



Christchurch City Council

SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 30 MAY 2007

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

Acting Community Board Secretary

Janet MacDougall

Phone 941 6726

Email: janet.macdougall@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 2 MAY 2007
PART B	3.	GOOD NEIGHBOUR AWARDS
PART B	4.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
PART B	5.	PETITIONS
PART C	6.	BELFAST MUSEUM COMPUTER PURCHASE
PART C	7.	APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE TO BYLAWS REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
PART C	8.	ENGLISH PARK/ST ALBANS SCHOOL NEW PLAYGROUND
PART C	9.	RICHMOND PARK DEVELOPMENT PLAN

30. 5. 2007

- 2 -

	ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION
PART C	10.	REQUEST FOR FUNDING - REDWOOD TENNIS
PART C	11.	NOTICES OF MOTION
PART B	12.	UPDATE OF BOARD FUNDS
PART B	13.	UPDATE FROM COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER
PART B	14.	CORRESPONDENCE
PART B	15.	MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 16 MAY 2007

The report of the ordinary meeting of 16 May 2007 is attached.

CHAIRPERSON’S RECOMMENDATION

That the report to Council of 16 May 2007 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

3. GOOD NEIGHBOURS’ AWARDS

3.1. Mr and Mrs Hogers, of Redwood.

Mr/s Hogers are regular walkers through the local Redwood reserves, and are constantly tidying up on behalf of the community, and reporting to the Council those matters that require attention so as to keep the neighbourhood looking clean and tidy.

3.2. Ava and Katerina Tong, of Hoani Street.

These two ladies have taken a proactive role in taking a walking school bus through to Northcote School every day wet or fine. Papanui Police also acknowledge their leadership in teaching and supporting children to be safe and healthy.

4. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

4.1 Dennis Hills - Chairman of Belfast District Museum.

Dennis Hills will be in attendance to address the Board on current activities, and in support of the funding request included in today’s agenda as Clause 6.

4.2 Penny Cunliff

Penny Cunliff will be in attendance regarding Julian Harding’s business on Papanui Road.

5. PETITIONS

5.1 Mr Bluet and Mrs Hills – issues in Barnes Road.

6. BELFAST MUSEUM COMPUTER PURCHASE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Stephen McArthur, DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	Manager, Catherine Mc Donald, DDI 941 8879
Author:	Roger Cave, Community Engagement Adviser, DDI 941 5407

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1 The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s consideration to a request from the Belfast District Museum Trust [the ‘Trust’] to fund the purchase of computer equipment to enable them to access and administer stored information pertaining to the activities and historical records of the Museum.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Trust, as the administrative body of the local Museum, is run by volunteers to collect, preserve and display artefacts of local Belfast history.

6. Cont'd

3. The need to become more professional in carrying out their duties has led the Trust to seek funding to purchase computer equipment to better discharge their responsibilities.
4. The Community Board has had a longstanding relationship with the Trust through the former Kapuatohe Historic Reserve Management Committee.
5. The Trust wishes to purchase computer equipment so as to be able to provide visitors with photographs [from the historic collections which are held on CD], to be able to scan other photos and artefacts brought in by visitors.
6. The Trust believe that there will be a broader base of community input and ownership into the future of the Museum, and these purchases will enable the Trust Board to provide information/photographic service to visitors and the community who wish to pursue their interest in the history of Belfast.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The request is for a Board grant, in the sum of \$2,500 [maximum], and it is recommended that this be sourced form the Board's 2006/07 Discretionary Funds.

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

9. Yes, Community Board funding, page 176 of the LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

10. The Trust is legally constituted, and the Board has the delegated authority to make a grant, if it sees fit to do so.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Pages 94 [City Development, "to retain heritage items"].

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

12. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Strong Communities.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. Discussed informally with members of the Shirley Papanui Community Board.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

16. That the Community Board give consideration to the request from the Belfast District Museum Trust for a grant to enable them to purchase computer software for the Museum.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

7. APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE TO BYLAWS REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8177
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Strong Communities
Author:	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 LGA 2002 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.¹ 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 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 the 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 delegate the power to appoint the Community Board members of the subcommittee to each Community Board.

