



## Christchurch City Council

# RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

TUESDAY 12 JUNE 2007

AT 5.00PM

HELD IN THE BOARDROOM, SOCKBURN SERVICE CENTRE,  
149 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, CHRISTCHURCH

**Acting Community Board Principal Adviser**

Clare Sullivan  
Telephone: 941-6601  
Fax: 941-6604  
Email: [clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz)

**Community Board Secretary**

Graham Sutherland  
Telephone: 941-5112  
Fax: 941-5110  
Email: [graham.sutherland@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:graham.sutherland@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 - 23 MAY 2007
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
  - 3.1 SCHOOL LANDSCAPE PROJECT FOR KYLE PARK
- PART B 4. CORRESPONDENCE
- PART B 5. PETITIONS
- PART B 6. NOTICES OF MOTION
- PART C 7. APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE TO BYLAWS REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
- PART C 8. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
- PART C 9. HEI HEI BROOMFIELD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRIEF COUNSELLING
- PART C 10. BUS STOP – 56 ILAM ROAD
- PART A 11. RICCARTON/WIGRAM ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE - REPORT OF 21 MAY 2007 MEETING
- PART C 12. RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE - REPORT OF 23 MAY 2007 MEETING

**We're on the Web!**

[www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/](http://www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/)

**12. 6. 2007**

**- 2 -**

- PART C 13. RICCARTON/WIGRAM TRANSPORT AND ROADING COMMITTEE - REPORT OF 25 MAY 2007 MEETING**
- PART B 14. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B 15. BOARD FUNDS UPDATE**
- PART B 16. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE**
- PART B 17. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**
- PART C 18. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF THE MEETING REPORT – 23 MAY 2007

The report, both open and public excluded, of the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board meeting of 23 May 2007 have been circulated to members.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 SCHOOL LANDSCAPE PROJECT FOR KYLE PARK

Two students from Hornby High School would like to address the Board to provide information on the school landscape project for Kyle Park.

4. CORRESPONDENCE

5. PETITIONS

6. NOTICES OF MOTION

7. APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE TO BYLAWS REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8177
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Programme Manager Strong Communities
<b>Author:</b>	Terence Moody

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is for the Community Board to nominate a representative to a subcommittee to feed Community Board members' views in to the review of bylaws.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. A seminar was held on 13 March 2007 of Councillors and Community Board members to provide information on the required reviews of bylaws under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the process that must be undertaken to comply with the Act. Section 158 of the LGA 2002 requires bylaws to be reviewed within five years of 1 July 2003 if they were made prior to the Act coming into force, or if made under the LGA 2002 within five years of the date they were made. Reviews must be carried out in accordance with section 155 which requires that the Council is satisfied that a bylaw is necessary, and the perceived problems cannot be dealt with in any other manner. At least 24 bylaws are required to be reviewed prior to the end of June 2008 and timetables for these reviews have been set.
3. On 10 May 2007, a Council meeting decision was made to form a subcommittee.<sup>1</sup> The subcommittee will provide a single conduit for communication with Community Boards about the reviews and highlight specific reviews likely to be of high interest. The subcommittee will gather feedback in a timely and efficient fashion and enable a fast turnaround of initial comments on the reviews prior to the formal consideration by the Council required under the Act. The options analysis for each review will be sent to the subcommittee prior to the matter going on to the Council. It will be necessary to ensure a prescribed turnaround time for responses back to the initiating units to meet timetables for the reviews. The terms of reference for this subcommittee is *to provide a process by which the views of Community Boards can be collected and considered and to communicate these views to the Council as part of the consideration of options in the reviews of bylaws*. The process is not intended to promote totally new bylaws but to consider the review requirements of the Act. Should the process identify

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to Council meeting minutes on this decision.

