



Local Government Commission

**Proposal for the abolition of Banks
Peninsula District and its inclusion in
Christchurch City**

COMMISSION'S FINDINGS AND DECISIONS

Proposal for the abolition of Banks Peninsula District and its inclusion in Christchurch City

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This document contains the Local Government Commission's findings and decisions in respect of the proposal for the abolition of Banks Peninsula District and its inclusion in Christchurch City.
- 1.2 On 4 November 2003 the Local Government Commission (the Commission) received a proposal, initiated by electors of Banks Peninsula District, for the abolition of Banks Peninsula District and its inclusion in Christchurch City. The proposal was initiated under clause 1(3)(c) of Schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act).
- 1.3 Upon receipt of the proposal, the Commission's Chief Executive Officer, in accordance with clause 34(2) of Schedule 3 of the Act, referred the proposal to the electoral officer of the Banks Peninsula District Council to check whether the required number of electors had made the proposal. On 24 November 2003 the Commission received advice from the electoral officer that the petition had been made by the required number of electors.

2.0 REPRESENTATIVE OF ELECTORS

- 2.1 As required by clause 36 of Schedule 3 of the Act, the Commission, after consultation with the proposers, determined that Mr David Bundy would be the representative of the electors for the purposes of the proposal.

3.0 CONSULTATION ON PROPOSAL

- 3.1 On 19 February 2004 the Commission called for public submissions on the proposal. In accordance with clause 37(c) of Schedule 3 of the Act the Commission also sought the views of:
 - the Banks Peninsula District Council;
 - the Christchurch City Council;
 - the representative of the electors;
 - the Auditor-General;
 - the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment;
 - the Secretary for Local Government;
 - the Secretary for the Environment;
 - the Chief Executive of Te Puni Kōkiri;
 - affected Māori organisations identified by Te Puni Kōkiri: Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, and five Banks Peninsula rūnanga;

- the Selwyn District Council; and
 - persons and organisations identified by the Banks Peninsula District Council and the Christchurch City Council as having a potential interest in the proposal.
- 3.2 In its public notice inviting submissions on the proposal, the Commission advised that it could consider how the proposal affected the system of local government in any district affected by the proposal. Under clause 40 of Schedule 3 of the Act this includes:
- which system of local government in the district best meets the criteria in subpart 2 of Schedule 3 of the Act, such as those relating to good local government;
 - whether or not good local government would be promoted by the inclusion of any part of the district in the district of another local authority (whether by the constitution of a new district or by the alteration of boundaries);
 - whether or not the system of representation in the district best meets the criteria of clause 5 of Schedule 3 of the Act, such as the requirement for fair and effective representation;
 - whether or not good local government of the district would best be promoted by:
 - the existing system of community boards and their responsibilities; or
 - an alternative system of community boards or responsibilities; and
 - any other matters the Commission considers appropriate.
- 3.3 The closing date for submissions was 30 April 2004. 142 submissions were received – 13 submissions were drawn from those persons and organisations detailed in paragraph 3.1 of this document. A list of submitters is attached as an Appendix to this document.
- 3.4 In accordance with clause 38 of Schedule 3 of the Act the Commission, on 3 May 2004, forwarded a copy of the submissions received to the representative of the electors, together with advice that the representative of the electors had 20 working days to notify the Commission in writing if he sought to withdraw the proposal. On 11 May 2004 the Commission received advice from the representative of the electors that he and his fellow proposers wished to proceed with the proposal.
- 3.5 To meet its obligations under clause 37(3) of Schedule 3 of the Act the Commission held separate meetings in Canterbury on 19 and 20 August 2004 with the representative of the electors and his fellow proposers, and representatives of the Banks Peninsula District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Canterbury Regional Council and Selwyn District Council. The Christchurch City Council advised that it wished to be heard at a hearing of submitters to be held in September 2004.

- 3.6 On 9 and 10 September 2004 the Commission held meetings in Lyttelton, Christchurch and Akaroa to hear those submitters who wished to speak to their written submissions. The Commission heard submissions from 28 persons and organisations, including the Christchurch City Council. Those persons and organisations are marked with an asterisk in the Appendix.
- 3.7 On 3 February 2005 the Commission met with representatives of the five Banks Peninsula rūnanga at Te Wheke marae, Rapaki.

4.0 OTHER ENQUIRIES AND CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 In addition to the various meetings, the Commission also initiated studies into:
- the communities of interest in Banks Peninsula District and of the linkages of those communities with neighbouring districts; and
 - the operational and financial issues associated with implementation of the proposal.
- 4.2 The communities of interest study was undertaken by Taylor Baines and Associates. It updated a previous study undertaken in 1998 by Martin Ward for the Commission. The report was made publicly available on 18 February 2005. The Commission has not received any comments on the report following its public release.
- 4.3 The operational and financial study was undertaken by Capital Strategy Limited. The draft report was provided to the Banks Peninsula District Council, the Christchurch City Council, the representative of the electors, the Selwyn District Council and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu for comment prior to its finalisation. The report was made publicly available on 15 April 2005. The Commission has not received any comments on the report following its public release.
- 4.4 The findings of these studies are discussed in Section Seven of this document.

