



Christchurch City Council

SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

TUESDAY 7 MARCH 2006

AT 5.00 PM

IN THE BOARDROOM,
SOUTH LIBRARY, SERVICE CENTRE AND LEARNING CENTRE,
66 COLOMBO STREET, CHRISTCHURCH

Community Board: Phil Clearwater (Chairperson), Oscar Alpers, Barry Corbett, Paul de Spa, Chris Mene, Sue Wells and Megan Woods.

Community Board Principal Adviser

Lisa Goodman

DDI: 941-5108

Email: lisa.goodman@ccc.govt.nz

Community Secretary

Peter Dow

DDI: 941-5105

Email: peter.dow@ccc.govt.nz

- PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**
- PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**
- PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

INDEX

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 21 FEBRUARY 2006
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
- PART B 4. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
- PART C 5. RYDAL RESERVE – PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT/UPGRADE
- PART C 6. HUNTSBURY AVENUE WALKWAY – TREE REMOVAL REQUEST
- PART C 7. HUNTSBURY AVENUE – NO STOPPING RESTRICTION
- PART B 8. COLOMBO STREET/TENNYSON STREET – INTERSECTION SAFETY
- PART C 9. NEW BUS SHELTER LOCATIONS
- PART A 10. ST MARTINS PARK – ST MARTINS BOWLS INC – LEASE
- PART C 11. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD DRAFT OBJECTIVES 2006/09
- PART B 12. BOARD FUNDS - UPDATE
- PART B 13. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE
- PART B 14. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

We're on the Web!

www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 21 FEBRUARY 2006**

The report of the meeting of 21 February 2006 has been separately circulated.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

3.1 **YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND – REPORT BACK**

Dale Clark will report back to the Board on his trip to Brazil to train and compete at the Del Ponte Futsal Centre of Excellence.

4. **BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

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

5. **RYDAL RESERVE – PLAY EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT/UPGRADE**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Michael Aitken, Greenspace Manager
Author:	Ann Liggett, Parks & Waterways Area Advocate, DDI 941-5111

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Board to approve the final landscape plan for Rydal Reserve play equipment replacement/upgrade, following community consultation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Rydal Reserve play equipment replacement/upgrade is a project in the Greenspace Unit's 2005/06 capital programme.
3. A public information leaflet was distributed to key stakeholders and the local community for feedback on a concept plan which also gave several choices of different play equipment pieces.
4. Approximately 350 leaflets were circulated with 68 submissions received, all in support of the project.
5. Results of the feedback regarding the play equipment options were:
 - (a) **Option A**

Double Rocker	36
Spring Toy	26
 - (b) **Option B**

Space Net	44
Supa Nova	20
6. Due to feedback results a Double Rocker and Space Net will be the two new pieces of equipment installed.

5 Cont'd

7. Changes made to the concept plan following feedback are as follows:
 - Native grasses in the new border gardens around the play area instead of carpet roses
 - Add an additional two paving stones to existing hopscotch to make into traditional hopscotch
 - Proposed seat to be changed to a picnic table and moved closer to the trees for shade
 - Add an additional two seats to the Greenspace seating programme to be placed on the north side of the park away from the playground
8. A copy of the final plan incorporating these changes is **attached** for information.
9. A letter has been sent to all submitters advising them of the changes following the consultation and that a report is coming to this meeting for final approval.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. All work will be funded by the Greenspace Unit's Capital Works Programme 2005/06.
11. Play equipment will be installed as per Playground Safety Standards by a Council approved contractor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve the final concept plan for Rydal Reserve play equipment replacement/upgrade.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be supported.

6. **HUNTSBURY AVENUE WALKWAY – TREE REMOVAL REQUEST**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Michael Aitken, Greenspace Manager
Author:	Tony Armstrong, Arborist, DDI: 941 8578 and Ann Liggett, Parks and Waterways Area Advocate, DDI: 941 5111

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval to remove four wattle trees (*Acacia* spp.) located adjacent to the entrance of Huntsbury Walkway, Centaurus Road and replace with appropriate planting for this site. The **attached** photographs refer.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In October 2005, a request was received on behalf of the residents of 120 Centaurus Road, to remove four wattle trees on their northeast boundary, being on Huntsbury Walkway.
3. The reason for the request is owing to nuisance caused by the overhanging canopy and shading.
4. The trees were pruned in 2002 to address overhanging branches, however in 2004 another request was assessed as having no health and safety issues with limited pruning options. The trees were neither pruned ('topped' as requested) or removed on that basis.
5. In 2005 the residents approached a contractor to prune back overhanging branches, and it was recommended to them that the trees should be removed, hence the current request.