**7. Cont'd**

objectives that may need to be considered by totally new bylaws these will be noted and addressed once the review of existing bylaws is completed.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. The input of Community Boards will be conducted through normal Board processes. The joint committee approach should reduce the potential for duplication and delay, and assist Council in meeting its statutory deadline. There are no extraordinary financial implications from the proposed process.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

5. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6. The Council has the power under the LGA 2002 to appoint or discharge committees and subcommittees (clause 30). The Council can also delegate powers to subcommittees in accordance with clause 32, Schedule 7 of the LGA 2002 for the purposes of efficiency and effectiveness in the conduct of the Council's business. In this case, there is no need to delegate any powers to the subcommittee as its primary purpose concerns gathering and distributing information to and from the Community Boards in respect of the bylaw reviews. The Council has delegated the power to appoint the Community Board members of the subcommittee, to each Community Board.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

7. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

8. The report is consistent with the Democracy and Governance Activity Management Plan in the LTCCP in that the recommendations contribute to ensuring that there is suitable community input to the Council's decision making. See Our Community Plan 2006-2016 Volume 1 Page 111.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

9. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

10. No specific strategies involved.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

11. Compliance with Strategic Directions to promote participation in democratic processes by *making it easy for people to understand and take part in Council decision-making processes.*

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

12. An initial seminar was held on 13 March 2007 with Community Boards and copies were distributed to all board members. The proposed structure was reported to Council on 10 May 2007 and adopted.

7. Cont'd

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

13. That the Community Board nominate a member as its representative on the Bylaw Reviews Subcommittee to collectively ensure that the views of the Community Boards are incorporated as part of the review process required for all bylaws under the Local Government Act 2002.

**BACKGROUND (THE BYLAW REVIEW PROCESS)**

14. A seminar was held on 13 March 2007 of Councillors and Community Board members, to provide information on the required reviews of bylaws under the LGA 2002 and the process that must be undertaken to comply with the Act. Where Community Board members were unable to attend, copies of the material presented and the notes of the meeting were distributed for their information. Section 158 of the LGA 2002 requires bylaws to be reviewed within five years of 1 July 2003 if they were made prior to the Act coming into force, or if made under the LGA 2002 within five years of the date they were made. Reviews must be carried out in accordance with section 155 which requires that the Council is satisfied that a bylaw is necessary, and the perceived problems cannot be dealt with in any other manner.
15. If it is determined that a bylaw is the most appropriate way of dealing with the problem the Council must decide that the bylaw is the most appropriate form and does not give rise to any implications under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (NZBORA). This means the Council must be able to show that the bylaw provision being considered serves an important and significant objective, there is a rational connection between the provision and objective and it does not interfere with any right or freedom protected by the NZBORA.
16. The Code of Good Regulatory Practice requires that consideration be given to:
  - Efficiency - by adopting only regulations for which the costs to society are justified by the benefits;
  - Effectiveness - to ensure it can be complied with and enforced at the lowest possible cost;
  - Transparency - by defining the nature and extent of the problem and evaluating the need for action;
  - Clarity - in making things as simple as possible, to use plain language where possible, and keeping discretion to a minimum; and
  - Regulation should be fair and treat those affected equitably.
17. Section 145 of the LGA 2002 provides the general bylaw-making power for territorial authorities for the following purposes:
  - (a) protecting the public from nuisance;
  - (b) protecting, promoting, and maintaining public health and safety; and
  - (c) minimising the potential for offensive behaviour in public places.
18. Sections 146 and 147 provide specific bylaw-making powers to regulate:
  - On-site wastewater disposal systems
  - Waste management
  - Trade wastes
  - Solid wastes
  - Keeping of animals, bees, and poultry
  - Trading in public places
  - Water races
  - Water supply
  - Wastewater, drainage, and sanitation
  - Land drainage
  - Cemeteries
  - Reserves or Recreation grounds
  - Prevention of the spread of fires involving vegetation subject to provisions of the Forest and Rural Act 1977

7. Cont'd

For liquor control purposes the Council is empowered to prohibit or regulate the consumption of liquor, bringing of liquor, or possession of liquor in a public place.

19. There remain some provisions which enable territorial authorities to make bylaws which are contained in the Local Government Act 1974, which largely relate to the use of roads and traffic matters. These tend to be more specific in nature than the purposes set out in the LGA 2002. Some of the bylaws due for review may fall within the 1974 Act provisions.
20. The table below sets out the bylaws that must be reviewed by June 2008.

