



## Christchurch City Council

# SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 6 SEPTEMBER 2006

AT 4.00 PM

IN THE BOARDROOM, PAPANUI SERVICE CENTRE,  
CNR LANGDONS ROAD AND RESTELL STREET

**Community Board:** Yvonne Palmer (Chairperson), Myra Barry (Deputy Chairperson), Ngaire Button, Bill Bush, Graham Condon, Megan Evans, Norm Withers.

**Community Board Principal Adviser**

Elsie Ellison

Phone 941 6701

Email: [elsie.ellison@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:elsie.ellison@ccc.govt.nz)

**Community Board Secretary**

Elaine Greaves

Phone 941 6726

Email: [elaine.greaves@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:elaine.greaves@ccc.govt.nz)

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

### INDEX

	ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION
PART C	1.	APOLOGIES
PART C	2.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – BOARD MEETING OF 16 AUGUST 2006
PART B	3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
	3.1	Lesley McMillan
	3.2	Peggy Kelly
PART C	4.	DARROCH RESERVE - FENCING
PART C	5.	BROOKLANDS DOMAIN – TENNIS COURT
PART C	6.	QUEENSPARK BUS PRIORITY PROJECT - HILLS ROAD
PART A	7.	REQUEST FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY TRAFFIC AND PARKING BY-LAW 1991
PART B	8.	REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD'S EVENTS COMMITTEE
PART B	9.	REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND COMMITTEE
PART B	10.	BOARD MEMBERS' ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS
PART B	11.	COMMUNITY BOARD CONFERENCE

**6. 9. 2006**

**- 2 -**

- PART B 12. UPDATE OF BOARD FUNDS**
- PART B 13. UPDATE FROM COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER**
- PART C 14. NOTICE OF MOTION**
- PART B 15. PETITIONS**
- PART B 16. CORRESPONDENCE**
- PART B 17. CHAIRPERSON'S AND BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B 18. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

Board members will observe a minute's silence in memory of the late Nick Chapman, former Community Advocate.

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 16 AUGUST 2006**

The report of the meeting of 16 August 2006 has been circulated to the Board under separate cover (see attached).

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the report to Council of 16 August 2006 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

**3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**3.1 Lesley McMillan**

Lesley McMillan (Co-ordinator of Avebury House) will update the Board regarding activities at Avebury House.

**3.2 Peggy Kelly**

Peggy Kelly will address the Board in relation to the following two issues:

- a. Tree protection, Packe Street Community Garden.  
Ryan Young, President of Canterbury Botanical Society, will also be in attendance (submission attached).
- b. Tagging – proposal to establish a Tagging Action Group (submission attached). Trish Hammersley, former President of the Christchurch Branch of the National Council for Women of New Zealand will also be in attendance.

**4. DARROCH RESERVE - FENCING**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Mary Hay, DDI 941 5410

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to install post and cable fencing with associated plantings and open access points on the front and rear boundaries of Darroch Reserve, following community consultation.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2. The Darroch Reserve/Otukaikino Wetland Area Plan was approved by the Shirley/Papanui Community Board in November 2005. This included the installation of a playground in Darroch Reserve in 2005/06 and a staged development of the Otukaikino wetland, located over the stop bank from the playground. The playground development included a low post and cable fence across the Rushmore Drive frontage, which is yet to be installed.

#### 4. Cont'd

3. In June 2006 the Transport and Greenspace Unit received a petition from the residents of Rushmore Drive and surrounding areas, signed by 122 residents. The petition seeks action in relation to a number of issues in Darroch Reserve/Otukaikino Wetland, including a request for security fencing of the front and rear boundaries of Darroch Reserve, with two access gates at each boundary, creating a park that is closed in on all four boundaries and has restricted access via gates. The intended purpose of this requested fencing is to enhance safety for vulnerable users of the playground.
4. Council officers have advised the residents that post and cable fencing and associated plantings would be installed on the front and rear boundaries of the reserve to provide a clear delineation of the park's boundaries. This solution is not acceptable to the petitioner, who seeks security fencing, which he considers is necessary to cater for the toddlers and people with disabilities that use this park. Staff have therefore reassessed the fencing needs of the reserve in terms of the special needs of this community.
5. Darroch Reserve has two types of vulnerable users: those in wheelchairs (7 wheelchair users within 200m of the park) and a large number of toddlers (27 under 3 years old) - some of which have unpredictable behaviour.
6. The feedback from these users is that wheelchair access is essential, as the park is well used by local residents in wheelchairs. These users noted that the proposed low post and cable fencing with openings without gates would be ideal. Some of the residents that have toddlers that 'bolt' agreed that low fencing enhanced with plantings will provide an effective barrier to toddlers in the park, despite the fact that the access-ways will not be gated. This was considered to be adequate as the caregiver's attention could be focussed on small areas where there are breaks in the fence.
7. It is the view of Council staff that the installation of security fencing could create a false sense of security within the park and lead to the risk of children being left in the park unsupervised. Staff recommend the installation of low post and cable fencing with associated plantings and open access points on the front and rear boundaries of the reserve to clearly define the park's boundaries. As this solution is not accepted by the petitioner, Community Board approval to proceed with post and cable fencing is sought.

#### **FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

8. There is funding in the 2006/07 Capital Works Programme of \$3,000 to fence and landscape the front and rear boundaries of Darroch Reserve.
9. The cost of installing post and cable fencing with associated plantings on the front and rear boundaries of Darroch Reserve is approximately \$3,000.
10. The cost of providing 1.2m high mesh fence with two gates on each of the boundaries of Darroch Reserve is approximately \$9,000. The Transport and Greenspace Unit's Parks and Cemeteries Asset Management Plan, which manages the park's assets, is silent on this level of service. Policy does not exist to fence the frontage of parks. Normal Council practice is for a low post and rail or post and cable fence. All fences are installed to Parks Unit standards and are of a low profile and visually unobtrusive.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approves the installation of post and cable fencing with associated plantings and open access points on the front and rear boundaries of Darroch Reserve.

