

**BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

MONDAY 20 DECEMBER 2010

AT 4PM

**IN THE BOARDROOM,
LINWOOD SERVICE CENTRE,
180 SMITH STREET**

Community Board: Linda Stewart (Chairperson), Tim Baker, David East, Julie Gorman, Glenn Livingstone, Tim Sintes, and Chrissie Williams.

Community Board Adviser
Peter Dow
Phone 941 5305 DDI
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 MINUTES – 22 NOVEMBER 2010**
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
 - 3.1 Rawhiti Community Sport Incorporated**
 - 3.2 New Brighton Project – Eco Market Proposal**
- PART B 4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
- PART B 5. NOTICES OF MOTION**
- PART B 6. CORRESPONDENCE**
- PART B 7. BRIEFINGS**
 - 7.1 Street Trees – 264 Mairehau Road**
- PART A 8. ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2010/11**
- PART A 9. ELECTED MEMBERS' EXPENSES AND ALLOWANCES 2010/11**
- PART C 10. BREEZES ROAD – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION EXTENSION AND INSTALLATION OF PARKING DEFINITION LINES AT ARANUI PRIMARY SCHOOL**
- PART C 11. HAWKE STREET –TRAFFIC AND PARKING MANAGEMENT**
- PART C 12. ST PAUL'S PRIMARY SCHOOL - PROPOSED BUS STOP - CRESSWELL AVENUE**
- PART C 13. BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD 2010/11 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - APPLICATION – RAWHITI COMMUNITY SPORTS INCORPORATED**

- | | | |
|----------------------|------------|---|
| PART C | 14. | BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD 2010/11 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - APPLICATIONS - KIDSCAN STANDTALL AND OLA TAUMAFAI TRUST |
| PART C | 15. | BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD 2010/11 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - APPLICATION – PEGASUS BAY CHARITABLE TRUST RE THREE-PHASE POWER AT NEW BRIGHTON BEACH PARK/PLAYGROUND |
| PART C | 16. | BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUNDING SCHEME - APPLICATIONS – LYDIA JOHNSON, SHARNEE DAVIES, JORDAN BAKER, ROSE TULISI, MONICA TULISI, NELL TULISI |
| PART C | 17. | NEW ZEALAND LOCAL BOARDS' AND COMMUNITY BOARDS' CONFERENCE 2011 – BOARD MEMBER'S ATTENDANCE |
| PART C | 18. | BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD - GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2010/13 TERM |
| PART C | 19. | BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD - RECESS COMMITTEE |
| PARTS B&C | 20. | COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
20.1 Upcoming Activities
20.2 Board Meeting Dates for 2011
20.3 Chief Executive's November 2010 Council Update |
| PART B | 21. | BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS |

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES– 22 NOVEMBER 2010**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 22 November 2010, are **attached**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 22 November 2010, be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 RAWHITI COMMUNITY SPORT INCORPORATED

Representatives of the organisation will be in attendance to speak in support of a funding request to the Board for their KiwiSport Co-ordinator.

Clause 13 of this agenda refers.

3.2 NEW BRIGHTON PROJECT – ECO MARKET PROPOSAL

Representatives of the New Brighton Project will be in attendance to update the Board on the Eco Market proposal.

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. BRIEFINGS

7.1 STREET TREES – 264 MAIREHAU ROAD

Staff will update the Board regarding the two Silver Birch street trees on the Chartwell Street frontage of number 264 Mairehau Road.

8. ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2010/11

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Lisa Goodman

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to enable the Council to formulate a proposal to be submitted to the Remuneration Authority for the payment of remuneration to elected members for the balance of this financial year; up until 30 June 2011.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Currently, the remuneration pool for the elected members of the Christchurch City Council and its eight community boards has been fixed at \$1,472,123 for the 2010/11 financial year. This excludes the Mayor's gross salary of \$168,700 which has already been fixed by the Remuneration Authority.
3. Based on the rules and principles set by the Remuneration Authority the Council is now required to determine how it proposes to allocate the pool amongst the fifty three elected members (Councillors and Community Board members) for the balance of the 2010/11 financial year and, once decided by the Council, submit its proposal to the Remuneration Authority for approval. That approval must be given before the Council can implement its proposed remuneration structure. The proposal will cover the period between the date on which current elected members took office (Friday 15 October 2010) and 30 June 2011.
4. Given that:
 - (a) the total amount of the remuneration pool is unchanged from the previous financial year, and
 - (b) the Remuneration Authority has previously set out its views on the remuneration ratio between Councillors and Community Board members, including a distinction between metropolitan and rural Community Boards,

it is proposed that the remuneration levels for the Deputy Mayor, Councillors, Community Board Chairs and remaining Community Board members be continued at the same levels as those immediately prior to the election, ie retain the status quo.

5. All Community Boards have been consulted on the contents of this report.

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

6. Sufficient provision has been included in the 2010/11 Annual Plan for all elected member salaries to be continued at or about their present levels, until 30 June 2011.

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

7. 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 2010/11 remuneration proposal (or any variation thereof) has been approved by the Remuneration Authority, it will be gazetted via the Local Government Elected Members' Determination 2011.

8. 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?

8. Page 156 of the LTCCP, level of service under Democracy and Governance refers.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

9. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

10. The Council's proposal for remuneration must be received by the Remuneration Authority no later than February 2011 so that the Authority can issue its final Determination for this year. This has meant there has been sufficient time to consult with all Community Boards and seek their views which will be included in this report when it is submitted to the Council.
11. In submitting its proposal to the Remuneration Authority, the Council is required to notify the Authority of:
- (a) details of any dissent at Council;
 - (b) details of any dissent from its community boards.
12. Any person (including individual community boards) also has the ability to express any opposing views they might have on the Council's final proposal direct to the Remuneration Authority. Although there is no set closing date for the lodging of such submissions with the Authority, they should be lodged as soon as possible after the Council has reached a final decision on its preferred remuneration structure, as the Authority intends to deal with each application within a relatively short time-frame.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board recommends that the Council:

- (a) Adopt the salary only model as its basis of remuneration for elected members of the Christchurch City Council for the remainder of the 2010/11 financial year.

Note: The remuneration framework requires all community board members to be paid an annual salary (i.e. there is no provision for the payment of meeting fees to community board members).

- (b) Recommend to the Remuneration Authority for its approval that the remuneration levels for the Deputy Mayor, Councillors, Community Board Chairs and remaining Community Board members be retained at the same ratios as those for 2008/09, 2009/10 and the three month period leading up to the 9 October 2010 local body elections, i.e. that the status quo be retained.
- (c) Note that the Remuneration Authority must be advised of any dissent expressed by members of the Council or its Community Boards in relation to the Council's final proposal.

8. Cont'd

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**Remuneration Framework**

13. 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).
14. A brief summary of the remuneration framework and the rules and principles under which the Remuneration Authority works is attached as **Attachment One**.
15. The indicative pool for Christchurch City Council elected member remuneration in the remainder of 2010/11 is \$1,472,123. This is for the total remuneration for the Deputy Mayor and Councillors, and 50 per cent of the total remuneration paid to **elected** Community Board members (excluding Councillors as they have been appointed by the Council to community boards). Fifty per cent of the total remuneration paid to elected community board members is paid outside the pool.
16. Only one salary is payable to elected members. Thus, a Councillor who serves as an appointed member of a Community Board is paid a Councillor's salary only, and receives no additional payment for serving on the Community Board.
17. Directors' fees paid to Councillors who serve as directors of Council-controlled organisations cannot be taken into account when considering Councillors' remuneration. The directors' fees paid to such Councillors reflect their service as directors of the companies concerned, rather than their role as Councillors.
18. The Mayor's salary is set independently by the Remuneration Authority, and is not 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.