CC Public Places and Signs Bylaw 2003	BP District Refuse Bylaw 2002
CC Dog Control Bylaw 1997	BP Trade Wastes Bylaw 2000
CC Refuse Bylaw 1995	BP Wastewater Drainage Bylaw 2000
CC Bylaw No. 118 (1981) Parks and Reserves	BP Water Supply Bylaw 1998
CC Traffic and Parking Bylaw 1991	BP Amusement Devices and Shooting Galleries 1996
CC Water Related Services Bylaw 2001	BP Nuisances 1996
CC Bylaw No. 110 (1980) Cemeteries	BP Public Swimming Pools 1996
CC Bylaw No. 103 (1979) Public Swimming Pools	BP Gin Trap Bylaw 1991 No. 1
CC Bylaw No. 120 (1982) Estuary and Foreshore	BP Cemetery Bylaw 1996
BP Licences for Vehicle Stands on Streets 1996	BP Marine Facilities Control Bylaw 2002
BP Parks and Reserves 1996	BP Traffic and Parking Bylaw 1998
BP Mobile or Travelling Shops, and Hawkers and Itinerant Traders 1996	BP Stock Control Bylaw 1994 No. 1

21. A number of units are involved in the reviews and some bylaws will be considered jointly by more than one unit. A programme has been developed for consideration of the bylaws and the process must be adhered to whether a bylaw is to have minor or substantive changes, remain unchanged or be revoked. The full process of review requires consultation with the Executive Team, the Council and Community Boards, and progression through public consultation, submissions and a hearings panel. A minimum of five or six months is commonly required to complete a review. The table above shows that 24 bylaws must be reviewed in the next 12 months although some reviews will be able to be combined and some bylaws will possibly be able to be revoked on the grounds that their objectives are covered by other legislation. The Council must consider the need for Community Board input, and the time that may be involved in this additional consultation, with the relatively tight timetable legally required to complete the bylaw reviews.
22. The seminar concluded that a small subcommittee of Community Board members and Councillors formed to undertake an initial consideration of the reviews could be the most efficient, effective and timely method of obtaining Community Board input. The subcommittee could provide a single conduit for communication with the Community Boards about the reviews and highlight specific reviews likely to be of high interest. It is expected that the subcommittee could gather feedback in a timely and efficient fashion and enable a fast turnaround of initial comments on the reviews prior to commencement of the formal consultation process required under the Act. The proposal was that the options analysis for each review would be sent to all community board members for comments back through the Community Board's representative to the subcommittee prior to the matter going on to the Council. It would be necessary to ensure a prescribed turnaround time for responses back to the initiating units to meet timetables for the reviews. The process is not intended to be used to promote totally new bylaws. These can be raised and considered at any time, but this process is limited to considering the review requirements of the Act. If through the process possible new bylaws are identified for consideration these will be noted and addressed once the review of existing bylaws is completed. It must be noted that the Community Boards can have another opportunity to provide feedback through the special consultative procedure.

**7. Cont'd**

23. Council Decision – On 10 May 2007 the following decisions were made at the Council meeting:
- (a) Resolve to appoint a subcommittee to consider initial reviews of the Council's bylaws and provide feedback to the appropriate Units on the views of the Community Boards, prior to the matters being formally considered by the Council.
  - (b) Resolve that the subcommittee comprise one representative from each of the eight community boards and two Councillors.
  - (c) Appoint two Councillors to be members of the subcommittee.
  - (d) Delegate the power to appoint one Community Board member of the subcommittee to each Community Board.

