

22. 7. 99

**RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD  
16 APRIL 1999**

**A meeting of the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board  
was held on Friday 16 April 1999 at 4.00pm**

**PRESENT:** Mike Mora (Chairperson), Paddy Austin,  
Neville Bennett, Helen Broughton, David Buist,  
Mary Corbett, Ishwar Ganda, Bob Shearing and  
Alison Wilkie

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Mr Alec Ford (Deans Avenue Precinct Society),  
Martin Maguire (Community Advocate) and  
Dale Wreford (Committee Secretary).

**INTRODUCTION**

The special meeting of the Community Board was called to consider a discussion document, "Review of Wards and Community Board Boundaries and Council Elections" in order to prepare a submission for the Local Government Commission on behalf of the Board by 5.00 pm on 19 April 1999.

The Christchurch City Council had resolved to review its membership and the ward system during 1999. This was in order to provide time to consider the alternative proposals prior to 2001, respond to the Local Government Commission's request and contemplate the possible effects that may result if the proposed union with Banks Peninsula District proceeds.

The Community Board reports that:

**PART B – REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**1. REVIEW OF WARDS AND COMMUNITY BOARD BOUNDARIES AND  
COUNCIL ELECTIONS**

**Board Discussions**

Concern was expressed at the short time frame available for the preparation of submissions, and the consequent lack of opportunity for each Board to consult with its immediate neighbouring Community Board, ie Fendalton/Waimairi, Spreydon/Heathcote and Hagley/Ferrymead.

**Riccarton/Wigram Community Board 16.4.99**

**1 Cont'd**

The Board also was of the opinion that the boundary issue should be discussed in depth and then finalised once the Banks Peninsula District amalgamation matter is decided.

**Preface to Submission**

It was noted that the Board was of the view that it did not go along with change for the sake of change. The Board would only support any such proposals for change if these were seen to be of demonstrable benefit to the ratepayers, and could be seen to strengthen the community of interest. It was also noted that there had been no strong demand from the community for changes to be made.

**Discussion of Issues**

The following issues (in bold) were considered, and the Board's response noted immediately after each heading.

**1.1 Should the Council be elected at large? (The 1997 review submission rejected this option).**

The Board considered, that, as the current system has proved satisfactory and is working well, the current ward system be retained, rather than the Council being elected at large.

**1.2 How many Councillors should be elected to the City Council? (24 at present).**

It was noted that the Riccarton Residents' Association had requested in writing that the *status quo* remain. The Deans Avenue Precinct Society representative, Mr Alec Ford, who was at the meeting, also endorsed this request on behalf of his organisation.

The consensus of the Board was that the number of Councillors elected to the City Council should be 24, plus 2, should amalgamation with Banks Peninsula District proceed, (ie a post amalgamation total of 26 Councillors).

**1.3 How many wards do you see as being appropriate? (12 at present).**

During discussion, the meeting considered the perceived lack of common interest within a ward between, for example, the inner city dwellers and those residing at Taylors Mistake. It was suggested that it might be more appropriate to identify the community of interest and then fit the wards around these, rather than the other way around. The Board envisaged that such a radical change may eventually take place, but this was not necessarily the right time to achieve this.

The Board was in agreement that the *status quo* remain in place, ie that there be 12 wards.

22. 7. 99

**Riccarton/Wigram Community Board 16.4.99**

**1 Cont'd**

**1.4 How many communities and Community Boards do you see as being appropriate? (6 at present).**

The Board considered that six communities and Community Boards be retained as at present.

**1.5 How many Community Board members and how many appointed Councillors should be on each Board? (6 and 3 respectively at present).**

There was a feeling amongst Board members that if Councillors are elected, they should be part of the Community Board and be able to represent their ward, although some concern was expressed against any radical structural change.

The Board agreed by consensus that, should the *status quo* be retained for the number of wards, provision be made for the inclusion of a fourth Councillor member of the Community Boards.

**1.6 Should the boundaries of the communities and Community Boards be altered?**

The Board was of the opinion that the boundaries should remain as they are at present.

**1.7 Are the Council's six existing service centres and associated Community Board facilities in appropriate locations?**

The Board agreed by consensus that the six existing service centres and associated Community Board facilities are in appropriate locations for the foreseeable future needs of the community.

**2. PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS**

Mr Alec Ford, having listened to the discussion on the issues before the Board, advised that, in his opinion, his Association would generally be in agreement with the Board's submissions.

The meeting concluded at 5.30 pm.

**CONFIRMED THIS 5TH DAY OF MAY 1999**