6 Cont'd

6. After inspection of the tree, three options were presented to the residents:
 - (a) Option A - Trees be pruned back further to the boundary.
 - (b) Option B - Trees be left in the interim and removed by the following year.
 - (c) Option C - Trees are removed as soon as possible.
7. The resident's preferred option was Option C.
8. The four wattle trees are approximately 8-10 metres in height with a canopy spread of 12 metres plus. They have grown on an embankment beside a public walkway and elevated above the adjacent property to the south west. Root growth is therefore restricted but does not appear damaged or unstable. The trunks appear to have some structural weakness but which is not atypical for the genus. The canopy form appears slightly unbalanced, due to previous pruning, but the health is not affected other than some evidence of gall/canker, which again is not atypical of the genus.
9. The benefits or positive features of the trees are shade/screening/shelter, evergreen and lowering canopy. Also the location is quite prominent in the streetscape. The adverse effects or negative features include some risk of branch failure and canopy decline. The trees are also not large in stature or significant in being a specimen type planting. There is also a history of ongoing complaints regarding nuisance.
10. A full investigation of nuisance was not carried out as evidence was not apparent at the time of inspection, ie there was no apparent damage and the trees had been pruned back from the property.
11. There is an outstanding and ongoing issue with trees in the public space and conflict with private properties the nature of which is claimed to be a nuisance but not proven. Given the low amenity value and limited maintenance options of the trees in question, removal is supported with replanting as a mitigation for any loss of amenity value. The planting site is restricted but given its location this is relevant for renewal planting.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. The cost of the work will be covered under the existing city-wide arboricultural operations budget.
13. These trees are not protected under the City Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve the removal of four wattle trees located adjacent to the entrance to Huntsbury Walkway, Centaurus Road and replaced with appropriate planting in consultation with the resident of 120 Centaurus Road.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

7. HUNTSBURY AVENUE – NO STOPPING RESTRICTION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment
Officer responsible:	Don Munro, Transport & City Streets Manager
Author:	Patricia Su, Traffic Engineer, DDI 941 6428

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s approval for the extension of broken yellow “no stopping” restrictions on Huntsbury Avenue. The **attached** plan refers.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council has received a request from a resident concerning cars parked partly over a vehicle entrance.
3. The request has been investigated and consultation with the public was undertaken. Currently, there is a white “V” line marked onsite to indicate that the space is limited, however this does not have any legal standing and apparently some motorists have been ignoring the linemarking. The available length of the area is 5.3 metres (after deducting the 1 metre length that is required from a vehicle entrance either side). Larger vehicles parked here would be doing so illegally and may on occasions obstruct driveways making it difficult and unsafe when entering or exiting the adjacent properties.
4. Extending the broken yellow lines around the bend to include this area would prevent any vehicles from parking in this space at all times, and will improve the safety for the two adjacent properties by improving the visibility and accessibility to their driveways.
5. Consultation with the two adjacent property owners indicated that both were in favour of the proposal.
6. The extension of a broken yellow “no stopping” line from around the bend to include this area is considered the most cost effective and practical solution to the problem.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. Cost is minimal and provided for in the operational budget.
8. Land Transport Rule, Road User 2004 provides for this.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board resolve that:

- (a) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the eastern side of Huntsbury Avenue commencing at a point 180 metres from its intersection with Aotea Terrace and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 78 metres be revoked.
- (b) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the eastern side of Huntsbury Avenue commencing at a point 156.5 metres from its intersection with Aotea Terrace and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 101.5 metres.

CHAIRPERSON’S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be supported.