Prior to Election: Determination

19. The salaries that applied to Christchurch City Council elected members for the 2009/10 (excluding the Mayor), carried over to the period up to Friday 15 October (the date current elected members came into office), were:

	Total Positions	Individual Salary	Totals
Deputy Mayor	1	\$99,571	\$99,571
Councillors	12	\$86,249	\$1,034,988
<i>Total Councillors salaries</i>	13		<i>\$1,134,559</i>
City CB Chairs	6	\$24,270	\$145,620
BP CB Chairs	2	\$16,018	\$32,036
City CB members	24	\$16,989	\$407,736
BP CB members	8	\$11,216	\$89,728
<i>Total CB salaries</i>	40		<i>\$675,120</i>
<i>less 50% outside pool</i>			<i>\$337,560</i>
Total paid from pool			\$1,472,119

8. Cont'd

20. Factors underlying the rationale given previously by the Remuneration Authority in 2007 for approving the above ratio between Councillors and Community Boards, and Deputy Mayor and Councillors, are as follows:
- (a) The size, complexity and in particular the accountability of the Councillors' role, especially compared to that of the members of Community Boards
 - (b) Maintaining a margin between the remuneration of the Deputy Mayor and that of a Councillor
 - (c) City Community Board Chairs – maintaining relativity with other urban Community Board Chairs
 - (d) Maintaining a 70 per cent relationship between the remuneration of Community Board members and that of the Board Chairs
 - (e) The remuneration for Chairs of the Peninsula Community Boards is well above the norm for chairs of rural community boards, but as part of Christchurch City there is a wider role for both the chairs and members, and a corresponding extra time commitment, which may not be faced by members of other rural community boards.

Post Elections: Interim Determination

21. The Remuneration Authority has already made an interim determination called the Local Government Elected Members (2010/11) (Except Auckland) Determination 2010 (SR2010/245). This interim determination is for the period from 15 October 2010 (when Councillors and elected Community Board members came into office) which provides for the payment of the following salaries to elected members of the Christchurch City Council in the immediate post election period:

Position	Annual Salary
Mayor	\$158, 527 (less adjustment for value of car supplied)
Councillors	\$69,000 (80% of previous levels)
Community Board members (metro)	\$15,300 (90% of previous levels)
Community Board members (Banks Peninsula)	\$10,000

22. These interim salaries will apply up until the date on which the Council has reached a decision on the preferred allocation of the indicative remuneration pool and the Council's agreed proposal has been submitted to and approved by the Remuneration Authority. Any increases applicable (including those relating to the positions of Deputy Mayor and Community Board Chairs) can then be backdated. The likely timing of the Authority's decision, which will be set out in its Determination, is February or March 2011.

Basis of Remuneration

23. 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.
24. Christchurch City Council has had a salary only basis for remuneration of all its elected members since 2004.

REMUNERATION STRUCTURE FOR REMAINDER OF 2010/2011

25. Given that:
- (a) the total amount of the remuneration pool is unchanged from the previous financial year, and

8. Cont'd

- (b) the Remuneration Authority has previously set out its views on the remuneration ratio between Councillors and Community Board members, including a distinction between metropolitan and rural Community Boards,

it is proposed that the remuneration levels for the Deputy Mayor, Councillors, Community Board Chairs and remaining Community Board members be continued at the same levels as those immediately prior to the election, i.e. retain the status quo.

- 26. While there are many possible options that can be provided on this topic (such as a mix of salary and meeting fees and other differences between elected members), given the Remuneration Authority's previous determinations staff are recommending that the 2009/10 relativities between elected members set out in paragraph 20 continue and be adopted by the Council as set out in the staff recommendation.

9. ELECTED MEMBERS' EXPENSES AND ALLOWANCES 2010/11

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Lisa Goodman

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to enable the Council to formulate a proposal to be submitted to the Remuneration Authority for its approval for the payment of expenses and allowances by the Council to elected members for the balance of this financial year, up until 30 June 2011.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Remuneration Authority has issued the Local Government Elected Members (2010/11) (Except Auckland) Determination 2010. As well as dealing with salaries (the subject of a separate report) the Determination also provides for the payment to elected members of reimbursement of expenses and the payment of allowances. These expenses and allowances are the subject of this report.
3. The Council is required to seek the Remuneration Authority's approval for any amendments to the allowances and expenses previously approved by the Authority. In doing so, the Council must take into account the Determination for 2010/11. For the first time, the Remuneration Authority has incorporated the issues of communications and travel time allowances in its Determination.
4. Overall, staff are recommending that the previous allowances and expenses for 2009/10 (see **Attachment One**) be continued, with exceptions to the following three areas: Communications, Vehicle Mileage, and Travel Time. It is also proposed to amend slightly the wording around elected member travel, training and courses, to provide greater clarification of circumstances when Council approval is needed or not. The proposed schedule for 2010/11 to be submitted to the Remuneration Authority for approval is set out in **Attachment Two**. The differences between the previous wording and proposed wording is shown in blue text in Attachment Two.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

5. Sufficient provision has been included in the 2010/11 Annual Plan for all elected member expenses and allowances to be paid as proposed.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

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.

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?

7. Page 156 of the LTCCP, level of service under Democracy and Governance refers

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

8. Not applicable.

9. Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

9. All Community Boards are being consulted on the recommendations of this report.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board recommends that the Council resolve to submit to the Remuneration Authority for its approval, the proposed rules and policies for the reimbursement of elected member expenses and allowances described in **Attachment Two** of this report.

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

10. The 2010 Determination provides that the Council may:
- (a) reimburse expenses in accordance with the expenses rules, and
 - (b) pay allowances in accordance with rules approved by the Remuneration Authority.
11. A copy of the previous expenses approved by the Remuneration Authority that applied for the 2009/10 year is attached as **Attachment One**. The Council is required to seek the Remuneration Authority's approval for any amendments to the allowances and expenses previously approved by the Authority. In doing so, the Council must take into account the Determination for 2010/11. This Determination, which sets out the remuneration for elected members, is a legal ruling with the same effect as a statutory regulation, which all Councils (except Auckland which has its own Determination) are required to follow. It is to apply for the period from immediately after elected members come into office (Friday 15 October 2010) up to 30 June 2011. For the first time, the Remuneration Authority has incorporated the issues of communications and travel time allowances in its Determination.
12. Overall it is proposed that the previous allowances and expenses be continued, with exceptions to the following three areas: Communications, Vehicle Mileage, and Travel Time. It is also proposed to amend slightly the wording around Councillors' discretionary allocation of \$4,000 for training and courses, to provide greater clarification of circumstances around when Council approval is needed or not. More detail and the rationale underlying each of these issues is set out below.

Communications Allowance

13. Unlike previous years, the Remuneration Authority has explicitly addressed the issue of communications allowances in its Determination for 2010/11, which states:
- (1) *"A local authority may, in accordance with this clause, pay a communications allowance to its members, and, in the case of a district council or a city council, the members of community boards situated within its district, towards the expenses of all or any of the following:*
 - a) *a mobile telephone*
 - b) *a computer or ancillary equipment*
 - c) *an Internet connection.*
 - (2) *The maximum amount of the allowance is \$500 for the period beginning with the commencement of this determination and ending on the close of 30 June 2011.*
 - (3) *A communications allowance is not payable to the extent that the local authority provides the member with any of the following:*
 - a) *the use of a mobile telephone*
 - b) *the use of a computer or ancillary equipment*
 - c) *an Internet connection."*
14. In terms of the level of the communications allowance, the amount of \$500 for the remainder of 2010/11 equates to \$750 per annum. The Authority has indicated in correspondence to local authorities that:
- "Most people have a home computer with internet connection, a home telephone and a mobile phone and would have these even if they were not elected members. The allowance is intended to meet any extra costs, over and above normal ownership, that may be incurred because of their duties as elected members. This could cover such things as increased mobile phone usage, increased internet usage, or extra costs of printing inks. The Authority considers the amount of \$500 would more than cover the cost of those additional usages".*

9. Cont'd

15. After examining the Authority's Determination and seeking further clarification from Authority members, and taking into account past practice at the Christchurch City Council in terms of both provision of equipment and ratios between Councillors and Community Board members, staff have provided advice to incoming elected members on options available. These recommended options are set out on page 7 of **Attachment Two** – the proposed schedule of expenses and allowances to apply for the remainder of 2010/11.