#### **CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

#### 4. Cont'd

##### **BACKGROUND ON DARROCH RESERVE FENCING**

11. Darroch Reserve is located in north-west Belfast, allocated to Council as the reserve contribution from the surrounding sub-division of Rushmore Drive, Riegler Place, Greenmeadow Gardens and Langley Place. Darroch Reserve backs onto part of the Otukaikino Wetland that extends through to the Groynes. The two reserves are separated by an Environment Canterbury secondary stopbank.
12. The subdivision surrounding Darroch Reserve is geographically isolated in terms of access to playgrounds. In 2004 a local residents' group contacted Council staff proposing that Darroch Reserve could be developed as a playground. The group submitted this request to the Annual Plan with a petition of 81 signatures.
13. The Greenspace Unit had funding in the 2005/2006 financial year for riparian development on the Otukaikino River and a new playground development at Darroch Reserve. A draft concept plan was prepared in June 2005 and distributed to the local community for comment. There was strong support for the plan, with some amendments being sought. These included a request that the playground area to be fully fenced (with access gates) and a request that there be a fence with a toddler/child proof lock between the playground and the wetland.
14. A report was presented to the Community Board in November 2005 recommending that, in terms of the fencing, a post and cable fence should be installed across the road frontage of Darroch Reserve to restrict both vehicle access and children running onto Rushmore Drive. This report was approved by the Board.
15. In June 2006 the Transport and Greenspace Unit received a petition from the residents of Rushmore Drive and surrounding areas, which seeks action in relation to a number of issues in Darroch Reserve/Otukaikino Wetland. This included a request for security fencing of the front and rear boundaries of Darroch Reserve, with two access gates at each boundary, creating a park that is closed in on all four boundaries and has restricted access via gates. The intended purpose of this fencing is to improve safety for park users.

##### **Fencing of the Darroch Reserve Road Boundary**

16. The community's petition raised concerns about the volume and speed of traffic on Rushmore Drive and the potential danger that this poses to young children that use the park. Subsequent discussions with the petitioner revealed additional concerns that, as this community has a large number of physically and intellectually disabled residents, there is a need for security fencing that would prevent vulnerable park users leaving the park unless accompanied by caregiver.
17. The petition also sought that speed bumps be installed on Rushmore Drive. Rushmore Drive is a local road cul-de-sac with relatively low traffic volumes and, while there is a planned subdivision of 26 homes in this area, the expected traffic volumes are not high. Council staff have investigated the request for speed humps and determined that Rushmore Drive does not meet the criteria for traffic calming. However, Council will install signage that alerts drivers to the fact that there may be children in this location. This solution has been well received by local residents. Staff have been advised by residents that the speed issue is attributable to one or two neighbours that live locally. These people have not been responsive to requests to slow down. Community members have been advised to discuss this issue with the local Community Constable.
18. Staff have reconsidered the type of fencing that is required on the road frontage, discussed the petitioner's concerns and contacted the disabled users that have been identified. Darroch Reserve has two types of vulnerable users: those in wheelchairs (7 wheelchair users within 200m of the park) and a large number of toddlers (27 under 3 years old) - some of which have unpredictable behaviour.

#### 4. Cont'd

19. The feedback from these users is that wheelchair access is essential, the park is well used by local residents in wheelchairs. The recently installed pathways have catered for this and are much appreciated by the park's wheelchair users. These residents noted that the proposed post and cable fencing would be ideal as it provides openings without gates. Some members of the community that have toddlers that 'bolt' agreed that low fencing enhanced with planting will provide an effective barrier to toddlers in the park, despite the fact that the access-ways will not be gated. The reason given was that this would be adequate as the caregiver's attention could be focussed on small areas where there are breaks in the fence. This solution is not accepted by the petitioner, who would like to see security fencing with access controlled by gates. However, it should be noted that a number of the signatories accept that a low fence without gates would be preferred.
20. Low post and cable fencing is consistent with the fencing solutions adopted in other reserves in the city that are on local roads. Most local parks have no fence or a low barrier on the street frontage and the decision to install a security fence is usually made in a situation where the park is adjacent to a major arterial route or significant feeder road.
21. In response to the community's concern about the risk of toddlers bolting onto Rushmore Drive, staff propose to enhance the proposed post and cable fencing with additional planting that allows for a 3 metre wide gap for maintenance vehicles. This will provide a visual barrier to toddlers and clearly define the park environment from the road environment. The access points will remain open and have a minimal access width of 1.2 metres that is obstacle free, in accordance with the Parks and Waterways Access Policy (April 2002).

#### **Fencing of the Darroch Reserve's Rear Boundary (adjacent to Stop Bank)**

22. The community's petition raised concerns about the potential hazards of the Otukaikino Wetland, located on the other side of the stopbank from the playground. Concerns relate to the concealment of the wetland and its potential to provide a drowning hazard for young children.
23. The Darroch Reserve/Otukaikino Wetland Area Plan (attached) include linkages from Darroch Reserve to footpaths and boardwalks around the wetland that may ultimately be connected to the Waimairi Walkway. Work on the wetland is ongoing, with the issue of the concealment of the wetland be initially dealt with by the installation of a sign that warns of a concealed waterway and, more recently, by the clearing of vegetation around the waterway.
24. The approved Area Plan did not include fencing at the rear boundary of Darroch Reserve as staff considered that the stopbank was a sufficient boundary to the Darroch Reserve playground. The petition seeks for this rear boundary to be fully fenced with access gates.
25. Staff have reconsidered the type of fencing that is required on the rear boundary of the reserve. In response to community concern about the perceived risk of children running from the playground, over the stopbank and into the wetland, we propose to erect a low post and cable fence, with plantings and open access points to link with pathways. Rather than providing a substantial barrier to the wilderness area on the other side of the stopbank, it is important to make people aware of the potential hazards and allow them to manage such hazards appropriately. This fencing, in combination with the existing signage and ongoing maintenance of the vegetation around the wetland, will ensure that park users are aware of the potential water hazard on the other side of the stopbank.

#### **OPTIONS**

26. Two options were considered for the fencing of Darroch Reserve:
  - (a) Post and cable fencing and plantings with open access points. Funding is available for this fencing option, which is consistent with fencing solutions throughout the city. It is wheelchair accessible, provides a good definition of park boundaries and allows ongoing integration of the park with adjacent wetland and walkways.

**4. Cont'd**

- (b) Security fencing with gates. This option is inconsistent with the level of service provided to other local parks and no funding is available for this option. Not consistent with access policy and not wheelchair accessible. This type of fencing may provide false sense of security in park, which will always have an element of risk and require supervision of vulnerable users. It may also provide opportunity for bullying in the park. This option would be more visually obtrusive.