8. COLOMBO STREET/TENNYSON STREET – INTERSECTION SAFETY

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment
Officer responsible:	Don Munro, Transport and City Streets Manager
Author:	Lachlan Beban, Signals and SCATS Engineer, DDI 941-8680

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Board on the outcome of investigations into traffic issues in the Beckenham shops area. The issues were raised following a survey of residents regarding the safety of pedestrians using the Colombo/Tennyson Streets intersection, and a subsequent deputation to the Board by representatives of the Beckenham Neighbourhood Association.

BACKGROUND ON COLOMBO STREET/TENNYSON STREET – INTERSECTION SAFETY

2. At the Board's 16 August 2005 meeting, Council officers were asked to report back to the Board on the following issues:
 - (a) To simplify the intersection the car access by Hardings Chemist must be removed - could an entrance/exit be made via Somerfield Street?
 - (b) Could the lights be phased so pedestrians have more time to cross and cars have time to get through the intersection (current phasing of lights needs correcting)?
 - (c) The whole of Beckenham shops area made a "go slow" zone.
 - (d) How does this issue relate to the Citywide Passenger Transport Study?

Access Adjacent To Hardings Chemist/Post Shop

3. The access point to the car park behind Hardings Chemist has a left-turn only on exit. It is illegal to turn right or proceed straight ahead. While it would make the intersection less complicated if this access point was removed, Council cannot simply remove this access. The driveway was in place before the signals were installed and as such the property owner has existing use rights. An alternative point of access onto Somerfield Street would require negotiation between Harding's Chemist and the property owner of 142 Somerfield Street.
4. As a general rule, driveways opposite the side street at T-intersections are not signalised. Generally they do not have enough traffic demand to justify their own phase and would cause too much confusion if run in conjunction with the phase for the side road. At present the situation is clear, as left-turning vehicles leaving the driveway must give way to the right-turners from Tennyson Street. Since the installation of the Colombo/Tennyson Streets traffic signals in June 1996, there have been no reported crashes involving vehicles using this access/egress. A diagram and report are **attached** showing reported crashes in the area over the last five years.

Pedestrians At Colombo/Tennyson Streets Intersection

5. The current phasing of the signals is adequate to cater for both the needs of motorists and pedestrians. The time given to each vehicle phase varies throughout the day as the system controlling the signals dynamically adjusts the amount of green time based on the volume of traffic on each approach. The amount of time given to pedestrians is always the same and is based on 6 seconds of green (to allow pedestrians to start crossing) and a flashing red clearance period (determined from an 85% percentile walking speed of 1.2m/s). Both crossings across Colombo Street have 13 seconds of clearance for the 15 metre length of crossing.
6. Some protection for pedestrians at the signals is already provided in the form of a 'late-start'. Basically this prohibits vehicles from moving for a short period as the pedestrian phase is introduced, giving time for pedestrians to get out on the road and be more visible to turning traffic. At the Colombo/Tennyson Streets and Colombo/Strickland Streets intersections we have increased the amount of late start for pedestrians from 3 seconds to 6 seconds. The

8 Cont'd

disadvantage of this is that it reduces the amount of time available to traffic and will increase the length of queues on Strickland Street and Tennyson Street. To a certain extent the impact of this is mitigated by the low volume of pedestrians. The late start is only introduced when there is a pedestrian demand to cross Colombo Street and as such does not occur in every cycle of the signals.