Vehicle Mileage Allowance and Travel Time Allowance

16. During the past 12 months the Remuneration Authority has reviewed its previous decisions around the payment of a Vehicle Mileage allowance. The provisions of the 2010/11 Determination are unchanged in this regard; that an allowance may be paid to a maximum amount of \$0.70 per kilometre to elected members, provided that:
 - (a) the member travels in his or her own vehicle, and by the most direct route reasonable in the circumstances; and
 - (b) is on the local authority's business.
17. In addition to the above conditions, however, the Authority has advised in subsequent correspondence to local authorities that the rules for expenses and allowances relating to Vehicle Mileage should cover:
 - (a) A **threshold of distance travelled for any one event** (a threshold of 30 kilometres or more with only distance in excess of the threshold qualifying for payment will have automatic approval), and
 - (b) The **maximum payment to any one elected member in a year** (a maximum of 5,000 kilometres claimed in any one year will have automatic approval), and
 - (c) The allowance per kilometre (must be less than or equal to \$0.70 per kilometre).
18. Also for the first time the Remuneration Authority has advised that an allowance for time travelling on Council business is payable. The Authority's Determination states:
 - "1) *A local authority may, in accordance with this clause, pay a travel time allowance to the following persons:*
 - a) *its members; and*
 - b) *in the case of a district to council or a city council, the members of community boards situated within its district.*
 - 2) *The local authority may pay a travel time allowance for travel by the member, including travel to and from the member's residence, if the travel is –*
 - a) *on the local authority's business; and*
 - b) *by the quickest form of transport reasonable in the circumstances.*
 - 3) *The maximum amount of the allowance is \$15.00 per hour."*
 - 4) *However, a member who can properly be regarded as being a full-time member is not entitled to be paid a travel time allowance.*
19. In addition to the conditions in paragraph 19 above, the Authority has advised that the rules for Travel Time Allowance should cover:
 - (a) A **threshold of travel time for any one event** (a threshold of two hours or more with only time in excess of the threshold qualifying for payment will have automatic approval), and

9. Cont'd

- (b) The **maximum payment to any one elected member in a year** (a maximum of 100 hours claimed in any one year will have automatic approval) and
 - (c) The allowance per hours of travel time (must be less than or equal to \$15).
20. In correspondence to local authorities providing further guidance on its Determination, the Remuneration Authority advises that in relation to travel time and vehicle mileage:
- (a) It is generally accepted that a person in a full time job does not get paid for travelling to and from work or for extra time that may be needed for travel on employment business. The Authority does not intend giving a definition of "full time" for the purposes of the Travel Time Allowance, as it expects each local authority to decide whether a position can properly be regarded as full time or not. It does invite local authorities to consider things such as:
 - (i) would a person in the position, if carrying out their duties to a high standard, have any time for other paid employment?
 - (ii) would ratepayers expect the person to be full time in their role?
 - (b) A Council can set a Vehicle Mileage threshold which best reflects its unique geography. The Authority would be unlikely to agree to a threshold less than 30 kilometres.
 - (c) A maximum distance of more than 5,000 kilometres in any one year for one member could be paid provided the geographical nature of the region warrants it; a case would need to be made to justify it.
 - (d) "One event" means one council meeting or one event which the member is expected to travel to and attend as part of their duties. The travel to and from the event would be a single trip, or if the round trip was in excess of the threshold then a payment could be made.
21. Before considering this Council's proposal to the Remuneration Authority on the issue of Vehicle Mileage Allowance, it is worth considering the number and level of allowances claimed by elected members for vehicle mileage in the past. Section 5 of Attachment One outlines the previous rules for mileage allowance claimed; the type of Council meetings or events for which mileage allowance could be claimed.
22. For the 2009/10 year:
- (a) A total of nine Councillors claimed the allowance. The total kilometres claimed by any one Councillor ranged from 130 kilometres to 13,831. The highest amounts claimed were by the Councillor for Banks Peninsula, reflecting the mileage travelled to attend meetings around the Peninsula, followed by the Deputy Mayor.
 - (b) A total of 13 Community Board members claimed the allowance, seven of which were on Banks Peninsula Community Boards. The total kilometres claimed by any one Board member ranged from 400 (a city Community Board member) to 7,000 (a Banks Peninsula Community Board Chair). The kilometres claimed for any one event ranged from three kilometres (city Community Board members) to 188 kilometres (Banks Peninsula Community Board members).
23. Taking into account the Remuneration Authority's comments regarding thresholds in paragraphs 17 to 21 above, the full time nature of a position in paragraph 21, and the information in paragraph 23 on previous patterns of travel and claims for mileage allowance, the following is proposed for inclusion in the rules to be proposed to the Remuneration Authority under the heading "Travel Time and Mileage allowances":

9. Cont'd

1. For all elected members, reimbursement at \$0.70 per kilometre for car running associated with attendance at Council related meetings or events, with:
 - (a) a minimum threshold of distance travelled being 30 kilometres for any one round trip, with only distance in excess of this threshold qualifying for payment, and
 - (b) a maximum threshold of 5,000 kilometres that can be claimed by any one elected member in any one year, with the exception of the Councillor for Banks Peninsula, who is able to claim a maximum of 8,000 kilometres.
2. For Community Board members only, reimbursement at \$15 per hour for travel time for any one Council related meeting or event, with:
 - (a) a minimum threshold of 2 hours of time travelled for any one round trip, with only time in excess of this threshold qualifying for payment, and
 - (b) a maximum of 100 hours that can be claimed in any one year.
24. The above proposal is based on the following assumptions:
 - (a) Councillors would be viewed as having a full time position, and
 - (b) a case can be made to the Remuneration Authority that given the geography of the Banks Peninsula and the distances to travel around the ward and between the ward and Civic Offices in the city, the Councillor for the Banks Peninsula ward will incur greater distances and longer period of time for travelling, as evidenced by claims made in 2009/10.

Clarification of Travel and Attendance at Conferences and Courses

25. In the previous term, questions of clarification were raised with regard to the provisions of section 6.4 of the schedule of allowances and expenses, that relates to Travel and Attendance at Conferences/Courses/Seminars (pages 3 to 5 of Attachment One). Specifically the questions related to when Council approval is required for travel undertaken by individual Councillors, and for costs of Community Board travel/conference attendance when representing the Council. The intent of the previous provisions remains the same; section 6.4 of Attachment Two has been redrafted to ensure greater clarity around the different scenarios when travel and attendance at conferences is undertaken by any elected member.

10. BREEZES ROAD – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION EXTENSION AND INSTALLATION OF PARKING DEFINITION LINES AT ARANUI PRIMARY SCHOOL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Michael Thomson, Senior Traffic Engineer – Community

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north east side of Breezes Road, and approval to install parking definition lines on both sides of Breezes Road at the Aranui Primary School.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Staff have received a request from the Aranui Primary School Board of Trustees to extend a no stopping restriction outside the school frontage to improve the visibility for children crossing at the school patrol.
3. Currently, broken yellow lines exist from the kerb extension, outside the residential property on the south east side of the school to a point 20 metres northwest (approach side) of the school crossing. This allows one vehicle to park outside the school, between the end of the broken yellow lines and the schools north western driveway. School officials consider visibility and therefore safety will be improved if this one car park is removed.
4. The installation of parking definition lines (commonly called parking ticks similar to those marked for metered parking) was also requested. This will minimise the likelihood of motorists parking too close to residents vehicle entrances. These lines also define individual spaces better, which creates more efficient use of kerbside parking. For example, a length of kerbside between two vehicle entrances maybe able to accommodate three parked cars, but if two motorists park with bigger than necessary distances between their cars, then possibly only two cars may fit in the area.
5. As there is no time limit parking restriction on Breezes Road, the Board will have to approve an exemption to this policy.
6. School officials have consulted with the school community and adjacent residents/property owners. The outcome of this consultation is described in paragraphs 15 to 17 below.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$500.

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 the 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. 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.

10. Cont'd

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

12. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. Council policy states:

Individual parking spaces may be marked on arterial or other roads within shopping centres where parking (P30, P60 etc) restrictions apply. If there are benefits to traffic management (including the marking of cycleways) along arterial roads, parking limit lines may be extended to areas outside the restricted parking zone.

14. 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?

15. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

16. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, Pedestrian Strategy 2001, Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

17. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. The school has sought feedback on this proposal via its school newsletter. No objections from the school community were received.
19. School officials also contacted residents/occupiers/property owners at 11 properties adjacent to the school. Ten supported the proposal. One resident would not support the proposal, stating that they are unhappy with the school patrol/crossing position. This is unrelated to the broken yellow line extension.
20. The Officer in Charge - Parking Enforcement, agrees with this recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Revoke the following parking restriction:
- (i) That the existing parking restriction on the north east side of Breezes Road, commencing at a point 154 metres north west of the Pages Road intersection and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 42 metres, be revoked.
- (b) Approve the following:
- (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north east side of Breezes Road commencing at a point 154 metres north west from its intersection with Pages Road and extending in a north westerly direction for a distance of 59 metres.