¹ Please refer to council meeting minutes on this decision.

7. Cont'd

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.

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.

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

14. That the Chairperson be nominated 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)

15. 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.

7. Cont'd

16. 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.
17. 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.
18. Section 145 of the LGA02 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
 - (c) minimising the potential for offensive behaviour in public places
19. 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, and
 - Prevention of the spread of fires involving vegetation subject to provisions of the Forest and Rural Act 1977.

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.

20. 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.

7. Cont'd

21. 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

22. 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.
23. 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.
24. Council Decision – On 10 May 2007 the following decisions were made at the Council meeting:
- 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.
 - Resolve that the subcommittee comprise one representative from each of the eight community boards and two Councillors.

7. Cont'd

- (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. ENGLISH PARK/ST ALBANS SCHOOL NEW PLAYGROUND

General Manager responsible:	Jane Parfitt General Manager City Environment Group DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Michael Aitken Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Mary Hay

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the approval of the Shirley/Papanui Community Board to proceed to detailed design and construction/ implementation of the English Park/St Albans School New Playground.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Christchurch City Council staff have been working with the St Albans School Board of Trustees on a proposal to install a new playground on the school site, which will be open to the public out of school hours. St Albans School has a policy of welcoming the community into its grounds. This joint project will result in benefits to both parties with the school gaining a new senior playground and the Council gaining a new public playground, out of school hours, in an area that is deficient in senior play equipment and has limited public space in which to locate one. The Council will contribute \$50,000 and the school will contribute \$38,000. A large part of the school's contribution was raised through a School Fair and other events, with the support of the Parent Teachers Association.
3. In designing a new play space, the school was aware that there were a number of traditional playgrounds in the area. With the new playground, the school wanted to create a play space that promoted creative and social play. To determine the views of the school children, workshops were run by the school. This included taking the children to several playgrounds around the city (e.g. Spencer Park and Owen Mitchell Park) and resulted in the selection of different types of play elements, which were popular with the children, such as the climbing net.
4. The preliminary research helped to inform the project objectives, which were to:
 - Develop a concept incorporating feedback from workshops with children, input from the school representatives, council officers and the wider community;
 - Provide play equipment that encourages children to develop a range of fundamental movement skills (locomotor, stability, manipulation, movement and body awareness);
 - Provide play equipment that encourages social and physical play;
 - Design a playground space that is safe, creative, has educational values (considers the link with the waterway);
 - Playground meets NZ playground standards.
5. The Project Team developed a concept to meet these objectives, which included the following:
 - A small spacenet climbing frame - approx 5m high;
 - A 'Pukeko Egg' play structure - painted concrete;
 - An eel motif play area - containing stepping stones, bar/climb play structure, climbing rings and spacewalker, seating;
 - 'Raupo' climbing poles and balance beam;
 - Landscaping;
 - An interpretive fence panel - to compliment the design of English Park.

This concept provides a range of activities with differing degrees of challenge, from the imaginative and social play associated with 'pukeko eggs' and 'raupo' climbing poles to the smaller climbing structures and the more challenging 5m high climbing net.

8. Cont'd

6. In April 2007 a publicity pamphlet was distributed to approximately 600 residences and key stakeholders (refer attachment 1). This pamphlet included a summary of the concept, an initial concept plan and a feedback form. More detailed design plans were on display at the school. The project team sought feedback from the community to see whether the proposal was generally supported.

The project team also attended a meeting arranged by the school for parents to comment on the plans (August 2006) and visited the St Albans Community Market at English Park (April 2007). These meetings provided the project team with the opportunity to hear any issues and answer questions about the proposal.