5.0 SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS

- 5.1 The main points raised in the submissions of the parties consulted under clause 37(c) of Schedule 3 of the Act were as follows:
- the proposal is supported;
 - the proposal is opposed;
 - the proposal will provide the best system of local government for the combined area;
 - the Banks Peninsula District Council lacks, and always will lack, the resources and capacity to meet the demands for sound integrated management of Banks Peninsula;

- there is a need to ensure that rating is affordable and equitable for both Peninsula and City ratepayers if the proposal proceeds;
- the petition of electors which initiated the proposal by no means indicates that the majority of Banks Peninsula residents support the proposal;
- convincing arguments in favour of the proposal have yet to be presented – there is insufficient information to determine the benefits or otherwise of the proposal;
- there must be community support for change – it is unclear that there is any current strong support for change;
- the community must know that the “no change option” is available;
- there appears to be a case for including the Lyttelton Harbour Basin in Christchurch City and the balance of Banks Peninsula District in Selwyn District;
- there has been no significant interest or comment from residents of Banks Peninsula District or Selwyn District for a part amalgamation with Selwyn District;
- Banks Peninsula is an outstanding natural feature which would be greatly enhanced by the Christchurch City Council;
- a significant improvement in capacity for project work in Banks Peninsula could be expected from the Christchurch City Council, with that council taking a wider view of the benefits of potential projects than occurs at present;
- there is a strong option for local authorities to undertake joint initiatives and sharing of administrative services;
- Banks Peninsula representation would diminish on an enlarged Christchurch City Council – Banks Peninsula currently enjoys good representation, with approachable local councillors;
- Banks Peninsula residents need assurance that services levels would be maintained or enhanced if the proposal were put into effect;
- dividing Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) between two districts for land use planning under the Resource Management Act does not promote good territorial planning – if the proposal proceeds the catchment of Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) should be included in Selwyn District to better assist regional council responsibilities;
- the whole of the area of Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) should be included in Selwyn District if the proposal proceeds;
- Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) should be under the control of one territorial authority;
- the landscape character and environmental values of Banks Peninsula are of critical importance – achieving sustainable development of the Banks Peninsula area requires a more strategic approach to planning with input from the wider region as well as from local communities;
- Banks Peninsula is transitioning from a rural to semi-urban character – the Banks Peninsula District Council is under considerable pressure to provide a full range of services with a small rating base;

- the population and rating base of Banks Peninsula is inadequate to support local government functions in Banks Peninsula;
- the current local government boundaries do not reflect functional linkages in terms of landscape, property ownership, and commercial and recreational activities;
- the proposal is supported – Banks Peninsula should become a ward of the City, electing two councillors and with two community boards;
- the proposal is opposed on the basis of the information currently available – but if it does proceed then Banks Peninsula should be a ward of the City with at least one councillor, and the area should have one community board;
- the same delegations should be provided to new Banks Peninsula community boards as are conferred on the Christchurch City community boards; and
- the existing Banks Peninsula service centres should be retained.

5.2 The 129 general submissions covered much the same ground as the matters outlined in paragraph 5.1. Additional matters raised included:

- relatively small costs for infrastructure in Banks Peninsula have major local impacts on rates while the City could easily support improved services;
- it is important that the Banks Peninsula area be included in its totality in Christchurch City, and not spilt between adjoining authorities;
- a community board structure in Banks Peninsula could address detailed local issues that councillors would not have time to consider;
- Christchurch's seaport and airport should be in a common political boundary;
- Banks Peninsula should retain its own governing council;
- implementation of the proposal would incur significantly extra costs for Christchurch City and less local control for Banks Peninsula ratepayers;
- the Lyttelton Harbour Basin is virtually a suburb of Christchurch;
- implementation of the proposal would unfairly burden the ratepayers of Christchurch City with the costs of improving the infrastructure on Banks Peninsula;
- instead of implementing the proposal, consideration should be given to transferring parts of Christchurch City into Banks Peninsula District;
- the communities of interest represented by the Lyttelton-Mount Herbert Community Board and the Akaroa-Wairewa Community Board are distinct, and community boards for those areas should be retained;
- Lyttelton could be placed in the Ferrymead Ward for council elections, with the balance of the Banks Peninsula District comprising a new ward;

- the integrated management of the Port Hills would be better served by one local authority;
- the size and rural nature of the Banks Peninsula area would be quite daunting for the City Council to maintain and develop;
- there are no assured benefits to Banks Peninsula electors that would make up for the loss of local decision-making;
- Christchurch City electors might have no say on a proposal that will directly impact on them (i.e. no poll of Christchurch City electors on the proposal) – the abolition process is undemocratic for Christchurch ratepayers;
- Selwyn District should be considered for union with Christchurch City;
- Banks Peninsula residents would lose their say in what is happening in their area;
- Banks Peninsula District Council is exceeding its goals and objectives and consistently produces unqualified audit reports; and
- Māori have achieved good representation on the Banks Peninsula District Council, but would be unlikely to achieve such representation on the Christchurch City Council.

6.0 DISCUSSIONS OF PROPOSAL IN RELATION TO CRITERIA

- 6.1 Clause 3(1)(a) of Schedule 3 of the Act requires the Commission to satisfy itself that a proposal or scheme will “promote good local government” of the districts concerned. With regard to the word “promote”, the Commission is conscious that it has various meanings, but is satisfied that in the context of the legislation, the clear intention was that the word have the meanings: to advance, help forward, enhance, or improve. The expression “good local government” is not defined in the Act. However, the Commission has adopted a view, based on a consideration of section 10 of the Act (which sets out the purposes of local government), that the achievement of those purposes would be the basis of good local government. Additionally, clause 3 of Schedule 3 itself, by listing various requirements to be met, can, in the Commission’s opinion, be accepted as a strong indicator of matters to be taken into account in determining what may be good local government. When considering the various criteria set out in subclause (1) of clause 3, the Commission must consider also the factors in subclause (2) of that clause.
- 6.2 Clause 40 of Schedule 3 of the Act provides that the Commission may also consider wider issues. The issues that the Commission could consider are set out in paragraph 3.2 of this document.
- 6.3 By considering all the above factors, the Commission interpreted the expression “promote good local government” as meaning that implementation of the proposal would best improve or enhance the local government of the Banks Peninsula area.

