



Christchurch City Council

SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

TUESDAY 18 APRIL 2006

AT 5.00 PM

IN THE BOARDROOM,
SOUTH LIBRARY, SERVICE CENTRE AND LEARNING CENTRE,
66 COLOMBO STREET, CHRISTCHURCH

Community Board: Phil Clearwater (Chairperson), Oscar Alpers, Barry Corbett, Paul de Spa, Chris Mene, Sue Wells and Megan Woods.

Community Board Principal Adviser

Lisa Goodman

DDI: 941-5108

Email: lisa.goodman@ccc.govt.nz

Community Secretary

Peter Dow

DDI: 941-5105

Email: peter.dow@ccc.govt.nz

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

INDEX

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 4 APRIL 2006
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
- PART B 4. CORRESPONDENCE
- PART B 5. PETITIONS
- PART B 6. NOTICES OF MOTION
- PART B 7. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
- PART B 8. TRANSPORT AND CITY STREETS UNIT UPDATE
- PART B 9. CASHMERE VALLEY RESERVE – CASHMERE TENNIS CLUB PROPOSED NEW LIGHTING
- PART A&C 10. RUSKIN RESERVE – CREATION OF A SWALE AND LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED NATURALISATION OF BAXTER'S DRAIN
- PART B 11. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD WORKING PARTY – REPORT OF 30 MARCH 2006
- PART B 12. HILLMORTON HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
- PART A 13. ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2006/07

We're on the Web!

www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/

18. 4. 2006

- 2 -

- PART C 14. CROSS OVER TRUST – APPLICATION FOR FUNDING**
- PART B 15. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE SCAP COMMITTEE –
REPORT OF 3 APRIL 2006**
- PART B 16. BOARD FUNDS - UPDATE**
- PART B 17. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER’S UPDATE**
- PART B 18. MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS**

SEMINAR – 6.30PM

- 1. ECAN’S DRAFT LTCCP**

1. APOLOGIES

Phil Clearwater, Chris Mene.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 4 APRIL 2006

The report of the meeting of 4 April 2006 has been separately circulated.

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the report of the Board's ordinary meeting of 4 April 2006 be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

4. CORRESPONDENCE

5. PETITIONS

6. NOTICES OF MOTION

7. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Board members to provide updates on community/Council issues.

8. TRANSPORT AND CITY STREETS UNIT UPDATE

Richard Bailey from the Transport and City Streets Unit will be in attendance to update the Board on current issues.

9. CASHMERE VALLEY RESERVE – CASHMERE TENNIS CLUB PROPOSED NEW LIGHTING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Michael Aitken, Greenspace Manager
Author:	Ann Liggett, Parks and Waterways Area Advocate

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to advise and seek support from the Board regarding the Cashmere Tennis Club's application to install new floodlighting, including the erection of nine new poles, on Cashmere Valley Reserve prior to the Greenspace Manager granting approval under delegated authority.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Cashmere Tennis Club was formed in 1922 and is based at Cashmere Valley Reserve where they have clubrooms and thirteen artificial tennis courts. Currently the club has 310 junior members and 150 senior members.
3. The proposal is to erect 9 x 6.0m Spunlight steel pole light towers with Philips OptiFlood lamps to enable courts 2 and 3 to be lit (plan **attached**). The design utilises 6 metre poles with a maximum tilt angle of 10° from the horizontal to provide adequate light with a low obtrusive installation.
4. The poles will be painted in environmentally sympathetic colours (such as "court green") for concealment purposes.

9 Cont'd

5. There will also be the installation of appropriate underground wiring to the new poles.
6. The reason for the new lighting is to provide extended time for coaching particularly at the junior level.
7. With the erection of the nine new poles and associated lights, two court areas for training will be illuminated (lighting plans **attached**) and it is intended the courts will be used any night of the week when there is insufficient light.
8. The proposal has been granted resource consent with the matters of non-compliance being:
 - Rule 13-2.2.1 Parking and loading
 - Rule 13-2.3.8 Access for high traffic generators

This is a non-notified application.

9. Advice received from the Council's Consultant Traffic Planner indicates that any adverse effects will be insignificant (copy **attached**).
10. The applicant has stated that the court lighting system will be operated by meters located in the Clubhouse, meaning that the lights will only be on when a tennis court is being used. All light circuits will be connected through a cutoff switch that will automatically turn the lights off at 9.30pm.
11. The Greenspace Unit has been in close contact with the Club and is comfortable with the current proposal. The Unit acknowledges the Club's need for additional lighting and believes the application is well justified.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. The Greenspace Manager has delegated authority from the Council (23 October 1996) to approve applications for floodlights on sports parks subject to the necessary resource consents and consultation with the appropriate Community Board.
13. The Cashmere Tennis Club is meeting all project expenses with the only costs to the Council being those associated with the processing of this application.
14. A resource consent is required for this project which has been granted. The Building Act 2004 states that a pole or mast does not become a building until it exceeds 7 metres in height from the point of attachment. The Club proposal as submitted will not require a Building Consent.
15. Philips Lighting has designed the system and a qualified and registered electrician will be contracted to do the installation.
16. The lights will be in the ownership of the club with all future maintenance, electrical and running costs being the responsibility of Cashmere Tennis Club.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board endorse approval being given by the Greenspace Manager for the application, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) The applicant to obtain the necessary Resource Consents and Building Consents at its cost before commencing installation of the lighting system on the park.
- (b) The applicant or contractor being responsible for obtaining plans of all services presently laid underground in the park (electricity, telephone, sewerage, storm water, high pressure water supply and irrigation).
- (c) The applicant being required to deposit scaled plans, showing the lighting poles and cable layout in the park, as built, within two months of the work being completed.

9 Cont'd

- (d) The applicant being responsible for all costs associated with the installation and maintenance of the lighting system.
- (e) The applicant being responsible for ensuring that the lighting system is maintained in a safe and tidy condition at all times.
- (f) That the lights not be operated after 9.30pm.
- (g) That the area is restored to its previous condition following the completion of the work to the satisfaction of the Council.
- (h) That approval will lapse if the development is not completed within two years of application.

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendations be adopted.