7. The public consultation received a 13% response rate (78 responses). Community feedback was generally very positive. From the 78 submissions there was 94% support for the proposal. Four opposed the proposal due to concerns about security, lack of challenging play opportunities, impingement on school's outdoor space, inadequate consultation. The consultation outcome and project team responses are summarised in attachment 2.
8. The key issues identified by submitters relate to:
- Security;
 - Issues relating to the ongoing management of the school;
 - Preference for the money to be spent on other projects.
9. In terms of the security issues, the project team acknowledge that there is always a chance of attracting undesirables in to any area. However, in terms of park management it has been found that attracting more people to an area and incorporating Crime Prevention through Environment Design principles into the design, serves as a deterrent to antisocial/illegal activities. The gate between English Park and the school will be closed during school hours, during which time the school will supervise the children's use of the playground. After school the gate will be opened, at which time the appropriate level of supervision will need to be provided by parents/caregivers.
10. A number of issues relating to the ongoing management of the school, e.g. use of the OSCAR facilities, were raised in the public consultation. All of these issues had been considered by the school as part of developing this concept. The school's responses are included in the attached consultation summary (attachment 2).
11. Some concerns were raised by the community about using these funds for reserve development, in light of the recent decommissioning of Edgware swimming pool. However, funds allocated for reserve development, such as this playground proposal, are separate to the funds for pool upgrades and maintenance and the budgets are not interchangeable. This project is responding to a need for senior play facilities in the area. It includes a modest contribution by Council of \$50,000 and would not be possible without the cooperation of the school and the Ministry of Education.
12. No amendments to the concept plan were required as a result of consultation.
13. The recommended concept plan is included as attachment 3. The implementation of this project is scheduled for June/July 2007.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

14. The funding from Council is being provided from the Transport and Greenspace Capital Programme. The Council is contributing \$50,000 plus GST towards the play facility. As the funding is from the capital budget, the Council will retain ownership of listed equipment for the purpose of depreciation.
- Play equipment to the value of \$35,887;
 - Soft Fall undersurfacing to the value of \$14,113.

8. Cont'd

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

15. Yes. Funding is provided from within existing Playgrounds–New Installations, and Playground Undersurfacing budgets within the 2006/07 Transport and Greenspace Capital Programme.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

16. The legal instrument to be used to give effect to the proposed shared arrangement relating to the playground is a licence to occupy that the School Board of Trustees propose to grant to the Council. The proposed Licence will set out the terms regulating the relationship between the School and the Council concerning the playground and will grant the Council legal rights of access to the playground to be erected in school grounds for the benefit of the community.
17. The terms of the proposed Licence have substantially been agreed between with the School Board of Trustees and the Ministry of Education, but subject to formal Council approval being obtained and the Council being satisfied that it has undertaken all necessary public consultation in relation to the proposal.
18. In summary the proposed licence contemplates the following arrangements:
- The Council will assist the St Albans School Board of Trustees to construct the playground by providing project support. The Board of Trustees is to be primarily responsible to provide the playground equipment and to construct the playground;
 - The Council will contribute equipment to the playground as part of construction to a maximum value of \$50,000 plus GST;
 - The Board of Trustees will contribute funding of \$38,000 to the playground as part of the construction;
 - The Council is granted a licence to use the playground for the benefit of the community generally after school hours;
 - The School is entitled to exclusive use of the playground during normal school hours;
 - The School is required to maintain the playground and to ensure that it complies with NZ Standard 5828 2004, however the Council is required to contribute up to \$1500 plus GST per annum to the costs of such maintenance;
 - The Council is required to conduct an annual inspection or audit of the playground to ensure that it is being properly maintained;
 - The Board of Trustees and the Council may form a committee to manage their relationship concerning the playground;
 - The Board of Trustees is required to insure the playground, but the Council is required to contribute a proportion of that;
 - The term of the licence is 25 years, subject to a right of the Board of Trustees to cancel the licence if the licence area is required for any educational purpose;
 - The licence fee payable is a nominal \$1 per annum.
19. In a separate report, supported by the Shirley/Papanui Community Board on 2 May 2007, Council staff have sought that the Council grant delegated authority to the Corporate Support Manager to agree as he shall see fit the terms of a Licence to occupy part of the St Albans School site with the St Albans School Board of Trustees and the Ministry of Education for the purposes of establishing and operating a joint school/community playground within the St Albans School site and to enter into such licence on behalf of the Council.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

20. **LTCCP 2006-2016
Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Page 123**

Recreation – By offering a range of active and passive recreation and leisure opportunities

Health – By providing areas for people to engage in healthy activities.

