

**SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

WEDNESDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2009

AT 4PM

**IN THE BOARDROOM
PAPANUI SERVICE CENTRE
CORNER LANGDONS ROAD AND RESTELL STREET**

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

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES**
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – BOARD MEETING OF 4 NOVEMBER 2009**
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
 - 3.1 Ginny Larsen (Neighbourhood Trust) – Parenting Week**
- PART B 4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
- PART B 5. NOTICES OF MOTION**
- PART B 6. BRIEFINGS**
 - 6.1 Gary Lennan – Unit Manager Inspections and Enforcement**
- PART C 7. SISSON PARK – SECOND CONSIDERATION**
- PART C 8. INNES ROAD– PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION**
- PART C 9. REQUEST FOR FUNDING - CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN SAMOA (SHIRLEY YOUTH GROUP)**
- PART C 10. SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD – 2010 MEETING DATES**
- PART B 11. CORRESPONDENCE**
- PART B 12. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
 - 12.1 Current Issues**
 - 12.2 Update on Local Capital Projects**
 - 12.3 Board funding update for 2009/10**
 - 12.4 CSR Report for October 2009**

We're on the Web!

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

18. 11. 2009

- 2 -

PART B 13. ELECTED MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE

PART B 14. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – 4 NOVEMBER 2009

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting (both open and public excluded sections) of Wednesday 4 November 2009 will be circulated **separately**.

CHAIRPERSON'S OR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting (both open and public excluded sections) of Wednesday 4 November 2009 be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 GINNY LARSEN (NEIGHBOURHOOD TRUST) – PARENTING WEEK

Ginny Larsen will provide information on Parenting Week.

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

The following notices of motions are submitted by Yvonne Palmer pursuant to Standing Order 3.10.1:

5.1 That the Shirley/Papanui Community Board:

- (a) Re-establish the Acheson Avenue one stop shop reference group with a wider brief
- (b) Agrees that the membership of the Acheson Avenue one stop shop reference group be the full Board
- (c) Agrees that the purpose of the Working Group is to regularly liaise with Housing New Zealand Corporation local staff and other Government Departments on matters affecting the Shirley/Papanui community and advocate on behalf of, and for, those residents.

5.2 That the Shirley/Papanui Community Board request staff to prepare a report requesting expenditure from the 2009/2010 Discretionary Response Fund for preparation of a booklet detailing the history and achievements of the Shirley/Papanui Community Board since its establishment in 1989, and that it be prepared by a contractor yet to be determined.

6. BRIEFINGS

6.1 GARY LENNAN (UNIT MANAGER, INSPECTIONS AND ENFORCEMENT UNIT)

Gary Lennan will provide a briefing on the Unit he manages.

7. SISSON PARK – SECOND CONSIDERATION

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.
- 5.4 The views of three residents were sought on cost sharing the replacement of trees. Only one has agreed to share the cost of removal and replacement with shrubs. Two have declined any cost sharing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

55. 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. INNES ROAD– PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Nilesh Redekar, Graduate Traffic Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Shirley/Papanui Board to approve that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Innes Road, northeast of Rutland Street.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Staff received a request from a resident of Innes Road for a No Stopping Restriction on the kerbside special vehicle lane (cycle lane) on the northwest side of the Innes Road, northeast Rutland Street, as vehicles are parking on the cycle lane and forcing cyclists out into the busy traffic lane of Innes Road (attached).
3. Innes Road is designated as a Minor Arterial road carrying almost 14,000 vehicles per day.
4. There is currently no existing stopping restrictions installed on the northwest side of Innes Road.
5. The Christchurch City Council is planning to install No Stopping Restrictions on all kerbside special vehicle lanes to stop vehicles parking to create a safer environment for cyclists. This will also improve traffic flow on the main carriageway as cyclists will not need to enter the traffic lane to manoeuvre around parked cars. This also supports the Council strategies which encourage sustainable transport use.
6. Although parking restrictions within special vehicle lanes falls under the Land Transport (Road User) rule 2004 (section 6.6) and road code – which states that 'A driver or person in charge of vehicle must not stop or park the vehicle in any special vehicle lane' there is still some confusion with road users. By installing broken yellow lines within these special vehicle lanes there will be no confusion for motorists as to whether they can park here and enforcement will be made easier.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$200.

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

8. The installation of road markings and signs is within the LTCCP Streets and Transport Operational Budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
10. 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.
11. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

12. As above.

8 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. 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?

14. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

15. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

16. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. No consultation has been carried out as the Land Transport (road user) Rule 2004 (section 6.6) 'a driver or person in charge of vehicle must not stop or park the vehicle in any special vehicle lane.' So there is no loss to parking or any affects on adjacent properties. The broken yellow lines merely serve to reiterate the Road User Rule.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Board approve that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Innes Road commencing at the intersection with Rutland Street and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of 99 metres.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

9. REQUEST FOR FUNDING - CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN SAMOA (SHIRLEY YOUTH GROUP)

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Recreation and Sport 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 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund for the Congregational Christian Church in Samoa.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Congregational Christian Church in Samoa traces its beginnings to the arrival in 1830 of missionaries sent by the London Missionary Society, accompanied by missionary teachers from Tahiti and the Cook Islands and a Samoan couple from Tonga. Since the second half of the 20th century, the Samoan church has continued to forge ecumenical relationships with other churches locally, regionally and internationally. Now it has become a transnational church with eight districts (synod or diocese) outside Samoa: one in the USA, one in Hawaii, three in Australia and three in New Zealand. It has one congregation each in Fiji and American Samoa.
3. The Congregational Christian Church in Samoa (Shirley Parish) was established in March 2009 at Emmett Street Christian Centre. The Youth Group meet every second Sunday. This gives the youth the opportunity to come together and have some recreational and cultural opportunities. The Youth Group has 60 members and ages range from 10 years to 30 years.
4. The Congregational Christian Church in Samoa (Shirley Youth Group) wants to run two sports and cultural days for the youth. The days will consist of sports during the day and in the evening a prize giving and Fiafia night will be held. The Parish hope to get as many of the youth involved in the organisation and running of the day.
- 5.. The Congregational Christian Church in Samoa is requesting \$2,000 from the Discretionary Response Fund to assist with the costs of running sports and cultural days twice a year for their Shirley Youth Group. They are a new group with a new project. The Youth group was not established before small grants closed therefore the group is eligible to apply to the Discretionary Response Fund.

Congregational Christian Church in Samoa (Shirley Youth Group) Sports and Cultural Days

INCOME	
<i>Funds on hand</i>	100
<i>Registration</i>	100
Sponsorship	200
Fundraising	200
Total	600
 COSTS	
<i>Team Uniforms</i>	600
<i>PA System</i>	750
<i>Lunch BBQ</i>	300
<i>Dinner</i>	350
<i>Band</i>	200
<i>Trophies and Awards</i>	400
Total Costs	\$2,600

Balance \$2,000 |

9 Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6. The Shirley/Papanui Community Board currently has \$29,795 in their Discretionary Response Fund available to allocate.

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

7. Yes, see page 172, Discretionary Response Fund.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. Not applicable.

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

9. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

10. Page 176 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?

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

12. Community and Strengthening Communities Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

13. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approve a grant of \$1,150 from the 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to assist the Congregational Christian Church in Samoa (Shirley Youth Group) in running two sports and cultural days to be held in November 2009 and April 2010.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approve a grant of \$1,000 for uniforms, trophies and awards only.

10. SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD – 2010 MEETING DATES

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To seek the adoption by the Shirley/Papanui Community Board of its ordinary meeting dates from February to September 2010 inclusive.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In order that the business of the Board can be conducted in an orderly manner, and to allow public notification to be given of those meetings in compliance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, it is necessary for the Board to adopt a schedule of ordinary meetings for 2010.
3. The next triennial Christchurch City elections will be held on Saturday 9 October 2010, and the schedule of dates therefore lists meetings from February to September inclusive. It will be for the incoming Board to decide on its governance and meeting arrangements, following the elections.
4. The dates proposed assume that meetings of the Shirley/Papanui Community Board will continue to usually be held on Wednesday in the first and third weeks (with some exceptions) of each calendar month commencing at 4pm. The practice of having a Board Seminar prior to the meeting is also proposed to continue. All ordinary meetings would be held in the Boardroom, Papanui Library/ Service Centre, corner of Langdons Road and Restell Street, Papanui.
5. The schedule includes an additional ordinary meeting proposed for 4pm on Wednesday 21 July 2010, to consider allocation of the Board's Strengthening Communities Funding, and also includes the date for the Shirley/Papanui Community Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee meeting at 4pm on Tuesday 23 August 2010.
6. The Board will also recall that week three of each calendar month is "community week" for Councillors; where as far as possible Council meetings are not scheduled during that week so that Councillors have the opportunity to be active in the community in their representation role, including for Community Board business and activities. By agreeing to the dates for its 2010 meetings as proposed in this report, the Board will assist with achieving the aim of keeping week three as a "community week".

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

7. Yes. Provision is made in the 2009-19 LTCCP on pages 154 to 159, for elected member representation and governance.

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

8. Yes. In respect of Schedule 7, Clause 19 of the Local Government Act 2002, community boards may adopt a schedule of ordinary meetings that are also required to be publicly notified in accordance with Section 46 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

10 Cont'd

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?

9. Yes. Pages 156 to 159 of the LTCCP refers regarding levels of service for democracy and governance.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

10. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

11. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- (a) It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board consider adopting a schedule of ordinary meeting dates for 2010 to be held at 3pm in the Boardroom, Papanui Library/ Service Centre, corner of Langdons Road and Restell Street, Papanui, as follows:

Wednesday 3 February 2010
Wednesday 17 February 2010
Wednesday 3 March 2010
Wednesday 17 March 2010
Wednesday 31 March 2010
Wednesday 14 April 2010 -
Wednesday 5 May 2010
Wednesday 19 May 2010
Wednesday 2 June 2010
Wednesday 9 June 2010 – (Strengthening Communities Workshop)
Wednesday 16 June 2010
Wednesday 30 June 2010
Wednesday 14 July 2010 – (for allocation of 2010/11 Strengthening Communities Funding only)
Wednesday 28 July 2009
Wednesday 4 August 2010
Wednesday 18 August 2010
Wednesday 1 September 2010
Wednesday 15 September 2010

- (b) It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee meeting be held on Tuesday 10 August 2010 at 4pm.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

11. CORRESPONDENCE

Any items of correspondence will be separately circulated to members.

12. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE

12.1 CURRENT ISSUES

12.2 UPDATE ON LOCAL CAPITAL PROJECTS

That the Board receives the Local Capital Project Update for information.

12.3 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE FOR 2009/10

12.4 CSR REPORT FOR OCTOBER 2009

13. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short brief to other members on activities that have been attended or to provide information in general that is beneficial to all members.

14. MEMBERS QUESTIONS