10. RUSKIN RESERVE – CREATION OF A SWALE AND LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED NATURALISATION OF BAXTER'S DRAIN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Michael Aitken, Greenspace Manager
Authors:	Tony Hallams, Policy and Leasing Officer Greenspace Unit Ann Liggett, Parks and Waterways Area Advocate Greenspace Unit Eric Banks, Parks Planner Greenspace Unit

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board to:
 - (a) Approve an easement being created over Ruskin Reserve, a Local Purpose Reserve, to enable a swale to be constructed which will be contiguous with the naturalisation of Baxter's Drain.
 - (b) Support a request to the Council to approve easements being created for Baxter's Drain where it transits through the rear of properties in Burke Street and Fairfield Avenue (held as Local Purpose (Drainage Reserve)), and Fairfield Avenue and Braddon Street, (held as fee simple land).
 - (c) Approve Option One as the final design for the Ruskin Reserve landscape development.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Greenspace Unit seeks approval to create easements to accommodate the creation of a swale on Ruskin Reserve and contiguous with this work, the naturalisation of Baxter's Drain, which was supported in a decision by the former Council Parks, Gardens, and Waterways Committee on 23 September 2004.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

3. The Community Board has the delegated authority from the Council (16 December 2004) to make the decision whether to grant the easement or not for a stormwater swale to be located on Ruskin Reserve.
4. The applicant is seeking individual easements over a part of the following parcels of land:
 - (a) Lot 2 DP 7517
 - (b) Lot 1 DP 76118(Local Purpose Reserve)
 - (c) Part Lot 81 DP 2382 (Local Purpose Drainage Reserve)
 - (d) Part Lot 81 DP 2384 (Local Purpose Drainage Reserve)

10 Cont'd

- (e) Pt Lot 66 DP 1499
- (f) Lot 1 DP 355884
- (g) Lot 2 DP 355884
- (h) Lot 3 DP 355884
- (l) Lot 4 DP 355884
- (j) Lot 5 DP 355884 Pt RS 66.

5. Drawing SM1595 –01 under **Attachment One** provides a description of the relevant parcels of land where the easements are sought.
6. **Attachment Two** details a copy of a an officer's report with a recommendation to the former Council Parks, Gardens and Waterways Committee, and the decision by that Committee on 23 September 2004, supporting the purchase of properties in Braddon Street, Fairfield Avenue, Burke Street, and Ruskin Street. The legal descriptions of these properties are covered under 4 (a), (e) to (j), as detailed above. Because these properties are held as fee simple, the approval of the Minister of Conservation will not be necessary to enable easements to be lodged as survey plans with Land Information New Zealand. This is also applicable to the land held as Local Purpose Drainage Reserve, although approval will need to be obtained for the land held as Local Purpose Reserve, (Ruskin Reserve).
7. **Attachment Three** and **Attachment Four** detail Option One and Option Two for the possible routes for the intended swale with associated landscaping; the plans having been compiled by the City Solutions Unit at the Greenspace Unit's request. The public's access to Ruskin Reserve will not be diminished by either of the proposals, and officers are of the view that the proposed easement route and landscaping will enhance the reserve.
8. Part 1 of section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977 allows for the granting of rights-of-way and other easements across reserves. Pursuant to Sections 48(1)(f) and 48(6) of the Reserves Act 1977 it is necessary for the Council to obtain an easement over the area where the storm water swale is to be built. The intended easement will cover all the area of the swale, although throughout most of the year, aside from stormwater run off events, there will only be a small quantity of water in the swale.
9. Greenspace Unit staff have run in tandem a community consultation exercise (in which the public were invited to made comments on their preferences for either Option One or Option Two as detailed above relating to Ruskin Reserve), and publicly advertised over one calendar month the overall proposal relating to Ruskin Reserve and the naturalisation of Baxter's Drain. No objections were received.
10. The occupiers of residences straddling Ruskin Reserve also received a letter to advise them of the proposal, but no objection to the proposal has been received by the Council .
11. Swale and park capital works amounting to \$560,000 is provided for in the Greenspace budget and will be carried out in the 2006/07 financial year.

BACKGROUND ON RUSKIN RESERVE – CREATION OF A SWALE AND LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED NATURALISATION OF BAXTER'S DRAIN

12. The Council's Greenspace Unit on behalf of the Council seeks to create a swale with landscaping on Ruskin Reserve, and contiguous with these works, the naturalisation of Baxter's Drain. A description of the proposal is detailed under **Attachment Five** and **Attachment Six**.
13. Approval for the proposal was granted by the former Council Parks, Gardens and Waterways Committee on 23 September 2004 (refer **Attachment Two**).
14. The proposal has been fully advertised in tandem with a community consultation, with no objections received.
15. The community consultation involved placing two options for the redevelopment of Ruskin Reserve, a Local Purpose Reserve, and these options are detailed as **Attachment Three** and **Attachment Four**.

10 Cont'd

16. As a result of community consultation, 33 submitters supported Option One, 12 submitters supported Option B, with three supporters supporting either option, with Option One being the favoured option.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED BY THE APPLICANT

17. **Option One:** Apply for easements to enable creation of a broad vegetated swale.

This option would allow the project to proceed as outlined to the Board in a report of 5 July 2005.

18. **Option Two:** Easement to create swale not applied for.

If approval for the easement was not applied for, then the swale could not be constructed in a continuous fashion between Ruskin Reserve and Addington Cemetery. One possibility could be to construct an intermittent open swale and replacement piped watercourse. i.e. (Ruskin Reserve to Burke Street, (piped), Burke Street to Fairfield Avenue (swaled), 47 Fairfield Avenue (piped). Another possibility could be to re-pipe the entire length.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

- (a) That the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board, under delegated authority from the Council, resolve to support Option One detailed as the preferred redevelopment proposal for Ruskin Reserve, and easements being granted as provided for in Section 48(1)(f) of the Reserves Act 1977, over a part of the following parcels of land:

Lot 1 DP 76118 (Local Purpose Reserve)
Pt Lot 81 DP 2382 (Local Purpose Drainage Reserve)
Pt Lot 81 DP 2384 (Local Purpose Drainage Reserve).

- (b) That the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board, under the General Governance provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, recommend to the Council that easements be granted over part of the following parcels of land:

Lot 2 DP 7517
Pt Lot 66 DP1499
Lot 1 DP 355884
Lot 2 DP 355884
Lot 3 DP 35588
Lot 4 DP 355884
Lot 5 DP 355884 Pt RS 66

subject to the following conditions:

- (i) That the applicant lodges survey plans of the proposed easements with Land Information New Zealand within three months of the granting of the easements.
- (ii) That the approval of the Minister of Conservation is obtained for the granting of the easements on the Local Purpose Reserve.
- (iii) That the applicant obtains any necessary consents.
- (iv) That before work commences on the site, the principal contractor be responsible for locating any existing services on the Local Purpose Reserve, and ensuring that contractors do not damage them during construction.
- (v) That the easement construction areas be maintained by the Christchurch City Council and their contractors in a safe and tidy condition at all times.

10 Cont'd

- (vi) That a bond of \$2,000 is to be paid by the principal contractor to the Christchurch City Council via the Parks and Waterways Area Advocate at the Beckenham Service Centre, before work commences on the site. This bond, less any expenses incurred by the Council, is to be refunded to the payee upon the completion of the work, and lodgement of the survey plan as built, with the Water and Waste Unit, for notation on drainage plans.

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendations be adopted.

**11. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD WORKING PARTY –
REPORT OF 30 MARCH 2006**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
Officer responsible:	Lisa Goodman, Community Board Principal Adviser
Author:	Peter Dow, Community Secretary

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the Hillmorton Working Party meeting as follows:

**Report of a meeting of the Hillmorton Working Party
held on Thursday 30 March 2006 at 5.15pm
in Meeting Room 1, Beckenham Service Centre**

PRESENT: Phil Clearwater (Chairperson), Oscar Alpers, Paul de Spa and Megan Woods

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Chris Mene and for lateness from Oscar Alpers and Paul de Spa.

2. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairperson welcomed various community representatives to the meeting, and provided an overview of the Board's interest and involvement to date including progress on the draft conservation plan funded by the Board.

3. CURRENT SITUATION

Mr Michael Aitken, Greenspace Manager, advised that Ngai Tahu has confirmed its purchase of the Hillmorton Hospital site.

Details of the process and timeframes regarding the subdivision consent application were provided.

Input from the Council's Community Support, and Strategy and Planning Units, was now to hand and along with a response from the Greenspace Unit, a report would be submitted to the Board in the near future.

The Community Support Unit has concluded that the area is well served by community facilities, and therefore the Hillmorton building is not required as a community facility.

Greenspace wish to use the reserve contribution to acquire the garden area in front of the building, not the building itself or land.

11 Cont'd

The Strategy and Planning Unit, with financial assistance from the Board, has been preparing a Conservation Plan including associated costings to bring the building up to a useable standard, with the estimate for such work being in the region of \$450,000 excluding land costs. In addition, there would be the costs of building purchase. No Council provision has been made for the possible purchase of the building, or work to bring it to a useable standard, in the draft LTCCP.

Council heritage staff do not consider the building has a high priority for protection.

The following points were noted from the ensuing discussion:

- The availability of other local community facilities was disputed.
- Details to be obtained and advised on the likely level of reserve contribution.
- Clarification requested on the building's heritage values vis-à-vis the view of Council staff, compared to what is mentioned in the draft of the Conversation Plan.
- Retention of the building is the primary objective, therefore, funding sources are a key consideration along with ascertaining community input and views.
- Possible uses of the building include artists' residence, residential occupation, use by community groups, café/restaurant and a museum.
- The Board should continue to act in its advocacy role and ascertain community input via a public meeting.
- In addition to the refurbishment costs associated with the building was the acquisition of the land the building sits on, along with 2,000m² of land surrounding the building.
- Clarification was requested on the extent and use of reserve contribution funds and whether the building could be included.
- Clarity requested about the Category 2 provisions in the City Plan given the contra heritage view.
- Staff were asked to let the Board know when the subdivision consent was lodged.
- Volunteer effort would be sought to restore the building once ownership is secured.
- A concept plan for the site and the immediate area was tabled showing a more defined linkage between the building and the nearby water tower.

4. NEXT STEPS

- The first priority was to save the site in public ownership including retention of the building.
- Action plan required to stop its further deterioration.
- Assess making the building useable by the community.
- Public meeting option to be pursued.
- Noted that a formal report on the overall matter would be made to the Board in the near future.

The Chairperson thanked the community representatives for their attendance and contributions.

The meeting concluded at 6.37pm.

11 Cont'd

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATIONS

- (a) That the report be received.
- (b) That the Board host a public meeting to obtain the views of the community.

12. HILLMORTON HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment, DDI 941-8556
Officer responsible:	Michael Aitken, Greenspace Manager
Author:	Michael Aitken, Greenspace Manager

PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Board of various issues relating to the Administration Building on the former Hillmorton Hospital site.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2. The Hillmorton Hospital site has recently been purchased by Ngai Tahu from the Canterbury District Health Board. Under a Consent Order issued by the Environment Court dated 5 June 2003 the Christchurch City Council can, within three months, purchase the administration building. If this is not done the heritage listing will be lost and Ngai Tahu has the right to demolish the building
- 3. The Council's heritage team have identified that there is insufficient heritage significance or completeness in the site to warrant pursuit of any further protection.
- 4. The Community and Recreation Unit have undertaken an analysis of community facilities in the vicinity. Their analysis shows that the area is well served by community facilities. They have recommended that the Hillmorton building not be developed as a community facility.
- 5. The Greenspace Unit have identified the area they desire to acquire from the reserve contribution and this does not include the building
- 6. The current estimates to bring the building up to a usable standard are \$448,000 plus GST and consent costs. This does not include any cost of purchase for the building or the land it stands upon.
- 7. There is no budgetary provision for the acquisition of the land and building or the conservation of the building.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. Structural strengthening, fire protection, architectural refurbishment/restoration	\$278,000
Veranda	\$ 24,750
Egress Doors	\$ 5,000
Toilet Block	\$ 45,000
New floor coverings	\$ 17,880
Repaint	\$ 5,280
Kitchenette & WC	\$ 20,000
Power and Water	\$ 20,000
P&G	\$ 9,550
Margin	\$ 7,000
Contingency	\$ 15,000
Total	<u>\$448,000</u>

12 Cont'd

9. It is estimated that an additional \$25,000 would be required to provide sprinkler installation
10. The above costs do not include GST or consent costs.

BACKGROUND ON HILLMORTON HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

11. The Hillmorton Hospital Administration Building (formerly Sunnyside Hospital) is sited at 1 Lincoln Road and was constructed between 1871 and 1891 for use as a hospital.
12. The building is a remnant of a larger complex that was listed as a Group 2 heritage building. The complex consisted of buildings designed by various architects. The belief is that the Administration Building was designed by Campbell. The remainder of the main hospital building on the site has been demolished and significant areas of the hospital site have been identified for sale and subdivision.
13. Before a Crown property can be sold in the South Island it must first be offered to Ngai Tahu. Following District Health Board public consultation and Board decision to sell the land in 2004 they sought consent from the Minister of Health to the sale, and this consent came in late 2004.
14. As a result of a City Plan Reference to the Environment Court appealing the heritage listing of the Sunnyside Administration building (**Attachment One**), Healthlink South and the Christchurch City Council confirmed through a Consent Order by the Environment Court on 5 June 2003 the following:

"The proposal put to the Court is one which involves two key elements. Firstly, that a subdivision consent is granted for the development of the Health Board land (Sunnyside); and secondly, that the administrative block land is not acquired by the Council within three months. If those two pre-conditions are met then the listing in the appendix, and consequently its protection as a historic building, would lapse."

15. Ngai Tahu has now confirmed their purchase of the Hillmorton Hospital site. The issue of the old administration building has been asked to be finalised so the subdivision plan can be prepared. Ngai Tahu has indicated their preference is to demolish the building.
16. The City Council is to be provided with a three month period in which to negotiate with a new owner over the acquisition of the building if its heritage listing is to remain. Otherwise a new owner would be permitted as of right to demolish the building.

KEY ISSUES

17. At the request of the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board a heritage conservation plan has been prepared with financial support from the Community Board (**Attachment Two**). This work currently estimates functional costs – earthquake, fire, electrical, drainage etc. as \$278,000. To bring the building up to a usable standard – (new toilets, disabled access, kitchenette, floor coverings, lighting etc) will cost a further \$170,000, bringing the total estimate to \$448,000 plus GST and consent costs. The full report is still in its final draft stages. The draft report identifies where the fabric of the building has heritage merit but this is not a consideration of the overall merit of the building. The heritage team have identified that there is insufficient heritage significance or completeness in the site to warrant pursuit of any further protection. Our heritage planners are clear that a remnant of an historical site does not automatically have the same intrinsic value as a full site.
18. The Community and Recreation Unit have undertaken an analysis of community facilities in the vicinity (**Attachment Three**). Their analysis shows that the area is well served by community facilities. They have recommended that the Hillmorton building not be developed as a community facility.

12 Cont'd

19. In addition to the conservation costs the Council would need to acquire the land the building sits on and about 2000^{m²} surrounding. While the use of reserve contribution funds owed by the subdivision could avoid needing to find these funds from current budgets, any use of reserve contribution will inevitable reduce reserves in other parts of the subdivision. The Greenspace preference is to acquire the park-like grounds near the building rather than the building itself. The final amount of reserve contribution will not be known until the subdivision plans are lodged, but initial estimates are that there will only be enough to secure the park-like grounds.
20. The purchase and conservation costs for this proposal are not foreshadowed in the 06/16 LTCCP.

OPTIONS

21. There are two possible options:
 - (a) That the Community Board recommend to Council the purchase of the administration building at the Hillmorton Hospital site.
 - (b) Maintain the status quo, i.e. do not meet the pre-conditions as set out in the Consent Order as issued by the Environment Court on 5 June 2003, thereby waiving the option to purchase.

PREFERRED OPTION

22. To adopt option (b) to not meet the pre-conditions as set out in the Consent Order issued by the Environment Court on 5 June 2003.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board receive this report.

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

13. ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2006/07

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
Officer responsible:	Anusha Guler, Secretariat Manager
Author:	Max Robertson, Council Secretary

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - (a) enable the Council to make a decision at a May 2006 meeting to send to the Remuneration Authority regarding remuneration to be paid to elected members (except the Mayor) for the 2006/07 financial year; and
 - (b) permit Community Boards to indicate to the Council their preferred option for the allocation of the 2006/07 remuneration pool amongst the elected members of the Christchurch City Council and the eight Christchurch community boards.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Remuneration Authority has advised that the remuneration pool for the elected members of the Christchurch City Council and its eight community boards has been fixed at \$1,529,250 for

13 Cont'd

the 2006/07 financial year and that the Mayor's gross salary has been fixed at \$151,330. In the case of the Mayor this figure represents the gross amount to be debited against the pool - the Mayor's net salary will be adjusted to reflect the fact that he has full private use of a car provided by the Council.

3. This represents an increase of \$59,306 in the 2005/06 pool of \$1,469,944.
4. Based on the rules and principles set by the Remuneration Authority the Council is now required to decide how it proposes to allocate the pool amongst its elected members for the 2006/07 financial year and, once agreed, to submit its proposal to the Remuneration Authority for approval. It should be emphasised that the Remuneration Authority expects the pool to be fully allocated, and it is thus incumbent on the Council to revise the current salaries to reflect the full amount of the pool.
5. The Council's proposal must be approved by the Remuneration Authority before any amended salaries proposed by the Council can be implemented.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. The principal statutory provisions which apply in this instance are the Seventh Schedule of the Local Government Act 2002, and the Remuneration Authority Act 1977. Once this Council's 2006/07 remuneration proposal (or any variation thereof) has been approved by the Remuneration Authority, it will be gazetted via the Local Government Elected Members' Determination 2006.
7. Once the allocation of the increased pool has been decided by the Council and approved by the Remuneration Authority, it will be necessary to reflect the resulting expenditure in the nine different budget provisions for this item (Councillors and eight community boards).
8. There are some substantial budgetary and rating implications associated with some of the options postulated in this report, ie:

Option	Additional Expenditure	Resulting Rate Increase
1	\$66,856	+0.036%
2	\$73,880	+0.040%
3	\$71,356	+0.038%
4	\$81,356.76	+0.044%
5	\$382,180.38	+0.204%
6	\$461,508.68	+0.247%
7	\$156,205	+0.084%
8	\$156,205	+0.084%

BACKGROUND ON ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2006/07

9. The Remuneration Authority is responsible for setting the salaries of elected local government representatives (clause 6 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 refers).
10. A brief summary of the remuneration framework and the rules and principles which the Remuneration Authority works under is **attached** as Appendix A.
11. The Remuneration Authority revises remuneration pools annually, and each council is thus required to review its levels of remuneration prior to the start of each financial year, based on the new pool. Therefore, this report has been submitted to allow the Council to consider the allocation of the increased pool for the 2006/07 financial year. The salaries proposed will thus apply from 1 July 2006.
12. The Authority has now released the Christchurch City indicative pool for 2006/07, which amounts to:

13 Cont'd

Total pool	\$1,529,250
less Mayor's gross salary	\$151,330

Net pool available for Deputy Mayor, 12 Councillors, eight community board chairs and 32 community board members	\$1,377,920

13. This represents a total increase of **\$59,306** in this Council's remuneration pool.
14. Although included within the pool, the Mayor's salary is independently set by the Remuneration Authority.
15. It should also be noted that 50% of the total remuneration paid to community board chairs and elected (not Councillor appointments) community board members is paid outside the pool.
16. The pool is fixed by the Remuneration Authority relative to other councils and has regard to population, expenditure and assets. The merging of Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula does not produce a remuneration pool equal to the sum of the two separate pools.
17. Although the Mayor's salary is set by the Remuneration Authority, it is included within the pool. Where a Mayor has partial or full private use of a car provided by the Council (as is the case in Christchurch), the Mayor's gross salary is reduced by an amount which reflects both the extent of private use and the value of the car supplied.