7. Often the suggestion is made to provide an exclusive pedestrian phase or Barnes Dance. These are not an acceptable treatment on an arterial road in a suburban environment. As an entire phase is devoted to pedestrians, during which vehicles are unable to move, they are extremely inefficient and can only be justified where there are a large number of pedestrians and additional delay to vehicles can be accepted, such as the central city. It should be noted that exclusive pedestrian phases also cause excessive delays to pedestrians. Current pedestrian wait times of around 30 second would increase to around 60 seconds.
8. If we were installing a new set of traffic signals at a T-intersection, the design would not include a pedestrian facility in conflict with vehicles turning right out of the side street. Ultimately the solution might be to remove this crossing at the Colombo/Tennyson Streets intersection if the additional late-start proves ineffective. This is likely to meet with negative response from the community as the additional distance and time delay involved in making the crossing to the northeast corner are an inconvenience to pedestrians. There is always a compromise that has to be made between safety, efficiency and convenience.
9. Since the installation of the traffic signals, there have been two reported crashes involving pedestrians at this intersection. In both cases the pedestrian was crossing on the north side of the intersection when struck by a vehicle making a right-turn out of Tennyson Street.
10. There is a relatively large number of pedestrians crossing in the mid-block area between the two intersections. Mostly this involves people who patronise the shops and need to cross the street to get from their parked vehicle to businesses on the opposite side. As there is more time and distance involved in using the signalised pedestrian facilities at either of the two intersections, most pedestrians choose to cross mid-block. In a video survey undertaken between the hours of 8-9 am on Tuesday 18 October 2005, 41 people crossed the road in the area between the two intersections. Only 16 (39%) of these 41 used the signalised crossings.

Vehicle Speeds On Colombo Street

11. Colombo Street is a major arterial road, and near the Beckenham shops it carries around 17,500 vehicles per day. Surveys were undertaken by Council staff using a radar gun to ascertain the speed of vehicles passing through this area. The 85th percentile speed was 47 km/h (i.e. 85% of vehicles are travelling at less than 47km/h). As a general rule, measured 85th percentile speeds tend to be higher than the posted speed limit. In this case the speed is comparatively low and suggests that there is not a speeding issue in this area. This is to be expected, as the road environment is such that it is not conducive to excessive speed. There are a variety of interactions taking place in the vicinity of the two closely spaced sets of traffic signals - parking manoeuvres, bus stops, driveways, cyclists and pedestrians.

Somerfield/Strickland Streets Intersection

12. In the past five years there have been two non-injury crashes reported at this intersection. In comparison to other intersections in Christchurch this does not indicate a serious safety concern. Extending the traffic signals at Colombo/Strickland Streets to include this intersection is not feasible. The two intersections are too close together and as such it would not be practical to run them as one intersection. For the intersection to function would require elaborate phasing and signal head placement, and would probably create more problems than it would solve. There is also insufficient space between the two intersections to allow any queuing and it would not be possible to provide adequate and safe pedestrian facilities as exist at present. It would also degrade the level of service for traffic on the arterial road, Colombo Street. The current layout of the intersection is as good as it can be without some major work to realign the approaches, which would require property purchase and significant sums of money, and cannot be justified at this point in time.

8 Cont'd

13. The suggestion was made to remove the left-turn display which allows vehicles to make a left turn from Colombo Street in to Strickland Street while the Strickland Street phase is running. While it is agreed that this would help to simplify the situation for vehicles exiting Somerfield Street, there are reasons for continuing to operate the left-turn green arrow. There are a high number of vehicles making this left-turn movement, especially in the morning peak hour period (487). Were the left-turn never able to run at the same time as the Strickland Street phase, the length of queues of left-turners would significantly increase, leading to regular blocking of the northbound thru lane. There are already times when the mid-block section between Tennyson and Strickland Streets is filled. Removing the left-turn green arrow would significantly increase the occurrence of this happening, reducing the efficiency of both intersections and increasing delays to motorists. The only way to relieve the ensuing congestion would then be to increase the length of the left-turn lane by removing parking on the west side of Colombo Street, a move which is unlikely to be endorsed by any of the local businesses.

Driveway at Colombo/Strickland Streets

14. The driveway between First National Real Estate and Filadelfio's falls into a similar category as the one adjacent to Hardings Chemist. A video survey was undertaken on 26 October 2005 to evaluate usage of the driveway. In total there were 68 vehicle movements in the ten and a half hour period between 07.30 and 18.00. This does not indicate a demand high enough to justify the signalling of this driveway.
15. In the past five years there have been no reported crashes involving vehicles using this driveway.

Relationship To Citywide Public Transport Priority Plan

16. There are unlikely to be any major changes to the geometry or signal timings of the intersections in the area as part of the Citywide Public Transport Priority Plan.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

17. Nil – this report is for information only.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Community Board receive the information on the outcome of investigations into traffic issues in the Beckenham shops area.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

CHAIRPERSON'S COMMENT

I would also like the Board to explore the matter of the slower speed zone option.