10. Cont'd

- (ii) An exemption of the Council's parking tick policy (26 April 1995) and allow parking ticks (parking definition lines) to be installed on both sides of Breezes Road at, and in the vicinity of Aranui Primary School as shown on plan TG 108801 (refer **Attachment 1**).

11. HAWKE STREET – TRAFFIC AND PARKING MANAGEMENT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Authors:	Paul Forbes Assistant Traffic Engineer/Michael Thomson, Traffic Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to respond to the Board's resolution, following its meeting of 12 April 2010 seeking a further report on parking management in Hawke Street between Shaw Avenue and Marine Parade.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At its 12 April 2010 meeting, the Board resolved: *"That staff be requested to report back to the Board addressing the entranceways into the commercial car park on the south side of Hawke Street including the use of no stopping restrictions and parking limit lines."*
3. A traffic management review report was commissioned and is included as **Attachment 1**. This had been done as the parking, access and traffic issues are interrelated. The consultant's report provides an up-to-date safety history and traffic operation analysis of Hawke Street.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. There are no cost implications relating to the staff recommendations.

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

5. Yes, as above.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw provides the Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
7. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
8. 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?

9. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

10. 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

11. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

12. The recommendations align with the Council's Parking Strategy.

11. Cont'd

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

13. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. As no changes have been recommended, there has been no consultation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Burwood /Pegasus Community Board:

(a) Receive and accept the recommendations in the attached consultant's Hawke Street Traffic Management Review Report, namely:

(i) Speed

Retain the status quo.

Note: The eastern end of Hawke Street is generally a low speed environment and there is not a speed problem.

(ii) Land Use

Retain the status quo.

Note: The current land use zoning along Hawke Street has been in place since the City Plan was first notified in 1995 and involved substantial community input. There are other forums available for residents to voice their concerns in relation to development and zoning complaints such as making submissions on resource consent applications and participating in variations and plan changes.

(iii) Commercial Car Parking Area

Retain the status quo.

Note: While a communal car parking area with a reduced number of vehicle crossings would be desirable, this is difficult to achieve given the number of titles and landowners involved. The Council does however have some control if and when redevelopment of the site occurs. Landowners (applicants) and planners can only be vigilant in any future redevelopment (resource consent) proposals by fully considering access widths (including relevant seal markings where necessary), on-site queuing space, parking layout and circulation.

(iv) On Street car parking

Retain the status quo.

Note: Removing on-street car parking could increase vehicle speeds by reducing "side friction" and would result in parking migration effects further afield. The underlying business zone in the surrounding area suggests that some kerbside parking will always be present. The vehicles that are choosing to park on the surrounding streets are not causing any undue concern in relation to safety, efficiency or visibility and this is confirmed by the lack of reported crashes along the road, particularly at each commercial crossing. The Road User Rules 2004 Section 6.9 prohibits vehicles from parking within one metre of a vehicle entrance. Although our casual observations do not reveal any obvious examples of illegal parking, targeted enforcement action is always an option where parked vehicles do not comply with this rule. The Christchurch City Council Policy for installing additional kerbside parking limit lines also does not support markings either side of individual crossings, especially where the kerbside parking resource has no time restriction and where it is not an arterial road.

11. Cont'd

(v) Cycle facilities

Retain the status quo.

Note: The slow speed environment, the lack of cycling demand and the lack of crash history suggests that dedicated cycle facilities are not warranted.

(vi) Pedestrian Facilities

Retain the status quo.

Note: However, when Hawke Street is due for kerb and channel renewal, consideration could be given to reducing the road width, providing pedestrian islands and creating indented parking bays.

12. ST PAUL'S PRIMARY SCHOOL PROPOSED BUS STOP- CRESSWELL AVENUE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Steve Dejong, Transport Engineer – Transport

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to retrospectively seek the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's approval for a School Bus Stop that has been installed on Cresswell Avenue following the September 2010 earthquake. The **attached** plan refers.

BACKGROUND

2. As a result of the Christchurch earthquake on 4 September 2010, St. Paul's Primary School, which has a roll of 300 students and was previously located at 37 Gayhurst Road, Dallington, was badly damaged and could no longer operate from this facility.
3. St. Paul's Primary School has been relocated to the south east corner of the Cathedral College site at the corner of Barbadoes Street and Moorhouse Avenue. St Paul's Primary School commenced operation from this new site, at the beginning of the fourth term on 11 October 2010. The school will remain on this site for approximately two years until another permanent location for the school can be established.
4. St. Paul's Primary School is providing buses to transport those children unable to make their own way to the new site. These buses collect the children from two locations in Dallington, (the collection point bus stops are the subject of this report) and transport them to the new school site and return them back again at the end of the school day.
5. Under emergency powers, (Earthquake Response and Recovery Act 2010) on 30 September 2010, the Council approved School Bus Stops, a P3 school drop off/pick up zone and a P120 parking restriction along the new school frontages of Barbadoes Street and Moorhouse Avenue to facilitate the operation of St Paul's Primary School from the Cathedral College site. The collection point bus stops within the Dallington area (St Paul's Primary School zone) were not included in the report to the Council on 30 September 2010 because at that time, these locations had not yet been identified.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

6. During the ensuing period from 30 September 2010 to the commencement of the school's fourth term on 11 October 2010, while the Council was in recess, five possible bus stop locations in the Dallington area were recommended by the consultants working for St Paul's Primary School. The Council staff identified the two best locations from the five. The first being Cresswell Avenue, located beside the Burwood Park Tennis Club which is within the Burwood/Pegasus Ward and is north of the old St Paul's Primary School site. The second location is just over the ward boundary in the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board area, situated outside Rodem House at 690 Avonside Drive and is south of the old St Paul's Primary School location.
7. With the commencement of the fourth school term on 11 October 2010, buses started operating from both the Cresswell Avenue and Avonside Drive school bus stop sites. Soon after this date safety concerns were raised regarding the operation of these School Bus Stop locations. Because the School Bus Stops were not signed or marked, parents waiting to deliver their children to, or retrieve their children from the buses would park where the school bus was to stop forcing the school bus to stop within the live traffic lane causing safety and congestion issues. Sometimes the school buses would use the scheduled bus stops and the scheduled buses would stop in the live lane to allow their passengers to alight.

12. Cont'd

8. Staff wanting to remedy these identified safety issues as soon as possible were faced with the Council now being in recess for the 2010 local body elections. It was therefore not possible to report to the Community Boards until December 2010. Discussions were therefore undertaken with staff and it was decided to mark and sign the two school bus stops identified within the Dallington area to remedy the identified safety concerns and submit a retrospective report to the two new Boards as soon as practicable.
9. Marking the location of the School Bus Stop on the ground with a yellow painted Bus Stop box will identify exactly where the school buses will stop so there is no confusion where parents or other motorists should park. Signing the school bus stops will indicate to motorists the operation times of these school stops. It is proposed that the School Bus Stops will operate one hour prior to the commencement of the school day being 7.30am to 8.30am, and for one hour after the completion of the school day being 3pm to 4pm. Outside of these two stated one hour periods, the marked School Bus Stops will be available for motorists to park on.
10. Placing the Creswell Avenue School bus stop within the inset parking bay beside the Burwood Park Tennis Club gets the school buses completely off the live traffic and parking lanes and offers additional safety to children by providing a waiting area behind the wire rope barrier at the edge of the park. This inset parking bay has also been signed as "Angle Parking Other Times" to maximise the use of the available space.
11. The Burwood Park Tennis Club and residents living opposite the proposed School Bus Stop were informed of the proposal, receiving a letter and plan from Opus, who were the consultants engaged by St Paul's Primary School. Both the tennis club and residents were understanding and supportive of the situation. Several residents raised operational safety concerns (previously mentioned in paragraph 7), therefore the School Bus Stop area which was previously in the parking lane next to the kerb was relocated into the inset parking area beside the tennis club. Council staff door knocked the residents living directly opposite the inset parking area and spoke to the tennis club, once again the club and all residents were understanding and supportive of the proposal.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

12. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$800.