**8. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – SARAH LOUISE MARTIN**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Recreation and Sports Unit
<b>Author:</b>	Lisa Gregory, Community Recreation Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an application for funding from the Community Board's 2006/07 Discretionary Fund. There is nil balance in the Board's Youth Development Scheme.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The applicant, Sarah Louise Martin, is a 15 year old student who lives in Hornby and is seeking Community Board support to travel to Canberra with the New Zealand Under 17 Women's Cycling team from 5 – 9 July 2007.
3. Sarah has been involved in competitive cycling for 4 years and since 2005 has developed into a New Zealand Junior Champion and a New Zealand representative. Sarah's ultimate goal is to compete at an Olympic Games and this trip will offer her the experience required to gain selection for future international events.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. The following table provides a breakdown of funding requested:

<b>SARAH LOUISE MARTIN</b>	
<b>EXPENSES</b>	<b>Cost (\$)</b>
Accommodation / flights / food / ground transport	\$2,000.00
Pre tour camp	\$550.00
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$2,550.00</b>
Funds raised to date by applicant	\$400.00
<b>Amount Requested from Community Board</b>	<b>\$1,550.00</b>

5. This is the first time that the applicant has applied to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board for financial support.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

6. Yes, see page 172 LTCCP, Youth Development Scheme and Discretionary Fund.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

7. There are no legal issues to be considered.

**8. Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

8. Aligns with page 170 LTCCP, regarding Community Board Project funding.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

9. Yes, see page 172 LTCCP, Youth Development Scheme and Discretionary Fund.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

10. Application aligns with the Council's Youth Strategy and local Community Board objectives.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

11. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

12. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

13. It is recommended that the Board approve the application and allocate \$350 to Sarah Louise Martin from the 2006/07 Discretionary Fund.

**9. HEI HEI BROOMFIELD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRIEF COUNSELLING**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	Community Support Unit General Manager, DDI 941-8879
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Ian Burn Community Development Advisor
<b>Author:</b>	Ian Burn Community Development Advisor

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board for \$340 for funding for the Hei Hei Broomfield Community Development Worker to attend training in Grief Counselling.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Hei Hei Broomfield Community Development Worker Tracey Buunk is seeking funds towards the costs of attending training towards a Certificate in Grief Support with Lois Tonkin. Tracey has recently been in the situation of supporting a number of people through the process of bereavement and would like to have the skills to be able to do this with a higher degree of skill. She feels that the people she is supporting are unlikely to feel comfortable going to an external counsellor.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

3. The following outlines budgetary requirements for 2007:

<b>Cost</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Grief Counselling Training	1 September	\$710
<b>Total Cost</b>		<b>\$710</b>

The difference between the \$340 requested and the cost of \$710 is to be funded by Tracey's employer, the Family and Community division of Anglican Social Services, from their training budget.



**9. Cont'd**

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

4. Yes, see page 172 LTCCP, regarding the discretionary fund.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

5. There are no legal issues to be considered.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

6. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

7. Yes.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

8. Yes, see page 172 LTCCP, regarding the discretionary fund.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

9. Yes, in alignment with the Community Wellbeing Strategy.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

10. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

11. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board approve \$340 in support of this application from the Board's 2006/07 Discretionary fund.

**10. BUS STOP – 56 ILAM ROAD**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, Jane Parfitt DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Michael Aitken Unit Manager Transport & Greenspace
Author:	Lindsay Eagle

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to provide information for the Board concerning the bus stop currently at 56 Ilam Road in the Board's area (refer attached). The Board is asked to consider the possibility of repositioning this bus stop to another location.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The resident owner at 56 Ilam Road has requested that the bus stop be moved away from along the frontage of this property. The stop has been at this location for many years.

3. Staff consider that the existing location is the most suitable position for the bus stop.

**10. Cont'd**

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. The direct cost for uplifting and relocating the existing bus stop furniture and road marking would amount to about \$1,500. Reinstating the footpath and berm area at both locations would amount to a further \$2,000.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

5. The Transport and Greenspace Unit budget for public transport infrastructure maintenance for the current financial year contains financial provision for this type of work.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6. Land Transport Rules Traffic Control Devices 2004 provides for the erection of bus stop signs.

**Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?**

7. Yes, see above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

8. Providing bus stops within 800 metres spacing along a bus route.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

9. Yes, see above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

10. Liveable City (3) Provide safe, efficient and affordable transport system. Ensure access to goods and services, and work opportunities.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

11. 8 (h) Page 64. Our Community Plan.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

12. Agreement has not been gained from either of the owners of the adjoining properties to establish a permanent bus stop along the outside frontage of their property.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board decide and make a resolution as to the location of the bus stop along this section of Ilam Road.

