

**SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

WEDNESDAY 7 OCTOBER 2009

AT 4PM

**REHUA MARAE
79 SPRINGFIELD ROAD, ST ALBANS**

Community Board: Yvonne Palmer (Chairperson), Ngaire Button, Kathy Condon, Pauline Cotter, Aaron Keown, Matt Morris and Norm Withers.

Community Board Adviser

Peter Croucher
Phone 941 5414 DDI
Email: peter.croucher@ccc.govt.nz

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

INDEX	PG NO	
PART C	3	1. APOLOGIES
PART C	3	2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – 16 SEPTEMBER 2009
PART B	3	3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT 3.1 Mr JH Parrett - Sisson Park 3.2 Ralph Ross (Shirley Residents' Association) – Quinns Road Safety Improvements
PART B	3	4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
PART B	3	5. NOTICES OF MOTION
PART B	3	6. BRIEFINGS
PART C	8	7. SISSON PARK - TREE REMOVAL REQUEST
PART C	15	8. QUINNS ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS
PART C	23	9. REQUEST FOR FUNDING - SHIRLEY COMMUNITY TRUST
PART C	25	10. YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – THOMAS TUUTA
PART C	27	11. CRIMEWATCH (CHRISTCHURCH) INCORPORATED
PART C	29	12. MARIAN COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT GROUP
PART C	32	13. PROPOSED GIVE WAY SIGNS ON SIDE ROADS OF PAPANUI ROAD AND MAIN NORTH ROAD - MAYS ROAD, TOMES ROAD, PAPAROA STREET, PERRY STREET, DORMER STREET, BLAIR AVENUE, FRANK STREET, WYNDHAM STREET, WINSTON AVENUE, LOFTUS STREET, PROCTOR STREET, SHEARER AVENUE, APOLLO PLACE, MEADOW AVENUE

7. 10. 2009

PART C	49	14.	PROPOSED GIVE WAY SIGNS – GRESFORD STREET, GUILD STREET, HENDON STREET, WARDEN STREET
PART C	55	15.	SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNICATION WITH THE COMMUNITY
PART B	57	16.	CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANTS
PART C	63	17.	NEIGHBOURHOOD WEEK FUNDING
PART B	72	18.	CORRESPONDENCE
PART B	72	19.	COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE 18.1 Current Issues
PART B	72	20.	QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – 16 SEPTEMBER 2009

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Wednesday 16 September 2009 are **attached**. The public excluded minutes of the meeting have been separately circulated to members.

CHAIRPERSON'S OR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 16 September 2009, both open and public excluded, be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 MR JH PARRETT

Mr JH Parrett will speak on the Sisson Park tree removal request.

3.2 RALPH ROSS (SHIRLEY RESIDENT'S ASSOCIATION)

Ralph Ross will speak on the Quinns Road Safety Improvements.

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

Nil.

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

Nil.

6. BRIEFINGS

Nil.

7. SISSON PARK - TREE REMOVAL REQUEST

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace, Acting Unit Manager
Author:	Mary Hay (Consultation Leader), Tony Armstrong (Arborist)

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to consider a resident's request for the removal of four trees (three Alders and a Eucalyptus) from Sisson Park, Casebrook.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. A request has been made to Council, from Mr and Mrs McCormack for 25 Applewood Place, to remove three trees (two Alders and a Eucalyptus) from Sisson Park. The Alders are located at the Applewood Place entrance, on the right (southern boundary) as you enter the reserve and the Eucalyptus along the northern boundary of the reserve.
3. As a result of the consultation, a request to remove another Alder tree has been received.



4. Mr and Mrs McCormack are neighbours to the reserve and are concerned that the trees, which are located on their northern boundary:
 - (a) Block sunlight to their property for most of the day, depending on the time of the year (lack of light/warmth, mossy lawn)
 - (b) Drop large amounts catkins and seed heads, which create lots of debris/litter and damage their property (blocked pool equipment, stained paintwork)
5. In order to determine the view of the wider community, feedback has been sought from 160 properties in the vicinity of Sisson Park. The majority of the affected residents support the removal of the three trees. Other residents used this consultation to seek the removal of an additional Alder from the park, which is shading their property.
6. An arboriculture assessment of the trees has been undertaken. This indicates that there are no arboriculture reasons to remove the trees in question, these being a large Eucalyptus and three medium sized Alder trees.
7. It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board decline the request to remove either the Eucalyptus or the Alder trees.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The cost to remove and replace the four trees is estimated at \$5,000 (including watering and aftercare maintenance for one year).

7 Cont'd

9. The STEM evaluation for the Eucalyptus tree is 126 points and 72 for each of the Alders.
10. The STEM valuation for the Eucalyptus tree is \$24,400 and the Alders combined is \$13,400 for each (\$40,200 combined).
11. STEM (A Standard Tree Evaluation Method) is the New Zealand national arboriculture industry standard for evaluating and valuing amenity trees by assessing their condition and contribution to amenity along with other distinguishable attributes such as stature, historic or scientific significance.
12. There is no funding allocated within the Transport and Greenspace Parks Maintenance budgets for the removal of healthy and structurally sound trees that are not causing infrastructure or property damage or do not have tree health and safety concerns.
13. Placing the reserve onto the capital renewals programme would mean that there would be at least a 3-year wait for work to commence as Council has existing city wide commitments programmed over that period.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) budgets?

14. The recommendation aligns with the current LTCCP budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

15. The Greenspace Manager has the following delegation with respect to trees:

“In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager’s control.”
16. While the Transport and Greenspace Manager has the delegation to remove the tree, current practice is that in most cases requests to remove healthy and structurally sound trees are placed before the appropriate Community Board for a decision.
17. A “protected” tree can only be removed by a successful application under the Resource Management Act. These trees are not listed as protected under the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan.
18. Consideration of the following City Plan Policies may be of some benefit –

Volume 2: Section 4 City Identity

4.2.1 Policy: Tree Cover

To promote amenity values in the urban area by maintaining and enhancing the tree cover present in the City.

Tree cover and vegetation make an important contribution to amenity values in the City. Through the redevelopment of sites, existing vegetation is often lost and not replaced. The City Plan protects those trees identified as “heritage” or “notable” and the subdivision process protects other trees that are considered to be “significant”. The highest degree of protection applies to heritage trees.

Because Christchurch is largely built on a flat plain, trees and shrubs play an important role in creating relief, contributing to visual amenity, and attracting native birds.

The amount of private open space available for new planting and to retain existing trees is influenced by rules concerning building density and setback from boundaries. The rules do not require new planting for residential development but landscaping is required in business zones.

7 Cont'd

4.2.2 Policy: Garden City

To recognise and promote the “Garden City” identity, heritage and character of Christchurch.

A key aspect of achieving this policy will be maintaining and extending environments and vegetation types which compliment this image. A broad range of matters influence and contribute to this image, including the following:

- (a) tree-lined streets and avenues
- (b) parks and developed areas of open space

14.3.2 Policy: “Garden City” image identity

To acknowledge and promote the “Garden City” identity of the City by protecting, maintaining and extending planting which compliments this image

- 19. An application to prune or remove the tree may be made to the District Court under The Property Law Amendment Act 1975.

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

- 20. Council has the legal right to approve or decline the application to remove the trees.
- 21. The District Court can order the pruning or removal of the trees under The Property Law Amendment Act 1975.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

- 22. Removing and replacing the trees without obtaining reimbursement from the applicant is inconsistent with the current Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) as funding has not been allocated in the Transport and Greenspace Unit operational tree maintenance budget for the removal of structurally sound and healthy trees. Therefore obtaining reimbursement from the applicant to remove and replace a structurally sound and healthy tree is consistent with the current LTCCP.
- 23. Funding is available in the Transport and Greenspace Unit Street Tree Capital Renewals budget for the removal and replacement of trees which are no longer appropriate species or no longer appropriate in their current position.
- 24. Retention of the trees is consistent with the Activity Management Plan provided the trees are structurally sound and healthy.
- 25. Removal and replacement of the trees is consistent with the Activity Management Plan.
- 26. Removing and not replacing the trees is not consistent with the Activity Management Plan.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

- 27. Yes, as per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

- 28. Social Wellbeing Policy - Engage citizens and communities in decision-making and policy implementation. Increase and maintain living standards sufficient to ensure everyone can participate in the life of the community and live lives they find fulfilling.

7 Cont'd

29. Removing and replacing the trees would be consistent with the Christchurch Urban Design Vision.
30. Removing and replacing the trees would be in keeping with the Garden City Image as per the City Plan.
31. Removing and not replacing the trees would not be in keeping with the Garden City Image as per the City Plan Volume 2 Section 14.3.2.
32. There is currently no overarching citywide strategy for vegetation management.
33. There is currently no policy for the pruning or removing of trees in public spaces. A Draft Tree Policy is being worked on.
34. If replacement trees are provided, removing the trees would be in keeping with the Garden City Image.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

35. Yes, as per above.

BACKGROUND

Consultation Process

36. The Consultation Leader discussed the resident's request with members of the Community Board, on site on 18 August 2009, prior to public consultation.
37. The consultation period was from 19 August - 2 September 2009. A letter was sent to 160 properties in the vicinity of the park (an area bounded by Sawyers Arms Road, Veitches Road, Northfield Road and Northcote Road). This letter outlined a summary of the issues, a plan and a request to contact the Consultation Leader with feedback about the proposal. Also included was an offer to meet onsite, if requested. Submitters were also advised of the upcoming decision date, the decision making process and how they could be involved in this and the expected timeline for the project. All calls and emails were replied to by the Consultation Leader.

Consultation Outcome

38. There were 26 respondents, who indicated the following:
 - (a) 23 sought the removal of some or all of the trees - due to the nuisance/potential risk to neighbours and view that the trees were inappropriately large for this reserve. Submissions were received from most of the residents directly affected by the Eucalypt and two Alders and they all noted that they were a nuisance and would like to see them removed.
 - (b) 2 did not indicate a preference (but instead sought the removal of street trees)
 - (c) 1 indicated that they would like the Eucalyptus tree to stay
39. Residents also asked staff to consider two other trees in the park. A large Alder is shading the property at 34 Brogar Place and the Board is asked to consider its removal as part of this proposal. A resident has also noted that a small shrub is damaging the fence of 31 Northfield Road – this will be investigated by staff.
40. The full schedule of community feedback and project team responses will be circulated separately to Board members.

7 Cont'd

41. This consultation clearly indicates that the majority of local residents that responded to this proposal support the removal of trees in the park. This is because they consider them to be a nuisance or an inappropriate species in this setting.
42. These trees are healthy specimens and are considered by staff to be entirely appropriate in their current setting. The Eucalyptus tree is one of a few large trees growing within the immediate area and as such its loss would have a detrimental affect not only on the reserve but also the local landscape. Parks are one of the few remaining open spaces available for large tree planting.

General

43. Council has received a number of requests from residents bordering Sisson Reserve to prune back trees and shrubs over several years. These requests have been actioned by either removal or pruning of shrubs with some tree pruning also being undertaken.
44. Records show that staff have been in discussions with Mr McCormack over the trees and shrubs bordering his property at 25 Applewood Place since March 2008. The shrubs in the garden were pruned off the fence line as a result of this.
45. The Eucalyptus tree is healthy and structurally sound with no history of branch failure and is approximately 14m distance from Mr and Mrs McCormack's fence and 22m distance from their dwelling. Given the distance from the property staff do not consider that it would cause a sufficient amount of shade to warrant its removal.
46. The two Alder trees bordering Mr and Mrs McCormack's property are small to medium in height and while they will shed some debris and cast a small amount of shadow staff do not consider that it is appropriate for these trees to be removed for these reasons.
47. Mr and Mrs McCormack have a solid brick wall running the length of their boundary with the reserve. This casts a solid shadow over the lawn and pool area all year round whereas the trees' shadow is affected by sun angle and leaf fall (the two Alders are deciduous). There are also some trees in the property at 33 Brogar Place that will have a shading and debris effect on the McCormack's property.
48. The Alder tree that is affecting 34 Brogar Place has been pruned to reduce it off the boundary of 38 Brogar Place. While it will cause some shade to the resident at 34 Brogar Place staff do not consider that the amount of shade is inappropriate and therefore do not consider this a reason for its removal.
49. It is noted that of the signatories to the original petition only two properties would be affected by shade – 25 Applewood Place and 33 Brogar Place. The residents on the north side of the trees have not previously raised concerns over them.

Options

50. (a) Decline the request to remove the Eucalyptus and three Alder trees from Sisson Reserve and
(b) Continue to maintain the trees to internationally accepted arboriculture standards, practices and procedures and continue to monitor the trees for ongoing health and structural integrity.
51. Approve the request to remove the Eucalyptus and three Alder trees from Sisson Reserve and charge the applicants \$5,000 for the cost of removal and replacement. All work is to be undertaken by Council's park tree contractor.
52. Approve the request to remove the Eucalyptus only from Sisson Reserve and charge the applicants for the cost of removal and replacement. All work is to be undertaken by Council's park tree contractor.

7 Cont'd

53. Approve the request to remove the Alders only from Sisson Reserve and charge the applicants for the cost of removal and replacement. All work is to be undertaken by Council's park tree contractor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

54. It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board –
- (a) Decline the request to remove the Eucalyptus and three Alder trees from Sisson Reserve
and
 - (b) Continue to maintain the trees to internationally accepted arboriculture standards, practices and procedures and continue to monitor the trees for ongoing health and structural integrity

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

8. QUINNS ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Christine Toner, Transport Consultation Leader

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Shirley/Papanui Community Board's approval for the proposed Quinns Road Safety Improvement to proceed to detailed design, tender and construction and to approve associated parking restrictions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Quinns Road, a local road running from Shirley Road to Briggs Road has been the subject of concern regarding safety issues for some time. There have been 19 crashes recorded in the street (for the period between 2004 and 2009) 14 of these occurred in the section between Hammersley Avenue and Briggs Road.
3. The surrounding area is residential. The Hammersley Park School main entrance is off Quinns Road within the study area. Shirley Creek is on the western side of Quinns Road, which constrains the width of the road and has resulted in a narrow road on the west side of the creek to service the properties on that side (from Hammersley Avenue to Orcades Street).
4. Following initial consultation undertaken in October 2006, which indicated considerable concern about speeding vehicles and 'hoon' driving along the length of Quinns Road and in particular in the area from Hammersley Avenue to Briggs Road, and a review of the vehicle crash data, it was established that the safety issues and concerns were related to the section of Quinns Road north of Hammersley Avenue,
5. Two options and a 'do nothing' option were evaluated against the initial information and a 'preferred option' plan fulfilling community and council objectives was developed for community consultation.
6. The proposal includes the introduction of seven new raised speed humps between Briggs Road and Hammersley Avenue; new centre lane markings and retro-reflective raised pavement markers at the intersection of McIntyre Street and Quinns Road; a two metre wide splitter island at the Voss Street and Quinns Road intersection, with an opening on the island to provide a crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists; decreased kerb radius at the south east side of the intersection of Voss Street and Quinns Road, to reduce the traffic turning speeds and to provide a straight crossing and good visibility for pedestrians to cross Voss Street; an extra kerb build-out east side of Quinns Road outside the Hammersley Park School, to match the existing build-out on the west side of carriageway, to reduce the crossing distance to six metres, and improve pedestrians safety; and another two metre wide splitter island on the north side of the intersection with Hammersley Avenue to improve crossing facilities for pedestrians at this intersection.
7. This was presented to this Community Board on 15 July 2009 prior to distribution to stakeholders, property owners and residents. Of the 54 responses, feedback was positive, with 44% giving unqualified support and 33% supporting the proposal but asking a question or making a comment, mainly asking why the straight section of Quinns Road was not included in the proposal. The consultation feedback is summarised in paragraph 20.
8. After consideration of the feedback from consultation, it was decided to add some signage near the school warning drivers to expect children crossing. This change is shown on the updated Quinns Road Safety Improvement Plan for Board Approval TP313001 provided in **Attachment 1**.
9. The proposed traffic calming measures along this section of Quinns Road will be completed during the 2009-2010 financial year.

8 Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. Funding for the proposed Quinns Road Safety Improvement is programmed in the 2009–19 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) Neighbourhood Improvement Programme.
11. The current project cost estimates indicate there is sufficient budget allocated in the 2009–2019 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) to implement and complete the project. Construction is programmed to commence in the 2009/10 financial year.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

12. Funding for this project is provided within the Transport and Greenspace Unit's Capital Programme as outlined above.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

13. There are no land ownership issues associated with this project. The project is within existing land boundaries.
14. There are no Notable or Heritage trees shown along Quinns Road in the City Plan on the intranet.
15. There are no Heritage or Historic buildings, places and objects, shown along Quinns Road in the City Plan on the intranet.
16. Consents are not required. Community board resolutions are required to revoke the existing traffic restrictions in the street and approve the new traffic and parking restrictions, and the Community Board has the delegation from Council to make these decisions.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

17. The project aligns with the Transport and Greenspace Unit's Asset Management Plan, and the Neighbourhood Improvement Programme of the Planned Capital Programme, page 247, 2009-2019 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP).

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

18. This project is consistent with key council strategies including the Parking Strategy, Road Safety Strategy, Pedestrian Strategy and Cycling Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

19. Initial issues consultation was carried out in October 2006. Feedback indicated considerable concern about speeding vehicles and 'hoon' driving along the length of Quinns Road and in particular in the area from Hammersley Avenue to Briggs Road.
20. Three options, including the 'do nothing' option, were evaluated against the initial information and a 'preferred option' plan fulfilling community and council objectives was developed for community consultation. This was presented to this Community Board in on 15 July 2009 prior to distribution to stakeholders, property owners and residents. 57 replies were received, 43 (76%) of which were positive and in support of the proposal, or in support with a question or comment.

8 Cont'd

21. Issues raised:

Area of concern	Summary of issue	#
Generally positive	Appreciative of the proposal as they recognise that there is a real problem with 'hoons' speeding and doing wheelies etc in the street.	12
Generally negative	Speed humps don't work, make too much vibration and noise, people don't like speed humps.	6
The problem lies between Shirley Road and Hammersley Avenue	The straight part of Quinns Road has a much greater and more urgent speed and 'hoon' problem and the council attention should be there not in the winding part.	11
Concern about the school gate area	The crossing point for schoolchildren should be on the bend where they can see both ways.	4
Voss St intersection	Cars came off Quinns into Voss out of control.	1
	Very little traffic uses this intersection – doubt that it needs changing.	1
	Inclusion of Give Way sign at each end (including Marshlands Road end) and humps in Voss Street.	2
Pedestrian island	The Quinns/Orion-Hammersley intersection is very "open" despite one island only.	2
	Proposed Pedestrian Island - where situated there is only the road to walk onto in Orion Street	1
	Concern that the pedestrian island will do little to curb speed.	1
Orion St / Hammersley St intersection	At least 2 spots on Hammersley and 3 on Quinns would be far better.	1
	Suggestion to limit street parking to the school side of Quinns Road only outside the school as it is narrow, winding and cars have to stop to give way to on-coming traffic while also looking out for children.	1
Orcades St intersection roundabout	Concern about dangerous behaviour at the roundabout – and request to raise the roundabout surface to force drivers to drive around it.	1
McIntyre St/Quinns Rd intersection	Question that centre lane markings and reflective raised pavement markers will improve safety in this area, and request for a hump there as well.	1
West side of creek	Concern about the section of Quinns Road on the other side of the creek has problems with speeding vehicles as well, and this is especially unsafe at the bridge opposite the school.	1
Other locations	Concerns about specific location of specified road humps.	3

22. Key areas of concern arising from this feedback were discussed in detail. It was noted that the crash data identifies 19 crashes in the street between 2004 and 2009, and 14 of these are in the section between Hammersley Avenue and Briggs Road. This confirms earlier decisions to focus the safety improvements in this area rather than the straight section south of Hammersley Avenue, despite anecdotal evidence of considerable 'hoon' driver behaviour in that straight section.
23. These have been forwarded for consideration in future Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) years. After consideration of the comments about the location of kerb build-outs where school children cross Quinns Road, further investigation was carried out including discussions with the school principal and Ministry of Education, and it was decided to retain the existing and new build-outs and crossing point at the current location, and add some signage near the school warning drivers to expect children crossing. This change is shown on the updated Quinns Road Safety Improvement Plan for Board Approval TP313001 provided in **Attachment 1**
24. Project Team responses to other issues raised are shown in the submitters' spreadsheet and a full summary of the submissions received, along with the Project Team response, has been separately circulated to Community Board members.

8 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board:

- (a) Approve the Quinns Road Safety Improvement Project for detailed design, tender and construction as shown on the plan for board approval in **Attachment 1**.
- (b) Resolve the following parking restrictions:

RESOLUTIONS

Revocation of existing parking restrictions:

- (i) That any existing parking restrictions at any time on the west side of Quinns Road commencing at its intersection with Hammersley Avenue and extending 50 metres in a northerly direction be revoked.
- (ii) That any existing parking restrictions at any time on the east side of Quinns Road commencing at its intersection with Hammersley Avenue and extending 50 metres in a northerly direction be revoked.
- (iii) That any existing parking restrictions at any time on the east side of Quinns Road commencing at its intersection with Voss street and extending 50 metres in a southerly direction be revoked.
- (iv) That any existing parking restrictions at any time on the east side of Quinns Road commencing at its intersection with Voss street and extending 50 metres in a northerly direction be revoked.
- (v) That any existing parking restrictions at any time on the north side of Voss Street commencing at its intersection with Quinns Road and extending 50 metres in a easterly direction be revoked.
- (vi) That any existing parking restrictions at any time on the south side of Voss Street commencing at its intersection with Quinns Road and extending 50 metres in a easterly direction be revoked.

New no stopping:

- (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Quinns Road commencing at its intersection with Hammersley Avenue and extending 30 metres in a northerly direction.
- (viii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Quinns Road commencing at its intersection with Hammersley Avenue and extending 30 metres in a northerly direction.
- (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Quinns Road commencing at a point 166 metres north of its intersection with Hammersley Avenue and extending 18 metres in a northerly direction.
- (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Quinns Road commencing at its intersection with Voss Street and extending 15 metres in a northerly direction.
- (xi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Quinns Road commencing at its intersection with Voss Street and extending 10 metres in a southerly direction.
- (xii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Voss street commencing at its intersection with Quinns Road and extending 24 metres in a easterly direction.

7. 10. 2009

8 Cont'd

- (xiii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Voss street commencing at its intersection with Quinns Road and extending 18 metres in a easterly direction.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

8 Cont'd

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

25. Quinns Road is a local road, and within the study area it is approximately 920m long (from Shirley Road to Briggs Road) with a 9-10m wide carriageway. There is a varying width footpath (with or without a berm) along the east side of the road. On the west side there is a footpath from Orcades Street to Briggs Road and along the narrow road servicing the properties to the west of the creek. The area is zoned Living 1 (outer suburban). The surrounding area is residential. The Hammersley Park School main entrance is off Quinns Road within the study area. Shirley Creek is on the western side of Quinns Road, which constrains the width of the road and has resulted in a narrow road on the west side of the creek to service the properties on that side (from Hammersley Avenue to Orcades Street).
26. There have been 19 crashes recorded in the street (for the period between 2004 and 2009). 14 of these occurred between and including the intersections of Quinns Road and Hammersley Avenue, and Quinns Road/Briggs Road. Loss of control accounted for 11 of these crashes. The intersection of Quinns Road and Hammersley Avenue has been the site of significant concern for some years. However, anecdotal reports suggest that there are many near misses in the straight section of Quinns Road between Hammersley Avenue and Shirley Road, and that there are also many incidents of speeding cars, and hoon driving behaviour such as 'wheelies'. Further, it appears that drivers build up speed in the straight section and then lose control upon entering the narrower, curved sections, where the carriageway alignment and layout do not generally deter drivers from travelling too fast for the conditions.
27. Following initial consultation undertaken in 2006 and a review of the vehicle crash data it was established that the safety issues and concerns were related to the section of Quinns Road north of Hammersley Avenue, rather than the intersection itself.
28. After consideration of the feedback from consultation, it was decided to add signage at the appropriate distance on either side of the school entrance to warn drivers that children might be crossing ahead. This has been updated on the Quinns Road Safety Improvement Plan for Board Approval TP313001 provided in **Attachment 1**.

THE OBJECTIVES

29. The primary (must do) objective for the project is to improve safety for all road users, and the secondary (would like to do, but add cost) objective is to enhance the streetscape.

THE OPTIONS

30. Two different options were developed for comparison. Option 2 was selected as the preferred option.
31. Option 1 - Do Nothing – this option has not been selected as the preferred option as it does not meet the objectives.
32. Option 2 - includes the following:
 - (a) Four raised speed humps are proposed along Quinns Road from Briggs Road to Orcades Road to mitigate the speeding issues. They are 3.7 metres wide humps with asphaltic concrete surface and the humps will be raised to 75 mm height.
 - (b) Three raised speed humps are proposed along Quinns Road from Orcades Road to Hammersley Avenue to mitigate the speeding issues. They are 3.7 metres wide humps with asphaltic concrete surface and the humps will be raised to 75 mm height.
 - (c) In the vicinity of McIntyre Street and Quinns Road intersection, centre lane markings and retro-reflective raised pavement markers (RRPM) will be installed to provide better delineation at the intersection.

8 Cont'd

- (d) The provision of a 2-metre wide splitter island at the Voss Street and Quinns Road intersection, and an opening is proposed on the island to provide a crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists.
 - (e) At the intersection of Voss Street and Quinns Road, the southeast kerb radius will be decreased to five metres to reduce the traffic turning speeds, and also, the smaller radius will provide a straight crossing and good visibility for pedestrians to cross Voss Street.
 - (f) Provide an extra kerb build-out east side of Quinns Road to match the existing build-out on the west side of carriageway 170 m north of its intersection with Hammersley Avenue. This will reduce the crossing distance to six metres, and improve pedestrians' safety when crossing Quinns Road to Hammersley Park School.
 - (g) Another two metres wide splitter island is proposed on the north side of the intersection with Hammersley Avenue. This will improve crossing facilities for pedestrians at this intersection, which is utilised by a number of pupils at Hammersley Park School.
33. Option 3 - other isolated options were also considered and not pursued:
- (a) A platform at Hammersley Avenue/Orion Street/Quinns Road intersection - however, due to cost constraints, such a drainage changes and likely this was not considered further.
 - (b) Kerb build outs at Voss Street intersection rather than a pedestrian island - however, this required drainage improvement and did not mitigate any corner cutting that is occurring.
 - (c) Other road hump spacings were considered, however, the preferred option locations fitted with the existing crash history locations and locations of power poles/lighting to reduce lighting upgrade costs.
34. It should be noted that no changes were considered for the Orcades Street roundabout due to the complexity of the intersection and likely costs required to make any improvements here.

THE PREFERRED OPTION

35. Option 2 was selected as the preferred option, and is recommended, with the addition of signage at the appropriate distance from the crossing point outside the Hammersley Park School, in both directions, alerting drivers that there may be children crossing ahead.

9. REQUEST FOR FUNDING - SHIRLEY COMMUNITY TRUST

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Recreation and Sports Unit
Author:	Helen Miles, Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a funding application to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board to be considered under the Discretionary Response Fund for the Shirley Community Trust to assist with the costs of staging a Shirley Light Party as a Halloween Alternative on 31 October 2009.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Shirley Community Trust has been a significant community organisation in the Shirley area during the past decade. They offer a range of activities, events, and programmes. Their main operations base is the MacFarlane Park Neighbourhood Centre in Acheson Avenue. From this venue, they run pre-schooler groups, literacy programmes, bread distribution, elderly support and a highly successful neighbourhood café on Friday mornings.
3. The work of Shirley Community Trust is supported by a large group of volunteers coming from either St Stephen's Anglican Church or from the immediate neighbourhood.
4. In the previous three years, this event has been run in partnership with three local churches. This year the event has four churches working in partnership to host this event in the community. These are St Stephen's Anglican Church, Crossway Church, Destiny Church, and Emmett Street Christian Centre.
5. The purpose of the event is to give the local children a safe alternative to door knocking on Halloween. Past events have attracted 200 children and youth and there have been favourable comments received from both parents and children.
6. The event will be run at Hammersley Park School. Kids come dressed as their hero and participate in a variety of activities.
7. The group are currently seeking donations for the trick and treat bags and prizes, however the response has been extremely poor compared with other years.

<u>Light Party</u>	
<i>Bouncy Castle</i>	150
<i>Face painting paint</i>	78
<i>Craft Corner</i>	100
<i>Clown and novelty balloons</i>	200
<i>BBQ</i>	189
<i>Prizes</i>	100
<i>Trick or treat lollies for children to take home</i>	400
Total	\$1,217

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The Shirley/Papanui Community Board currently have \$37,116 in their Discretionary Response Fund available to allocate.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

9. Yes, see page 184, Discretionary Response Fund.

9 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. Not applicable.

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

11. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Page 184 of the LTCCP, level of service under Community Board funding Strong Communities.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

13. Recommendation is in line with Community Board discretionary budget and meets level of support within strong communities.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. Community and Strengthening Communities Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

15. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approve a grant of \$600 from the 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to the Shirley Community Trust to assist with the costs of staging the Shirley Light Party on 31 October 2009.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

10. YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – THOMAS TUUTA

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
Author:	Bruce Meder, Community Development Adviser, Community Support Unit

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board from Thomas Tuuta to the Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Thomas has recently begun a mentoring arrangement in tattoo with Otautahi Tattoo, a tattooing studio that prides itself on moving away from the stereotypical tattoo shop.
3. Thomas is primarily interested in the cultural/ancestral meanings of tattooing (ta moko¹) in the cultures of his ancestry: Samoan and Maori. Otautahi Tattoo allows Thomas to learn about this aspect of tattooing in a supportive manner with no less than 4 qualified tattoo artists to assist him. At present Thomas' interest in the cultural aspect of tattoo is his hobby and recreational pursuit. Thomas is interested in seeing if his passion could eventually become his vocation.
4. Thomas is 17 years old and lives at home with his mother and two brothers. He is a year 13 prefect at St Bedes College.
5. Because of his age Thomas is not eligible for any WINZ support.
6. Thomas comes across as a very dedicated and humble young man with a keen interest in discovering and passing on his cultural heritage. His mentor at Otautahi Tattooing writes that Thomas has "a great can do attitude" with a "good work ethic".

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. As Thomas has only just begun to learn the art of tattooing he has limited income, he is primarily being supported by his mother.
8. Thomas is limited as to how much he can do by not having his own equipment. At present he borrows the equipment of his tutors. However, this can be limited depending on the demand they have on them by clients. Hence, Thomas is applying for funding to enable him to purchase the equipment he needs and thus progress further in his chosen field.
9. There is a balance of \$6,060 in the Board's Youth development Fund.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

10. Yes.

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

11. There are no legal implications in regards to this application.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. This application aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, Page

¹ Ta moko is "the practice of scarring and marking the skin to reflect the whakapapa (genealogy) of the wearer. Moko can be seen as a cultural affirmation." (www.maoriart.org.nz)

10 Cont'd

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

13. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. This application aligns with the Strengthening Communities Strategy. It also aligns with the Community Board's Objectives, specifically those of:

- The Board acknowledges diversity and facilitates a vibrant, inclusive and strong community.
- The Board advocates for and supports local lifelong learning opportunities.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

15. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. None required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board allocate, from the 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund, a grant of \$580 to Thomas Tuuta to enable him to purchase equipment related to his education into Maori and Pacific Island tattooing principles and practice.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

11. CRIMEWATCH (CHRISTCHURCH) INCORPORATED

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
Author:	Bruce Meder, Community Development Adviser, Community Support Unit

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board from Crimewatch (Christchurch) Incorporated for \$1,250. The application is a joint one with Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board to whom Crimewatch are seeking a further \$1,250. The purpose of the funding is for the provision of signage on their cars.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Papanui Community Watch Inc. was incorporated in 1995 and recently (April 2009) changed its name to Crimewatch (Christchurch) Incorporated.
3. Crimewatch (Christchurch) Incorporated act to "assist the New Zealand Police in the promotion and fostering of law and order within the Christchurch Police sub-district by means of mobile and foot patrols, encouraging the general public to assist in this objective and to endeavour to provide a safer community for residents to live in" (Rule #2, Crimewatch (Christchurch) Incorporated).
4. The area in which this organisation operates is covered by both the Shirley/Papanui and Fendalton/Waimairi Wards. However, the organisation does also assist on projects outside this area, notably in other areas of the Northern Policing Area and at functions at AMI Stadium.
5. Because of the change of name the organisation now wish to update the signage on their vehicles as well as attach emergency lighting to these vehicles.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6. The total cost of this project is \$5,250, of which Crimewatch are requesting a \$2,500 grant. This request is shared between Shirley/Papanui and Fendalton/Waimairi Community Boards. Crimewatch are contributing the other \$2,750 out of their funds.
7. The latest Annual Audited Accounts (to 31 March 2009) of this organisation show an annual turnover of approximately \$12,000 with a surplus for the year of just over \$3,000. Their accounts showed a balance of almost \$3,800.
8. Crimewatch (Christchurch) Incorporated recently sent a delegation to the Board and applied to the Board for funding towards the costs of sending four persons to a National Training Seminar. This application was successful, with the Board allocating \$1,906 at its meeting of 3 June 2006.
9. The Board has \$37,116 available in its Discretionary Response Fund.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

10. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. There are no legal considerations.

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

12. Yes.

11 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. This application aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, Page

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

14. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

15. This application aligns with the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy, specifically:

- Enhancing the safety of communities and neighbourhoods.

16. It also aligns with the Shirley/Papanui Community Board's objective of:

- The Board advocates to make the Shirley/Papanui Ward a safer place for all residents.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

17. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board allocate, from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund, a grant of \$1,250 to Crimewatch (Christchurch) Incorporated to help with the costs of signage for their cars.

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted as this meets the Board's objective of a Safe City.

12. MARIAN COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT GROUP

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
Author:	Bruce Meder, Community Development Adviser, Community Support Unit

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board from the Marian College Environment Group for the purposes of developing a vegetable garden. The application is to be shared with the Burwood/Pegasus Ward. Hence, the total requested from the Shirley/Papanui Community Board is \$611.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Marian College is a Catholic Integrated School for girls located in North Parade, Richmond. It is a decile 7 school with a roll of almost 500 students.
3. The school has an Environment Group made up of students and staff. This group recycles paper, grass, cans and glass. Compost bins and two worm farms also enable them to recycle food scraps.
4. The Environment Group is also involved with education of the school community and runs an Environmental Hero Scheme, which rewards students who are involved in a positive manner towards the environment. Marian College is also a member of the Enviroschools network. The kaupapa of Enviroschools/Kura Taiao is about the well-being of the whole school, community, and eco-system.
5. The group has 40 students involved and has been operating for approximately eight years. The group meets fortnightly at lunch times.
6. The Environment Group now wish to build a vegetable garden, the objectives of which are:
 - To learn new skills about gardening.
 - To work co-operatively in the garden.
 - To grow plants that the school's food technology department can use.
 - To be able to share any excess with members of the local community in need.
7. The aim is to build six raised beds, with students undertaking this work under the supervision of the Kids Edible Gardens Co-ordinator, with assistance from the school's caretaker.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The budget for this project is as follows:

Timber (six beds at 5 x 1m)	\$ 648
15 bales of pea straw	\$97.50
1 bag of Blood n' Bone (8 kilograms)	\$27.40
4 m ³ organic compost	\$ 220
Consultation (2 hours at \$65 per hour)	\$ 130
Working bee (4 hours at \$25 per hour)	\$ 100
	\$1,222.90

9. The latest Annual Audited Accounts (to 31 December 2008) of Marian College show an annual turnover of just over \$4 million with a deficit of approximately \$100,000. Their Balance Sheet shows a Working Capital of \$110,000.
10. The Board has \$37,116 available in its Discretionary Response Fund.

12. Cont'd

11. The school does have an internal fundraising body, Marian Foundation, established “to provide resources and facilities for the college that would be otherwise unavailable.” However, funds from this source are not possible as this Foundation has been heavily committed to a new building and landscaping project in the school.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

12. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

13. There are no legal considerations.

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

14. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

15. This application aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, Page

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

16. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

17. This application aligns with the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy in part by:

- Improving basic life skills so that all residents can participate fully in society.

18. It also helps to meet the Community Board's objectives of:

- The Board advocates for Shirley/Papanui lifestyles that reflect a commitment to the guardianship of the local environment including waterways, and
- The Board advocates for and supports local lifelong learning opportunities.

19. The Shirley/Papanui Community Board also has a policy relating to assessing applications for funding from schools (30-6-99):

This criteria to be applied to all applications from schools within the Shirley/Papanui wards for funding from Project Funds, Discretionary Funding, Community Services fund (or similar Board established funds).

- *Does the proposal fit with the Community Board's strategic plan/vision?*

Yes.

- *Are there other sources of funding available to the schools?*

The College also has a “Marian Foundation” which is “established to provide resources and facilities for the College that would be otherwise unavailable”. See body of report (paragraph 11).

- *What is the community benefit: indirect – social, behavioural; direct – physical, environment?*

Benefit is primarily to the students of the school, although some excess produce is available to members of the community in need.

12 Cont'd

- *Can assistance be given through ways other than funding, i.e. advocating on behalf of the school to other agencies and government, providing advice?*
- *Is it an isolated request from one school or likely to be a need from all schools. The impact would need to be considered if it was likely to attract other requests.*

Many schools are developing edible gardens and the like. This could act as a precedent for further applications.

- *Is the funding to help fund a core educational/school programme?*

The Environment Group meets at lunchtimes and is not part of the school's core curriculum.

- *Do the benefits of the activity pertain primarily to students and/or their immediate families?*

Yes.

- *A report from Council staff on the request to be considered by the Community Board at its next ordinary monthly meeting.*

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

20. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

21. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board allocate \$600 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to Marian College as a one-off grant to help with the Marian College Environment Group establishing a vegetable garden.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

13. PROPOSED GIVE WAY SIGNS ON SIDE ROADS OF PAPANUI ROAD AND MAIN NORTH ROAD - MAYS ROAD, TOMES ROAD, PAPAROA STREET, PERRY STREET, DORMER STREET, BLAIR AVENUE, FRANK STREET, WYNDHAM STREET, WINSTON AVENUE, LOFTUS STREET, PROCTOR STREET, SHEARER AVENUE, APOLLO PLACE, MEADOW AVENUE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Authors:	Kirsten Mahoney, Project Manager, Patrick Cantillon, Project Manager, Mike Thomson, Senior Traffic Engineer.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Shirley/Papanui Community Board's approval that a Give Way sign be placed against:
 - (a) Mays Road at its intersection with Papanui Road
 - (b) Tomes Road at its intersection with Papanui Road
 - (c) Paparoa Street at its intersection with Papanui Road
 - (d) Perry Street at its intersection with Papanui Road
 - (e) Dormer Street at its intersection with Papanui Road
 - (f) Blair Ave at its intersection with Papanui Road
 - (g) Frank Street at its intersection with Papanui Road
 - (h) Wyndham Street at its intersection with Papanui Road
 - (i) Winston Avenue at its intersection with Main North Road
 - (j) Loftus Street at its intersection with Main North Road
 - (k) Proctor Street at its intersection with Main North Road
 - (l) Shearer Avenue at its intersection with Main North Road
 - (m) Apollo Place at its intersection with Main North Road
 - (n) Meadow Avenue at its intersection with Main North Road.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Council staff from the bus priority project team are recommending that Give Way Signs be installed at the intersections listed above, and as shown on the **attached** plans.
3. These streets are all side streets to Papanui Road and Main North Road, which are the subject of the Papanui Road/Main North Road bus priority project. Bus lanes and cycle lanes are currently being implemented along Papanui Road between Bealey Avenue and Harewood Road, and along Main North Road between Harewood Road and Queen Elizabeth II Drive as part of the bus priority project.
4. With the new road markings across these intersections, there is potential for vehicles to move right up to the lane markings of the cycle or bus lanes and place themselves in a very dangerous and unsafe situation, as there are currently no controls on these intersections.

13 Cont'd

5. The introduction of Give Way signs on these currently uncontrolled intersections will provide a limit line to vehicles departing from the side streets onto the main road and encourage vehicles to check the lanes before moving out into the main road.
6. No specific consultation has been carried out on the implementation of these proposed Give Way signs, as this issue was picked up as a safety issue by staff during the review of the detailed design plans.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$7,000.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

8. The installation of road markings and signs is within the Papanui Road/Main North Road Bus Priority project budget.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated April 2008. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
10. The installation of any signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

11. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community Outcomes-Safety and Community.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

13. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

15. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. No specific consultation has been carried out on these proposed Give Way signs, as this issue was picked up as a key safety issue by staff during the review of the detailed design plans for the Papanui Road/Main North Road bus priority project.

13 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approve the following:

That a Give Way Sign be placed against:

- (a) Mays Road at its intersection with Papanui Road
- (b) Tomes Road at its intersection with Papanui Road
- (c) Paparoa Street at its intersection with Papanui Road
- (d) Perry Street at its intersection with Papanui Road
- (e) Dormer Street at its intersection with Papanui Road
- (f) Blair Avenue at its intersection with Papanui Road
- (g) Frank Street at its intersection with Papanui Road
- (h) Wyndham Street at its intersection with Papanui Road
- (i) Winston Avenue at its intersection with Main North Road
- (j) Loftus Street at its intersection with Main North Road
- (k) Proctor Street at its intersection with Main North Road
- (l) Shearer Avenue at its intersection with Main North Road
- (m) Apollo Place at its intersection with Main North Road
- (n) Meadow Avenue at its intersection with Main North Road.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted with the exception of Dormer Street, which should be a Stop Sign because of the proximity of the Horner Street bend.

14. PROPOSED GIVE WAY SIGNS – GRESFORD STREET, GUILD STREET, HENDON STREET, WARDEN STREET

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Authors:	Kirsten Mahoney/Patrick Cantillon, Capital Programme, Project Managers, Mike Thomson, Senior Traffic Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Shirley/Papanui Community Board's approval that a Give Way sign be placed against:
 - (a) Gresford Street at its intersection with Hills Road;
 - (b) Guild Street at its intersection with Hills Road;
 - (c) Hendon Street at its intersection with Hills Road;
 - (d) Warden Street at its intersection with Hills Road.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Council staff from the bus priority project team are recommending that Give Way Signs be installed at the intersections listed above, and as shown on the attached plans.
3. These streets are all side streets to Hills Road, which is the subject of the Queenspark bus priority project. Bus lanes and cycle lanes are currently being implemented along Hills Road between Bealey Avenue/Fitzgerald Avenue and Shirley Road/Warrington Street, as part of the bus priority project.
4. With the new road markings across these intersections, there is potential for vehicles to move right up to the lane markings of the cycle or bus lanes and place themselves in a very dangerous and unsafe situation, as there are currently no controls on these intersections.
5. The introduction of Give Way signs on these currently uncontrolled intersections, will provide a limit line to vehicles departing from the side streets onto the main road and encourage vehicles to check the lanes before moving out into the main road.
6. No specific consultation has been carried out on the implementation of these proposed Give Way signs, as this issue was picked up as a safety issue during the review of the detailed design plans.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$2,000.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

8. The installation of road markings and signs is within the Queenspark Bus Priority project budget.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated April 2008. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
10. The installation of any signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

14 Cont'd

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

11. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community Outcomes-Safety and Community.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

13. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

15. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. No specific consultation has been carried out on these proposed Give Way signs, as this issue was picked up as a key safety issue during the review of the detailed design plans for the Queenspark bus priority project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approve the following:

- (a) That a Give Way Sign be placed against:
- (i) Gresford Street at its intersection with Hills Road;
 - (ii) Guild Street at its intersection with Hills Road;
 - (iii) Hendon Street at its intersection with Hills Road;
 - (iv) Warden Street at its intersection with Hills Road.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

15. SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNICATION WITH THE COMMUNITY

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Peter Croucher, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to request the Board to consider allocating up to \$5,000 from the 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to publish articles in local community newspapers which promote local Community Board information.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Board has indicated a wish to communicate information regarding Board decisions, information on local projects occurring in the ward, details of local events and any other relevant information of interest to the Shirley/Papanui community.
3. Funding is sought to purchase space in local community newspapers to present regular Board updates on these matters, with most information being sourced from the decisions made by the Board at its ordinary meetings. The articles would be prepared by the Council's Communications Unit, which has prepared similar articles for other Community Boards in recent months.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

4. Yes. There are no financial implications outside existing budgets. The Board currently has \$37,116 available in its Discretionary Response Fund

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

5. There are no legal implications.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

6. Yes. The Board's Discretionary Response Fund is part of the Community Grants schemes on page 176 of the 2009 - 19 LTCCP.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

7. The recommendation in this report aligns with the Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

8. Not required.

15 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board consider allocating up to \$5,200 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to publish Community Board articles in local community newspapers which promote local Board information.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

16. CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANTS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Liveable City
Author:	Katie Smith, Neighbourhood Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To report to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board the Character Housing Maintenance Grant applications that have been received for funding in the 2009/10 financial year for properties located within the Shirley/Papanui Ward.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At its meeting on 4 May 2006, the Council adopted guidelines and associated procedures for the processing and administration of applications for Character Housing Maintenance Grants.
3. Under the policy and guidelines approved by the Council, applications for grants are to be reported back to the relevant Community Board, who will then make recommendations to the Character Housing Grants Panel who will make the final decision on grant applications.
4. The Character Housing Grants Panel comprises a representative from each Community Board. Staff will provide specific heritage, urban design and neighbourhood planning advice to assist the panel in its decision-making.
5. This report informs the Board of those eligible applications received for Character Housing Maintenance Grants within the Board's area and which are for consideration at this meeting. Given the time frame available between the application deadline and the Board meeting date, full details are not available for circulation with this agenda. Details and photographs as submitted in each application will be displayed at the Board meeting to assist discussion. A summary though of each application has been **separately circulated** to enable members, should they so wish, to view the application properties prior to the Board meeting.
6. The Board is asked to assess applications with regard to their local knowledge and the criteria set out in the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy (**attached** as Appendix A) and recommend those applications they consider suitable for a grant to be forwarded to the Character Housing Grants Panel. To assist in the decision making process for each application, a list of criteria together with a weighting process is **attached** as Appendix B. The Boards are asked to consider the merits of each application whilst the Character Grants Panel will consider the level of funding for each application.
7. At its 16 September 2009 meeting, the Board confirmed that Pauline Cotter would continue to sit on the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Panel as the Shirley/Papanui Community Board representative.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The funding for the Character Housing Maintenance Grants has been approved by the Council and the funds set aside for this year in the 2009-2019 LTCCP.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

9. Yes, \$50,000 is included in the 2009-19 LTCCP (page 182, Community Grants) for the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Scheme.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. The Character Housing Maintenance Grant Policy requires that applicants agree in writing not to demolish or remove the property within 10 years of the awarding of the grant and to repay the grant should the property be sold within 5 years of receipt of the grant. This is provided for in the form of a Property Information Note placed upon the Land Information Memorandum.

16 Cont'd

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

11. The Land Information Memorandum will provide the required form of protection against demolition or removal within 10 years and for the repayment of the grant should the property be sold within 5 years of receipt of the grant.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Yes, the Character Housing Maintenance Grants scheme is aligned to the Community Outcome "*An attractive and well-designed city*" (LTCCP 2009-19, page 50), 'Community Outcome 9. Development provides for, among other things, ensuring "*our lifestyles and heritage are enhanced by our urban environment*" (page 54.) One of the success measures is that "*Christchurch is attractive and well maintained*" (page 54). Progress will be measured using headline indicators including "*perceptions of look and feel of the city*" (page 54). Character Housing Maintenance Grants contribute towards the external upgrading and maintenance of individual family homes which have a distinctive visual character and make a key contribution to the quality and identity of local streets.
13. Within the 'Activities and Services' section of the LTCCP, is "Community Support" which aims to provide project funding and operate community grant schemes at a local level that achieve heritage and environment outcomes (page 176). The Character Housing Maintenance Grants are decided upon at Community Board level with an aim to upgrade and maintain individual family homes which have a distinctive visual character and make a key contribution to the quality and identity of local streets.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

14. Yes, paragraphs 9, 12 and 13 above refer.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

15. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants Scheme aligns with the Character Housing Maintenance Grant Policy. It also aligns with the Strong Communities Strategic Direction by protecting and promoting the heritage character and history of the city and the Liveable City Strategic Direction in protecting Christchurch's heritage buildings and neighbourhood character.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

16. Yes, paragraph 15 above refers

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. Not applicable

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Receive this information.
- (b) Consider the Character Housing Maintenance Grant applications received.
- (c) Recommend those applications they wish the Character Housing Grants Panel to consider for a grant.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

17. NEIGHBOURHOOD WEEK FUNDING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 9418607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Manager
Author:	Clare Quirke, Community Engagement Manager

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to submit for consideration, Board applications for the allocation of Neighbourhood Week 2009/10 funding.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Local community groups, including residents' associations and neighbourhood support groups have applied for the Neighbourhood Week Funding that has been set aside by the Board.
3. Neighbourhood Week is a dedicated week in which individuals and groups are encouraged to get together and get to know one another locally. Neighbourhood Week 2009 is to be held from 31 October – 8 November 2009. Applications for funding closed on 4 September 2009.
4. The Community Board previously discussed criteria for funding Neighbourhood Week Events. This criteria is **attached**.
5. In some previous years where the demand for Neighbourhood Week funds has exceeded the funds set aside, the Board has allocated additional funds out of the Board's Discretionary Response Funding towards Neighbourhood Week to enable more groups to receive some funding towards their event. This has happened when there has been an increase in the number of groups applying for Neighbourhood Week funds. Should this be the case, the Board may wish to allocate a set amount of its Discretionary Response Funds as a contingency towards the above situation with the proviso that those funds not required go back into that Fund.
6. A matrix outlining the applications and staff recommendations is **attached**.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The Board has allocated \$7,143 from the Strengthening Communities Fund to assist individuals and groups to run events. It is not the intention of this funding to totally fund events. Those applying for funding are expected to partially resource events themselves either financially or through supply of materials.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

8. Page 172 of the LTCCP under Community support – Strengthening communities and page 176 of the LTCCP under Community support – Community grants.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Under Council Standing Orders 2.10 (Powers of Delegation). A Sub-committee may be appointed and given the power to act.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

10. Yes, clause 8 above refers.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

11. Yes, clause 10 above refers.

17 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

12. Funding for Neighbourhood Week activities aligns with the Council's Strong Communities Strategic Direction and Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

13. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Consider the applications as set out in the **attached** matrix and allocate Neighbourhood Week 2009 funding accordingly.
- (b) Assign delegated authority to the Board Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson to consider any additional applications and allocate funding, should any funds remain.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

7. 10. 2009

18. CORRESPONDENCE

Any items of correspondence will be separately circulated to members.

19. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE

19.1 CURRENT ISSUES

20. MEMBERS QUESTIONS