

3. CORRESPONDENCE

3.1 Belle Melzer – Letter of Appreciation

The following letter of appreciation has been received from Belle Melzer:

Thank you very much for the Community Service Award, an honour that means a great deal to me.

I look forward to continuing our work together to realise the visions we have for our city and for our communities.

Chairperson's

Recommendation: That the letter be received.

3.2 Hon Ruth Dyson – Low Sulphur Diesel

The Hon Ruth Dyson agreed at the Board's September MP's meeting to follow up on Christchurch low sulphur diesel availability. The following response has been received from Evelyn Cole of the Ministry of Economic Development:

Christchurch is receiving some of the lowest sulphur diesel in New Zealand. BP has been selling low sulphur diesel 500ppm (parts per million) in Christchurch since December 2000. It made the decision to supply lower sulphur diesel inspired by its global environmental campaign called the 40 Cities campaign. BP has a contract with the New Zealand Refining Company to supply it with the lower sulphur diesel for the Christchurch market. At the present time the Marsden Point Oil Refinery is only able to make small batches of lower sulphur diesel, so it is not possible for all New Zealand to receive diesel with 500ppm sulphur levels.

The regulated diesel sulphur levels are:

- for Auckland and Northland regions average sulphur level of 1,000ppm, maximum level per batch 1,400ppm.*
- for the rest of NZ average sulphur level of 2,200ppm, maximum level per batch 3,000ppm.*

From 1 August 2004, all New Zealand will have the same regulated diesel sulphur level of 500ppm average, maximum level per batch 600ppm, and from 1 January 2006, a maximum level of 50ppm.

(The other supplier whose diesel sulphur levels are usually 500ppm is Gull Petroleum. It does not supply the South Island at present. It also does not advertise its diesel as meeting a 500ppm specification, whereas BP does in respect of Christchurch. I understand that BP has been trying to negotiate with the Christchurch City Council for it to be supplied with lower sulphur diesel. It has not to date been successful. Lower sulphur diesel is more costly to produce.)

Chairperson's

Recommendation: That the information be received.

3.3 Hon Trevor Mallard – Withdrawal of SPARC Funding

The following letter has been received from the Hon Trevor Mallard in response to a letter expressing the Board's concerns about the process by which SPARC funding was withdrawn from the Community Sport Fund:

Thank you for your letter of 9 October expressing your Board's concerns at SPARC's decision to cease contributing to the Community Sport Fund.

I have been advised by SPARC that the decision to cease contribution to the CSF is part of a major shift in the way SPARC will use its funding to achieve its strategic goals.

In SPARC's strategic vision, the Sport Development operational unit will:

- *Help to co-ordinate the delivery of services across the sector through key funding contracts;*
- *Work with regional sports trusts;*
- *Work with groups to increase the number of volunteers, and to make them ore effective;*
- *Help to make changes to Government policy that will enable the sector to grow;*
- *Improve the linkage between regional sporting infrastructure and schools; and*
- *Target key organisations to develop and up-skill their people.*

In SPARC's launch document, SPARC recognised the role of local government in promoting community schemes that deliver more participation in physical recreation. I understand SPARC has now completed consultation with all Councils throughout the country to find out how best to get more people, more active, more often.

I have been advised that SPARC will publish a discussion paper within the next two months and that it intends to hold a further round of meetings with Councils in the first quarter of 2003.

I confirm my support for constructive partnerships between SPARC and local authorities and community boards and I look forward to advice on progress towards this over the next few months."

Chairperson's

Recommendation: That the information be received.

3.4 Heathcote Valley Community Association Inc – Rezoning of the Maltworks Site

A copy of the following letter addressed to the Regulatory and Consents Committee has been received from Colin Powick, President of the Heathcote Valley Community Association Inc. for the Board's information:

Thank you for your recent letter dated 21 June. May I apologize for our delay in replying, the secretary and myself were absent at the June meeting. Your letter had previously been circulated prior to the July meeting. At subsequent meetings of the Association, July, August and September the following points were brought forward in the discussions.

Although the members realise there is some difficulty in Council applying to rezone the land, it was felt a sign of support would not have gone a miss. It was felt that the present piecemeal use did nothing to enhance the area. There was concern that existing use rights may well be questioned. There was obvious deterioration and dilapidation around the edge of the site. It was pointed out , that when the maltworks were running there was regular maintenance done and the landscaping kept up. Now buildings were unpainted and unmaintained, with possible dangers like asbestos in some of the roofs. The landscaping had been badly neglected and now looked a mess.

The members were still of the same mind, that the Councillors, Mr. David Cox and Ms. Sue Wells should see the site at first hand. The meeting felt that there might be some compromise that could be reached where the periphery of the site was tidied up and landscaped, to at least mitigate the visual adverse effects. A lot of the land abutting Port Hills road may well be Council road. Landscaping or trees in this area would certainly help. In fact there are probably only two road frontage areas of concern. Some part of the site viewed from Martindales road near the railway bridge and the Port Hills road. We would ask the Council to try and think out of the square for the moment. Possible measures to mitigate the adverse effects could be the Council working with the owners, maybe accepting land around the periphery of the site as an early part payment of reserve contribution ahead of any development. Then once owning the land undertaking some tree planting. Trees in the areas previously mentioned would go a long way to reducing the impact on the village. Planting trees or similar landscaping in land areas that the Council already own.