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

13. The installation of road markings and signs is within the LTCCP Streets and Transport Operational Budgets. In this situation the costs will be charged to the appropriate Earthquake Recovery cost code.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

14. Clause 5 of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 states that the Council may set aside part of any road as a restricted parking area. A restricted parking area may be subject to such conditions as the Council determines by resolution.
15. The installation of any signs and/or markings associated with the parking restrictions must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

16. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

12. Cont'd

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

18. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

19. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Pedestrian Strategy 2001, Road Safety Strategy 2004, Parking Strategy 2003.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

20. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

21. The Burwood Park Tennis Club and residents living opposite the proposed School Bus Stop were informed of the proposal, receiving a letter and plan from Opus, the consultants engaged by St Paul's Primary School. The Tennis Club and residents were understanding of the situation and supportive. Several residents raised operational safety concerns, previously mentioned in paragraph seven, therefore the bus stop which was relocated into the inset parking area. Council staff door knocked the residents living directly opposite the inset parking area and spoke to the tennis club, once again all residents were understanding and supportive of the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board resolve:

- (a) That a School Bus Stop operating 7.30am to 8.30am and 3pm to 4pm on School Days Only, be installed within the inset parking bay on the north side of Cresswell Avenue commencing at a point 75 metres west of the Cresswell Avenue and Gayhurst Road intersection and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 39 metres.
- (b) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to 90 degree angle parking at all times, except between 7.30am to 8.30am and 3pm to 4pm on School Days Only, within the inset parking bay situated on the north side of Cresswell Avenue commencing at a point 75 metres west of the Cresswell Avenue and Gayhurst Road intersection and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 39 metres.

13. BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND 2010/11 - APPLICATION – RAWHITI COMMUNITY SPORTS INCORPORATED

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941- 8607
Officer responsible:	Recreation and Sport Unit Manager
Author:	Jacqui Miller, Community Recreation Advisor

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board to consider an application for funding from its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund. The application is from Rawhiti Community Sports Incorporated for their KiwiSport Co-ordinator for \$10,000.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In 2010/11, the total pool available for allocation for the Burwood/Pegasus Discretionary Response Fund is \$51,800. The Discretionary Response Fund opens each year on 1 July and closes on 30 June the following year, or when all funds are expended.
3. The purpose of the Fund is to assist community groups where the project and funding request falls outside other council funding criteria and/or closing dates. This fund is also for emergency funding for unforeseen situations.
4. At its meeting on 22 April 2010, the Council resolved to change the criteria and delegations around the local Discretionary Response Fund.
5. The change in criteria limited the items that the local Discretionary Response Fund does not cover to only:
 - (a) Legal challenges or Environment Court challenges against the Council, Council Controlled Organisations or Community Boards decisions;
 - (b) Projects or initiatives that change the scope of a Council project; and
 - (c) Projects or initiatives that will lead to ongoing operational costs to the Council.

The Council also made a note that: *"Community Boards can recommend to the Council for consideration of grants under (b) and (c)."*

6. Based on this criteria, the applications received are eligible for funding.
7. Detailed information on the application and staff comments are included in the **attached** Decision Matrix.

13. Cont'd

BACKGROUND

8. Rawhiti Community Sports Inc is an amalgamation of clubs including New Brighton Cricket, New Brighton Netball Club, New Brighton Rugby Football Club, Parklands Christchurch Unit Softball Club Inc, Rawhiti Golf Club, New Brighton Archery and New Brighton Bowling Club.
9. This is a Sportville model. Sportville is the partnership of sporting groups to better utilise facilities, volunteer base and to ensure survival of the participating sporting codes. The Council has zoned an area for a Sportville multi sports complex building known as Rawhiti Community Sports Inc.
10. The key focus of this group is to administer and operate the facilities in a manner agreed to by the members, namely: To provide information and assistance, resources and opportunities for communication with and between the members of Rawhiti Community Sport Inc; To meet and promote the interests of its membership through the provision of those facilities by (a) assisting in and fostering the development and growth of sports, recreation and leisure-time activity; and (b) improving the conditions of life for the people in the community.
11. Rawhiti Community Sport Inc, as part of its business plan, and part of its commitment to develop participation and capacity building in New Brighton and surrounding areas, wish to provide local indoor sports leagues (netball, soccer, dodgeball and futsal). Regardless of the weather conditions, day or night, indoor players will find a safe, clean and friendly atmosphere for their sporting enjoyment.
12. In May 2008, the organisation secured \$10,000 from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's 2008/09 Discretionary Fund to assist towards progressing the Rawhiti Community Sports complex project, this included scoping work to identify and integrate sports clubs, to establish the Rawhiti Community Sports Incorporated Board and governance protocols, and to secure other funding. The Club completed a 'Feasibility Study' which was presented to the Community Board on 30 August 2010 as part of the Club's full accountability for the \$10,000.
13. The Club received \$1,000 from the 2010/11 Burwood/Pegasus Small Grants Fund to purchase equipment necessary to establish an indoor sports league. This project also secured funds from Youth Town to help with the establishment costs for this project. The Club feel that they require an income stream to enable the long term project of a new multi user facility. An indoor league is an ideal opportunity for an income stream. The group estimates that this project will benefit up to 500 people, focusing on children, youth and adults. City-wide there are presently 4,000 children participating in youth leagues and 2,500 adults participating in adult leagues. This project will increase this participation number by offering leagues in the New Brighton area. The secondary focus will be to steer participants from this league into others sports offered by Rawhiti Community Sports Inc.
14. KiwiSport is a government funding initiative supporting sport for school-aged children. KiwiSport was launched by the Prime Minister on 11 August 2009 and provides funding for schools for year 1 to 8 students and year 9 to 13 students via the Ministry of Education (the KiwiSport Direct Fund) and community projects (via SPARC to regional sports trusts through the Regional Partnership Fund RPF) to achieve the aims of:
 - Increasing the number of school-aged children participating in organised sport.
 - Increasing the availability and accessibility of sport opportunities for all school-aged children.
 - Supporting children to develop skills that will enable them to participate effectively in sport.
15. The funding model for this project requires a direct contribution from schools (with additional \$13 per head schools have received from Ministry of Education specifically for sport and recreation), Regional Partnership Fund contribution (max \$24,500) from Sport Canterbury and a contribution coming from the local community for example the Council, Gaming Trusts etc. Sport Canterbury would like all contributions to be equal however are realistic that this may not be possible in all applications.

13. Cont'd

16. Throughout October and November 2009, the Sport Canterbury completed extensive community consultation to identify priorities for RPF investment. This community consultation identified a number of priorities including:
- The cost of transporting children to participate in sporting events and activities is a significant barrier to participation. The cost associated with accessing community based facilities has also been identified as prohibitive.
 - A need to support a human resource to facilitate, administer, coordinate and deliver sport based programmes at a community level.
 - The fundamental movement skills of children must be improved.
 - It is vital to preserve the role of Secondary School Sports Coordinators to continue to coordinate sport to students currently participating.
 - Sport for young people needs to be delivered in a less traditional, less competitive and less structured way to meet the changing needs and demands of young people.
 - Quality delivery of sport must be ensured through continued provision of training and resource support to teachers, senior students and volunteer coaches and officials. There is also a need to increase the number of coaches delivering sport.
17. Canterbury West Coast Investment Plan for KiwiSport Regional Partnership Fund investment reflects these priorities and will seek to achieve the aims of more young people participating in organised sport throughout our region.
18. Linfield Sports Kiwisport Programme – this Club received funding of \$5,000 from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's Discretionary Fund in September 2010 to establish the first KiwiSport Co-ordinator position in the ward. This was the first KiwiSport Co-ordinator role which the Board has funded. The Club also received \$10,000 from the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board as the 11 schools they are working with are predominantly based in the Hagley/Ferrymead ward. Linfield Sports has secured \$24,500 from Sport Canterbury for their project and direct funding from schools.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

19. The Board has **\$14,697** available for allocation in its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund. Should the Board grant the recommended amount, this will leave a fund balance of \$4,697 for allocation to 30 June 2011.

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

20. Yes, see page 184 of the LTCCP regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

21. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

22. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, page 172 and 176.

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

23. Yes, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes, including Board funding.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

24. Strengthening Communities Strategy, Children's Policy, Older Adults Policy, Youth Strategy, Out of School Programmes Policy and Sport and Recreation Strategy as detailed in the attached funding decision matrix.

13. Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

25. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board make a grant of \$10,000 to Rawhiti Community Sports Inc for the costs associated with the co-ordination and delivery of the KiwiSport programme as described in this report.

14. BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD 2010/11 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – APPLICATIONS - KIDSCAN STANDTALL AND OLA TAUMAFAI TRUST

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services Group, 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Unit Manager
Author:	Natalie Dally, Community Development Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board to consider two applications for funding from its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund from:
 - (a) KidsCan StandTall Charitable Trust for \$8,000; and
 - (b) Ola Taumafai Trust for \$24,000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In 2010/11, the total pool available for allocation for the Discretionary Response Fund is \$51,197. The Discretionary Response Fund opens each year on 1 July and closes on 30 June the following year, or when all funds are expended.
3. The purpose of the Fund is to assist community groups where the project and funding request falls outside other council funding criteria and/or closing dates. This fund is also for emergency funding for unforeseen situations.
4. At the Council meeting on 22 April 2010, the Council resolved to change the criteria and delegations around the local Discretionary Response Fund.
5. The change in criteria limited the items that the local Discretionary Response Fund does not cover to only:
 - (a) Legal challenges or Environment Court challenges against the Council, Council Controlled Organisations or Community Boards decisions;
 - (b) Projects or initiatives that change the scope of a Council project; and
 - (c) Projects or initiatives that will lead to ongoing operational costs to the Council.

The Council also made a note that: "Community Boards can recommend to the Council for consideration of grants under (b) and (c)."
6. Based on this criteria, the attached applications from KidsCan StandTall and Ola Taumafai Trust (refer **Attachment 1**) are eligible for funding.
7. Detailed information on the application and staff comments are included in the attached Decision Matrix (Attachment 1).

Financial Implications

8. There is currently **\$14,697** remaining in the Board's 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund.

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

9. Yes, see page 184 of the LTCCP regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. There are no legal considerations.

14. Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, pages 172 and 176.

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

12. Yes, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes, including Board funding.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. The application from KidsCan StandTall Charitable Trust aligns with the following Council Strategies and Policies:

- Strengthening Communities Strategy
- Childrens Policy

The application from KidsCan StandTall Charitable Trust aligns with the following Burwood/Pegasus Community Board objectives:

- The Board will play an active role in the Burwood/Pegasus ward by acknowledging diverse communities and will contribute to facilitating a vibrant, inclusive and strong community.
- The Board will promote local lifelong learning opportunities and recognise achievements.

14. The application from Ola Taumafai Trust aligns with the following Council Strategies and Policies:

- Strengthening Communities Strategy
- Youth Policy
- Childrens Policy
- Recreation and sport strategy
- OSP strategy

15. The application from Ola Taumafai Trust aligns with the following Burwood/Pegasus Community Board objectives:

- The Board will play an active role in the Burwood/Pegasus ward by acknowledging diverse communities and will contribute to facilitating a vibrant, inclusive and strong community.
- The Board will support and encourage residents to participate in local recreation, leisure and cultural activities.
- The Board will promote local lifelong learning opportunities and recognise achievements.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board:

- (a) Decline the application from KidsCan StandTall Charitable Trust for the Food for Kids programme.
- (b) Approve a grant of \$ 5,000 from its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund to Ola Taumafai Trust for Youth programmes operational expenses.

15. BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD 2010/11 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - APPLICATION – PEGASUS BAY CHARITABLE TRUST RE THREE-PHASE POWER AT NEW BRIGHTON BEACH PARK/PLAYGROUND

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Kim Swarbrick, Consultation Leader (Greenspace)

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek consideration of a funding request from the Pegasus Bay Charitable Trust. Funding is sought from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Boards 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund to install three-phase power at the New Brighton Playground Beach Park for the Trust's proposed inaugural New Zealand Sandcastle Competition.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The following table shows the organisation seeking the funding, the project name, amount requested and staff amount recommended.

Name of Group	Name of Project	Amount Requested	Amount Recommended
Pegasus Bay Charitable Trust	Funding application to install 3-phase power at New Brighton in order to hold the sandcastle event	\$5,000	\$0

3. Staff have spent considerable time investigating this funding application and liaison with respective Council Units regarding the asset ownership if this application was to proceed. The staff concerns are around whether or not the Discretionary Response Fund is the best method of funding this capital item.
4. The Christchurch City Council – Guide to Community Funding (available on the Council Website) under the Local Discretionary Response Fund heading states;

“Local applications will be assessed by staff and presented to the relevant Community Board for allocation. Community Board’s can grant funds to any group or person for any purpose, except:

- Legal challenges against Council, Community Boards or Environment Court decisions.*
- Projects or initiatives that change the scope of a Council project.*
- Projects or initiatives that will lead to ongoing operational costs to the Council.”*

Installation of a three-phase power facility would entail ongoing operational costs for the Council and is therefore not a good fit with the funding criteria. However, it should be noted that the project team for the proposed New Brighton Playground Upgrade Project (see paragraph 5) have already identified the need for three-phase power. If installed, the operational costs would therefore have to be met by the Council at that time. The issue of ongoing operational costs, as opposition towards this funding application, is therefore somewhat diminished. This is further lessened by the fact that any power usage by an event organiser could be charged back to the event organiser, where practical.

5. The New Brighton playground and toilet block are programmed to be upgraded in the 2011/12 financial year and there is currently \$1.2 million in the LTCCP for this purpose. Public information leaflets seeking feedback are being prepared for public consultation beginning in February 2011. The playground renewal is scheduled for construction between Easter and Labour Weekend 2012. As mentioned above, the project team are aware that three-phase power is desirable and are already considering options to have this included. Currently, any groups utilising the playground/grass area for events can use the existing single phase power source or if they require three-phase power they have been hiring a generator to provide their power needs.

15. Cont'd

6. If the playground upgrade project does not contain sufficient funding to cover the provision of three-phase power, and the application for funding from the Discretionary Response Fund is unsuccessful, then application for funding three-phase power would be made to the Council's next Long Term Plan in 2012.
7. The only place three-phase power that can be supplied to the playground beach park is from the transformer across the road fronting Countdown. Should the proposal proceed, this new connection will provide the main point of supply for three-phase power which can be redirected elsewhere on the reserve in the future.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. At the time of writing this report, the Community Board has \$14,697 remaining available for allocation in its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund.
9. Power Jointing Ltd (HV & LV Electrical Reticulation) have provided the Pegasus Bay Charitable Trust with a cost quote estimate of \$14,484.29 to complete installation of three-phase power based on open trenching. Should a high water table present problems then a variation for de-watering of trench work may be required which would increase costs. Whilst seeking \$5,000 from the Council, the Trust has not indicated how they would be covering the remaining cost.
10. Should the Community Board wish to support this application then it is suggested that the Trust confirm the balance of the required funding by 30 January 2011 and that if this cannot be achieved, then the Community Board consider reserving the right to withdraw its funding.

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

11. The recommendation of this report is that the application be declined as it is not eligible for Discretionary Response Fund (page 184 of the LTCCP) support due to it not meeting the scheme criteria.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. There are no legal issues to be considered.

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?

13. No, the Sandcastle Competition is a private event.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. If the project were to proceed, it would align with the following Council strategies; Strengthening Communities Strategy and Events Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. Not applicable.

15. Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board:

- (a) Decline the application from the Pegasus Bay Charitable Trust towards funding the installation of three-phase power at the New Brighton Playground area from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund as the project would, in the short term, lead to ongoing operational costs for the Council.
- (b) That the provision of three-phase power be investigated as part of the New Brighton Playground Upgrade Project in the first instance and that if insufficient funding is available, then alternate funding be sought in the Council's Long Term Plan in 2012.

15. Cont'd

BACKGROUND

16. The Pegasus Bay Charitable Trust was formed in 2010 with the key focus of establishing New Zealand's first International Sandcastle Competition at New Brighton. The Trust believes that this event will have a wide appeal across all socio-economic groups and communities within Christchurch. The New Zealand International Sandcastle Competition will involve over 12 activities including activities specifically for children, families, general public and Christchurch businesses. The Trust believes it has a social responsibility to make the competition affordable where families of all cultures and backgrounds will have access to participate. Dates of the competition will be the weekend of 5 and 6 March 2011 and will be held in conjunction with the New Zealand Surf Life Saving National Championships to be held at New Brighton Beach. The Trust sought a contribution of \$10,250 from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's Discretionary Response Fund in June 2010 towards the costs of establishing the Trust and event costs including co-ordination hours. The application was not supported by the Community Board at that time and funding was declined.
17. The Pegasus Bay Charitable Trust have been liaising closely with New Zealand Surf Life Saving as the Surf Life Saving Nationals will be held immediately after the Sandcastle event. The Dome will be located in the Village Green area from 4 to 13 March 2011 inclusive for the two events. New Zealand Surf Life Saving would also use three-phase power, if available, for their event. The Trust feel that three-phase power would be a valuable asset for the area and would assist future event organisers who use this area throughout the summer period.