**PREFERRED OPTION**

- 27. The preferred option is (a), low post and cable fencing and plantings with open access points.

**5. BROOKLANDS DOMAIN – TENNIS COURT**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Mary Hay, DDI 941-5410

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1. The purpose of this report is to obtain the Board's approval for the location and construction of a tennis court within Brooklands Domain.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2. A report was presented to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board in November 2005 to consider a proposed enhancement plan for Brooklands Domain. The plan suggested formalising a car park at the Anfield Street entrance however, this aspect of the proposal was not endorsed by the community. Feedback from consultation and a 95 signature petition indicated strong preference for a tennis court. Based on this, staff recommended that the amended concept plan for Brooklands Domain be approved and the funding from the proposed car park be reallocated to a tennis court.
- 3. The Board decision was to:
  - "1. Approve the amended landscaping plan for Brooklands Domain.
  - 2. Approve the reallocation of \$38,265 originally for Brooklands Domain car park to a tennis court facility, the design and construction subject to further community consultation on an appropriate site".
- 4. As a result of this decision, further consultation was required on the location of a tennis court. Three possible locations within Brooklands Domain were shown for a tennis court.
  - Location A – at the west side of the Anfield Street entrance to the Domain
  - Location B – inside the Domain, parallel to the skate half pipe
  - Location C – inside the Domain, adjacent to the east fenceline.

Copies of a proposal, which included these three options, were circulated at the Brooklands Gala Day at the end of January 2006.

- 5. Twenty eight written replies were received regarding the preferred location of the tennis court. The majority of the respondents (22) preferred a location at the south end of the Domain, near the other recreation facilities.
- 6. Residents from numbers 37, 49 and 28 Anfield Street (closest to the proposed location of the tennis court) were consulted with in person. The location for the court and the anticipated environmental effects were discussed. These residents, while supporting a tennis court in the Domain, did not favour a location at the south end of the Domain. While other locations for the tennis court were discussed at this meeting, these had issues in terms of safety, accessibility or impinging on the open space of the Domain.

**5. Cont'd**

7. A report was presented to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board in June 2006 to obtain Board approval for the construction of a tennis court within Brooklands Domain at Location A. At this public meeting a fourth option, Location D located to the west of the basketball court, was tabled by members of the community. Staff indicated that there could be additional costs associated with building up the tennis court in Location D. The Board resolved that the matter lie on the table until the costs associated with Locations A and D were determined and further community consultation was undertaken.
8. As a result of further investigations, staff have determined that there is no significant difference in construction costs between Locations A and D. However, it is noted that siting a tennis court in Location D is likely to exacerbate the existing ponding issues in this low-lying part of the Domain.
9. The Brooklands Community Centre (Inc) has undertaken community consultation. They sought comment in the Styx Post (distributed to all 386 Brooklands residents), seeking a preference for either Location A or Location D. They received 83 submissions (22% response rate) with 82 respondents opting for Location D and one for Location C.
10. All respondents to the plan have been sent a letter advising them of the details of the upcoming Community Board meeting so that individuals requiring speaking rights or interested in the project can attend.
11. The tennis court is scheduled to be constructed prior to Christmas 2006.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

12. The proposed development work for Brooklands Domain is programmed in the Greenspace Unit's capital budget for construction over the 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 financial years.
13. Council building consent may be required for construction of the tennis court. No issues are anticipated with obtaining these consents.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board approve Location D as detailed in the attachment to the agenda as the tennis court location, in order to proceed to detailed design and construction of the Brooklands Domain tennis court.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.



5. Cont'd

**BACKGROUND ON BROOKLANDS DOMAIN TENNIS COURT**

14. The Greenspace Unit has been redeveloping the Brooklands Domain. This project has included a pathway extending around the west side of the Domain, a basketball half court, a swale along the west side of the Domain and remedial tree work.
15. A draft concept plan was circulated at the Brooklands Gala Day (January 2006) for public comment. The three locations considered most feasible for a tennis court were made available and gala attendees were encouraged to fill out feedback forms nominating their preferred location for the tennis court.
16. A location toward the south end of the Domain was most preferred by respondents. Some of the comments received are outlined below:
  - It was important to many that the open space within the Domain was retained
  - Some respondents pointed out that (officially) a tennis court should be sited north/south in order to minimise sun glare – supporting location A or C
  - Respondents, especially parents, supported a location near the other recreation facilities so children can be watched while playing tennis
  - There was overall agreement that a tennis court would enhance the recreational opportunities at the Domain.
17. Based on the feedback above, a meeting was arranged with residents adjacent to the Anfield Street entrance to discuss a tennis court location in this area. Potential court locations for Brooklands Domain were shown and discussed with the residents attending the meeting. Positive and negative attributes of similar facilities in other parks were evaluated, with photographs shown for scale. While other locations for the tennis court were discussed at this meeting, these were problematic in terms of safety, accessibility or impinging on the open space of the Domain.
18. The main points raised at the meeting with residents related to the potential nuisance brought about by a tennis court – specifically noise, extra activity and tennis balls being hit over the fence – leading to an adverse effect on the quality of outdoor living. It is acknowledged that a tennis court will increase noise and activity, but experience with courts in other parks has shown that use averages off over time once the facility loses its novelty factor. The court will be fenced off on the side nearest to housing as well as being 10 metres from fencelines, helping to mitigate stray tennis balls. It is worth noting that the original proposal included a car park in this location, which would also have contributed to a change in the noise environment.
19. A concern that was raised about general vandalism and broken glass cannot be specifically managed by the Council. The court will be situated in an open location with good informal surveillance, which it is anticipated will minimise this issue. If socially unacceptable practices such as broken glass become a problem in the Domain, the problem can only be alleviated with a Brooklands community/Council partnership. If occurrences of vandalism are reported, Council contractors can remove or fix promptly. In addition, Council have supported other community initiatives to combat vandalism by supplying paint/rubbish bags etc. In regard to unauthorised vehicles entering the Domain, a bollard and chain fence has been constructed along Anfield Street entrance.
20. The block of land at Anfield Street was originally purchased by Council to be used as an additional entrance and car parking area for the Domain. It appears that some of the adjacent residents believed that this public open space would never be formally developed. This is not the case as Council has to consider the views of the Brooklands community, who have proactively requested a tennis court, both through the previous consultation process and a petition with approximately 270 names. As such, the intention to install a tennis court at Brooklands Domain is a community-driven proposal.