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

13. The resident owner of the property at 56 Ilam Road, Mr Peter Douglas, has expressed his strong dissatisfaction with the continued use of the road frontage along his property, for the use as a bus stop. He has requested that another location be found for the siting of this stop.
14. An investigation of this area of Ilam Road has been undertaken to assess other potentially suitable sites. Inspection identified that the stop could be moved to the frontage of the adjoining property to the north, No. 58, or to a site two properties to the south at No. 52. These two properties have suitable frontage characteristics. When approached each owner / resident of both these properties strongly disapproved of relocating the bus stop to a placement in front of their site.

**10. Cont'd**

15. This bus stop has been located to maximise access to the surrounding catchment area while allowing the bus to travel as freely as possible and to stop a minimum number of times. The spacing between the bus stops is convenient for bus drivers and patrons.
16. In locating new stops, the Christchurch City Council investigates a number of locations to assess suitability. It consults as a courtesy the property owner adjacent to a suitable location. It is preferred to locate stops where agreement has been gained from the property owners, however, where agreement is not reached a decision and recommendation has to be made as to what is the safest and best location for all parties; bus users, potential bus users, motorists and residents.
17. The owners have been invited to express their viewpoints to the Board at this meeting.

**THE OBJECTIVES**

18. To provide amenities for the public transport system which are safe, efficient and convenient.

**THE OPTIONS**

**Option A: Relocate the bus stop one property to the north at No. 58.**

19. The bus stop located on the eastern side of Ilam Road at a point 50 metres to the south of the intersection with Kirkwood Avenue be rescinded and a bus stop be created on the eastern side of Ilam Road at a point 32 metres south of the intersection with Kirkwood Avenue.

**Option B: Relocate the bus stop two properties to the south at No. 52.**

20. The bus stop located on the eastern side of Ilam Road at a point 50 metres to the south of the intersection with Kirkwood Avenue be rescinded and a bus stop be created on the eastern side of Ilam Road at a point 82 metres south of the intersection with Kirkwood Avenue.

**Option C: Status Quo**

21. The bus stop be retained at its present location along the frontage of 56 Ilam Road.

**THE PREFERRED OPTION**

22. Option C: Status Quo.

**11. RICCARTON/WIGRAM ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE - REPORT OF 21 MAY 2007 MEETING**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Clare Sullivan, Community Board Principal Adviser
<b>Author:</b>	Emma Davison, Community Secretary

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the Environment Committee meeting held on Monday 21 May 2007.

The meeting was attended by Neville Bennett (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Lesley Keast, Peter Laloli, Mike Mora, Bob Shearing and Tony Sutcliffe.

An apology for lateness was received and accepted from Helen Broughton.

**1. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**1.1 HALSWELL RUGBY LEAGUE FOOTBALL CLUB**

Representatives from the Halswell Rugby League Football Club addressed the Committee to express their concerns with current playing and training fields and flood lights not meeting the needs of their Club and further advocated with urgency for the proposed additional playing and training fields to relieve some of the pressure on the existing grounds.

The Committee received the information and its recommendation is recorded under Clause 4 of this report.

**1.2 HALSWELL RUGBY LEAGUE NETBALL CLUB**

Representatives from the Halswell Rugby League Netball Club addressed the Committee regarding the proposed new development of sportsfields on Halswell Domain. The Club are currently practicing on an improvised court behind the Rugby Club Rooms. This was a temporary arrangement which is no longer sustainable. The Club would like to see the Council progress the development of sportsfields on Halswell Domain with urgency.

The Committee received the information and its recommendation is recorded under Clause 4 of this report.

**2. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

Members were provided with an opportunity to share issues of concern and give a brief update on community activities.

It was requested that staff provide information on the status of Gilberthorpes Reserve, including a copy of the original subdivision application.

**3. SUPPLEMENTARY DEPUTATION**

The Committee resolved that the following supplementary deputation be received and considered at the present meeting.