16. BURWOOD/PEGASUS 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUNDING SCHEME - APPLICATIONS – LYDIA JOHNSON, SHARNEE DAVIES, JORDAN BAKER, ROSE TULISI, MONICA TULISI, NELL TULISI

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Recreation and Sport Unit Manager
Author:	Jacqui Miller, Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present for the Board's consideration, six applications for funding assistance from the Board's 2010/11 Youth Development Funding Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Funding is being sought by six applicants from the Board's Youth Development Funding Scheme,
3. The applicants are Lydia Johnson 13 years old of Aranui, Sharnee Davies 14 years old of Southshore, Jordan Baker 13 years old of Queenspark, three sisters Rose Tulisi 14 years old, Nell Tulisi 16 years old, and Monica Tulisi 19 years old from South New Brighton.
4. The balance available in the fund is \$860.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. The following tables detail event expenses and funding requested for the applicants:

Expenses for Lydia Johnson and Sharnee Davies	Cost (NZ\$)
Airfares	500
Accommodation	400
Uniform and Equipment	200
Shared costs of two adults/coaches	150
Total	\$1250
Amount requested	\$250
Fundraising	
Delivering phone books, sausage sizzles and mufti day at school	200 (each)

Expenses for Jordan Baker	Cost (NZ\$)
Airfares	228
Accommodation	318
Travel (Vans)	91
Total	\$658
Amount requested	\$550
Fundraising	90

Expenses for Tulisi Family (costs per person)	Cost (NZ\$)
Airfares	380
Accommodation	150
Event Entry Fee	200
Equipment	100
Food	50
Total	\$880
Amount requested	\$500 (each)
Fundraising	
Gardening for neighbours	100
Making it Happen – Sport Canterbury grant	500

16. Cont'd

6. Lydia Johnson, Sharnee Davies, Jordan Baker, Rose Tulisi, Monica Tulisi, Nell Tulisi are all first time applicants for the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's Youth Development Scheme Fund.
7. Ruth Johnson (Lydia's sister) received \$300 from the Board's 2010/11 Youth Development Fund at the 12 July 2010 Board meeting towards costs to attend the Southern Skies Touch tournament from 4 to 10 July in Brisbane, Australia.

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

8. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

10. This fund aligns with the 2009-19 LTCCP.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. Application aligns with the Youth Strategy and the Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board allocate the remaining \$860 from the 2010/11 Burwood/Pegasus Youth Development Scheme Fund as follows:

- (a) Lydia Johnson, \$130 to participate in the Get2Go Challenge from 6 to 10 December 2010.
- (b) Sharnee Davies, \$130 to participate in the Get2Go Challenge from 6 to 10 December 2010.
- (c) Jordan Baker, \$100 to play for the QEII Crushers Waterpolo team at the Under 14 Nationals in Wellington from 16 to 19 December 2010.
- (d) Rose Tulisi, Monica Tulisi, Nell Tulisi, \$500 to attend the New Zealand Maori Golf Tournament in January 2011.

16. Cont'd

BACKGROUND

12. **Lydia Johnson** is to participate in the Get2Go Challenge from 6 to 10 December 2010. Lydia attends Hillview Christian School. Lydia participated in the Canterbury Get2Go challenge and their team came first. They will participate in the five day Grand Final held at Great Barrier Island from 6 to 10 December 2010. The challenge will include sailing, problem solving, rock climbing, orienteering, sea kayaking, outdoor cooking, boogie boarding and search and rescue.
13. Now in its fifth year the Get2Go Challenge is like the Amazing Race, Treasure Island and Survivor, mixed together with adventure sports. There are 12 regional events around the country. These take the form of one day challenges that are held in Term 2 and 3 each year. In the regional one day events team need to navigate between four 60 minutes long challenges and attempt each in the allocated time. To maximise their score in each task teams are required to work together, using important team skills such as communication, problem solving, planning and decision making. The team in each region with the top score has been invited to participate in the five day Grand Final.
14. Lydia has a passion for different sports, she did competitive gymnastics for three years and was placed in various regional competitions. She went to the Nationals in 2008 and came 10th in the individual competition and second in the team events, since leaving gymnastics she plays basketball, netball, and cricket in the summer. One of Lydia's future goals is to play netball for Canterbury. Lydia is also involved in Girls Brigade.
15. Lydia's parents have provided evidence of their gross annual earnings which indicates a level of financial support is required for Lydia to attend this event.
16. **Sharnee Davies** is to participate in the Get2Go Challenge from 6 to 10 December 2010. Sharnee attends Hillview Christian School. Refer to the description above regarding the Get2Go Challenge.
17. Sharnee is the sixth oldest of nine children. She is very sports orientated and plays netball on Saturdays and Wednesdays and also volleyball, basketball, touch rugby and cross country. Sharnee is a great team player who has represented her school well in the sporting events listed as well as Get2Go for two years in a row.
18. Sharnee's parents support her in these extra activities as they feel it helps to build her confidence and character. Sharnee's father is a Social Worker at Stepping Stone Trust and Sharnee's mother is currently in her final year of her Social work qualification at Canterbury University.
19. **Jordan Baker** has been selected to play for the QEII Crushers Waterpolo team at the Under 14 Nationals in Wellington from 16 to 19 December 2010.
20. Jordan has been involved in Club Waterpolo for three seasons and is playing exceptionally well. 2010 has been a very busy year as he was selected to play at the Pan Pacific Championships in Auckland in July 2010 where the team placed second. He also played in a tournament in Dunedin earlier this year and was selected for the Chisnallwood School team at the recent AIMS games in Tauranga. The total costs which Jordan parents have paid for these trips is \$1,500. Jordan is also involved in touch rugby, rugby league and rugby. He was selected for the Canterbury "Metro" Under 65kg Rugby Team recently which won the tournament.
21. As part of his selection into the QEII Crushers team he is training two mornings per week from 6am to 7.30am, one fitness swimming session per week as well as team two evening skills and games sessions with the team.
22. The team fundraising activities have included selling croissants and lamingtons, which to date has raised approximately \$90 per player.

16. Cont'd

23. Jordan lives at home with his parents, one parent works full-time and other part-time. Jordan has a younger brother who is starting at Chisnallwood Intermediate in 2011.
24. **Rose Tulisi** 14 years old, **Nell Tulisi** 16 years old and **Monica Tulisi** 19 years old, are three sisters who live in South New Brighton. The girls are seeking funding support so they can attend the Maori Golf Nationals in Te Awamutu from 10 to 15 January 2011.
25. The New Zealand National Maori Golf Tournament is a six day tournament. It involves registration and practice day – 36 holes stroke play so grades are established. There are six days of match play with two games per day if they make the final. Over 600 people from New Zealand and Australia play at the tournament. Last year the family did not participate for the first time in six years due to the cost of participating.
26. Nell's teacher (Miss Dick) at Marion College has written some words of support for Nell as a result of her play during 2009. *"She has competed admirably this year in a variety of School, Canterbury and Nationals events, which included her being reselected in the New Zealand Elite Development Squad (the only girl from the South Island). Nell started the year by being runner-up in the New Zealand Maori Golf tournament and then runner up in the Press Invitation and Canterbury Stroke Play Championships in March. She was then selected in the Canterbury Senior Women's team and played several fixtures, including quadrangular where she again played well with good results. At the NZ Women's Amateur she qualified in the top division, however was unfortunate to play the eventual winner in the first round. Also during the year she competed in the 2009 Lion Foundation New Zealand Women's U23 Championship, and was the top South islander. During secondary school sports week Nell competed in the Youthtown NZ Gold Women's U19 Championships and was the top 15 year old girl"*
27. All of the girls have attended Te Kura Whakapumau Primary School so can speak fluent Maori, and feel that their attendance at the Maori Golf Nationals will help them to stay connected to their culture and language. The 2011 tournament is very significant to the girls as there will be a special ceremony to recognise Paki Blake, an official and supporter of the event who passed away during the tournament.
28. A letter of support has been provided for the girls by Stephanie Johnson. She has known the girls for 13 years. *"They are all very keen and talented sportswomen. Monica and Nellie have both at one time won the NZ Maori National Golf; Women's Division. Rosie excels in many different sports; some of which are Basketball, cricket, soccer, fencing, tennis, golf. All three girls are very committed and disciplined when it comes to practising and preparing for upcoming competitions and events. Monica is a very polite girl and has a quiet confidence. She is focused and competitive but is also very considerate of others. Nellie is very patient when it comes to teaching sporting skills to others. It is evident that she has a real gift in this area. Rosie has a flair for any sport she is involved with. She is competitive but is a very fair player and it is obvious she really enjoys playing any sport.*
29. The girls mother has provided evidence of her earnings which indicates a level of financial support is required to enable her daughters to attend this event.