8. Cont'd**Recreation and Leisure – Page 131**

Recreation – By encouraging more people to participate in leisure, physical and sporting activities.

Parks and Open Spaces Activity Management Plan

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

21. Social Wellbeing and Youth Strategy and Safer Parks Policy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

22. Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the local community via a letterbox drop and comment form to the local community. Meetings with the school and local community market were also undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

23. It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approves the plan in attachment 3 in order to proceed to detailed design and construction/ implementation of the English Park/St Albans School New Playground.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

9. RICHMOND PARK DEVELOPMENT PLAN

General Manager responsible:	Jane Parfitt General Manager City Environment Group DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Michael Aitken Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Mary Hay

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is:
 - (a) To seek the approval of the Shirley/Papanui Community Board to proceed to detailed design and construction/ implementation of the Richmond Park Development Plan; and
 - (b) To obtain the Board's approval to lease by way of a variation part of the Shirley Bowling Club site to the Shirley Tennis Club.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Richmond Park is a sport park that has its main access off Woodchester Street. The park provides for lower grade cricket and rugby, with Shirley Tennis Club and Shirley Bowling Club having facilities adjacent to the main park site, adjacent to Woodchester Street. Historically the use of these facilities has resulted in a large parking demand and the informal onsite parking results in a potential traffic/pedestrian conflict.
3. Access is also taken from Medway Street and Poulton Street. There is Council housing adjacent to the Poulton Street access. Marian College borders the park to the north and east, with foot and cycle traffic crossing the park to access the college, and other local schools (Shirley Intermediate and Shirley Boys High). Council previously purchased a Medway Street property to create better access through the park and to improve visibility into the previously under-utilised southern section of the park.

9. Cont'd

4. There are two parks nearby, Petrie Park and Sullivan Park, but these are small local parks. In addition to supporting organised sport, Richmond Park has a small play structure catering for younger children on the park which is well used by the neighbourhood. There are also opportunities for passive recreation, such as walking and informal games.
5. The Bowling Club no longer needs its second bowling green and are prepared to surrender part of its lease. The Tennis Club have indicated that they would accept a variation to their lease to include the former Bowling Club land so that they can construct two new competition standard tennis courts.
6. In 2003, a concept plan that considered the changing needs of the bowling and tennis clubs was developed and released for public comment. The key features of the plan were:
 - Construction of 34 car parks inside the Woodchester Street entrance;
 - Development of the Medway Street entrance for pedestrian/cycle access;
 - Redevelopment of the southern section of the park for passive recreation and upgrade of the drinking fountain near the children's playground;
 - Planting of additional trees alongside the cricket pavilion.
7. The community raised some concerns with the above proposal. It was thought that there may be a conflict between cars and pedestrians and also that proposed car park was too close to the cricket oval. Other issues about the use of the southern part of the park were also raised. The proposal was reconsidered by Council's Greenspace Planning team.
8. In 2006 a Capital Programme project team was formed. In response to planning investigations, the team developed the following objectives for the project:
 - Provide formalised on site parking in Richmond Park that meets the needs of the resident sports clubs;
 - Reduce conflict between pedestrians and vehicles on site;
 - To plan for the additional space to be provided by the removal of one bowling green;
 - To respond to the tennis club's request for two new courts;
 - To address tree maintenance issues in the park;
 - Consider the needs of the non-sports club users of the park;
 - Allow for informal sports and enhance passive recreational opportunities;
 - Enhance the amenity of the park and its entrances.
9. A traffic engineer assessed the site and developed a design for onsite parking that uses a drop off zone to maximise parking. The main car park is located inside the Woodchester Street entrance, clear of the cricket oval. Overflow parking will continue to be available in the southern section of the park, when necessary. This plan allows for the creation of the necessary onsite parking and for two new tennis courts.
10. An Arborist assessed the trees in Richmond Park and identified a number that are in decline and need to be removed or monitored for possible removal. In the southern section of the park seven trees have been noted for removal and three to be monitored for possible removal in the future. Species include Liquidamber, Chestnut, Ginkgo, Ash, Prunus, Euonymus and Lime. In the northern section of the park five trees have been noted for removal and six to be monitored for possible removal in the future. Species include Oak, Sorbus, Pittosporum, and Sycamore. All the proposed tree removals at Richmond Park result from their poor condition.
11. A concept plan, based on the project objectives, the engineer's and Arborist's assessments and the needs of the four sports clubs that use the park, was developed and released for public comment.
12. The project team developed a concept to meet these objectives, which included the following:
 - Construction of 11 car parks and a drop off zone (6 spaces) inside the Woodchester Street entrance. Retention of informal overflow parking for approx. 30 cars (fenced off);
 - Development of the Medway Street entrance for pedestrian/cycle access;