7.0 CONSIDERATIONS OF CRITERIA IN CLAUSE 3 OF SCHEDULE 3 OF THE ACT

Subclause (1)(a) – whether the proposal will promote good local government of the districts concerned.

- 7.1 This is the principal criterion that the Commission must satisfy itself would be complied with if the proposal were given effect to. However, the obligations imposed by clause 3 of Schedule 3 of the Act will be met only if the Commission is satisfied that:
- implementation of the proposal will improve or enhance the ability of local government in the Banks Peninsula area to achieve the purposes of local government as set out in section 10 of the Act; and
 - all the requirements of clause 3(1)(b) of Schedule 3 of the Act are met.

Legislative challenges

- 7.2 Legislation enacted since 1989, particularly the relatively recent enactment of the Local Government Act 2002, is, in the Commission's view, increasing the demand for enhanced competencies in local government. Larger authorities, with their greater and more broadly based resources, will tend to have an advantage in providing the needed competencies. Likewise, a local authority must be sufficiently resourced to be able to put meaningful and realistic management of resources and financial planning into effect.
- 7.3 The Commission considers that there is a need for long-term management of resources and financial planning. The integrity of such planning must be maintained if a local authority is to be able to respond to the wishes and aspirations of its communities.
- 7.4 These issues have been canvassed in the Controller and Auditor-General's report – *Local Government - Looking Back and Looking Forward* – which was presented to the House of Representatives in May 2002. In his report the then Controller and Auditor-General made the following observations:

The legislative requirements are the same for every local authority, notwithstanding differences in geographical size and characteristics, population, and location. In addition, community aspirations and expectations of their local authority may be quite different as between (for instance) a small rural local authority and a larger urban local authority.

By the term 'capability' I mean both the financial resources and the human resource capacity to meet the expectations of the community and the requirements of legislation. The Councils of several small rural authorities have approached

us seeking dispensation for a more relaxed (or simplified) response to the legislative requirements. I have steadfastly resisted the temptation to go down this path.

However, the fact that such approaches have been made demonstrates that smaller local authorities (and even mid-sized ones) are struggling to provide the range of expertise needed (such as policy analysts, economists and experienced asset managers) to meet their legislative obligations. And, as I noted earlier, some Councils in areas of declining population and growth have not yet come to terms with the prospect of reassessing services which may be unaffordable in the long term.

The challenge for Councils is to face the realities of what they can achieve and what they cannot achieve. Already, we are seeing some adjoining Councils sharing administrative support, or jointly providing a service (e.g. libraries). Moving forward requires understanding the needs of the community – but, on the other hand, can often require overcoming parochial interests and political hurdles. I believe that sharing the joint effort will become a developing trend.

- 7.5 These comments need to be considered in the context of the Banks Peninsula District Council which, with a rating base of approximately 7,500 rateable properties, is required to provide a increasingly wide range of local government services to a small population, spread over a unique and challenging landscape.

Population and land information

- 7.6 In the 15 years from 1986 to 2001 the Banks Peninsula District's population increased by 15 percent, from 6,843 to 7,848. Over this period population growth occurred in the Lyttelton Harbour Basin and Little River areas, while the Outer Peninsula area (the area of Banks Peninsula east of Hilltop) experienced a decline in population (from 1,782 persons in 1986 to 1,683 persons in 2001). At the time of the 2001 Census the District ranked 67th out of 74 territorial districts on the basis of population.
- 7.7 In the 15 years from 1986 to 2001, the Christchurch City's population increased by 12 percent. Its 2001 Census population of 316,227 ranked the City 2nd in population terms.
- 7.8 Banks Peninsula District comprises an area of approximately 108,000 hectares, while Christchurch City comprises an area of approximately 45,000 hectares.

Community of Interest considerations

- 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.

- 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.

Financial and operational considerations

- 7.18 As noted above, the Commission requested Capital Strategy Limited to undertake a study into the financial and operational costs of various reorganisation options based on the proposal. Information was obtained from the Banks Peninsula District Council, Christchurch City Council and Selwyn District Council for the purposes of the study, and those councils, together with the representative of the electors and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, were provided the opportunity to comment on the draft report before it was finalised.
- 7.19 The Capital Strategy Limited report states that approximately \$27.3 million (GST excl.) of additional capital spending, over and above the Banks Peninsula District Council's budget estimates as contained in its Long Term Council Community Plan, would be required in Banks Peninsula over the next ten years to:
- maintain assets at their current service potential;
 - address water quality and environmental discharge compliance needs; and
 - provide appropriate increases in service levels, e.g. road safety improvements.
- 7.20 The report notes that while the Banks Peninsula District Council would be able to fund this additional capital spending through the sale of its investments (comprising managed funds and equity investments), the sale of some surplus properties and debt, the Council's debt by 2014 would be near its policy limit.
- 7.21 Accordingly, after 2014, the Council would not be able to raise any more debt to fund additional infrastructure spending beyond the margin that would arise from growth in the number of ratepayers and the margin to its policy limit.
- 7.22 The report states that if all of the investments were not able to be sold to fund the recommended new capital spending, then the viability of the Council could become an issue before 2014. The Council would also have major difficulty in withstanding an unexpected expenditure shock, e.g. as a result of a major storm event.
- 7.23 Capital Strategy Limited considers that the Council currently faces resourcing problems in a number of key areas:

In general we are impressed with the dedication of BPDC staff, and what they have achieved in many areas with a relatively small staff. However we consider that BPDC is not currently adequately resourced with sufficient staff and financial resources to:

- *meet the increasingly onerous requirements and obligations of the wide range and constant stream of*

new legislation and regulations that local government has to comply with; and

- *in the policy formulation and Bill phase of legislation to be able to advocate effectively on behalf of its residents and ratepayers. We have assumed one additional staff member is required in this area.*

Please note that this is not meant as a criticism of the current BPDC staff's or elected members' abilities or efforts; it is symptomatic of a wider problem that faces a number of smaller Councils.

The Council does not currently have an adequate understanding of the condition and remaining life of all of its infrastructure assets that would be expected if it was exercising prudent stewardship as required by the Local Government Act (this is a legacy of prior Councils over many years – over the last few years Council has been addressing this shortcoming). It is assumed additional staffing is required to improve this situation.

Current consents and permits are being processed in a reasonable timeframe. The BPDC database is not up to date. There are many consents and permits in the system from prior years. It is apparent that many of these records apply to applications that have not gone ahead, or are unlikely to have been proceeded with. The status of others is unclear. More staff resources are needed to bring the systems up to an appropriate standard and get the records up to date. In bringing the records up to date Council staff will be able to ascertain if any construction works by applicants in the system have proceeded without Council consents/permits or inspection for compliance.

It is arguable that BPDC does not have the depth of financial and staff resources of a larger Council necessary to adequately plan for or defend its policy position in relation to the RMA.

- 7.24 The report's findings are consistent with the concerns expressed about smaller authorities by the Controller and Auditor-General, as detailed in section 7.4 above. The Commission is of the view that if the proposal were implemented the Christchurch City Council would have the financial resources and staff capabilities to effectively address the local government needs of the Banks Peninsula area.
- 7.25 Small councils, such as the Banks Peninsula District Council, face a range of fixed costs to meet the costs of the democratic process, and to set up and operate corporate systems regardless of the number of ratepayers. Large local authorities can achieve economies of scale so

that the proportion of ratepayer money spent on administration and support is lower than what small councils have to spend.

7.26 Significant savings for Banks Peninsula ratepayers would accrue if the proposal were implemented. The following table shows the rates requirements for the Banks Peninsula District, applying the capital spending and other assumptions contained in the Capital Strategy Limited report, compared with the rates that would be imposed over the Banks Peninsula area if it formed part of Christchurch City. The assumptions take account of advice provided to Capital Strategy Limited by Christchurch City Council staff that the Council would apply its current rating policy, which generally takes a district-wide approach to areas of benefit, in the first full financial year following an implementation of the proposal, rather than continuing with the complex Banks Peninsula District Council policy in the transition period:

Annual rates requirement for Banks Peninsula area (\$000) GST excl.	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14
Abolition of BPDC and its area included in Christchurch City	8,276	8,588	9,301	9,782	10,165	11,126	12,228	13,043	13,621	14,660
BPDC continues	9,013	10,004	10,734	11,111	11,542	12,496	13,546	14,338	14,963	15,938
Increase/ (Decrease) in Rates Income Required	(737)	(1,416)	(1,433)	(1,329)	(1,377)	(1,370)	(1,318)	(1,295)	(1,342)	(1,278)

Annual costs savings in the Banks Peninsula area would average \$1,350,000 per annum (GST excl.) after the first year.

7.27 The implementation of the proposal would have negligible impact on the rating burden of the ratepayers of the existing Christchurch City. Capital Strategy Limited has advised the Commission that because the costs associated with the area of Banks Peninsula being incorporated with Christchurch City would be spread across the approximately 150,000 ratepayers of the enlarged City, the impact on current Christchurch City ratepayers is insignificant. The estimated rates income for Christchurch City in 2005/06 is \$194 million (GST incl.), or an average of \$1,366 (GST incl.) per ratepayer across the current 142,000 ratepayers. The new rating requirement in 2005/06, including the Banks Peninsula area, would be approximately \$204 million (GST incl.), or an average of \$1,360 (GST incl.) spread across about 150,000 ratepayers. Year 2 (2005/06) has been chosen for comparison purposes because in Year 1 there would be transition costs of \$973,000 (GST excl.) that offset cost savings to some extent.

7.28 The application of the Christchurch City rating policies to rateable properties in Banks Peninsula District would have a significant impact on the rates charged to rateable properties in Banks Peninsula District. The rating impact would not be uniform across all properties because of the relatively complex rating policies currently applied by the Banks Peninsula District Council. Some examples of the rating impact follow (readers should refer to the Capital Strategy Limited report at www.lgc.govt.nz for further details and examples, and information on the assumptions that apply – all amounts are GST incl.):

Area	Average capital value of a sample property (2005/06)	BPDC continues	Area included in Christchurch City
Wairewa Ward – rural	\$387,000	\$1,170	\$844
Wairewa Ward – Kaituna	\$427,500	\$1,231	\$920
Akaroa Ward – rural	\$427,500	\$1,332	\$920
Lyttelton-Mt Herbert Ward –rural	\$478,500	\$1,407	\$1,016
Akaroa Ward – residential	\$372,000	\$2,260	\$1,500
Lyttelton- residential	\$264,000	\$1,864	\$1,098
Little River – residential	\$228,000	\$1,172	\$769
Diamond Harbour – residential	\$235,500	\$1,724	\$924
Governors Bay – residential	\$408,000	\$1,701	\$1,517
Duvauchelle – residential	\$301,500	\$1,898	\$1,151
Akaroa Ward Bays – residential	\$306,000	\$925	\$883
Akaroa Ward Tikao Bay – residential	\$231,000	\$1,452	\$909
Akaroa Ward Takamatua – residential	\$328,500	\$1,279	\$1,058
Akaroa Ward Pigeon Bay – residential	\$252,000	\$1,360	\$838
Akaroa Ward Wainui – residential	\$229,500	\$1,792	\$774