DISCUSSION

Decisions to be Made

18. In preparing its proposal the Council is required to make the following decisions:
 - To decide whether the remuneration pool should be allocated on a salary only basis, or whether it should be a mix of salary and meeting fees.
 - To agree appropriate levels/rates for the different positions/roles on the Council and its community boards and, using that information, develop an option for the allocation of the money within the remuneration pool.

Basis of Remuneration

19. Although it is possible for the Council to recommend the payment of a mixture of salary and meeting fees to Councillors, community board members must be paid on a salary only basis, without meeting fees.

Distribution Options

20. The allocation of the increased pool was discussed with Councillors and community board members at a seminar held on Thursday 16 March 2006. Three possible options for the allocation of the 2006/07 pool were presented at the seminar. Although the members present at the seminar did not indicate a preference for any of the three options presented, staff were requested to prepare some further options which:
 - Provided for the chairs and members of the Banks Peninsula community boards to receive a salary equivalent to 80% of the salaries payable to the chairs and members of the metropolitan community boards.
 - Assumed that 75% (rather than the present 50%) of the salaries payable to the chairs and members of community boards can be paid outside the remuneration pool (this option being based on oral advice from two elected members that the Remuneration Authority had recently indicated that it might be possible for 75% of the community board salaries to be paid outside the pool, if the Council were to submit such a remuneration proposal).

13 Cont'd

21. In response to an earlier enquiry, the Chairman of the Remuneration Authority advised in May 2005 that:
- “Any increase in the pool arising from combining the two councils is unlikely to, in itself, be sufficient to meet the salary of a new councillor (at existing Christchurch rates) plus the salaries currently payable to the Banks Peninsula community boards. It may be necessary therefore for the Authority to consider, for example, allowing the funding of the two community boards to be met entirely from outside the pool. All this will require some detailed discussions with your council in due course.”*
22. The Chairman of the Remuneration Authority has since orally confirmed that, in recognition of Christchurch's unique situation with the recent dissolution of Banks Peninsula District, the Authority is prepared to consider making “special arrangements” on a transitional basis for 2006/07, including the possibility of a greater proportion than 50% of the community board remuneration being paid outside the pool, or, alternatively adjusting the pool to reflect the additional payments resulting from the inclusion of Banks Peninsula.
23. The Chairman has indicated that any such “special arrangement” would be for 2006/07 and would not be permanent. Given that any such proposal for an increased amount of community board remuneration to come outside the pool is for one year only and that in 2007/08 (assuming minimal change in the pool figure) the elected members will be facing the same situation as now with having to operate within the 50/50 split, the question needs to be asked why members reach an arrangement for 2006/07 which needs to be reviewed again for 2007/08. Members could decide now to reach a decision for 2006/07 based on the 50/50 split which means the formula arrived at will have long term stability and any difficulty in arriving at that formula will be for this year only.
24. Staff were also requested to confirm the amount of the total pool figure. Staff retained Mr John Mackey from Deloitte to review the setting of the pool figure. Following a comprehensive review, Mr Mackey has advised that the Remuneration Authority's calculation of the indicative remuneration pool for Christchurch City for the year ending 30 June 2007 appears to substantially comply with the legislation, and is materially correct.

Principles Applicable to this Remuneration Review

25. Given that the Council is required to make a recommendation to the Remuneration Authority as to how the pool is to be divided it is considered appropriate that before considering options elected members consider the principles which should guide them in their deliberations on this topic.
26. It is considered that the following principles could be taken into account.
- Principle:** Remuneration for any elected position should be such as to attract people to hold office within the Council's governance structure so that remuneration should not limit the diversity of representation for councillor and community board positions.
- Principle:** Members with similar responsibilities should receive similar remuneration.
- Principle:** A differential rate of remuneration between the same class of elected member within the Council (e.g. councillor, community board chair or community board member) should exist only where it can be justified by reference to relevant differences.
- Principle:** Remuneration should be set at a level that acknowledges the impact that performing the role of an elected member has on personal lives and careers.
- Principle:** Remuneration should not be reduced part way through a three year electoral term, when that risk was not known to a candidate at the preceding election unless there are circumstances outside the Council's control.

13 Cont'd

Councillor Remuneration

27. At its meeting on 5 May 2005 the Council resolved to have a differential for the Deputy Mayor in recognition of her high workload and additional responsibilities.
28. At its meeting on 8 December 2005 the Council resolved that the Banks Peninsula Ward Councillor be remunerated at the same rate as the other Councillors on the basis that that Councillor has city wide responsibilities as well as the other Councillors.
29. The options below assume that the Council will not be changing its May and December 2005 resolutions in respect of these two positions.

Community Board Remuneration

30. At its meeting on 2 December 2004 the Council adopted a proposed remuneration structure which provided for the payment of salaries of \$32,500 and \$20,000 for community board chairs and members, respectively. Following representations to the Remuneration Authority, the Authority increased these salaries to the amounts shown below:

Position	2004 Salaries Proposed by CCC	2004 Salaries Fixed by Remuneration Authority
Community Board Chairs	\$32,500	\$35,000
Community Board Members	\$20,000	\$22,000

31. At the time, the Remuneration Authority advised that in approving these increases, it had been mindful of the following factors:
 1. *The need to equitably distribute the pool following the reduction in the number of councillors.*
 2. *The consequential increase in representational activities for community boards.*
 3. *The role of the community boards as established by government policy and the Local Government Commission's determination regarding the Christchurch City representation review.*
 4. *Representations made to the Remuneration Authority by community board members.*
32. The Authority also went on to say that Christchurch is seen as a model for how the two arms of local representation can work effectively at the macro and micro levels, and that the adjustments made by the Authority were not major, but established a slightly more rational relativity.
33. An issue that arose at the seminar on 16 March 2006 was that of a differential between "City board members and chairs" and "Peninsula board members and chairs." At present City board members are paid \$22,450 per annum while Peninsula board members receive \$6,273 per annum. The figures for community board chairs are \$35,850 and \$11,412, respectively. These are relativities of 28% and 32% respectively.
34. Community boards have their respective roles set by the Local Government Act 2002 and the other legislation administered by the Council.
35. S. 52 of the Act provides that the role of a community boards is to:
 - (a) *represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of its community; and*
 - (b) *consider and report on all matters referred to it by the territorial authority, or any matter of interest or concern to the community board; and*

13 Cont'd

- (c) *maintain an overview of services provided by the territorial authority within the community; and*
- (d) *prepare an annual submission to the territorial authority for expenditure within the community; and*
- (e) *communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community; and*
- (f) *undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to it by the territorial authority.*

36. That provision applies equally to all eight community boards. In addition the Council has given the same level of delegations to all eight boards. The Council's expectation of the workload of community boards as far as their delegated authorities is the same.

Land Area and Representation Ratios within each Community

37. At the seminar on Thursday 16 March 2006, I was asked to provide information relating to the land area of each community, and the number of residents represented by each community board member. The following table sets out this information:

Community	Land Area in Hectares	No of Members (including both elected and appointed members)	Population 2001 Census	No of Residents per member
Akaroa/Wairewa	94,320	6	3,027	505
Burwood/Pegasus	4,540	7	52,944	7,563
Fendalton/Waimairi	10,610	7	51,210	7,316
Hagley/Ferrymead	5,800	7	52,515	7,502
Lyttelton/Mount Herbert	21,480	6	5,397	900
Riccarton/Wigram	9,800	7	54,939	7,848
Shirley/Papanui	9,660	7	53,304	7,615
Spreydon/Heathcote	4,490	7	51,306	7,329

38. Certainly while there are population differences between the Boards the question needs to be asked whether the democratic responsibilities and the Local Government Act responsibilities of a Peninsula Board member are any less because they represent fewer people. Apart from having a greater number of people to represent a City board member does not have any additional governance responsibilities to a Peninsula board member.
39. The question also needs to be asked whether the responsibilities associated with the role of democratic representation is dependent on the number of constituents represented? If Christchurch is truly one city, the starting point surely would be equality of remuneration, except where a differential can be rationally justified. All Board members, regardless of the size of the population served by the Board need to have members fully engaged in their role and able to commit time to that role. Complex and contentious issues for a community board can arise from an area with a small population just as easily as an area with a large population. That can be more so where the small population area is developing and geographically is more challenging to administer.
40. Regarding a perception there may be that a larger population results in a higher workload thereby justifying a higher level of remuneration it must be borne in mind that at the present time the Council does not have any empirical data as to the workloads of elected members so that the "workload factor" should not be taken into account when the Council is setting remuneration. It has not been established with any certainty that having a greater population than another community board means the workload of a member of a board with a larger population is greater. In the absence of reliable data there is no rationale for a differential rate of payment for this reason.
41. Another factor to be borne in mind in setting remuneration is the geographical area of the community board areas. As can be seen from the table above the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert community is twice as large as the biggest City community while Akaroa/Wairewa is nine times larger. The travelling time for a Board member on the Peninsula in serving their constituents is greater than in a built up urban area. The ability to claim mileage is available equally to all Board members but should not recognition be given to the time physically spent travelling in addition to being present at meetings and engaging in Board business?

13 Cont'd

Auckland and Dunedin situations

42. Auckland City and Dunedin City have both urban and island/rural areas, and it is considered appropriate to look at the remuneration systems used by those two Councils.
43. In Auckland City, there are extremely small differences between the salaries paid to the chairs and members of the eight Isthmus community boards, compared with the salaries paid to the chairs and members of the two Hauraki Gulf community boards, despite the significant differences in their respective land area and population, as the following table discloses:

Position	Number of Positions	Current Salary
Isthmus Chairs	8	\$19,197
Isthmus Members	34	\$9,411
Waiheke Island Chair	1	\$18,070
Waiheke Island Members	4	\$8,690
Great Barrier Island Chair	1	\$18,070
Great Barrier Island Members	4	\$8,690

44. There are eight Isthmus community boards, and two Hauraki Gulf community boards, with the following land area and population:

Board/s	Land Area	Population
Isthmus	658 square km (total)	401,000 (total)
Waiheke Island	22 square km	7,000
Great Barrier Island	285 square km	1,100

45. The Chairman of the Remuneration Authority has orally advised that the small differentials which apply in the case of the Auckland City community boards are partly attributable to the fact that members of the two Hauraki Gulf community boards are required to spend considerable time travelling by ferry to attend meetings etc.
46. A similar situation applies in Dunedin City, where identical salaries are paid to the chairs, deputy chairs and members of all six Dunedin community boards, despite the substantial disparities in their land area and population, as the following table discloses:

Board	Land Area	Population	Number of Board Members	Salaries Applicable
Chalmers	78 square km	5,400	6	Chair \$17,303 Deputy Chair \$12,214 Member \$8,142
Mosgiel/Taieri	677 square km	15,100	6	
Waikouaiti Coast	515 square km	3,270	6	
Otago Peninsula	121 square km	4,230	6	
Saddle Hill	40 square km	5,130	6	
Strath Taieri	1,836 square km	650	6	

Remuneration Options

47. Eight options are **attached** to this report, comprising:
- Option 1, which envisages a range of reductions for the positions of Deputy Mayor, Councillors, the chairs and members of metropolitan community boards and increases for the chairs and members of the Banks Peninsula boards.
 - Option 2, which is based on the same percentage allocations of the pool as in 2005/06, with the same salaries being paid for the chairmen and members of all community boards.
 - Option 3, which assumes that 50% of the pool is allocated to Councillors, and 27% to community board members, with the ratio between metropolitan and Banks Peninsula community board positions maintained near their present levels.

13 Cont'd

- Option 4, which is based on the assumption that the chairs and members of the Banks Peninsula community boards will be paid 80% of the salaries applicable in the case of the metropolitan boards (with 50% of the applicable salaries being paid outside the pool, as at present).
- Option 5 - this assumes the same relativities between all positions as shown in Option 3, and has been prepared on the basis that 75% of all community board salaries are paid outside the pool.
- Option 6 - this assumes that 75% of community board salaries are paid outside the pool, with the Banks Peninsula chairs and members being paid 80% of the metropolitan board salaries, with the salaries for the Deputy Mayor and Councillors being adjusted so that the pool is fully allocated.
- Option 7 - this assumes the continuation of the present (2005/06 salaries and 2006/07) but with more than 50% of the community board salaries being paid outside the pool.
- Option 8 - this assumes reductions of \$2,000 for Councillors, \$1,500 for metropolitan community board chairs and \$1,000 for metropolitan community board members, with the total amount resulting from these reductions being distributed to the chairs and members of the Banks Peninsula community boards, and with more than 58% of the Banks Peninsula community board salaries being paid outside the pool.

Elected Member Allowances and Expenses

48. As part of its amended remuneration proposal, the Council is also required to seek the Remuneration Authority's approval for any amendments to the Schedule of Elected Member Allowances and Expenses previously approved by the Authority. The schedule **attached** as Appendix B is similar to the schedule previously approved by the Authority for 2005/06, with the following amendments:
- It provides for the payment of mileage allowance at a flat rate of 70 cents per kilometre for all qualifying travel, and clarifies the type of travel which qualifies for payment of mileage allowance.
 - It proposes an increase in the communications allowance from \$120 to \$150 per month.