9. Cont'd

- Redevelopment of the southern section of the park for a small amount of passive recreation;
 - New drinking fountain and seating area near the children's playground;
 - Planting of additional trees throughout the park;
 - Removal of trees that are in poor condition.
13. The proposed upgrade requires the removal of a block wall and two park benches to accommodate the on site car parking.
14. In February/March 2007 a publicity pamphlet was distributed to approximately 700 residences and key stakeholders (refer attachment 1). This pamphlet included a summary of the concept, an initial concept plan and a feedback form. The project team sought feedback from the community to see whether the proposal was generally supported. A meeting with the residents of Woodchester Street was subsequently arranged. This provided the project team with the opportunity to answer questions about the proposal and hear concerns about the traffic and parking issues that were raised by the residents.
15. The consultation received a 14% response rate (101 responses). Community feedback was generally very positive. Of the 101 submissions, there was 95% support for the proposal. One submitter opposed the proposal but did not make comment. One submitter supported part of the proposal but did not support the path to Medway Street, the parking or the tree removal. The consultation outcome and project team responses are summarised in attachment 2.
16. The main requests made by submitters were for:
- More seats and tables;
 - An upgrade to the playground;
 - Requests for lighting on paths and in carpark;
 - Amendments to landscaping;
 - Rationale for the tree removal (only supported if removal was necessary).
17. Other key issues identified by submitters relate to:
- Traffic volume and speed on Woodchester Street;
 - Parking demand on Woodchester Street;
 - Perceived lack of safety of the Medway St/ Woodchester St intersection;
18. The project team considered the feedback from consultation and revised the concept plan in the following way:
- Additional planting, adjacent to 27 Medway Street – to provide a buffer;
 - Removal of two proposed trees and relocation of two proposed trees, adjacent to 43 Medway Street – to ensure clear views into the park;
 - Additional picnic table, in the southern section of the park – as per resident request;
 - Additional play item – a Spica – to accommodate the needs of older children;
 - Tidy-up of existing playground with replacement of panels and paint – as per resident request;
 - Additional seating near playground – to the east and two the west with bench seat near oval – to accommodate socialising for parents;
 - Relocation of proposed tree next to picnic table, adjacent to 21 Woodchester St – as per resident request;
 - Relocation of proposed lime, north of the playground – to move away from neighbouring property;
 - Additional seat at northern section of park – as per resident request;
 - Removal of two proposed trees, adjacent to the proposed cricket club extension – to allow space for cricket players to warm up;
 - Adjustment to the carpark design - to improve access to cycle racks and to move the carpark further from the cricket oval. This has resulted in a reduction in the size of the drop off area, from approximately six cars to three cars;
 - Additional seat near car park – to accommodate people waiting to be picked up.