Halswell Rugby League Netball Club.

**4. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**4.1 HALSWELL DOMAIN**

That the Board:

- (a) Seek speaking rights at a forthcoming Council meeting, with urgency, to support the issues raised by the sports users of Halswell Domain.

**11. Cont'd**

- (b) Recommends to the Council that it investigate purchasing the block of land associated with the Neal Group Limited development to progress the development of the 5 hectares of sportsfields on Halswell Domain.
- (c) Requests information from staff on the current policy relating to the maintenance of drainage swales in public parks and reserves.
- (d) Requests further information on the historic buildings at Aidanfield.

**12. RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE - REPORT OF 23 MAY 2007 MEETING**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI: 941-8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Clare Sullivan, Community Board Principal Adviser
<b>Author:</b>	Emma Davison, Community Secretary

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the Community Services Committee meeting held on Wednesday 23 May 2007.

The meeting was attended by Tony Sutcliffe (Chairperson), Neville Bennett, Helen Broughton, Lesley Keast, Mike Mora, Peter Laloli and Bob Shearing.

**1. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**1.1 AGE CONCERN CANTERBURY**

Andrew Dickerson, Chief Executive, Age Concern Canterbury was present to update the Committee on the "Winter Warmth" project.

The Committee received the information.

**2. SEEDS COMMUNITY GROUP – APPLICATION FOR FUNDING**

The Committee considered an application for funding for \$10,000 for the salary of a trained facilitator/health professional to run a music and movement/support group for teenage/young mothers under 25 years and their pre-school children.

The Committee received the information and its recommendation is recorded under Clause 5 of this report.

**3. CHRISTMAS LIGHTS**

The Committee discussed options for tree lighting at Church Corner.

The Committee decided to request information from staff on the viability, including funding options, for tree lighting at Church Corner.

**4. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

Members were provided with an opportunity to share issues of concern and give a brief update on community activities.

**5. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board agrees to allocate the amount of \$10,000 to SEEDS towards the salary of a facilitate/health professional for their programme for teenage/young parents.

**13. RICCARTON/WIGRAM TRANSPORT AND ROADING COMMITTEE - REPORT OF 25 MAY 2007 MEETING**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI: 941 8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Clare Sullivan, Community Board Principal Adviser
<b>Author:</b>	Emma Davison, Community Secretary

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the Transport and Roading Committee meeting held on Friday 25 May 2007.

The meeting was attended by Mike Mora (Chairperson), Lesley Keast, Peter Laloli, Tony Sutcliffe and Bob Shearing.

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Neville Bennett and Helen Broughton.

**1. CORRESPONDENCE**

**1.1 BOSTON AVENUE HEAVY TRUCK RESTRICTION**

The Committee considered correspondence from Bob Bain regarding heavy traffic usage in Boston Avenue.

The Committee decided to add this matter to its list of current issues.

**2. PROPOSED ROAD AND RIGHT OF WAY NAMING**

The Committee considered a report seeking the Board's approval of one new road name, and one new right-of-way name.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 6 of this report.

**3. UPDATE ON CURRENT TRANSPORT ISSUES**

The Committee considered the spreadsheet circulated at the meeting providing an update on current transport issues in the Riccarton/Wigram community.

The Transport & Greenspace Unit Manger was also present to update the Committee on current issues.

**4. TRANSPORT & ROADING COMMITTEE FUNDS UPDATE**

The Committee received the information.

**5. MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

Members were provided with an opportunity to share issues of concern and give a brief update on community activities.

It was requested:

- That the Transport & Greenspace Unit Manager be invited to Committee meetings on a regular basis.
- That staff provide an update on the Chalmers Street issue at a forthcoming meeting.

**6. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Board approves the following names for use: Detroit Place and Midway Lane.

**14. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

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

**15. BOARD FUNDS UPDATE**

A schedule with up-to-date information regarding available balances in the Board's 2006/07 Environment Committee, Transport & Roading Committee and Discretionary Funds is attached for discussion.

**16. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE**

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

**17. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

**18. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

Attached.