Area	Average capital value of a sample property (2005/06)	BPDC continues	Area included in Christchurch City
Commercial Lyttelton	\$292,500	\$2,425	\$1,597
Commercial Akaroa	\$514,500	\$3,427	\$2,721
Lyttelton – Industrial	\$1,600,000	\$10,494	\$8,230

7.29 In addition to Banks Peninsula ratepayers receiving a significant financial advantage if the proposal were to proceed, the Commission is satisfied that the Christchurch City Council would be able to provide effective local government services across the area of the Peninsula. In particular, the Commission is satisfied that the Council has appropriate resource management expertise, and the ability to bring in any additional expertise required to address the concern of some submitters that the landscape and historic values of the Peninsula be retained and enhanced.

Promotion of good local government

7.30 Taking all the information provided to it into account, the Commission is of the view that a reorganisation scheme based on the proposal will promote the good local government of Banks Peninsula. The Commission is also satisfied that the proposal would promote the good local government of Christchurch City through enabling the enlarged City to effectively administer an area which is integrally linked to it and which is part of its broader community of interest.

7.31 Having determined that the proposal passes the test of good local government required under clause 3(1)(a) of Schedule 3 of the Act, the Commission is required to further consider the proposal against the criteria of subclauses (1)(b) and (2) of clause 3.

Subclause (1) (b)

(i) *Whether the Christchurch City Council will have the resources necessary to enable it to carry out its functions, duties and powers.*

7.32 Christchurch City Council is a large territorial authority, with approximately 142,000 rateable properties and rates funding in 2004/05 of approximately \$165 million (GST excl.). Banks Peninsula District Council has a rating base of approximately 7,500 properties and rates funding in 2004/05 of approximately \$9 million (GST excl.) – the billing address for more than 1,200 of these properties is located in Christchurch City.

7.33 While there would be transition costs associated with implementation of the proposal, including Year One costs of \$863,000 (GST excl.) for redundancy costs and \$110,000 (GST excl.) in transition costs for data

conversion (GST excl.), these costs would from the outset be more than offset by ongoing savings in areas such as democracy costs, information systems, computer costs, audit, legal, and vehicles.

- 7.34 Christchurch City already provides significant services on a contract basis to the Banks Peninsula District Council. This contract work is principally focused in the areas of reserves maintenance, water and sewer maintenance and building work.
- 7.35 The Commission is satisfied that the Christchurch City Council would have the resources necessary to enable it to carry out its functions, duties and powers if the proposal were put into effect.
- (ii) *Whether the Christchurch City Council would have a district which would be appropriate for the efficient and effective exercise of its role as specified in section 1 of the Act.*
- 7.36 Implementation of the proposal would require some administrative changes for the Christchurch City Council, and the Council and its staff will be required to give greater consideration to rural and peri-urban issues in their decision-making. The Commission is of the view that the Christchurch City Council has the capacity to bring in any additional expertise that it may require to administer a large rural area.
- 7.37 The Commission is satisfied that implementation of the proposal would provide a Christchurch City Council which would continue to be appropriate for the efficient and effective exercise of local government functions, duties and powers. The Commission also considers that implementation of the proposal would promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of the Banks Peninsula area on a sustainable and long-term basis.
- (iii) *Whether the Christchurch City Council would contain within its district a sufficiently distinct community of interest or sufficiently distinct communities of interests*
- 7.38 Taking into account the community of interest study prepared for the Commission, together with consideration of submissions and the matters discussed in paragraphs 7.9 to 7.17 of this document, the Commission is satisfied that this criterion would be met if the proposal were implemented.
- 7.39 While the Banks Peninsula area maintains three distinct communities of interest – Lyttelton Harbour Basin, Little River and Outer Peninsula – each of these areas has strong or developing linkages with Christchurch City. These linkages are developing through the increased mobility of Banks Peninsula residents and as a result of the significant growth of tourism activities on the Peninsula.

7.40 With the Akaroa Area School being the only secondary education provider in the Banks Peninsula District, Christchurch City continues to provide secondary education for the majority of the District's pupils. This educational linkage forms an important community connection with Christchurch for many families.

7.41 In the view of the Commission, implementation of the proposal would have no impact on the existing communities of interest in Christchurch City. No community ties would be severed by this proposal, rather there would be a reinforcement of existing and developing connections.

(iv) Whether the Christchurch City Council would be able to meet the requirements of section 76 of the Act.

7.42 Section 76 of the Act sets out requirements in relation to local authority decision-making. The Commission is satisfied that the Christchurch City Council would be able to meet its statutory requirements in this regard if the proposal were implemented.

Clause 3 subclause (2) paragraph (a): area of impact of functions, duties and powers of the Christchurch City Council; and paragraph (b): area of benefit of services provided.

7.43 The Commission considered the area of impact of functions, duties and powers of the Christchurch City Council for the proposed enlarged Christchurch City and the area of benefit of services provided and concluded that the proposed enlarged district would be appropriate for the delivery of those functions and services.

7.44 The Commission is of the view that the Christchurch City Council would have the ability to deliver appropriate services to the various parts of its enlarged district, and is therefore satisfied that the criterion is met in respect of the proposal.

Clause 3 subclause (2) paragraph (c): likely effects of the exclusion of any area from Christchurch City.

7.45 This criterion is not relevant to the proposal. Giving effect to the proposal would not leave a remainder district with diminished resources through the loss of any part of its district.

8.0 CONSIDERATION OF BEST FIT TO CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OF GOOD LOCAL GOVERNMENT

8.1 Having considered the proposal against the criteria of clause 3 of Schedule 3 of the Act, and in terms of the purposes of local government as specified in section 10 of the Act, the Commission is satisfied that the proposal meets the requirements of the criteria specified in clause 3 of Schedule 3.

8.2 In particular, the Commission is of the view that the proposal will promote the good local government of the Banks Peninsula area. The Commission has therefore determined to issue a draft reorganisation scheme for the abolition of Banks Peninsula District and the inclusion of its area within Christchurch City.

9.0 DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE SCHEME

9.1 The Commission received a number of submissions for variation to the proposal. They included:

- transferring the Lyttelton Harbour Basin area to Christchurch City and transferring the balance of the area of Banks Peninsula District to Selwyn District;
- transferring Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) to Selwyn District;
- transferring Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) and its catchment to Selwyn District;
- transferring Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) to Christchurch City;
- transferring the Port Hills area, in its entirety, to Christchurch City Council; and
- the proposition that if the Commission were to issue a reorganisation scheme then Christchurch City electors should have the opportunity to vote on the final scheme by way of a poll.

9.2 Two of these matters – transferring the total areas of Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) to Christchurch City and the Port Hills to Christchurch City – fall outside matters that the Commission can take into account in terms of the proposal. The Commission's powers, under clause 40 of Schedule 3 of the Act to consider wider issues, do not extend to it being able to provide for part of a district not affected by the proposal, in this case Selwyn District in respect of the areas of Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) and the Port Hills which fall within its district, being included in Christchurch City.

9.3 In terms of the proposition that most of the Banks Peninsula District should transfer to Selwyn District, the Commission did not consider that such a suggestion would enhance the good local government of the Banks Peninsula District to the extent that would be achieved through implementation of the proposal. While there are rural and some schooling connections to parts of Selwyn District, these do not outweigh the broader and deeper connections with Christchurch City.

9.4 The issue of the jurisdiction of Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) has been the subject of considerable deliberations by the Commission. The Selwyn District Council and the Canterbury Regional Council requested that the area of the lake currently within Banks Peninsula District should transfer to Selwyn District if the proposal were to proceed, while the Banks Peninsula District Council considered that the lake area should fall within one territorial jurisdiction and the Christchurch City Council considered that the matter required further consideration. The

views of the tangata whenua were similarly mixed. While Te Taumutu Rūnanga advised that if the proposal were to proceed its preference would be for the area to be included in Selwyn District, other persons at the hui at Te Wheke marae, Rapaki, on 3 February 2005, considered that as the Halswell catchment, which drains into the lake, flows through Christchurch City, it would be logical for the entire area of the lake and Kaitorete Spit to be included in Christchurch City.

- 9.5 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.
- 9.6 Several submitters expressed concern that Christchurch City electors would not have the opportunity to vote on the proposal if the Commission issued a final reorganisation scheme based on the proposal. The opportunity for Christchurch City electors to vote on a final scheme relating to this proposal would only arise if the Commission decided on a final scheme that involved the abolition of both Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula District, and the formation of a new City and City Council. In the view of the Commission such a scheme would go beyond the scope of “some modification or variation of the proposal” provided for under clause 39(a) of Schedule 3 of the Act when preparing a draft reorganisation scheme, as the scheme would be substantively different to the proposal. In any event, the Commission does not consider that the unnecessary disruption that would arise for the local governance of Christchurch City as a result of such a scheme would promote good local government.
- 9.7 The Commission has resolved to issue a draft reorganisation based on the proposal, i.e., the draft scheme provides that the Banks Peninsula District would be abolished and its entire area incorporated in Christchurch City.
- 9.8 For the purposes of the draft scheme the Commission has proposed that the scheme would come into force after the first election of the ward member and community board representatives for the Banks Peninsula area. An indicative date of 25 February 2006 for the election is included in the draft scheme. The actual date for an election would be set in any final reorganisation scheme issued in respect of this proposal.

9.9 It should be noted that in preparing a draft reorganisation scheme based on the proposal, the Commission has pursued an option not explicitly covered in the Capital Strategy Limited report. Capital Strategy Limited identifies in its report (section A2.4) the minor amount of operating costs associated with the Lake Ellesmere (Te Waihora) area. Because these costs are insignificant, the transfer of this area to Christchurch City, rather than to Selwyn District, would have no material effect on the results or conclusions reached in the report for the options reviewed.

10.0 BOUNDARIES (REQUIREMENTS OF CLAUSE 4 OF SCHEDULE 3)

10.1 The Commission certifies that, in respect of the abolition of Banks Peninsula District and its inclusion in Christchurch City, the boundaries of the enlarged Christchurch City would still conform to the boundaries of statistical meshblock areas determined by Statistics New Zealand and used for Parliamentary electoral purposes.

10.2 As both existing districts fall within the boundaries of the Canterbury Region, the implementation of the proposal has no impact on regional boundaries.

10.3 The requirements of clause 4 of Schedule 3 of the Act would therefore be met by the proposal.

11.0 REPRESENTATION AND MEMBERSHIP

11.1 In deciding to issue a draft reorganisation scheme based on the proposal, the Commission had to determine the representation for the Banks Peninsula area on the enlarged Christchurch City Council. The criteria for determining representation are set out in clause 5 of Schedule 3 of the Act which provides as follows:

If a joint committee of the affected local authorities or the appointed local authority or the Commission is required to determine the membership of a local authority as a consequence of any reorganisation proposal or scheme, the joint committee of the affected local authorities or the appointed local authority or the Commission must –

(a) provide for the effective representation for individuals and communities of that local authority; and

(b) comply with the requirements of the Local Electoral Act 2001; and

(c) take into account the responsibilities, duties and powers of that local authority.

- 11.2 Clause 59(2)(b)(ii) of Schedule 3 of the Act provides that the Commission, in preparing a reorganisation scheme, can prescribe ward or constituency membership which does not need to comply with section 19V of the Local Electoral Act 2001.
- 11.3 In considering ward arrangements for the Banks Peninsula area, the Commission noted that each of the 12 councillors in the existing Christchurch City represents, on average, 26,352 residents (2001 Census). In this context, a single member ward comprising the area of Banks Peninsula, with a 2001 census population of 7,833, would not comply with the requirements of section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001.
- 11.4 Similarly, the option of enlarging an existing City ward to encompass all or part of the Banks Peninsula area would not comply with the requirements of section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001. The Commission also considered that such options would not appropriately reflect community of interest considerations.
- 11.5 After a careful consideration of the issues, the Commission came to the view that in the context of an enlarged Christchurch City the Banks Peninsula area could be considered to be an isolated community requiring specific representation in terms of section 19V(3) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 for the following reasons:
- roading access to Christchurch City from the Outer Peninsula can be restricted in winter or storm conditions, and roading access from Lyttelton to Christchurch may at times be totally dependent on the Lyttelton Tunnel being open for traffic;
 - parts of the Peninsula are geographically isolated, with limited roading access; and
 - significant travel times can be incurred from parts of the Peninsula in accessing council services and in enabling effective representation.
- 11.6 Having determined that the Banks Peninsula area would be an isolated community requiring specific representation in order to provide effective representation for the area, the Commission is satisfied that a single member Banks Peninsula Ward should be constituted.
- 11.7 The enlarged Christchurch City Council would therefore have 13 members and the Mayor.

12.0 COMMUNITY BOARD STRUCTURE IN THE BANKS PENINSULA WARD

- 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.
- 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.

13.0 POWERS OF COMMUNITY BOARDS

- 13.1 The Commission has been advised by the Christchurch City Council that, in respect of a single community board for the Banks Peninsula area, the Council would wish to provide the community board with the same delegations conferred on the existing Christchurch City community boards, subject to the following variations:
- the board would have the power to recommend to the Council proposed expenditure from its reserve contributions account; and
 - the board would be provided with discretionary funding of \$20,000 (GST excl.) per annum.

- 13.2 For the purposes of the draft reorganisation scheme, the Commission has determined that the Lyttelton-Mount Herbert Community Board and the Akaroa-Wairewa Community Board should each have the same delegations conferred on the existing Christchurch City community boards, subject to the following variations:
- each board would have the power to recommend to the Council proposed expenditure from its reserve contributions account; and
 - each board would be provided with discretionary funding of \$10,000 (GST excl.) per annum.

14.0 OTHER MATTERS

Service Centres

- 14.1 The draft reorganisation scheme provides for the retention of the Lyttelton, Akaroa and Little River service centres for a period of at least five years from the date that a final scheme is implemented. Each service centre would, as a minimum, maintain the same levels of service existing at the time that the Banks Peninsula District Council is dissolved.

Rating System

- 14.2 The draft scheme also provides for the Capital Value rating system of the existing Christchurch City to apply to the Banks Peninsula Ward.

Transition issues

- 14.3 Although the Act does not empower the Commission to specify that a transitional committee should be constituted under the draft scheme, it considers that the two councils should carefully consider the benefits of forming a joint committee to deal with transition issues. Some of the issues that such a committee might consider include:
- (a) undertaking preparatory work relating to the Banks Peninsula area for the 2006/07 draft annual plan for the enlarged Council;
 - (b) 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
 - (c) 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
 - (d) making recommendations to the Christchurch City Council on such other administrative matters 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.

- 14.4 The Commission considers that the Councils should consider involving a representative of local Banks Peninsula iwi on any joint committee formed to deal with transition issues.

Local Acts

- 14.5 The draft scheme provides for changes to the membership of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993 and the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 as a consequence of the abolition of the Banks Peninsula District Council.

Orion shares

- 14.6 The Banks Peninsula District Council currently owns 1.65% of Orion Group Limited. There are pre-emptive rights and a defined process associated with the sale of these shares under the company's constitution. The Banks Peninsula District Council has sought clarification from the Commission on how these shares would be allocated if the proposal were to proceed. In the view of the Commission, the Council's shareholding would transfer to the Christchurch City Council when the reorganisation scheme takes effect in accordance with clause 67(c) of Schedule 3 of the Act, which provides that:

all real and personal property vested in an abolished local authority vests in its successor, subject to all existing encumbrances.

- 14.7 The vesting of Orion shares in the Christchurch City Council would not involve a sale. In the Commission's view the pre-emptive rights process in the company's constitution would not be initiated.

15.0 DECISIONS

15.1 After considering:

- the submissions it had received on the proposal;
 - the information it had obtained during its own investigations since the receipt of the proposal; and
 - the provisions of Parts 1 and 2 of Schedule 3 of the Act,
- the Commission made the decisions outlined in the following paragraphs.

15.2 The Commission:

- considered what system of local government in the Banks Peninsula area would best meet the criteria in Subpart 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 3 of the Act; and
- being satisfied that a reorganisation scheme resulting from the proposal for the abolition of the Banks Peninsula District and the inclusion of its district in Christchurch City would best promote good local government for the Banks Peninsula area; and
- being satisfied that the inclusion of any part of the Banks Peninsula District in the district of another local authority would not promote the good local government of either district;

resolved, pursuant to clause 39(a) of Schedule 3 of the Act, to issue a draft reorganisation scheme which will implement the proposal for the abolition of Banks Peninsula District and the inclusion of its area in Christchurch City.

15.3 The Commission considered which system of representation would best meet the criteria specified in clause 5 of Schedule 3 of the Act and resolved that the draft scheme would make provision for representation of the residents of Banks Peninsula area of the enlarged Christchurch City through the establishment of a Banks Peninsula Ward covering the area of the existing Banks Peninsula District, to be represented by one member.

15.4 The Commission considered whether the good local government of the Banks Peninsula area of the enlarged Christchurch City would be best promoted by -

- the existing system of communities and functions, duties and powers of community boards;
- an alternative system of communities; or
- a change in the functions, duties and powers of the community boards

and resolved that the draft scheme provide for –

- the establishment of the Lyttelton-Mount Herbert Community Board, comprising five elected members and one appointed member (being the member of the Council for the Banks Peninsula Ward);
- the establishment of the Akaroa-Wairewa Community Board, comprising five elected members (three elected from the Akaroa

Subdivision and two elected from the Wairewa Subdivision) and one appointed member (being the member of the Council for the Banks Peninsula Ward); and

- the community boards having the powers delegated to the existing Christchurch City community boards at the date that a final scheme is implemented, subject to the following two variations:
 - each board would have the power to recommend to the Christchurch City Council proposed expenditure from its reserve contributions account; and
 - each board would be provided with discretionary funding of \$10,000 (GST excl.) per annum.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION

Grant Kirby, Chairman
Linda Constable, Commissioner
Kerry Marshall, Commissioner

29 April 2005

APPENDIX

Submissions on the proposal were made by the following persons and organisations (an asterisk denotes that the submitter also appeared before the Commission):

Organisations consulted under clause 37(1)(c) of Schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 2002:

Banks Peninsula District Council *	Christchurch Combined Residents Association Inc
Christchurch City Council *	Department of Conservation (Canterbury Conservancy)
The Proposers *	Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc.) *
Selwyn District Council *	Lyttelton Residents and Ratepayers Guild *
Canterbury Regional Council *	Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment
Lyttelton Port Company Limited *	Takamatua Ratepayers' and Residents' Association
Ministry of Transport	

Public Submissions:

Rodney Chambers	Joy McLeod	Sheila M Lovell
Scott Butcher	John Riminton	Ivan Craw
Shirley Goodwin	JH and FM Simcott	Raymond W Adams
Karen Chambers	Richard Menzies	LJ and JL Inwood
TD Carrell	JR Mills *	K Smith
Terence Boucherie	Josie Yeates	V Adams
Ursula Boucherie	Audrey Harris	Doug Columbus
P Beban	Kenneth Harris	A & N de Kort
MC Day *	Lesley M Barnett	Suky Thompson *
Jeremy Agar *	Lorna & Bert Laing	O, A & V Rolton
Sue Stubenvoll	E Allen	Kate Sabiston
Myles White	Diana Harrison	Gaylene Saunders
Aubrey D Smith	Jens Christensen *	Maryrose Ansell
David Robinson	Klaus Rexer	Paul F Pritchett
AG Talbot	Mark Sadler	Jo Rolley *
RJF Barnett	KB Neal	Gregory Offer & Joanne Hay
Harry C Evison	Rosemary Fraser	Graham Tate
PB Thorp	Douglas Couch *	Ken Couling *
Doug McBride	Michael de Hamel *	Christopher and Robyn Grigg
Doug Illingworth	FM, RM, DA and AN Brown	Laura Haslam
Roger D Lascelles	Gabriella Barbara	Ken Sitarz
Steve Lowndes *	Brian Saunders	Lynne Sitarz
Duncan Whyte	David Wrathall	Stuart Pringle
Alan & Jo Mason	Steve & Christine Henderson	Andrew B Daly
Howard Williams	Warren Hardwick *	Dr Brent Martin
Miles K Cross	Margaret Jefferies	JP Thacker
Stephen Shimmin	Bridget O'Brien	SJ & IA Irving
Paddy Stronach	Graeme Hall	LAO Thelning
Patricia Laird	John Skilton	J Corboy *
Rex Harrison *	Martin Towers	J Parker
Wendy Everingham	Richard Moylan	M McSweeney
Alison Ross *	Robert McCaw	TR Marshall
Karen Aitken	Rodney Chambers	Bob Parker *
Tony Aitken	Ann & Paul Jolliffe	Alastair Craw
Barry Brunton	LN Smith	Pam Richardson *
Mary & Peter Botha	John West	Stewart Miller *
Janet Talbot	Andrew Dalglish	Helen Broughton & David Cox *
Richard Barnett	Esther & Glyn Phillips	Victoria Andrews *
Malcolm Frost	Claire Findlay	Jim Hopkins*
PaulusTelfer *	J, L & M Cook & David Brailsford *	Lorraine Griffiths
Mr & Mrs Pearson	Murray Thomas	Claudia Reid & Christopher Moore
Hazel Tait	Members, Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Ward *	GRL & EA Findlay & JE Porteous
Matiu Cookson	Ferrymead Residents Group	EcoEng Limited