Mileage Allowance

49. In September 2005, the Inland Revenue Department came out with new rules on mileage reimbursements for employees. Elected members are not, however, considered employees, but rather as "self employed" persons under the withholding tax regime. The IRD has indicated that it is reviewing mileage rates for self employed persons.
50. In the meantime, self employed persons may use the mileage rates published by the IRD, but only up to a maximum of 5,000 kilometres per year. If this is exceeded, the self employed person has the option of either using the specified rates up to 5,000 kilometres or, alternatively, claiming actual running expenses, apportioned for the percentage of business use. The mileage rates published by the IRD are:

Banded rate

1 to 3,000 kms	62 cents per km
3,001 kms and over	19 cents for each km over 3,000 (limited to 5,000 kms)

Flat rate

Any distance	28 cents per km (limited to 5,000 kms)
--------------	--

51. It has been noted that these rates could disadvantage the Banks Peninsula Councillor and Banks Peninsula Community Board members, who are required to travel greater distances than their urban counterparts to attend Council meetings and other related events.

13 Cont'd

52. Subject to the approval of the Remuneration Authority, it would be possible for the Council to amend its expenses policy to provide for the payment of up to 70 cents per kilometre for **all** qualifying travel incurred by elected members in any one year (ie the 70 cent rate would be paid for all travel, and would not be reduced after the member/s concerned had travelled 3,000 kilometres in any one year, or stopped completely after the member/s had travelled 5,000 kilometres in any one year). In this instance, the term “qualifying travel” refers to travel associated with attendance at the meetings or events set out in the Schedule of Elected Member Allowances set out in Appendix B to this report. Before the Local Government Act 2002 came into force, members could only claim for attendance at formally convened council, committee or subcommittee meetings, which they were required to attend. However, subject to the approval of the Remuneration Authority, mileage allowance can now be paid for attendance at a wider range of meetings or events, and the list of meetings or events set out in Appendix B has therefore been expanded to recognise this.
53. A number of other councils (eg ECan) pay their members at the rate of 70 cents per kilometre, with no limit, in recognition of the long distances their members are required to travel on the local authority’s business.
54. The revised schedule of elected member allowances and expenses **attached** has therefore been amended to:
- Provide for the payment of a flat rate of 70 cents per kilometre for all qualifying travel.
 - Clarify the type of travel which qualifies for payment of the allowance of 70 cents per kilometre.

Communications Allowance

55. At present, a flat communications allowance of \$120 per month is payable to the Deputy Mayor, Councillors and community board chairs as a contribution towards:
- Home telephone line rental
 - Monthly cellphone base rental charge
 - Council related toll calls made from home telephone line
 - Call charges for Council related calls made from cellphone
56. It has been suggested that there is justification for an increase in the standard allowance of \$120, to reflect (inter alia) the high number of Council related cellphone calls made by elected members, and the fact that at least two Councillors have wireless cards for their laptops, enabling them to stay in touch while on the move. It has also been pointed out that every phone call from Akaroa to the city is a toll call.
57. In these circumstances, there appears to be ample justification for the communications allowance to be increased from \$120 to \$150 per month. If the payment of this allowance continues to be limited to the deputy mayor, councillors and the chairs of the eight community boards, such an increase would result in the following additional expenditure:

Total annual payments at \$150 a month	\$37,800
Present annual payments at \$120 a month	\$30,240
Additional expenditure	\$7,560 per annum

58. At the recent seminar, some community board members gave their opinion that payment of the communications allowance should be extended to include all community board members, rather than being limited to community board chairs. The following schedule sets out the additional expenditure which would result if this suggestion were to be adopted:

Amount of Monthly Allowance	Annual Expenditure if Limited to Deputy Mayor, Councillors and Community Board Chairs (21 positions)	Annual Expenditure if Extended to Include all Community Board Members (53 positions)
\$120	\$30,240	\$76,320
\$150	\$37,800	\$95,400

13 Cont'd

59. Any increase in communications allowance from \$120 to \$150 per month, and any increase to include community board members, is currently unbudgeted.

Unanimity of the Council's Decision

60. In submitting its proposal the Council is required to notify the Remuneration Authority of:
- (i) details of any dissent at Council, and
 - (ii) details of any dissent from its community boards.
61. A community board also has the ability to express any opposing views it might have on the Council's final proposal direct to the Remuneration Authority.
62. If the Council's recommendations are unanimous and reasonable it is unlikely that the Commission will withhold its approval. It does, however, have the power to amend any proposal if the level of dissatisfaction is high or if the proposal is considered unreasonable.

CONCLUSION

63. It is essential that each board reaches a decision as early as possible on its preferred remuneration option, and on any recommended alterations to the present allowances and expenses policy, so that the boards' views can be taken into account by the Council when it reaches a final decision on its preferred remuneration option at its meeting on Thursday 11 May 2006.
64. The new salaries and expenses approved by the Remuneration Authority will apply from 1 July 2006.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Community Board decide:

- (a) Which salary option it wishes to recommend to the Council.
- (b) Whether or not it wishes to also recommend any changes to the present allowances and expenses in respect of mileage allowances, and the communications allowance.

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

- (a) That Option 8 be recommended to the Council.
- (b) That Appendix B be recommended to the Council.

14. CROSS OVER TRUST – APPLICATION FOR FUNDING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	Catherine McDonald, Acting Community Support Manager
Author:	Ingrid de Meyer, Community Development Advisor

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present an urgent funding request from Cross Over Trust for funding towards the salary of two Youth Workers. Cross Over Trust provide services for "at risk" youth and their families in the Spreydon/Heathcote Ward. They are seeking a total of \$20,000. There is currently \$5,489 remaining in the Board's 2005/06 discretionary fund and the SCAP fund has a current balance of \$16,966.

14 Cont'd

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Since November 2005 Cross Over Trust have submitted over \$60,000 worth of applications to various pub charities for funding. Unfortunately they have all been declined. Over the past 3-4 years Cross Over Trust has received funding from these sources. The funding received in the past equates to approximately 12-28% of their funding base. Short-term funding options are limited. Funding for the two youth worker positions runs out on 14 April 2006. Whilst other funding applications and processes are in hand there is no funding for salaries for two Youth Workers.
3. St Martin's Youth Trust have recently returned unused funding totalling \$2,294.50. This funding is now available for reallocation (received 3 April 2006). Board members will recall the St Martin's Youth Trust went through major change last year and reevaluated their involvement in youth work. The money being returned was allocated towards youth worker salaries and activities. This work is currently on hold, hence the return of the funding.
4. Cross Over Trust have been operating since 1989 and became incorporated in 1991. They work holistically. The activities and services currently provide include:
 - Manaakitanga Club programmes.
 - Social skill based activities.
 - General youth work support & advocacy.
 - Adventure based programme learning (supporting challenging 8-12 year olds).
 - School and home support services.
 - Mentoring.
 - Family support work.
5. The funding shortfall impacts on two key youth workers and the geographic areas of Sydenham, Addington and Spreydon. This will affect five of seven programmes currently running which equates to 35 families and 90 referred youth. Cross Over Trust is currently looking at funding strategies and service provision to prevent this shortfall from occurring again.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. There are no legal considerations.
7. The funding required is for youth worker salaries. Funding is required to retain these key workers. Cross Over Trust are committed to maintaining their level of service to the community. The Community Trust is also being approached for support in relation to this urgent application. The next available funding source for salaries is Lottery in June 2006.
8. The Council has provided financial support to Cross Over Trust over the past 10 years. This has been through the Community Development Scheme, the Board's project funding and discretionary fund. Most grants have been under \$5,000.
9. Audited accounts for the previous year have been sited. Current accounts are with their auditor. Funds on hand total \$17,831.57. Other funding yet to come in totals \$15,000, but will not be available until August 2006. The organisation has funds to operate but no salary funding available until August 2006.
10. Returned funding from St Martin's Youth Trust totals \$2,294.50. This funding was from the Board's project fund and was allocated for youth work.

BACKGROUND ON CROSS OVER TRUST – APPLICATION FOR FUNDING

11. Cross Over Trust has been operating in the Spreydon community for 17 years. The services they provide have grown over the years to meet the needs of the community. They now run four Manaakitangi clubs per year for 10-15 year olds. They work with six local schools through referrals from either school Principals, teachers, health nurses or other agencies such as

14 Cont'd

Lifelinks. They also provide a range of support and services such as recreation, youth adventure, leadership programmes, and the weekly Manaakitangi club. They now also deliver a youth specific project in Rowley. They employ 3.5 Youth Workers, a Manager, a family worker position, a counsellor working one day a week, and 22 volunteers, working with 150 youth and their families.

12. The two youth worker positions are key to youth services and programme delivery in Addington, Sydenham and Spreydon. Without salary funding there will be a loss of service, and the needs of these youth and families will not be met. Cross Over Trust provide a wrap service with the youth and families they work primarily with disadvantaged youth and their families providing preventative interventions, issues and concerns are identified as well as problem solving strategies and solutions working from a strengths based model.
13. The Manager and Trustees are looking at long term funding strategies to help prevent this from occurring in the future.
14. The Cross Over Trust service also aligns significantly with Community Outcomes, Council policies and community Board Objectives. Cross Over Trust contribute to the following Community outcomes:

A Learning City, A City of Inclusive and Diverse Communities, A City of Healthy and Active People, A Safe City.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Notes that the St Martin's Youth Trust has returned \$2, 294.50.
- (b) Allocates \$5,000 from its discretionary fund to the Cross Over Trust for the two youth worker salaries.
- (c) Refers the application to the SCAP Committee's May meeting for consideration of additional funding support.

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendations be adopted.

**15. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE SCAP COMMITTEE –
REPORT OF 3 APRIL 2005**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
Officer responsible:	Lisa Goodman, Community Board Principal Adviser
Author:	Peter Dow, Community Secretary

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the SCAP Committee meeting as follows:

**Report of a meeting of the SCAP Committee
held on Monday 3 April 2006 at 5.30pm
in Meeting Room 1, Beckenham Service Centre**

PRESENT: Phil Clearwater, Oscar Alpers, Rob Patterson, Jan Rogers and Doug Shepherd

1. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received and accepted from Bruce Harding and from Oscar Alpers for lateness.

15 Cont'd

2. MEETING REPORT – 27 FEBRUARY 2006

The Committee **received** the report of the Committee's meeting held on 27 February 2006.

3. SCAP 2005/06 FUND UPDATE

The Committee **received** an update on the status of the 2005/06 SCAP Fund.

4. PROJECT UPDATES

The Community Development Adviser (Erin Eyles) reported that the pilot Cross Cultural Seminar would be held on Tuesday 9 May 2006.

Feedback from members on expectations and hoped for outcomes from the Seminar included learning new information from participants, increased initial awareness of customs and cultures, a breakdown in barriers, improving communication skills, attitudinal changes and an examination of our own culture.

A funding request to cover costs associated with the Seminar would be made to the Committee in the near future.

Good progress was being made with the Older Adults Directory and again a funding request would be presented to the Committee's next meeting on 15 May 2006.

The Kohoa Tauleva Christchurch Trust is relocating to the Rowley Primary School and a request for funding support will be presented to the Committee on 15 May.

5. CHRISTCHURCH METHODIST MISSION - CHILDWISE

Matthew Williams, Childrens' Mentor, Christchurch Methodist Mission, was in attendance and he reported on the success of the Childwise Wise-up programme based at West Spreydon School. Matthew responded to questions from members about the programme including a time change to morning sessions owing to a shortage of facilitators for the current afternoon time slot.

From an accountability perspective, members sought an assurance that the Christchurch Methodist Mission would remain responsible for the operation of the programme at the school.

The Chairperson thanked Matthew for his report.

6. TE WHARE ROOPU O OTEREPO WALTHAM COMMUNITY COTTAGE

Adrienne Carmichael from the Waltham Community Cottage and Angela Kiripatea reported on the Maori Support Worker programme along with the new cultural strengthening programme called Project Puawai Maori. Puawai is a combination of the information gathered from the Harakeke Weaving Pilot programme also funded by the Committee.

Members asked questions of the representatives and the Chairperson thanked them for their report.

7. MEETING DATES

The Committee confirmed its next two meetings would be held at 5.30pm on Monday 15 May 2006 and 19 June 2006.

The meeting concluded at 7.00pm.

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received.

18. 4. 2006

- 25 -

16. BOARD FUNDS UPDATE

Attached is a schedule with current information on the Board's 2005/06 Project, Discretionary, SCAP and Youth Developments Funds.

DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the information be received.

17. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE

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

18. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

SEMINAR – 6.30PM

1. ECAN'S DRAFT LTCCP

Christchurch South Constituency Councillors, Sir Kerry Burke and Bob Kirk, will be in attendance to assist in a discussion on Ecan's Draft LTCCP.