9. Cont'd

19. The request for lighting was considered however paths inside parks are not generally lit unless there is not a safe alternative route on the surrounding roads. Lighting the park's paths gives the impression that the route is safe at night which may not be the case. These paths are designed for daytime use. Lighting is not proposed for the car park area at this stage. It will be locked at night unless the clubs leave it open for a function, in which case there will be lots of people around to provide passive surveillance. Lighting could be considered at a later if the tennis club considers that it is necessary
20. The tree work only involves the removal of trees that have been identified by the Arborist as being in decline. Replacement trees species are listed on the development plan. One tree is proposed for the north-eastern corner of the reserve but none are proposed for directly behind the tennis courts. The removal of the trees in the north-eastern corner of the reserve is supported by the adjacent neighbour.
21. The residents of Woodchester Street have sought action on a number of issues that pertain to their street. They have concerns about the speed and volume of traffic and a perceived lack of safety with the Medway Street intersection. The residents have been referred to the Network Operations and Traffic Systems Team Leader to investigate further.
22. The recommended concept plan is included as attachment 3. The Richmond Park Development Plan is will be implemented over three financial years. The footpaths, park furniture, fencing, tree removal and the landscape plan are scheduled for June-September 2007. The construction of the car parking is subject to the tennis club carrying out their work, to allow access to the site. Once the Shirley Tennis club has constructed the new tennis courts the car park can be constructed. This is expected to be completed by early 2009.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

23. The funding from council is being provided from the Transport and Greenspace Capital Programme. Specifically:
 - 2006/07 \$49,000 Richmond Park –Reserves Development
 - 2006/07 \$5,000 Richmond Park – Major Park Tree Replacement Projects
 - 2007/08 \$10,000 Richmond Park – Major Park Tree Replacement Projects
 - 2007/08 \$65,000 Richmond Park –Reserves Development
 - 2008/09 \$70,000 Richmond Park –Reserves Development

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

24. Yes. Funding is provided from within the Transport and Greenspace Capital Programme in the 2006-16 LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

25. There are Right of Way issues affecting this Reserve. Dialogue and negotiations are being undertaken with adjoining land owners to resolves these restraints.
26. The Council has granted a number of leases to Sports and Community Groups permitting the establishment of Recreational Activities on Richmond Park. These are:
 - The Richmond Cricket Club was established at this site with a lease to the Richmond Working Men's Club. The Board, in early 2006, granted the Richmond Working Men's Club a new lease over Richmond Park for an 11 year term including two 11 year rights of renewal.
 - The Shirley Bowling Club have been grant a renewable lease effective from the 1st April 1986 for terms of 21 years with perpetual rights of renewal. The area is not specified in the lease however it is clearly defined on a plan attached to the lease.

9. Cont'd

- The area occupied by the Shirley Tennis Club is not specified however it is clearly defined in a plan attached to the lease. The club have been granted a 21 year lease from the 1st October 1984 with a right of renewal for a further 21 year term. Lease renewal negotiations with the club are currently being held in abeyance until the outcomes of the consultative process is known.
27. It has been the Council's policy over a number of years that where perpetually renewable leases are requested to be varied to renegotiate the terms and conditions of any lease. The intention is to bring leases within the intent and current provisions of the Reserves Act 1977.
 28. Both the Shirley Tennis Club and Shirley Bowling Club hold leases over the Reserve. These are able, with Board approval and following public notification, to be varied with the consent of all parties.
 29. The Shirley/Papanui Community Board has delegated authority to approve variations to the leases.
 30. Any variations to the existing leases will require the approval of the Minister of Conservation.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

31. **LTCCP 2006-2016**
Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Page 123

Recreation – By offering a range of active and passive recreation and leisure opportunities
Health – By providing areas for people to engage in healthy activities

Recreation and Leisure – Page 131

Recreation – By encouraging more people to participate in leisure, physical and sporting activities

32. Parks and Open Spaces Activity Management Plan

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

33. Social Wellbeing and Youth Strategy and Safer Parks Policy

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

34. Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the local community via a letterbox drop and comment form to the local community and a meeting with residents at the bowling club.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board:

- (a) Approves the plan in attachment 3 in order to proceed to detailed design and construction/ implementation of the Richmond Park Development Plan; and
- (b) Accept the surrender of the lease over the number 2 bowling green from the Shirley Bowling Club and that their existing lease be renegotiated accordingly to align with the current provisions of the Reserves Act 1977; and
- (c) Approve a lease over the surrendered bowling green to the Shirley Tennis Club by way of a variation to their existing lease being subject to:
 - (i) Public notification under the Reserves Act 1977 and no sustainable objections being received.
 - (ii) The approval of the Department of Conservation being obtained.

9. Cont'd

- (iii) The applicants meeting all costs associated with the granting of the new lease.
- (iv) The Corporate Support and Transport and Greenspace Unit Managers be given delegated authority to negotiate and agree the annual rental.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted

10. REQUEST FOR FUNDING- REDWOOD TENNIS CLUB

General Manager responsible:	Stephen McArthur, General Manager Community Services DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	John Filsell, Unit Manager Recreation and Sport Unit
Author:	Helen Miles, Community Recreation Adviser DDI 941-5409

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to *resubmit* a funding application to the Board to be considered under discretionary funds from the Redwood Tennis Club [The Club]. The Club is requesting \$10,000 to assist in the upgrading of their tennis courts and Club rooms.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. *The Board considered an application from the Redwood Tennis Club for funding of \$10,000 to assist with the upgrading of its tennis courts and clubrooms.*
The Board **resolved** that further consideration of the application be deferred, pending the receipt of further information from the tennis club regarding the outcome of its current applications to other prospective funders.
3. *The Redwood Tennis club has managed secure a further promise of a \$15000 grant from the Canterbury Community Trust for Stage three of the project. This will only become available to the club when they can confirm they have the balance of the funding for stage three of the project in place. They are currently seeking the remaining amounts as outlined in the funding plan,*
4. Redwood Club was established in 1981 and has become an important part of Redwood Community. The Club currently has 104 members. The majority of these members are Juniors and this has remained fairly constant over the years. Their junior coaching programme is almost at capacity and is a major strength of the Club. One of the challenges the Club faces is to increase their adult membership by 50%. The Club is doing this through promotional activities however they do believe that dated facilities are less likely to attract new members.
5. The Club has excellent management structures in place and has formed a Development team to manage the upgrade project. The total project upgrade is budgeted at \$129,718.00.
6. The Redwood Tennis is seeking funding of \$10,000 to assist with the upgrading of their facilities. Asphalt tennis courts have an estimated life of 15- 20 years. Four of Redwood tennis courts are 23 years old; hence the urgent need of this maintenance. Currently court 1 to 4 will only need an overlay of asphalt and then all six tennis courts will require an acrylic surface coating to bring them up to acceptable minimum standards. The Clubrooms requires urgent maintenance and upgrade. This work includes: replacement of carpet (originally 2nd hand); Laying vinyl in kitchen and toilets (bare concrete); replacement of curtains (sun damaged and ripped); replacement of old zip (leaks) with modern sink water boiler; and addition of a pergola and shade cloth over outdoor seating area.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. Redwood Tennis have received a grant of \$700.00 from the Sport & Recreation Fund to purchase tennis balls and advise that funds on hand are going towards the cost of this project. *This request is covered by existing Shirley/Papanui Community Board budgets*