## 5. Cont'd

21. A report was presented to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board in June 2006 to obtain Board approval for the construction of a tennis court within Brooklands Domain. There were four options considered for the location of a tennis court at Brooklands Domain:
  - Location 'A' - Site and construct the tennis at the west side of the Anfield Street entrance to the Domain
  - Location 'B' - Site and construct the tennis court inside the Domain, parallel to the skate half pipe
  - Location 'C' - Site and construct the tennis court inside the Domain, adjacent to the east fenceline
  - Status quo – no tennis court in Brooklands Domain.
22. The staff recommendation was Location A. However, at the Community Board meeting a new option, Location D, was tabled by members of the community (refer attachment 1). Staff expressed the following concerns with this location, including:
  - Encroachment into the reserve's open space
  - Concern that the entrance to the Domain would be 'blocked' visually
  - A north/south orientation is ideal, to minimise sun glare
  - Issues with drainage, as Location D is very low lying.
23. The Board resolved that the matter lie on the table pending estimates for the additional costs associated with siting the court in Location D, and further community consultation.
24. As a result of further investigations, staff have determined that there is no significant difference in construction costs between Locations A and D. The Brooklands Community Centre (Inc.) has undertaken community consultation. A comment form was included in the Styx Post (distributed to all 385 Brooklands residents), seeking input to the proposed location of the tennis court. This consultation received 83 submissions (22% response rate) with 82 respondents opting for Location D and one for Location C. This indicates 99% support for Location D.

## OPTIONS

25. In the current round of assessment, there were three options considered for the location of the tennis court:
  - a) *Construct the tennis at the west side of the Anfield Street entrance to the Domain - Location 'A'*
26. The positive aspects of a court in this location are that this site has good visibility from the road for surveillance, is located in a north/south orientation, is located close to the children's play area and the remaining area is still open for informal car parking at large community events.
27. The negative aspects of a court in this location are that it does introduce a new hard surface into an existing grassed open space and is not supported by the adjacent resident, or the respondents to the consultation undertaken by the Brooklands Community Centre (Inc.).
  - b) *Construct the tennis court inside the Domain, west of the basketball court – Location 'D'*
28. The positive aspects of a court in this location are that it allows all of the recreational facilities in the Domain to be located within the same area. This location has strong support from the local community.

**5. Cont'd**

29. The negative aspects of a court in this location are that the court:
- Intrudes into the open green space area of the Domain
  - Contributes to the 'blocked off' feeling at the entrance to the Domain
  - Would have to be sited east/west, which potentially increases the sun strike for tennis players
  - Would be located in an area that is low lying and would be surrounded by water when this area floods. The court's base will be sufficient to allow it to drain but the new hard surface is likely to exacerbate the existing ponding at the Domain, which is occurring because this area is a low point and cannot be drained away effectively.
- c) *Status quo – no tennis court in Brooklands Domain*
30. This option does not fulfil community expectation and a previous Community Board resolution.

**PREFERRED OPTION**

31. The preferred option is b, (Location D), which has strong community support and locates all the recreational facilities in the Domain within the same area. However, it should be noted that siting a tennis court in Location D is likely to exacerbate the existing ponding issues in this low lying part of the Domain.

**6. QUEENSPARK BUS PRIORITY PROJECT - HILLS ROAD**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager, Transport & Greenspace Unit
<b>Authors:</b>	Jeanette Ward - Team Leader, Christine Toner - Consultation Leader; Capital Projects Unit;

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to proceed to consultation, design and construction of the trial Bus Boarder as shown in the concept plans in the attachment 1 to the agenda.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Approval is sought from the Board to carry out a trial of two Bus Boarders in Hills Road for the #70 Queenspark bus route (see attachment 2). This includes a programme of community consultation (see attachment 3) designed to be undertaken in conjunction with the trial.
3. The #70 Queenspark bus route is on one of three routes where bus priority is an issue.
4. This report outlines the proposal to install and trial two Bus Boarders – considered to be potential solutions to bus priority in congested, slow moving traffic such as is experienced in the trial area during afternoon peak traffic.
5. A Bus Boarder is an extension of the footpath and raised kerb into the nearside parking lane such that the bus can stop without leaving its position in the traffic stream.
6. A Bus Boarder in Hills Road (a two lane road with a flush median) will cause some motorists to overtake a stopped bus, whilst other motorists may choose to stop behind the bus. The purpose of the trial is to evaluate motorists' behaviour and whether it can be influenced by geometric layout changes.

**6. Cont'd**

7. Average stopping time for north-bound buses on Hills Road has been measured at 12 seconds, ranging from 3 to 45 seconds. On average, every fourth bus stops at a particular stop.
8. The bus, by retaining its place in the traffic flow, is expected to enjoy a faster journey.
9. Other options such as a bus lane have been considered, and are briefly discussed.
10. The trial parameters and the criteria that will be used for decision-making are based on bus travel time improvements and driver behaviour.
11. Council staff and the consultant recommend that the construction and trial of two Bus Boarders is the most cost effective means of evaluating the Bus Boarder as a bus priority measure, and is the means that is least likely to inconvenience residents.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

12. The total estimated cost of this project is approximately \$40,000. The project is funded from the Passenger Transport Infrastructure, Bus Priority budget of \$120,000 for 2006/07. There is also budget allocated in 2007/08 for the Queenspark Bus Priority Project.
13. There are no known legal implications for this project. Land Transport New Zealand is a stakeholder and any potential for legal implication will be fully addressed with that organisation.
14. No Community Board resolutions are required because the bus stop locations will not be changed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board approve the Hills Road Bus Boarder trial, as illustrated in attachment 1 of the agenda, to proceed to consultation, design, and construction.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

## 6. Cont'd

### BACKGROUND

#### **Christchurch City Council Bus Priority Project**

15. Three key bus routes have been identified as needing measures to help buses break through traffic congestion to make public transport faster and more reliable. (Details of the Christchurch City Council Bus Priority project can be read at the Council's website <http://www.ccc.govt.nz/environment/Transport/BusPriority/> ).

16. These corridors are:

Main North Road/Papanui Road (QEII Drive to the city)  
Colombo Street/Cashmere Road (Princess Margaret Hospital to the city)  
Queenspark bus route (to the city via New Brighton Road/Shirley Road/Hills Road)

This project applies to the #70 Queenspark route.

17. Among the tried and tested bus priority measures that will be considered for different parts of these corridors are:

- Improvements to bus stop locations and length
- Special traffic signal controls and layouts for buses
- Bus lanes (full and part time)
- Other methods such as Bus Boarders and clearways, that will safely give buses priority over other vehicles.

This project focuses on point d above.

18. One of the main problems facing bus operators and reducing the attractiveness of travel by bus in Christchurch is that buses have to compete with other vehicles for space in the traffic stream. Timetable reliability is at risk especially at peak times, because the buses have to wait to rejoin the traffic stream after picking up and putting down passengers.

#### **The #70 Queenspark route on Whitmore Street/Hills Road**

19. See attachment 2 for map showing the bus route and location of the proposed trial Bus Boarders.
20. The route has shown steady growth over the last few months and Environment Canterbury (ECan) expect that when the service is fully reviewed again in 2010 (when the current contract expires) it is likely to be increased from a 15 minute to a 10 minute frequency.
21. ECan and Christchurch City Council are currently writing a new Passenger Transport Strategy (the draft of which is going out for consultation in September 2006) which includes targets set for ECan by the community, to double patronage again by 2012.
22. This part of the route suffers from congestion, with high volumes of slow moving traffic mainly over three hours in the afternoon and early evening peak period. In several areas the traffic slows down to around 15-20kph. Typically at these speeds and high volume, drivers are reluctant to let a bus that has pulled into a bus stop rejoin the traffic stream.
23. There are two bus services operating north-bound on Hills Road/Whitmore Street - #70 Queenspark (48 buses between 7.30am and 6pm) and Kainga (one per day). The #70 Queenspark service enjoys the fifth highest passenger patronage in Christchurch.
24. During the peak (3.30pm - 6pm), there are 14 Queenspark buses travelling north. These buses leave Hoyts at 5,10 and 15 minute intervals.
25. It is therefore important to introduce some initiatives to resolve this problem if bus usage is to be encouraged and ECan to meet its targets.

**6. Cont'd**

26. The problems created for buses by the congestion are particularly noticeable in Fitzgerald Avenue, Whitmore Street and Hills Road, from Heywood Terrace to Shirley Road, in the afternoon peak. The Shirley Road/Warrington Street intersection acts as a bottleneck, causing the slow moving traffic stream to back up, sometimes all the way back to Heywood Terrace.
27. Bus priority measures for Fitzgerald Avenue approaching Bealey Avenue are currently under investigation and will be reported to the Community Board in due course.
28. In the morning, the south-bound traffic congestion is nowhere near as great, due to the capacity of the Bealey Avenue/Fitzgerald Avenue/London Street/Whitmore Street intersection. Thus there is at present no need for new bus facilities on the eastern side of the road. However, a recent Community Board decision to remove all parking along the eastern side of Hills Road between Shirley Road and Warden Street will be implemented by the time this trial begins.
29. Four-laning of this part of Whitmore Street and Hills Road is currently on the Capital Works Programme for 2011/12. However, there is urgent need to provide some relief before this time, especially for bus transport, in order to achieve the city's stated aim of increasing patronage.

**The case for a trial of Bus Boarders on Hills Road between Bealey Ave and Shirley Road**

30. The congestion occurring during peak periods indicates that there is a need for some form of bus priority measure in this stretch of Hills Road.
31. The built out Bus Boarder on a two-lane road is a new concept to Christchurch. There are several similar facilities in use in the four-lane section of Fendalton Road. Cathedral Square has bus stops within the traffic lanes which have been operating for some time now. There is also a bus stop in Ferry Road near the Woolston Fire Station which occupies the majority of the traffic lane, and operates quite successfully.
32. Council staff and consultants believe that this location is ideal for trialling the Bus Boarder concept, and have confidence that it will be successful if the benefits can be conveyed to the public. This will then increase the efficiency of the services to Queenspark.

**Proposed location for these Bus Boarders in Hills Road**

33. Attachment 1 shows the proposed location and layout of the two Bus Boarders in detail.
34. One of the proposed Bus Boarders would be located on the west (north-bound side) of Hills Road between Dudley Street and Edgeware Road.
35. The other Bus Boarder in the trial would be located on the west (north-bound side) of Hills Road just north of the Warden Street intersection.

**Why a trial?**

36. Prior to four-laning Hills Road, there is no effective way of addressing congestion for all traffic using this corridor. The trial proposed in this report is expected to bring improvements for public transport and is considered to represent the best possible solution, compared with alternatives such as a dedicated bus lane, which is discussed later.
37. Council staff recommend introducing the Bus Boarders in Hills Road as a trial. The trial will include consultation with stakeholders and the general public, whose views will be taken into consideration in later decision-making about installing this type of bus priority measure in some other areas of the city.

## 6. Cont'd

38. Both proposed trial locations have a flush median separating the single traffic lanes. It is not known how motorists will react to a bus stopped in the traffic lane ahead of them. The gap between the stopped bus and the flush median will be about 2.0m wide. Some motorists may choose to utilise the flush median and drive around a stopped bus. Other motorists may decide to stop behind the bus and wait until the bus gets moving again. Once the first motorist has stopped, the behaviour of subsequent motorists might change, making them more inclined to stop as well. Part of the trial will be to find out whether motorist behaviour changes with the gap between the stopped bus and the flush median being increased or decreased.

### The Bus Boarder



**Bus Boarder in Greater Manchester**



**Bus Boarder in Auckland**

39. The Bus Boarder is an extension of the footpath and raised kerb into the nearside traffic lane such that the bus can stop without leaving its position in the traffic stream.
40. Bus Boarders are known to be in use in Auckland, Wellington, and the UK (Greater Manchester, Plymouth, Peterborough are examples).
41. The Bus Boarder is designed to reduce the 'dwell time' at bus stops, thereby reducing journey time and improving reliability
42. A Bus Boarder:
- Reduces the time taken for passengers to board and alight.
  - Reduces delay in re-entering the flow of traffic where buses have stopped.
  - Lets the road space ahead of a stopped bus clear out from traffic, enabling the bus to travel faster after leaving the stop.
43. Other benefits of a Bus Boarder include:
- The enlarged waiting area can be more attractive for the waiting passengers.
  - Improved access to the bus for passengers by allowing the bus to line up parallel to the kerb, largely without manoeuvres.
  - The bus driver can more easily see the waiting passengers.
  - Vehicles cannot illegally park at the bus stop. When vehicles are parked at either side of the bus stop, it is often difficult to manoeuvre a bus into the bus stop and close to the kerb for convenient passenger loading and unloading. As a result, the rear door is often not close to the kerb, meaning that passengers have to step onto the carriageway, rather than the elevated footpath, which is often difficult for elderly people. A bus Boarder overcomes all those problems.
44. Further information about the use of Bus Boarders in the UK can be read at [http://www.tfl.gov.uk/buses/downloads/accessible\\_bus\\_stop\\_design\\_guidance.pdf](http://www.tfl.gov.uk/buses/downloads/accessible_bus_stop_design_guidance.pdf) and in Auckland at <http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/auckland/transport/buses/first.asp>

## 6. Cont'd

### How does a Bus Boarder work?

45. In other cities around the world the Bus Boarder is used to alleviate two problems – that of illegally or carelessly parked vehicles blocking access to the kerbside bus stop or bus bay, and that of re-entering the traffic stream after stopping.
46. In congested, slow moving traffic, buses take longer to re-enter the traffic stream. There is evidence indicating that this is the case in Christchurch and that it is a particular contributor to delays on the #70 Queenspark route. Compounding the problem is the legal situation in New Zealand where drivers are not obliged to give way to a bus indicating to leave a bus stop. The common situation in other countries is that buses do have the right-of-way when leaving a bus stop. A Bus Boarder enables the bus to stop without leaving the traffic flow.
47. Unrestricted or illegal parking often prevents buses reaching stops or aligning correctly with the kerb to ensure close and level boarding. Extending the footway out into the nearside lane to create a boarding and alighting platform called a Bus Boarder may help to remove these sources of delay and to improve safety for passengers.
48. Provision of a raised kerb at a Bus Boarder can be a further deterrent to obstructive car parking or stopping to pick up or set down passengers. Other vehicles may park in the lee of the Boarder, but the position of the bus in the main flow is maintained and passengers may have easier access to the bus.
49. Clearly, the road width needs to be sufficient to permit the construction of a Boarder without the possibility of a stopped bus blocking the passage of oncoming vehicles or without causing unacceptable delay to following traffic.

### Will it create further delays for the traffic stream as a whole?

50. Critics will immediately see that the Bus Boarder stops in the only traffic lane, causing the vehicles behind it to stop also. First impressions are that the Bus Boarder will cause more traffic delays. However, the proposition of this project is that the stopping time at each Bus Boarder will be brief, and the buses will be able to move off quickly and make very good progress to the next Bus Boarder and beyond. Thus queues of general traffic are ultimately displaced by one bus length, but for a bus, this will bring improvements in travel speed and less delay experienced at a bus stop.
51. Christchurch buses, with Metro Card fare paying technology, are now experiencing particularly quick loading time – on average this is 5-6 seconds per person. Our pre-trial observation of the current bus stop situations carried out at five bus stops on this section, by ECan on Friday 28 July and Monday 1 August 2006 (0730hrs to 1830hrs) shows that relatively few passengers use these stops and that the buses do not stop at all bus stops.
52. The observations showed, per day:
  - Fifty-six bus stopping events, out of a potential 240 events (if all buses had stopped at all bus stops) - on average, buses stop at every fourth bus stop only
  - Eighty-one passengers alighting or boarding
  - Average stop length was 14.9 seconds for boarding, 10.2 seconds for alighting – averaging overall at 12 seconds per stop
  - Minimum stopping time was 3 seconds. Maximum stopping time was 45 seconds.
  - In the main the stops were for one passenger, with an average of 1.45 passengers/stop.
53. This information and that from further studies will enable us to model the impact on traffic flows.



## 6. Cont'd

### **How will bus borders work on a two lane road?**

54. In many other situations the Bus Boarder is used on a four-lane road, and the traffic behind the bus can change lanes to overtake it at each Bus Boarder stop, as happens on Fendalton Road. However, this lane changing manoeuvre in itself can cause problems, especially in congestion.
55. On a two-lane road such as Hills Road, there is still room for cyclists and motorcyclists to overtake the bus. As discussed above, motorists may or may not overtake a stopped bus. The purpose of the trial is to measure road user behaviour, and whether this is influenced by geometric layout changes such as different lane widths.

### **Should it operate 'full time' or just a few hours during the peak?**

56. One option is to operate the Bus Boarder trial for only specified peak hours in the afternoon, and having a conventional bus stop adjacent, that would operate during the rest of the day. However, the project team considers that this would cause confusion among bus drivers and passengers as to where to stop/wait. In addition, this option would take up double the kerbside length for the bus stop, thus reducing available parking space.
57. Thus this proposal is for the Bus Boarders to operate on a full time basis, ie 24 hours a day, 7 days a week on Hills Road.

### **What issues do we expect for cyclists?**

58. Cyclist behaviour around this Bus Boarder is anticipated to be similar to that experienced in other situations where a bus stop is located in a kerbside cycle lane – that they will overtake the bus on the carriageway. Such situations arise in Fendalton Road, Main Road Redcliffs and Ferry Road. In the development of the Fendalton Road bus facilities, cyclist group representatives said that some cyclists may prefer to undertake the bus on the left hand side, so the Council built a footpath cycle bypass. Consultation will be carried out to obtain cyclists' viewpoint based on their experience in Fendalton Road.
59. At this point Council staff expect cyclists to overtake the bus on the right, in the carriageway, and see no problem with this. Less confident cyclists will choose to wait behind the bus until it moves off.

### **What issues do we expect for motorists?**

60. The key reason for carrying out this trial is that there is a lack real knowledge about how motorists in Christchurch will behave when faced with a Bus Boarder on a two-lane road.
61. Staff expectation is that motorists will overtake the bus on the right, but that they will do this carefully and slowly as the available carriageway for this manoeuvre will be narrow. Some motorists will stop behind the bus because they perceive the gap to be too narrow.
62. Behaviour will depend somewhat on driver personality – once one driver has proceeded past the bus, others may follow; however, once one is stopped behind a bus others behind are expected to stop also.

### **Why not other measures?**

#### *Bus Lane*

63. Attachment 4 shows a bus lane option.
64. The relatively low frequency of bus use suggests that a dedicated bus lane (which involves moving the flush median and pedestrian islands, localised, part time parking bans on the east side of Hills Road, and complicated measures to enable the bus to turn right at Shirley Road) is not justified.

**6. Cont'd**

- 65. A bus lane could operate during peak periods only, reverting to parking or be available for all vehicles at other times.
- 66. A north-bound bus lane would by its nature be located adjacent to the nearside kerb, and would involve the removal of all parking from the western side of Whitmore Street and Hills Road between Bealey Avenue and Shirley Road at peak times. As already mentioned, parking has just recently been removed along the eastern side of Hills Road between Shirley Road and Warden Street. Parking restrictions would have to be enforced strongly – one car parked in the bus lane would disrupt the bus travel and negate the purpose entirely.
- 67. A bus lane could be terminated just north of Warden Street, with buses re-entering the traffic stream and reaching the right turning lane. This would be similar to a bus leaving a bus stop at present.
- 68. As an alternative to terminating a bus lane just north of Warden Street, it could be continued up to the intersection with Shirley Road and Warrington Street. However, the buses turn right at this intersection. To accommodate right turning buses into Shirley Road would require significant modification to the signal sequence – and would severely compromise the efficiency of the intersection without necessarily providing benefits to buses.
- 69. Thus, a bus lane is not considered technically feasible or desirable for the full length of Hills Road/Whitmore Street due to operational problems at the Hills/ Shirley/Warrington intersection. A bus lane terminating just north of Warden Street is not considered desirable due to the parking loss along the entire western side south of Warden Street. Therefore Council staff recommend a trial of two Bus Boarders, on the basis that that Bus Boarders may be a more efficient means of creating bus priority in this section of Hills Road.

**CONCLUSION**

- 70. There is an acknowledged need to implement bus efficiency measures on the west side of Whitmore Street and Hills Road in the evening peak period. The suggested Bus Boarder trial is seen as being the most cost effective measure for this location, and is considered to be the option that will have the least impact on residents. Council staff believe that with good publicity, motorists and other public will see this option in a positive light, particularly compared with other more costly alternatives. It is hoped that the measurements carried out during this trial will prove that Bus Boarders are successful and that they should be used as an effective tool in similar problem areas across the city.

**7. REQUEST FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY TRAFFIC AND PARKING BY-LAW 1991**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Secretariat Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Elaine D Greaves, DDI 941-6726

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's recommendation to Council for an amendment to the Christchurch City Traffic and Parking By-law 1991.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2. Inspector J W Doyle (Area Commander, Southern Christchurch, New Zealand Police) and Senior Sergeant Trevor Pullen recently made submissions to the Council requesting an amendment to the Ninth Schedule of the Christchurch City Traffic and Parking Bylaw 1991 to address street racing activities in the Hasketts Road/Barters Road area.

**7. Cont'd**

3. The Police are now canvassing all community boards for information relating to problem areas that could be added to the Schedule.
4. A Joint Forum was held by the Shirley/Papanui and Fendalton/Waimairi Community Boards on 21 August 2006 and the following roads were identified for inclusion:
  - Kaianga Road
  - Spencerville Road
  - Lower Styx Road
  - Husseys Road
  - Pound Road
  - Ryans Road
  - Savills Road
  - Guys Road
  - Chattertons Road
  - Miners Road
  - McLean Island Road
  - Coutts Island Road
  - Blakes Road
  - Guthries Road
  - Dickey's Road
5. As the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board's Works and Traffic Committee will be considering this matter further, the staff recommendation of this report relates only to the Shirley/Papanui community.

**FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6. There are financial considerations relating to this report. There will be a need in terms of the By-law to erect signage on all the roads listed in the Ninth Schedule of the By-law. The cost of this signage, across the city, if all boards wish to have roads included in the Schedule could be significant and is currently unbudgeted.
7. It is noted that the Council is required to erect signage on roads added to the Ninth Schedule, and local residents advised accordingly.
8. The By-law provides that the prohibited times in listed streets are Friday – Sunday 9pm -5am, and the same times on statutory holidays.
9. Once all the boards have considered this issue staff will prepare a report for the Council on the implications of including these additional streets to the Ninth Schedule. Inclusion of streets in the Ninth Schedule prohibits the movement of all cars along that street during the prohibited times except for residents living in the street, trade vehicles, security vehicles and Council vehicles.
10. So when a street is listed in the Ninth Schedule it is unlawful for the general public to drive along that street during the prohibited times and requires them to take alternative routes around the city. For this reason it is important for the Council to see from an overall perspective what streets community boards are putting forward to be listed in the Ninth Schedule so as to ensure that the public can move around the city with reasonable ease, and without greatly inconveniencing the public.
11. Once community boards have considered this issue staff will put a report to Council with recommendations on the streets put forward by community boards and with the usual advice regarding the legal and financial issues and any policy issues that may arise.

**7. Cont'd****STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board recommend that Council resolves:

- a) To add the following roads to the Ninth Schedule of the Christchurch City Traffic and Parking By-law 1991:
- Kaianga Road
  - Spencerville Road
  - Lower Styx Road
  - Husseys Road
  - Coutts Island Road
  - Blakes Road
  - Guthries Road
  - Dickeys Road

with effect from the date of Council's resolution, subject to the erection of the signs referred to in clause 68A(3) of the Christchurch City Traffic and Parking By-law 1991.

- b) That Council's resolution be publicly notified, as required by clause 68A(4) of the Christchurch City Traffic and Parking By-law 1991.
- c) That staff provide advice to Council on the list of streets submitted by community boards.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**8. REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD'S EVENTS COMMITTEE**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Secretariat Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Elaine D Greaves, DDI: 941-6726

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to submit the following report of the Board's Events Committee which met on 16 August 2006:

**Report of a meeting of the Events Committee  
held on Wednesday, 16 August 2006 at 9.20 am  
in the Boardroom, Papanui Service Centre**

**PRESENT:** Yvonne Palmer (Chairperson), Myra Barry, Bill Bush, Ngaire Button and Megan Evans.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Elsie Ellison (Community Board Principal Adviser)  
Elaine Greaves (Community Board Secretary)  
Roger Cave (Community Engagement Adviser)  
Liz Afualo (Community Engagement Officer)  
Sharon Munro (Administration Support Officer)

**1. NEIGHBOURHOOD WEEK 2006**

A communications plan was tabled for feedback from Committee members, with the following changes being agreed to:

## 8. Cont'd

### Background

- The second paragraph to be deleted, as it was felt the content was too negative and unnecessary.

### Stakeholder

- The first bullet point to read "Community Board, Mayor and Councillors".
- Neighbourhood Support and Community Constables to be included as a stakeholders.

### Key Messages

- The first bullet point to read "Neighbourhood Week is about getting to know the people in your neighbourhood (delete the words "who live close to you")".
- Delete the third bullet point (too negative) and replace it with the last bullet point.

### Communications Table

- Should also include Northlands Mall on 16 September 2006.
- Try and promote Neighbourhood Week via TV One's information slot at the close of the 7.00 pm weather update.

The following should also be noted:

- A new poster has been produced to promote this year's event. Committee members were requested to select two pictures from the poster to be used for the colouring in competition.
- Neighbourhood Week needs to be promoted in the Mairehau community (as per feedback obtained as part of the Mairehau research), including promotion of funding available to the community – staff to contact the researcher to ascertain appropriate community contacts (eg schools, churches, Plunkett, Neighbourhood Support Groups, Council housing, etc.).
- Colouring competition categories 5-7, 8-10 and 11-12 year olds.
- The Committee has a policy of allocating around \$2.00 per head in terms of applications received for community events to celebrate Neighbourhood Week.
- Applications for funding close 29 September 2006. Once all applications have been received, information will be transposed into a spreadsheet for the Events Committee to consider at 11.00 am on 11 October 2006.
- Staff were asked to investigate location of photograph collection from previous Neighbourhood Weeks supported by the Board.

## 2. HOST RESPONSIBILITY AWARDS

It was agreed judging would take place on 21 September 2006 at 7.00 pm. Staff to arrange booking for a Council van. Judging to be undertaken by Events Committee members (excluding Megan), District Licensing Association and Police.

In line with last year's practise, Police and Licensing staff will put together a list of premises to be visited. It should be noted, however, that the Committee would also like to include the chartered clubs (eg Papanui, Shirley, Richmond, St Albans).

## 3. RESIDENTS' GROUPS SUPPORT POLICY REVIEW

The Community Support Unit is currently reviewing the Residents' Groups Support Policy. Groups have been advised of the review and will be invited to a session to discuss.

**8. Cont'd**

It was noted that some of the residents' groups in the Board's area currently have no legal status (eg Redwood, Kaianga, Belfast).

It was agreed that the outcome of the review would be a good topic for a future Joint Forum (with Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board).

**4. HERITAGE AWARDS**

It was agreed that this year's event held at Rehua Marae was a great success.

It was noted that applications for Heritage Awards need to start being accumulated between now and the closing date for next year (30 April 2007).

The Committee would prefer to keep Heritage Awards separate to Heritage Week. In the past, the Board has funded Heritage Walks (Graham Stanley) for Heritage Week.

It was suggested for next year's Heritage Awards that a Power point presentation be put together to show everyone pictures of places that have been nominated for an award.

It was agreed that the Awards need to be more widely publicised and nominations sought from the community. It was acknowledged that work needed to be done to illicit more involvement from local schools.

The meeting concluded at 10.23 am.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the information be received.

**9. REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND COMMITTEE**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Secretariat Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Elaine D Greaves, DDI 941-6726

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to submit the following report of the Board's Events Committee which met on 16 August 2006:

**Report of a Meeting of the Youth Development Fund Sub Committee  
held on Wednesday 16 August 2006 at 9.00 am  
in the Boardroom, Papanui Service Centre**

**PRESENT:** Yvonne Palmer (Chairperson), Myra Barry, Ngaire Button, Bill Bush and Megan Evans.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Elsie Ellison (Community Board Principal Adviser)  
Elaine Greaves (Community Board Secretary)  
Bruce Meder (Community Development Adviser)

**1. YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND APPLICATIONS**

The Committee's approval was sought to two applications for funding from the Board's Youth Development Fund.

**9. Cont'd**

The Committee **resolved** to grant the following from the Board's 2006/07 Youth Development Fund:

- A. \$150 to Johanna English to enable her to participate as a member of the Bel Canto, Burnside High School's Senior Girls' Choir in the 2006 Choral Finale to be held in Auckland 23-27 August 2006.
- B. \$750 to Joshua Harrison to enable him to participate in a France/New Zealand Exchange Programme commencing in December 2006.

The meeting concluded at 9.15 am.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the information be received.

**10. BOARD MEMBERS' ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS**

A schedule is attached detailing Board members' accountability reports for the period January to June 2006.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the information be received.

**11. COMMUNITY BOARD CONFERENCE**

A report by the Board Chairperson is attached providing details of the above forum held in Hutt City on 14 and 15 May 2006. Copies of the Powerpoint presentations referred to in the report have been distributed separately.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the information be received.

**12. UPDATE OF BOARD FUNDS**

Attached are schedules detailing the Board's 2006/07 Discretionary, SCAP, Youth Development and Sport and Recreation Fund.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the information be received.

**13. UPDATE FROM COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER**

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the information be received.

**14. NOTICES OF MOTION**

Pursuant to Standing Order 2.16.1, notices of motion have been received in writing as follows:

- i) *Sawyers Arms Road/Lacebark Lane*  
That Transport Unit staff investigate the parking of vehicles on the corner of Lacebark Lane/Sawyers Arms Road and that marking of bus stops be carried out to prevent vehicles from parking on the bus stops. Consultation with the resident on the corner of Lacebark Lane to be undertaken in regard to the possible shifting of the bus stop to this site.
- ii) *104-106 Sawyers Arms Road*  
That the Board request Transport Unit staff to install a loading zone outside the businesses located at 104-106 Sawyers Arms Road to allow large trucks to park while waiting to access Christchurch Steel (the Manager of the business supports the Board's actions).
- iii) *113-117 Sawyers Arms Road*  
That the Board request Transport Unit staff to investigate safety issues and carry out appropriate works to remedy residents' concerns relating to such matters being experienced as a result of the increase in parking from the industrial buildings on Sawyers Arms Road.
- iv) On the basis that a number of school principals have indicated an interest in participating in Junior Neighbourhood Support, the Board request a report from staff regarding the provision of further funding to support this initiative in the Shirley/Papanui community.

**15. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

**16. CORRESPONDENCE**

**17. CHAIRPERSON'S AND BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

Board members will be provided with an opportunity to give an update on community activities.

**18. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS** (If any have been submitted in accordance with Standing Orders 4.1.1 to 4.1.5)