After our meeting in July, the secretary was requested to write to the owners and we have been waiting for a response, but to no avail. As a result we have held off sending this letter in case we were able to take up some dialogue with the directors of the company. We now believe it is time for the Council to take some action. It was felt that the Hagley Ferrymead Board should also be involved and we will copy this letter to them for their comments. It should be pointed out that during this time the owners have continually worked at demolishing certain of the smaller out buildings. So it would appear they have a development plan and schedule in mind.

We realize the Council has constraints on the finance available, but would stress this is an urgent case, that will only get worse if something is not done soon. We await the Committee's positive response. Should you require any further information please contact me.

A copy of a previous letter sent to the Board on rezoning the Maltworks site is attached for the Board's information.

Colin Powick has subsequently advised that the Association has received a reply from the Consents and Regulatory Committee. David Cox and Sue Wells are to meet representatives of the Association on site at a time yet to be arranged.

Chairperson's

Recommendation: That the information be received.

3.5 Englefield Residents Association – Neighbourhood Improvement Plan

The following letter has been received from Bona Anna, Vice-Chairperson, Englefield Residents Association:

I am writing on behalf of the Englefield Residents Association. We are very keen to see positive developments in our area and in the inner east side of our city generally. The members of our Association work consistently hard to support initiatives that will improve Christchurch's eastern side for the benefit of all residents and visitors.

In 1994 the Gilby Neighbourhood Improvement Plan was prepared for the Environmental Planning and Policy Unit of the Christchurch City Council. This report proposed many excellent improvements for this area. However, it has not as yet been implemented. (The Gilby Neighbourhood Group has since changed its name to the Englefield Residents Association Inc.)

This year, as a result of the council's community consultation for the works on Avonside Drive, another document has been presented, The Avonside Drive River Road Corridor: Report on Traffic and Environmental Matters. Our Association, together with neighbouring community and residents' groups, is presently considering a response to this report.

It seems timely, therefore, to propose that a project to improve the Englefield area be included in the next funding round. The two documents already mentioned could form the basis of a revamped 2003 improvement plan. We propose that the Council, the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board and the Englefield Residents Association work together to finalise an improvement plan which draws from both documents and which satisfactorily integrates the best features of both.

The Englefield Residents Association is always willing to work co-operatively with local bodies to carry through positive projects. We are an inspired and motivated group who love Christchurch and who enjoy living in the Englefield area. We look forward to, and support, community development in partnership with the Christchurch City Council and the Hagley-Ferrymead Community Board.

In anticipation of a positive response.

Chairperson's

Recommendation: That the letter be referred to the Urban Planning Team for a report back to the Board including a wider update on Neighbourhood Improvement Plans and the process for implementing Neighbourhood Improvement Plans.

3.6 Grand Lodge of New Zealand R.A.O.B –Legal Arts Project

The following letter has been received from Bernhard A J Wilson, Woolston R.A.O.B Lodge Secretary:

On Tuesday, 15 October 2002, Sharon Williams attended our Lodge meeting and spoke about the programme in relation to the graffiti problem with our Lodge building. We are really impressed by similar projects which have been carried out in Christchurch through the Legal Arts Programme initiative. On her advice, I am now writing to you to request that you consider our Lodge building to be part of this worthwhile project.

For some years our building has been the target of graffiti vandalism, and this problem has been getting worse over the past six months. Our attempts to rectify the problem by painting over the graffiti are expensive and demoralising, as the vandalism persists despite our efforts.

Our Lodge is part of 133 minor Lodges throughout New Zealand, each of which is non-profitable and governed by our national body, the Grand Lodge of New Zealand, R.A.O.B. GLE. The finance raised through our meetings comes from the pockets of individual members, and the money is transferred back into the community by donations to organisations and charities, such as seeing-eye dogs, Cholmondeley Home, the Bone Marrow Transport fund, Lyttelton St Johns, the Sumner Life-Boat Institute, Girl Guides, the Westpac Helicopter Trust fund, the NZ Foundation for the Blind, the Cot Death Society, to name a few.

Our Lodge believes that the Legal Arts Programme is an excellent solution to the graffiti problem; it is a positive, proactive approach and is to be commended. Our Lodge building is on a very busy road, and we take pride in maintaining our building and keeping the grounds tidy. We are, if necessary, prepared to contribute to this programme, to assist in its implementation. I trust you will consider our application in a favourable light.

A report on this project has been prepared by Sharon Williams, Legal Art Co-ordinator (refer clause 4) and should be considered with this letter.

The Community Advocate comments: The Lodge building is situated at 538 Ferry Road. I have been advised that the Lodge owns the building and that the Lodge has been meeting the cost of removing graffiti from the building. I am supportive of the legal art concept, but am also aware that the Board's funding guidelines include a presumption against funding metropolitan organisations.

Chairperson's

Recommendation: That the Board decline the request for funding in view of the organisation being a national/metropolitan group.