10. Cont'd

<u>REDWOOD TENNIS CLUB INC</u>				
<u>Construction Costs</u>				
<u>Courts</u>		<u>Excl. Gst</u>	<u>Gst</u>	<u>Incl. Gst</u>
Stage 1	<i>Establish & Access Site</i>	1,200.00	150.00	1,350.00
	<i>Repair Edges of Courts 1-4</i>	6,734.00	841.75	7,575.75
	<i>Install Root Barrier</i>	600.00	75.00	675.00
	<i>Install new net posts</i>	4,000.00	500.00	4,500.00
	<i>Supply 4 sets net posts</i>	2,400.00	300.00	2,700.00
	<i>Supply and lay 25mm asphalt</i>	29,177.00	3,647.13	32,824.13
	<i>Temporary Line Mark Courts 1-4</i>	1,900.00	237.50	2,137.50
		46,011.00	5,751.38	51,762.38
Stage 2	<i>Supply & Install synthetic surface</i>			
	<i>Courts 5 & 6</i>	18,026.00	2,253.25	20,279.25
	<i>Line Mark Courts 5 & 6</i>	950.00	118.75	1,068.75
		18,976.00	2,372.00	21,348.00
Stage 3	<i>Supply & Install synthetic surface</i>			
	<i>Courts 1 - 4</i>	25,946.00	3,243.25	29,189.25
	<i>Line Mark Courts 1 - 4</i>	1,900.00	237.50	2,137.50
		27,846.00	3,480.75	31,326.75
Stage 4	<i>Clubrooms Renovation</i>			
	<i>Curtains & Flooring</i>	8,238.22	1,029.78	9,268.00
	<i>Paint</i>	177.78	22.22	200.00
	<i>Plumbing & Zip Water Heater</i>	1,178.67	147.33	1,326.00
	<i>Pergola Sun</i>			
	<i>Shade</i>	1,820.44	227.56	2,048.00
		11,415.11	1,426.89	12,842.00
General	<i>Project Management Design & Specifications</i>	5,778.00	722.00	6,500.00
	<i>Contingency 6%</i>	5,279.00	660.00	5,939.00
		11,057.00	1,382.00	12,439.00
Project Totals		115,305.11	14,413.02	129,718.13
<u>Funding Plan</u>				
Stage 1 - Already Completed as follows		<u>Request</u>		<u>Granted</u>
	<i>Southern Trust</i>	20,000.00		15,000.00
	<i>NZ Community Trust</i>	20,000.00		10,000.00
	<i>Scottwood Trust</i>	20,000.00		10,000.00
	<i>Eureka Trust</i>	30,000.00		5,000.00
	<i>Canterbury Foundation</i>	20,000.00		5,000.00
	<i>Pub Charity</i>	20,000.00		5,000.00
		130,000.00		50,000.00
	<i>Stage 1 has recently been completed, with the final cost of \$50,187 after \$1,575 savings were made when some root barriers were not needed</i>			

10. Cont'd

Stage 2 Project Budget \$21,348	<u>Request</u>	<u>Granted</u>
<i>Lion Foundation</i>	20,000.00	10,000
<i>Century Foundation</i>	15,000.00	10,000
		20,000.00
<i>This stage was completed in March 2007, with the actual cost \$21,341.</i>		
Stage 3+ 4		
<u>Already Applied for</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Granted</u>
<i>Canterbury Community Trust</i>	30,000.00	15,000.00
<u>Now applying for</u>	<u>Request</u>	
<i>CCC Community Board</i>	10,000.00	
<i>Eureka Trust</i>	10,000.00	
<i>NZ Community Trust</i>	10,000.00	
<i>Southern Trust</i>	10,000.00	
Total Pending	40,000.00	

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

8. Yes, see page 172, Discretionary Fund.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Not applicable

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

10. Not applicable

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Page 176 of the LTCCP, level of service under Community Board funding.

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

12. As above

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Recreation and Sport, Youth, Community & Social Wellbeing policies

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Yes

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. Not applicable

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approve a grant of \$7,000 from discretionary funds for the upgrade of tennis courts and that the Redwood Tennis Club seek funding from other sources to complete the project.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

11. NOTICES OF MOTION

12. UPDATE OF BOARD FUNDS

Schedules detailing the Board's 2006/07 Discretionary, SCAP, Youth Development and Sport and Recreation Funds will be available at the meeting.

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 (refer attached).

14. CORRESPONDENCE

- Tony Ring - restricted parking (attached).
- R. A. Davison - Northwood Bus submission (attached).
- Styx Living Laboratory – car parking security (attached).

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