its support for the indicative funding in the Draft Long Term Plan from 2022-23 for a Multi-Purpose Arena (ID#1026).

Having the Arena in place will in the Board's view, accrue sustained economic benefits to the city in the decades to come.

The Board notes the recent publicity on the low usage levels for the Council's Lichfield Street parking building.

Some suggested options for consideration aimed at stimulating demand, and therefore overall revenue, include:

- Two hours free parking and keeping hourly charges the same after that,
- Lower the hourly/half hourly rate after the first hour,
- Have no free parking but decrease the hour charge by half.

In the Board's view, holding and/or lowering these charges would encourage more people into the central city attractions without adding to their expenses in doing so.

The Board also urges the Council to optimise the revenue generated from Development Contributions so as to keep up with the growth demands occurring in the south west.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Flood protection</p> <p>Since the earthquakes, houses along parts of the Heathcote/Ōpāwaho River have been more susceptible to flooding. We understand the effects of this on residents. To reduce the risk of homes flooding we propose speeding up our programme to dredge the river between the Woolston Cut and Radley Park and through to Hansen Park.</p> <p>What do you think of us prioritising this project over other land drainage recovery work, so we can complete it within two rather than three years?</p> | <p>While the focus presented is on dredging a mid-section of the Heathcote River, it is important to acknowledge as the Board does, the large scale of ongoing investment being made by the Council in land drainage projects in the headwater catchments of both the Heathcote/ Ōpāwaho and Halswell/Hurutini Rivers.</p> <p>On completion, Hendersons Basin and its surrounds will equate to an area the size of Hagley Park.</p> <p>These important retention and detention assets located primarily in the Halswell Ward will contribute much to control flooding for those communities in the mid and lower reaches of the Heathcote/ Ōpāwaho River.</p> <p>These basins will also add considerably to the environmental and amenity values of these local areas by providing for public use and access while actively serving to improve the quality of the water entering our local rivers.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Board fully supports all such related projects, including the ongoing Growth-Critical Strategic Land Acquisitions Programme (ID#36942) in the finalised Long Term Plan.</p> |
| <p>Drinking water, wastewater, stormwater and flood protection</p> <p>We propose prioritising work to maintain our drinking water, stormwater and flood protection infrastructure over work to maintain our wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>What do you think our approach to managing our drinking water, wastewater, stormwater and flood protection assets, and how we're prioritising the work?</p> | <p>The Board totally supports the Council's objective of having untreated drinking water for Christchurch.</p> <p>Also, the goal of obtaining treatment exemption status for the long term is endorsed, and as with the Council, is the highest priority for the Board.</p> <p>The Board records its understanding of the present circumstances in relation to the twelve month programme to temporarily chlorinate the city's water supplies while the well heads are upgraded.</p> <p>Budget investment in reliable infrastructure alongside sound maintenance and effective monitoring and compliance is in the Board's opinion fundamental to achieving and holding to the objective of having untreated drinking water for the city long term.</p> <p>So to in the Board's view is the priority and investment required to safeguard our unique drinking water aquifers from contamination.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>The Board also reiterates its other comments (flood protection section) regarding the extent and importance of the land drainage projects planned for the south west.</p> |
| <p>Transport</p> <p>Making our city safer for people to travel in, whether by car, bicycle or on foot, has been a priority for this Council. We are keen to press on with these initiatives, to complete the network of cycleways, improve safety at more intersections and make the central city more accessible for everyone. We also want to restore our road condition to a level that is similar to other New Zealand cities over the next 20 years.</p> <p>What do you think our approach to managing our transport projects, and how we're prioritising this work?</p> <p>There has been a lot of feedback express community concerns about the dangers presented at a range of intersections (for example, Harewood, Breens and Gardiners Roads) and the state of many streets and footpaths. As a Council we wish to agree on a framework for prioritising intersection improvement and street and footpath renewals, to ensure we meet our residents' needs.</p> <p>What do you think we should take into account when prioritising the work that needs to be done?</p> <p>Do you think the priorities should be informed by the local Community Board?</p> | <p>By way of examples, the Board supports the funded inclusion of these local projects in the approved Long Term Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riccarton Bus Priority – Public Transport Corridor <p>The Board does ask that in the final Long Term Plan, a notation be included for this project to explain that the Design Plans for this project were approved by the Council in 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ilam/Middleton/Riccarton - Intersection Safety (and its link to the MCR Nor'west Arc project) • Lincoln Road Corridor <p>The Board restates its view on the importance of this strategic transport and public transport link for the rapidly growing areas in the south west and the Nga Puna Wai Sports Hub into the central city.</p> <p>The aligned proposed improvements at the Lincoln/Whiteleigh/Barrington Intersection are also endorsed by the Board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads and Footpaths (various) throughout Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton wards <p>The Board notes that many of these projects are described as Committed – contractually, Growth – critical, Growth – desirable, and Increased Levels of Service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division Street (at Riccarton Road) - entrance enhancements • Awatea/Carrs and Awatea/Owaka - pedestrian safety improvements • Halswell Junction Road Extension <p>The Board thanks the Council for the proposed \$3.7 million of funding in 2018-19 to enable completion of this strategic transport link.</p> <p>The Board was recently briefed on the commencement of a Corridor Study for Cashmere Road.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>While not wanting to pre-empt the outcome of the study, the Board would ask that funding is available in the Long Term Plan and/or Annual Plans to give effect to any approved outcomes from this important study.</p> <p>A specific site still requiring improvement is the intersection of Cashmere Road and Penruddock Rise.</p> <p>The Board has submitted a number of times on this location and records that an additional 400 sections are being developed at the top of Westmorland which will just add to the traffic management pressures at this intersection.</p> <p>The Board fully endorses the local elements of both the Nor'West Arc and Quarrymans Trail Major Cycle Route projects.</p> <p>In relation to the Quarryman's Trail, the Board asks that every opportunity be explored to tie the project implementation in with adjoining land development and the Council's own land drainage programmes in the North Halswell and Hendersons Basin areas.</p> <p>The Board recently received correspondence from the local Member of Parliament for crossing facilities to be provided in Princess Street so that employees of local businesses can safely cross the street.</p> <p>The Board puts forward this request on the basis that funding can be prioritised for a facility from the Council's road safety improvements budget.</p> <p>In response to the question posed, the Board embraces the idea that priority setting be informed by feedback provided by the community boards.</p> |
| <p>Facilities</p> <p>In this document we list our top priorities. The funding allocated will allow us to improve or complete a wide range of facilities that will benefit Christchurch now and in the future.</p> <p>Do we have the priorities rights? Are there other projects you would prioritise, and if so, what would you defer to free up funding?</p> <p>In this document we discuss a new funding method for community assets that are not owned by the Council but which benefit the community.</p> <p>What do you think of using a targeted rating system to help progress non-Council community projects?</p> | <p>The Board repeats its earlier endorsement and funding of these projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riccarton Community Centre <p>The Board asks that in the adopted Long Term Plan, a notation be provided to explain the budget provision of \$1,009 million is to complete the new building and that land sale proceeds and a prior budget allocation of \$1 million, will contribute to the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hornby Library, Customer Services and South West Leisure Centre • Linwood/Woolston Pool |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Are there projects in your community that could benefit from such an approach?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lyttelton Marina Project (Naval Point) <p>The Board believes in the fundamental importance of having a good mix of greenspace areas in new developments.</p> <p>Useable and attractive greenspace and reserve areas are a key feature in new subdivisions and in growing communities.</p> <p>There is a sense that some of the 'reserve' areas being provided in the south west have too much of a utility focus and are presented in a form that does not openly attract users.</p> <p>Actual land taken for open space is the Board's preference to the alternative of cash in lieu.</p> <p>While offering its support for the Multi-Purpose Arena, the Board considers this could be claimed to be a regional facility and accordingly, funding contributions from territorial authorities throughout the region would not be unreasonable.</p> <p>The Board repeats its support for the continuation of the Council's strategic land acquisitions programme as being critical in meeting the demands of future planned growth.</p> <p>The Board has mixed views on using targeted rates as a means of contributing to non-Council community projects.</p> |
| <p>Heritage</p> <p>We are keen to know your views on the almost depleted Central City Landmark Grant Fund, through which we have helped fund work to restore heritage buildings that are in private ownership.</p> <p>Do you think the Council should continue to contribute \$1.9 million per year to Landmark Grant Fund for the next three years?</p> | <p>The Board supports the Council's proposal to continue to contribute \$1.9 million per annum to the Landmark Grant Fund for the next three years.</p> <p>The Board notes with appreciation the proposed funding provision in 2018-19 towards the restoration of Chokebore Lodge.</p> |
| <p>Any other comments</p> | <p>The Board raises the aspirational idea of an indoor velodrome to serve the sporting needs of Christchurch and the region. Some funding in the Long Term Plan to initiate appropriate investigations on this proposal is therefore sought.</p> <p>The continuation of the Council's annual Community Grants Fund local programme, is endorsed.</p> <p>The Board has a view that the uptake of applications would benefit from additional publicity being carried out especially during the period when applications are being invited.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>With regard to the service standards for parks maintenance, the Board agrees with the Council's actions to reinstate the service levels for parks, reserves and riverbanks (6.4.1 <i>Neighbourhood Parks Activity Management Plan</i>).</p> <p>From the Board's perspective, having a high standard of greenspace maintenance is a core Council responsibility.</p> |
|--|--|

12 April 2018