

Christchurch City Council

BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA NO 239

WEDNESDAY 16 AUGUST 2006

5.00 PM

IN THE BOARDROOM, CNR BERESFORD AND UNION STREETS NEW BRIGHTON

Community Board: Glenda Burt (Chairperson), Carole Evans, Carmen Hammond, Caroline Kellaway, Tina Lomax, Don Rowlands, Gail Sheriff

Community Board Principal Adviser				
Clare Sullivan				
Telephone:	941-6601			
Fax:	941-6604			
Email:	clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz			

Acting Community Secretary

Leanne Smith	1
Telephone:	941-6624
Fax:	941-6604
Email:	leanne.smith@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

- PART B REPORTS FOR INFORMATION
- PART C DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

PAGE

3	PART C	1.	APOLOGIES
-	PART C	2.	CONFIRMATION OF REPORT
-	PART B	3.	PETITIONS
-	PART B	4.	CORRESPONDENCE
-	PART B	5.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
-	PART B	6.	RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY GROUPS
4	PART C	7.	ROAD NAMING
5	PART C	8.	BURWOOD/PEGASUS YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
7	PART C	9.	CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT WORKING PARTY
9	PART B PART B PART B PART B	10.	COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE 10.1 Notice of Upcoming Board Reports 10.2 CSR Calls Update - July 10.3 Burwood/Pegasus Community Board Objectives 2006-09
-	PART B	11.	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ADVISER'S UPDATE



- 2 -

- 9 PART B 12. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS 2.16
- PART B 13. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS 4.1
- PART B 14. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
- PART B 15. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORT

The report of the ordinary meeting of the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board held on Wednesday 2 August 2006 has been circulated to Board members.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the report of the ordinary meeting held on Wednesday 2 August 2006 be confirmed.

3. PETITIONS

4. CORRESPONDENCE

5. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

6. RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY GROUPS

Time is allocated at Board meetings for Residents' Association/Community Group representatives to address the Board on local matters. Each group is being invited to do this in rotation.

Don Rowlands will provide an update from the Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust.

- 4 -

7. ROAD NAMING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
Officer responsible:	Environmental Policy and Approvals Manager
Author:	Bob Pritchard, Subdivisions Officer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to obtain the Board's approval to one new road name.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2. The approval of proposed road and right of way names is delegated to Community Boards.
- 3. The Subdivision Officer has checked all proposed names against the Council's road name database to ensure they will not be confused with names currently in use. The names have also been discussed with staff at Land Information NZ who act on behalf of the emergency services in respect to road naming.

Kingsbridge Drive/Brooker Avenue - Enterprise Homes Limited

A residential subdivision creating 89 new allotments is under construction on a large block of land situated between the end of Brooker Avenue and Travis Road, and west of Kingsbridge Drive. The subdivision will extend Brooker Avenue about 30 metres, and Kingsbridge Drive will extend west through the block to service the majority of the allotments. One new cul-de-sac running north off the extension of Kingsbridge Drive, will serve the remaining allotments (**plan attached**).

One new road name is required for the new cul-de-sac. The applicant company has proposed the following names for consideration by the Board: **Flaxon Fells; Swiftbridge Place; Paradise Place** and **Belletti Place**. With the exception of Belletti, all names are associated with swamps or wetlands, and as such, are in keeping with the locality, the subdivision is on the opposite side of Travis Road to the Travis Wetland Nature Heritage Park. Belletti is the name of a famous Italian football player, proposed because of the proximity to the playing fields and reserve.

There is a possibility of confusion between Belletti Place and the existing names Betty Place and Bellina Place. The policy on road names specifies that personal names used should be those of prominent Cantabrians or New Zealanders, or having a long standing connection with the land being subdivided. Belletti is not in line with the policy. Paradise Place, and the existing Paradyne Place may also be confused. There are 18 names in use in Christchurch that finish with "bridge", although none of them should be confused with Swiftbridge Place. There are no names similar to Flaxon Fells.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. The administration fee for road naming is included as part of the subdivision consent application fee, and the cost of name plates is charged to the developer. There is no financial cost to the Council. Local Authorities have a statutory responsibility to approve road names.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approve the name "Flaxon Fells" for the new cul-de-sac running north off Kingsbridge Drive.

- 5 -

8. BURWOOD/PEGASUS YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	Recreation and Sports Manager
Author:	Jacqui Leask, Burwood/Pegasus Community Recreation Adviser Marion Morton, Burwood/Pegasus Community Development Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to discuss the Youth Development Scheme, specifically to review the current Burwood/Pegasus Youth Development Scheme funding criteria. (A copy of the current criteria is **attached**.)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2. The Youth Development Fund has been in existence in the Burwood/Pegasus ward since 2001. Historically the Youth Development Scheme has been administered by the Community Development Advisor in the Burwood/Pegasus ward. Last year a metropolitan review of the Youth Development Scheme was carried out by Deidre Ryan, Senior Community Development Adviser and in November 2005 the results of this review were released.
- 3. The review brought about changes to the Youth Development Scheme application process. A set of guidelines were distributed to Community Development and Community Recreation staff to assist staff with the processing of applications. The guidelines given to staff included the following statements:
 - (a) Funding criteria to be agreed with each Board on an individual basis.
 - (b) A review of funding criteria could take place at the start of the year when Boards decide how much money to set aside for the scheme.
 - (c) The new application form to be revised to be ward specific, this will include ward specific funding criteria.
- 4. In the 2005/06 financial year \$5,000 was allocated as funding for the Burwood/Pegasus Youth Development Scheme. All available funding had been allocated. Applications continued to be received for the Youth Development Scheme and from the number of applications that are being processed by staff it appears that there is a growing awareness in the community of the existence of this scheme.

RECOMMENDATION

5. That the Board agree to consider the following issues when setting the funding criteria to be utilised for the 2006/07 financial year:

(a) Limits to the Allocation Amount

Addition to the existing funding criteria information of a limit on the amount allocated to an individual.

Historically this has been a one off grant of \$250 for events under \$2,000 and \$500 for events over \$2,000.

(b) **Restriction Criteria relating to the Number of People Funded**

With the increasing awareness of this fund it is common to receive a number of applications from members within the same team. Some consideration on how the Board deal with this situation would assist with the decision making process.

(c) Allocation Amounts to Family Members

Staff have received inquiries from families who have more than one child selected to represent the province/their school, etc. and want to know if they can apply to this fund for more than one member of their family. Staff suggest in this instance that the Board may choose to make one allocation payable equally to family members.

(d) Reporting back to the Board from Successful Applicants

Historically the Board have received a written report from successful applicants following the expenditure of their funding support. The Board may have a preference for the style of reporting which it receives from applicants which should this be specified in the criteria.

(e) Maximum Number of Applications from the Same Individual

As the fund has been in operation for five years and awareness has increased. The Board may wish to consider stating a maximum number of times which an individual or team may apply to the fund. For example funding may be limited to two grants per individual or team, and no more than one in any 12 month period.

(f) Retrospective Funding

The current funding criteria states that retrospective applications will not be considered however, the Board may wish to consider clarifying, that all applications will be considered by the Board if the application is received by staff prior to the event/activity for which the applicant(s) seek funding.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6. There are no financial or legal issues to be considered.
- 7. Current accountability processes are sound and do not require modification.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board receive the information and discuss accordingly.

9. CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT WORKING PARTY

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of the report is to submit for the Board's consideration the following report:

A meeting of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Working Party was held on Monday 7 August 2006, in the boardroom, at 5.00 pm.

- **PRESENT:** Glenda Burt, Carmen Hammond and Don Rowlands.
- In Attendance: Senior Sergeant Al Stewart, Deirdre Hart, Alan Cockburn, Murray Sinclair, Marie Byrne and Leanne Smith
- **APOLOGIES:** Alan Hickman and Inspector Craig McKay

Glenda Burt opened the meeting by welcoming attendees to the first meeting of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Working Party.

Glenda outlined that the Working Party was established to progress the implementation of and encourage community education of Civil Defence Emergency Management in the Burwood/Pegasus ward. A tsunami would likely be the greatest impact of disasters for the Board area.

The meeting discussed the practicalities of the Coastal Evacuation Plan working and how to inform residents of an impending disaster striking.

There were concerns raised of the ability of the Police to notify all residents in the area by driving down every street with sirens on and the ability to evacuate EPH complexes, schools and hospices.

The following are outcomes of the above discussion:

• Educational information to the community has to simple, clear and make the community feel empowered and not anxious. The 'be ready' message has to be coordinated.

It was decided to hold two community workshops for the Southshore and Central New Brighton areas, which would include North New Brighton. The workshops will be a similar model to the Northshore meeting recently held, which will provide Civil Defence and pandemic planning information to residents. The workshops to include the Police, Civil Defence and Public Health staff. The workshops to also include the positive protections the coastal has eg sand dunes.

Some other avenues of getting the 'be ready' message out to the community would be to utilise residents' association, school and Board newsletters and the Council's website, which includes the children's "What's the Plan Stan" link.

 Not to rely on one system eg phone, door knocking, police cars with sirens etc. Possibility of installing sirens along the coastal area to notify a larger number of people.

It was suggested that the Board write a letter to the Council to investigate the installation of a warning system.

• Development of fridge magnets and leaflet with simple evacuation instructions.

It was decided that the Community Engagement Adviser to investigate the costs of fridge magnets and leaflets to be provided to all coastal residents and to write a report to the Board requesting Discretionary funding.

WORKING PARTY RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board:

- 1. Receive the information.
- 2. Hold two community workshops to provide Civil Defence and pandemic planning information to residents in the Southshore and Central New Brighton areas.
- 3. Write a letter to the Council to investigate the installation of a warning system for natural disasters.
- 4. That staff investigate the cost of providing evacuation details on fridge magnets and leaflets to all coastal residents and a report be submitted to the Board requesting financial assistance from the Board's Discretionary fund.

10. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE

10.1 NOTICE OF UPCOMING BOARD REPORTS

- Horseshoe Lake Dog Park
- Owles Terrace
- 2005/06 Project Fund Accountability Report
- North New Brighton War Memorial and Community Centre Landscaping Plan
- Bexley Road Renaming
- New Brighton Road Bus Stop

10.2 CSR CALLS UPDATE (1 TO 31 JULY 2006)

Attached.

10.3 BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD OBJECTIVES 2006-09

Circulated separately to Board members.

11. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ADVISER'S UPDATE

Verbal update from the Community Engagement Adviser.

12. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS 2.16

13. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS 4.1

Members may at any ordinary meeting put a question to the Chairperson concerning any matter relevant to the role or function of the Community Board concerning any matter that does not appear on the order paper. All questions are subject to Standing Orders 4.1.1 to 4.1.5.

14. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Board members will have an opportunity to provide updates on community activities and/or Council issues.

15. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.