9. NEW BUS SHELTER LOCATIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment
Officer responsible:	Don Munro, Transport & City Streets Manager
Author:	Debbie Hunt, Project Coordinator, DDI 941-8707

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval on locations for new bus shelters.

9 Cont'd

BACKGROUND ON NEW BUS SHELTER LOCATIONS

2. In 1998 a joint initiative between Environment Canterbury and the Christchurch City Council saw the development of the Public Passenger Transport Strategy (1998). The strategy set out a programme of improvements designed to dramatically improve public transport services in Christchurch. Among other things these improvements include a target of 500 bus shelters to be installed by June 2006.

BUS SHELTERS

3. Under s339 of the Local Government Act 1974 the Council has the right to erect a shelter on footpaths of any road subject to a number of considerations. One of those is giving a formal notice to the occupier and owner of land likely to be affected by the erection of the shelter and giving them an opportunity to formally object.
4. The options available to the Board are to either approve the locations and give staff the approval to issue the formal notice to the owners and occupiers of the properties, or to decline the request, which will mean staff will need to find another location.

CONSULTATION

5. Initial consultation has been undertaken with the owners and occupiers of the following properties for the erection of a bus shelter. The following table identifies which locations approval has been gained for and which approval has not been gained.

6.

Location	Owner/ Occupier Approval	Owner/Occupier Objection	No response from Owner/ Occupier to Initial Consultation
39 Frankleigh Street		✓	
103 Hoon Hay Road	✓		
287 Hoon Hay Road			✓
283 Lincoln Road		✓	
40 Mathers Road	✓		
Opp 88 Mathers Road (Hoon Hay Park)	✓		
56 Whiteleigh Avenue	✓		
22 Ensors Road	✓		
79 Wilsons Road			✓
64 Halswell Road			✓
75 Halswell Road			✓
105 Halswell Road			✓
126 Halswell Road			✓

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. Should the site be approved, the site will be offered as a suitable location for an Adshel shelter. If accepted, there would be no cost to the Council. If Adshel does not accept the site then the cost to the Council would be \$10,000 which will be met within existing budgets.
8. Under s339 of the Local Government Act 1974 the Council may erect on the footpath of any road a shelter for use by intending public-transport passengers or taxi passengers provided that no such shelter may be erected so as to unreasonably prevent access to any land having a frontage to the road. The Council is required to give notice in writing to the occupier and owner of property likely to be injuriously affected by the erection of the shelter, and shall not proceed with the erection of the shelter until after the expiration of the time for objecting against the proposal or, in the event of an objection, until after the objection has been determined.

9 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Approve the installation of bus shelters at the following bus stops where approval has been gained from the owner and occupier:

103 Hoon Hay Road
 40 Mathers Road
 Opp 88 Mathers Road (Hoon Hay Park)
 56 Whiteleigh Avenue
 22 Ensors Road

- (b) Authorise staff to issue the appropriate notices in terms of s339 of the Local Government Act (1974).

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be supported.

10. ST MARTINS PARK – ST MARTINS BOWLS INC – LEASE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Michel Aitken, Greenspace Manager
Author:	Lewis Burn, Property Consultant, DDI 941-8522

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board's recommendation to the Council to grant a new lease to St Martins Bowls Inc over the existing men's and women's bowling facilities which have been amalgamated under one new not-for-profit organisation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The lease to the former Men's Bowling Club premises expired on 31 October 2005 while the women's lease agreement expired on 30 May 2004. Both leases contain a perpetual right of renewal for terms of 21 years.
3. In 2001 the Men's and Women's Clubs amalgamated to form a new Incorporated Society registered as St Martins Bowls Inc. The rent accounts with the Council were combined for billing purposes and tacit agreement was reached with the clubs that one new lease would be put in place at the time the existing agreements expired, to reflect that the combined facilities are now the asset and responsibility of the newly constituted club.
4. Agreement has been reached with the new club for a lease to commence from 1 April 2006 for an initial term of 10 years with two rights of renewal for terms of 10 years each, and one final term of 5 years less one day (the maximum term permitted by subdivision rules) in the form of Council's generic ground sports lease. The lease final expiry date is 30 March 2041 if all renewals are exercised, and will take in the existing site, buildings and carpark, a total area of approximately 5669 square metres (refer plan SM1625-01 **attached**).

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

5. The Board does not have delegated authority to authorise the granting of the proposed new lease as such a decision needs to be made by the full Council. The Board does however have recommendatory powers to the Council.

10 Cont'd

6. The land involved is held by the Council under the Local Government Act 2002 so the notification procedures and consent process under the Reserves Act will not apply.
7. There is an obligation on the Council to renew the present agreements subject only to lease compliance and that Council considers there is sufficient need to continue to provide facilities for bowls (that is there is not a greater demand for some other sport or recreational activity that would provide a higher public benefit). The Greenspace Unit considers that presently the benefit to the greater community would be the continued use of the site by the St Martins Bowls Club. The new lease, which will be for a finite term (i.e. not perpetually renewable), will contain this same renewal qualification.
8. The annual rental for this lease will be set in accordance with the Council's existing charging policy for sports organisations.
9. The club is responsible for lease preparation costs and these are assessed at \$300 plus GST.
10. The existing lease agreements to the former men's and women's clubs are to be simultaneously surrendered.

BACKGROUND ON ST MARTINS BOWLS INC

11. The Men's Bowling Club was established on St Martins Park soon after the Council took title to the sports ground in the early 1950's. The Women's Club opened as a separate facility in October 1957, by which time the Council had acquired the adjacent title on which part of the Council's Cresselly Place housing complex is established. The present carpark off Clouston Street was formally incorporated into the Men's Bowling Club lease in October 1987.
12. The former men's and women's clubs at their annual general meetings in mid 2001 formally resolved to transfer the funds, assets and membership to the new club which was registered as an Incorporated Society on 23 March 2001. The constitution of the new club was approved by Bowls Canterbury and Bowls New Zealand.
13. Membership of the new Club as at 31 December 2005 stands at 108 made up of:
 - Life Members and Full members (80)
 - Social Members (21)
 - Honorary Members (6)
 - Associate member (1)
14. A copy of the Financial Statements for the year ended 30 April 2005 has been sighted. The Club is operating with modest excess income over expenditure. The balance sheet confirms that the Club is a viable entity.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board recommends to the Council that it:

- (a) Approve the grant of a new lease (in the form of the Council's generic sports ground lease) to St Martins Bowls Inc. for a term (including renewals) not exceeding 35 years less one day commencing 1 April 2006 of the existing bowling facility comprising approximately 5669 square metres shown as parcels A and B on SM 1625-01.
- (b) Accept a surrender of the lease agreements with the St Martins Women's Bowling Club and the St Martins Bowling Club effective on 30 March 2006.
- (c) Authorise the Corporate Support Manager to conclude and administer the terms of the lease.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

11. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD DRAFT OBJECTIVES 2006/09

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Anusha Guler, Secretariat Manager
Author:	Peter Dow, Community Secretary, DDI 941-5105

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present to the Board its draft objectives for 2006/09 for consideration and adoption (**attached**).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In recent months, the Board has been developing its objectives for the 2006/09 period; what it wants to achieve for its ward, and how it will achieve these objectives. This is to ensure that the Board's activities and funding are aligned with the Community Outcomes and Council's strategic framework. These objectives are intended to align with the first three years of the Council's 2006/16 LTCCP.
3. The Board will have an opportunity to review these objectives and progress made on an annual basis.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. There are no financial or legal considerations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board consider the draft objectives and resolve whether or not to adopt them.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the draft Board Objectives for 2006/09 be adopted.

CHAIRPERSON'S COMMENT

For the Board's Objectives to be a meaningful tool it is suggested that the proposed Board Working Party consider the arrangements for ongoing implementation and monitoring of its objectives.

12. BOARD FUNDS UPDATE

Attached are schedules with current information on the Board's 2005/06 Project, Discretionary, SCAP and Youth Development Funds.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the information be received.

13. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE

The Community Board Principal Adviser will update the Board on current issues.

14. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS