

26. 5. 2005

**SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD  
17 MAY 2005**

**A meeting of the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board  
was held on Tuesday 17 May 2005 at 5pm**

- PRESENT** Phil Clearwater (Chairperson), Oscar Alpers, Barry Corbett, Chris Mene, Paul de Spa, Sue Wells and Megan Woods.
- APOLOGIES:** Oscar Alpers arrived at 5.06pm and was absent for clause 4 and part of clause 5.
- Sue Wells retired at 6.42pm and was absent for part of clause 8.

The Board reports that:

**PART B – REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**1. UPDATE OF BOARD FUNDS**

The Board **received** an update regarding its 2004/05 Project, Discretionary, SCAP and Youth Development Funds.

**PART C – REPORT ON DELEGATED DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE BOARD**

**2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORT TO COUNCIL: 3 MAY 2005**

It was **resolved** that the report of the Board's meeting of 3 May 2005 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

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

The Board received updates on current issues and **resolved** to give delegated authority to a committee comprised of Oscar Alpers, Phil Clearwater and Megan Woods, to formulate and lodge a submission on Environment Canterbury's draft 2005/06 Annual Plan by 30 May 2005; subject to ratification at the Board's 7 June 2005 meeting.

**4. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

Members were provided with an opportunity to give a brief update on community activities/Council issues, in line with the Board's Objective No. 2 - "To ensure local people's needs are being represented".

It was **resolved** that Oscar Alpers be appointed as the Board's liaison person on the Sydenham Heritage Trust.

**5. BUCHAN STREET P10 PARKING RESTRICTION**

The Board's approval was sought for the implementation of a 10 minute parking restriction on the west side of Buchan Street between Byron Street and Penbury Street, Sydenham.

The Board **resolved** that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 10 minutes on the west side of Buchan Street commencing at a point six metres from its intersection with Penbury Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 23 metres.

26. 5. 2005

**Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board 3.5.2005**

**6. TRANSPORT AND CITY STREETS CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAMME UPDATE**

Board members were provided with an opportunity to give feedback and suggestions for improvement on the capital works programme update previously distributed.

It was **resolved** that the suggestions and questions received, particularly in regard to safety improvements on Ensors Road at Fifield Avenue, be conveyed to the Transport and City Streets Unit.

**7. BOARD SUBMISSION ON 2006/07 ANNUAL PLAN**

The Board **resolved** to ratify its submission on the Council's draft 2006/07 Annual Plan as follows:

**GENERAL SUBMISSION**

Presentation, Process and Timeframes

The Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board would like to see a more "user-friendly" approach taken by production of a short, 4-6 page synopsis of the Annual Plan, with an explanation of its relationship to the LTCCP; making it clearer that the Annual Plan is an "add on" to the latter. Although it is difficult to significantly modify the LTCCP, the Annual Plan can provide an opportunity for the Council to make necessary changes (Section 85 LGA).

In terms of the Annual Plan's relationship to the LTCCP, the two processes should be tied together better, to avoid potential confusion. For example, only six days after the submissions on the Annual Plan close, the Council will then begin public consultation on draft community outcomes. Better planning and coordination of consultation would help to avoid any public confusion.

**Changes to Less Significant Services and Activities**

At the level of detail in the draft Annual Plan, it is difficult for elected members to identify whether there are going to be any changes to activities/services below the level of a significant activity (and if so, the nature of those changes). The Board seeks an assurance through the Annual Plan that the status quo will remain for such activities/services unless there is specific reference to a variation or discontinuance in the Plan or the variation or discontinuance is approved by the affected Community Board(s) or Council.

**SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS ON THE DRAFT**

**Democracy and Governance**

The Board questions the basis of the allocation of the cost of proposed services to "Democracy and Governance" (page 45). The only explanation given for the increases or decreases is determinations of the Remuneration Authority. A cynical view of the \$11 million cost allocated to "Democracy and Governance" would be that this is a convenient way of reducing the apparent cost of all other services.

The performance measures in the "Democracy and Governance" section are almost meaningless as measures of democracy and good governance, and require to be completely rewritten. One performance measure for elected member representation should be "Monitoring of the financial performance and reporting of the Council on at least a quarterly basis".

Since the Council is a public body, it must be seen to undertake relevant and meaningful financial monitoring and publish its accounts. There are also sound business reasons to do so. The Council should have reports on the performance of the administration against the Council's objectives and financial management. The Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board submits that in order for the Council to fulfil its governance role, it is necessary for Council to receive at least quarterly budget reports in its agendas.

## 7. Cont'd

### Timing of Major Capital Projects

The Council is urged to adopt as part of the Annual Plan a policy of more flexible timing for capital projects (particularly major building and roading projects), in order to achieve the same results at lower cost. This can be achieved by factoring in economic "peaks and troughs" to planning; so that wherever possible the peaks are avoided and implementation of major projects is undertaken during the "troughs", in order to make cost savings and level out economic activity - thus benefiting both ratepayers and the local economy.

### The Council as a Good Employer

Having regard to the Council's embracing of Triple Bottom Line reporting, its statutory duty to be a good employer (Section 39, LGA) and several of the identified Community Outcomes, the Annual Plan must include meaningful performance measures to enable the community to judge the Council's performance in this important area and hopefully to see the Council as leading by example.

### KEY ITEMS OF IMPORTANCE TO BE ADDRESSED BY NEXT LTCCP

The Board would like to give an indication of key issues of importance that it will be promoting to be addressed in the next LTCCP.

- The administration building on the former Hillmorton Hospital site is worthy of retention and restoration. As a start, the Board is funding, from its 2004/05 project funds, the cost for a conservation plan to be undertaken for the building.
- Consideration should be given as to how the two storey Water Services building adjacent to the Beckenham Service Centre/South Library can best be utilised for community and Council purposes.
- The Board will be paying close attention to the development of the Council's Aquatic Strategy, to ensure the needs of residents in the Spreydon/Heathcote ward are met.
- The Board is strongly supportive of urban renewal initiatives that support community "hubs" and promote local economic activity. To the extent to which funding is available for such activity, reactivation of the "Sydenham Town Enhancement Strategy" is a priority.
- Desirable activities identified by the Heathcote River Vision project and the Heathcote Asset Management Plan may require an increase in funding.

It was noted that both Phil Clearwater and Oscar Alpers would speak to the Board's submission.

## 8. URBAN DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The Board **resolved** to formulate the following comments on the Urban Development Strategy as its first draft (pending attendance at the Spreydon/Heathcote public meeting to be held on 25 May 2005) with a view to the submission being finalised at its 7 June 2005 meeting:

### Business as Usual Option

- Redevelopment would be minimal.
- People have freedom of choice; more organic approach taken.
- Houses able to retain their character while still being quite close to the city (currently zoned living 1).
- Uncoordinated approach.
- Disappointed at the way Waimakariri has responded to options put to it in terms of both rural and domestic growth.
- Potentially, there may not be any countryside left around Christchurch, which will impact on everyone.

26. 5. 2005

**Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board 3.5.2005**

**8. Cont'd**

- Effects on mobility are significant.
- Green belt concept is not in the City Plan.
- A lot of development to the south west (eg Aidansfield) which will impact on Heathcote River; transport issues, etc.

**Option A**

- Extra emphasis needs to be put on transport, including light rail.
- Need to look at more infrastructure to support expansion and get people into Christchurch city.
- Need to look at expanding options further to encompass Ashburton and Timaru, including Darfield and Amberley to the north.
- In terms of redevelopment, care needs to be taken in terms of Waltham – a lot of bad urban redevelopment has been done in terms of how sections have been subdivided and the consequent impact on residents' quality of life.
- A lot more money needs to be budgeted to protect heritage values and some private properties where there are significant heritage features.
- This option is open to the best transport choices, land use and housing choices.
- Uses the least amount of land available – this is a good thing – the best option in terms of retaining a rural belt.
- Natural Environment – water use – if compared to other options it is the best, but a 35% increase in consumption to what we use now is not tolerable.
- Use of grey water should be an option – the document has to dig deeper to say there are ways to reduce or sustain options in terms of water use.

**Option B**

- This option is more dispersed geographically.
- As homes become older and sea levels rise owing to global warming, it would make sense to move away from at risk areas in terms of liquefaction.
- Support the creation of community "hubs" within the city – this is a strength of the model.
- Transport and cost of congestion – huge amount of money.
- There is a reference to light rail and it should be noted that the spending of \$2 billion on road widening/maintenance to avoid congestion becomes unacceptable.
- Emphasis on light rail as a public transport solution for option B.
- In terms of a projected increase in new housing in the Diamond Harbour area, while some of the population growth might choose to travel via Lyttelton Harbour/Tunnel, the general increase in traffic volume would certainly impact on Dyers Pass Road.
- In terms of natural environment – in particular the Halswell area, more flooding would occur if the area is expanded any further.

**Option C**

- In terms of a projected increase in new housing in the Diamond Harbour area, while some of the population growth might choose to travel via Lyttelton Harbour/Tunnel, the general increase in traffic volume would certainly impact on Dyers Pass Road.
- This option takes away fertile soils, no agrarian area – would have to bring produce in from elsewhere in the country – this needs to be protected.
- Biggest problem is with congestion and increased water demand; a lot of development in the south west area and people coming from the Governor's Bay area.
- There would be a loss of identity for the city because it spreads too far afield.

**General Comments**

- Staff to be congratulated on the format of the document – very user-friendly.
- The strategy has been publicised well with local newspapers.

The meeting concluded at 7.24 pm

**CONSIDERED THIS 7<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JUNE 2005**

**PHIL CLEARWATER  
CHAIRPERSON**