17. NEW ZEALAND LOCAL BOARDS' AND COMMUNITY BOARDS' CONFERENCE 2011 – BOARD MEMBER'S ATTENDANCE

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for a Burwood/Pegasus Community Board member(s) to attend the 2011 New Zealand Local Boards' and Community Boards' Conference in Rotorua in May 2011.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The conference is being held in Rotorua from Thursday 5 to Saturday 7 May 2011. The theme for the conference is 'Communities on Board – The Changing Face of Community Governance' and will reflect on Boards' relationships, communications and advocacy with their communities, as well as considering the implications of the establishment of Auckland's 'super city' on communities throughout New Zealand Boards. More information is **attached**.
3. The programme includes keynote speakers and interactive workshops hosted by experts, and the presentation of the Best Practice Awards in recognition of community board projects and initiatives which have made a difference.
4. On 27 September 2010, this Board resolved that the 'Matariki at the Marae' event be approved as a Burwood/Pegasus and Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's Best Practice Awards joint entry at the 2011 conference. Staff are currently working to complete the entry.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. The conference registration cost for each appointed delegate is \$591 excluding GST, noting this is the early bird rate until 4 March 2011. The standard registration from 4 March 2011 will be \$676. In addition, accommodation and airfare costs will be in the order of approximately \$350 and \$300 respectively, per person.
6. The Board's 2010/11 remaining operational budget of \$3,510 has the necessary conference and training funding available to fund the attendance of two Board members.

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

7. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

8. There are no direct legal implications involved. A Community Board resolution is required for expenditure for attendance of Board members at conferences.

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. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

10. Not applicable.

17. Cont'd

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board give consideration to approving the attendance of a Board member(s) to the 2011 New Zealand Local Boards' and Community Boards' Conference in Rotorua from 5 to 7 May 2011.

18. BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD - GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2010/13 TERM

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of the report is to seek the adoption of a governance structure for the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board for the 2010/13 term.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At an informal gathering on 16 November 2010, Board members discussed possible governance structures for the 2010/2013 term.
3. It was noted that during its previous term, the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board and some of the other community boards, had held two ordinary meetings in each calendar month. This allowed for all items of business to be progressed on a regular basis. The minutes/report of the Board meeting were confirmed at the following fortnightly Board meeting and then referred on to the next appropriate Council meeting. In addition to the decision-making Board meetings, seminar meetings were scheduled at the conclusion of the Board's meetings if necessary, or prior to the commencement of the meeting. Seminars provide an opportunity for Board members and staff to have an in-depth discussion on issues where no decisions at that time, are required.
4. Members agreed that the structure used by the previous Board was effective, and accordingly should be continued for the current term. It was also acknowledged that should a need be identified for ad hoc or standing committees, then this could be considered by the Board, as required.
5. In addition, it is proposed that the Board establish its Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee at this time. The Small Grants Fund provides small grants to eligible not-for-profit groups whose activities provide opportunities in the areas of community, social, recreation, sports, arts, environment or heritage to the wider community or to specifically defined communities of interest. The emphasis is on small projects which assist community groups to enhance their capacity and/or increase participation in their activities.
6. Community Boards have delegated authority to determine final funding decisions for their respective Community Board Small Grant Funds; this was determined by the Council on 24 July 2008.
7. In December 2009, the Council adopted the *Grants Working Party Criteria Changes* Report, consequently the Community Boards have the opportunity to decide whether or not to appoint community representatives to the Board's Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee for the next three years of funding rounds.
8. Each Community Board will have a Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee to allocate their Small Grants Fund (SGF) which for this Board is \$72,529.
9. If the Community Board decides to appoint community representatives to the Board's Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee, staff will begin the nomination process for representatives early in 2011. The following involvement areas/skills will be advertised when calling for community nominations and are seen as a guideline to assist in covering the various sectors within your local community:
 - Disabled, sport and recreation, arts and culture, welfare and social services, Maori, ethnic groups, environment and heritage.
 - Interest and involvement in community issues/groups.
 - Some experience in committee processes

18. Cont'd

- Knowledge of various committees of interest.
 - The ability to be articulate and assertive.
10. After nominations have been received, staff will report back to the Community Board (Public Excluded) with details of nominees in order for the Board to decide on their chosen representatives.
 11. The membership of the Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee needs to be decided on by the Board including the number of community representatives, if so determined. As a guideline, it is suggested that there be up to five Board members and four to six community representatives.
 12. The term of appointment for community representatives will be three years i.e. until 2013/14, and will be undertaken on a voluntary basis.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

13. Provision is made in the 2009–19 LTCCP on page 156 for the elected member representation and governance support.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

14. Yes, a Council, or Community Board, may appoint committees, subcommittees other subordinate decision making bodies and joint committees (clause 30, Schedule 7). Council's and Community Board's also have the power to appoint or discharge any member of a committee (clause 31(1)). Such committees, etc are "*subject in all things to be control of the local authority [or read community board], and must carry out all general and special directions of the local authority given in relation to the committee or other body or the affairs of the committee or other body*" (clause 30(3)),
15. The minimum number of members for a "committee" is three, with a quorum being two (one of whom must be an elected member), or the quorum can be a greater number, as determined by the Community Board. At least one member of a committee must be an elected member of the Community Board, but an employee of the local authority cannot be a member (if they are acting in the course of their employment).
16. Clause 31 also provides: "(3) The members of a committee or subcommittee may, but need not be, elected members of the local authority [community board], and a local authority or committee may appoint to a committee or subcommittee a person who is not a member of the local authority or committee if, in the opinion of the local authority, that person has the skills, attributes, or knowledge that will assist the work of the committee or subcommittee."
17. Clause 26(3) is also relevant, as it provides that the Council/Community Board may appoint a member of a committee to be the chairperson of the committee, or if a chairperson is not appointed then the power of appointment may be exercised by the committee. A deputy chairperson can also be appointed to act in the absence of a chairperson (clause 26(4)). This person will preside at any meeting if the chairperson is absent from a meeting. However, if a deputy chair has not been appointed or if they are also absent then the members of the committee that are present must elect one of their number to preside at the meeting.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

18. Page 156 of the LTCCP level of service under democracy and governance.

18. Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

19. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

20. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board:

- (a) Give consideration to approving its governance structure for the 2010/13 term as set out in paragraphs 3 and 4 above.
- (b) Consider the adoption of its ordinary meeting dates for 2011.
- (c) Establish the Burwood/Pegasus Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee with the following Term of Reference:
 - To allocate annually under delegated authority, the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's Small Grants Fund – Local, in accordance with Council policy and the LTCCP.
- (d) Decide whether or not to appoint community representatives to the Burwood/Pegasus Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee.
- (e) Appoint up to five Board members to the Burwood/Pegasus Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee for the funding rounds 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14.
- (f) Authorise the Burwood/Pegasus Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee to appoint a Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson at its first meeting.
- (g) Set a quorum of five members for the Burwood/Pegasus Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee, one of whom must be an elected member.

19. BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD - RECESS COMMITTEE

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to put in place delegation arrangements for matters of a routine nature (including applications for funding) normally dealt with by the Board, to cover the period following its last scheduled meeting for 2010 (being 20 December 2010) up until the Board resumes normal meetings proposed to commence in January/February 2011.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In previous years, it has been normal practice for the Board to give delegated authority to the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson to make decisions on its behalf during this recess period.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- (a) That a Recess Committee comprising the Board Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson (or their nominees) be authorised to exercise the delegated powers of the Board for the period following its 20 December 2010 meeting up until the Board resumes normal business early in 2011.
- (b) That the application of any such delegation be reported back to the Board for record purposes.

20. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE

20.1 UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

20.2 BOARD MEETING DATES FOR 2011

20.3 CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S NOVEMBER 2010 COUNCIL UPDATE

(Refer **attached**)

21. BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS