

RICCARTON WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD

AGENDA

TUESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2010

AT 5PM

**IN THE BOARDROOM,
SOCKBURN SERVICE CENTRE
149 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, CHRISTCHURCH**

Community Board: Mike Mora (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen, Ishwar Ganda, Sam Johnson, Judy Kirk, and Peter Laloli.

Community Board Adviser

Liz Beaven

Telephone: 941-6501

Email: liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

	CLAUSE	
PART B	1.	APOLOGIES
PART C	2.	CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 23 NOVEMBER 2010
PART B	3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
PART B	4.	PETITIONS
PART B	5.	NOTICES OF MOTION
PART B	6.	CORRESPONDENCE
PART B	7.	BRIEFINGS
PART A	8.	ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2010/11
PART A	9.	ELECTED MEMBERS' EXPENSES AND ALLOWANCES 2010/11
PART C	10.	BLENHEIM ROAD, ANNEX ROAD AND SPARKS ROAD - PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTIONS IN CYCLE LANES
PART C	11.	CALVERTON PLACE – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION
PART C	12.	APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – JESSICA FITZGERALD
PART C	13.	GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS FOR NEW TERM

We're on the Web!

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

14.12.2010

- 2 -

- PART C 14. NEW ZEALAND LOCAL BOARDS AND COMMUNITY BOARDS CONFERENCE
2011 – BOARD MEMBERS ATTENDANCE
- PART C 15. RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD - RECESS COMMITTEE
- PART B 16. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
- PART B 17. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
- PART B 18. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 23 NOVEMBER 2010**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Tuesday 23 November 2010 are **attached**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 23 November 2010 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **PETITIONS**

5. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

7. **BRIEFINGS**

8. ELECTED MEMBERS' REMUNERATION 2010/11

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

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) 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, i.e. 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 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		\$1,134,559
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		\$675,120
<i>less 50% outside pool</i>			\$337,560
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, Democracy Services Manager

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 difference 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 (attached).

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."*

9 Cont'd

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”.

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.”*

9 Cont'd

- (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 18 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 2 hours or more with only time 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 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 \$15.00).
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).

9 Cont'd

23. Taking into account the Remuneration Authority's comments regarding thresholds in paragraphs 16 to 20 above, the full time nature of a position in paragraph 20, and the information in paragraph 22 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":
- (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 3-5 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. BLENHEIM ROAD, ANNEX ROAD AND SPARKS ROAD - PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTIONS IN CYCLE LANES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Paul Forbes, Assistant Traffic Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to install 'No Stopping' lines at all cycle lanes that are adjacent to the kerb that are not currently marked with no-stopping lines in the Riccarton/Wigram ward.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Prior to 2004, lanes marked for cyclists were not legally recognised as a special vehicle lane and vehicles were able to park in them. To overcome any issues with vehicles parking in these lanes specially marked for cyclists, 'No Stopping' lines were installed.
3. With the inclusion of cycle lanes as a special vehicle lane in 2004 as part of the Land Transport Rule, Traffic Control Device 2004, vehicles are now prohibited from parking in cycle lanes. This meant that "No Stopping" lines are no longer required as it is covered in the national road rules.
4. As a result some cycle lanes have therefore been installed without 'No Stopping' lines. The Parking Enforcement Officers are now experiencing difficulties in enforcing vehicles parked in the cycle lanes throughout the city where 'No Stopping' lines have not been installed.
5. Blenheim Road is a Major Arterial 60 kilometres per hour road. It has existing cycle lanes on the both sides of the road. High volumes of traffic use this road on a daily basis and there are limited access points onto and off this road. Some existing cycle lanes, on both the north and south side of the road between Curletts Road and Mandeville Street, do not have 'no stopping' restrictions. Staff are proposing to install 'no stopping' restrictions along these sections to complete the network and make it continuously 'no stopping'. The proposed sections of road to have 'no stopping' lines installed are shown in **Attachments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5**.
6. Annex Road is a 50 kilometres per hour road located in an industrial area. It has existing cycle lanes on both sides of the road and some parking bays are provided. This road is frequented by heavy goods vehicles and a wide cycle lane has been allowed to provide a buffer for the cyclists. Parts of this cycle lane could be mistaken as a parking area. Staff are proposing to install 'no stopping' restrictions as shown in **Attachment 4**.
7. Sparks Road is a Minor Arterial 60 kilometres per hour road. It has existing cycle lanes on both sides of the road leading into and out of the intersection of Halswell Road and Sparks Road and P30 time restricted parking bays are provided on both sides of the road. The kerb and flat channel on the northern side of Sparks Road ends at the entrance to the Halswell Library. From the south western corner of number 481 Sparks Road to the walkway entrance to Garforth Green there is a grass berm, footpath and cycle lane. The cycle lane and footpath are often confused for a parking area. Following a recent request from the public, improvements were made to help clearly define the footpath and cycle lane. Improvements made included sealing the cycle lane, removal of existing edge marker posts, installation of additional cycle and pedestrian symbols and installation of edge marker posts and no stopping signage. Staff are requesting that the Board retrospectively approve the 'no stopping' restrictions as shown in **Attachment 5**.
8. 'No Stopping' lines are to be installed within cycle lanes because if one vehicle is parked over the cycle lane road marking symbol it is unclear for the drivers of other vehicles that there is a cycle lane and they are not permitted to park in a cycle lane.
9. Installation of 'No Stopping' lines within these cycles lanes will remove any possible confusion regarding parking within a cycle lane which will instantly improve the safety for cyclists and increase the functionality of the cycle network.

10 Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. The estimated cost of this proposal is \$1,300.

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. 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.
13. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated 9 December 2010. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
14. 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?

15. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

16. 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?

17. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

18. 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?

19. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

20. No-one has been consulted in regard to the installation of these 'No Stopping' restrictions. We are formalising an existing situation and the installation of broken yellow lines confirms to road users that they cannot park in cycle lanes. There is no change to road users or residents living adjacent to these sections of road.
21. The Officer in Charge - Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.

10 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

Revoke the following parking restrictions:

- (a) All existing parking restrictions on the north side of Blenheim Road from its intersection with Curletts Road and extending in a easterly direction to its intersection with Hansons Lane.
- (b) All existing parking restrictions on the north side of Blenheim Road from its intersection with Picton Avenue and extending in a easterly direction to its intersection with Manderville Street.
- (c) All existing parking restrictions on the north-eastern side of Annex Road from its intersection with Lunns Road to its intersection with Birmingham Drive.
- (d) All existing parking restrictions on the south-western side of Annex Road from its intersection with Lunns Road to its intersection with Venture Place.
- (e) All existing parking restrictions on the north side of Sparks Road from its intersection with Halswell Road to its intersection with MacArtney Avenue.

Approve the following on Blenheim Road:

- (f) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Blenheim Road commencing at it's intersection with Curletts Road and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 123 metres.
- (g) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Blenheim Road commencing at a point 145 metres from the it's intersection with Curletts Road and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 241 metres.
- (h) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Blenheim Road commencing at a point 406 metres from it's intersection with Curletts Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 92 metres.
- (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Blenheim Road commencing at its intersection with Annex Road and extending in a westerly direction to its intersection with Hansons Lane.
- (j) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Blenheim Road commencing at its intersection with Picton Avenue and extending in an easterly direction to its intersection with Manderville Street.
- (k) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Blenheim Road commencing at its intersection with Foster Street and extending in a westerly direction to its intersection with Whiteleigh Road.
- (l) That a Bus Stop be installed on the north side of Blenheim Road commencing at a point 123 metres from it's intersection with Curletts Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 22 metres.
- (m) That a Bus Stop be installed on the north side of Blenheim Road commencing at a point 386 metres it's intersection with Curletts Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 20 metres.

Approve the following on Annex Road:

- (n) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north-eastern side of Annex Road commencing at its intersection with Lunns Road and extending in a south-easterly direction to its intersection with Midas Place.

10 Cont'd

- (o) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north-eastern side of Annex Road commencing at it's intersection with Lunns Road and extending in a south-easterly direction for a distance of 157 metres.
- (p) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north-eastern side of Annex Road commencing at a point 174 metres from it's intersection with Lunns Road and extending in a south-easterly direction to its intersection with Birmingham Drive.
- (q) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south-western side of Annex Road commencing at it's intersection with Nazareth Avenue and extending in a south-easterly direction for a distance of 26 metres.
- (r) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south-western side of Annex Road commencing at it's intersection with Venture Place and extending in a south-easterly direction for a distance of 52 metres.
- (s) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south-western side of Annex Road commencing at its intersection with Lunns Road and extending in a south-easterly direction to its intersection with Venture Place.
- (t) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 5 minutes on the north-eastern side of Annex Road commencing at a point 157 metres it's intersection with Midas Place and extending in a south-easterly direction for a distance of 17 metres.

Approve the following on Sparks Road:

- (u) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Sparks Road commencing at its intersection with Halswell Road and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 18 metres.
- (v) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 30 minutes on the north side of Sparks Road commencing at a point 18 metres in an easterly direction from its intersection with Halswell Road and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
- (w) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Sparks Road commencing at a point 34 metres west of its intersection with Halswell Road and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 138 metres.

11. CALVERTON PLACE – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Paul Forbes, Assistant Traffic Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval for the installation of no-stopping restrictions on the western side of Calverton Place.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Staff received a request from the Community Board, that a No Stopping Restriction be installed on the western side of Calverton Place. Please refer to the attached plan (**Attachment 1**).
3. This request was made because of parking in the narrow section of Calverton Place blocking access to other residences.
4. The Road User Rule section 6.1 states:
 - (a) *Vehicles must be parked with due care and consideration. A driver or person in charge of a vehicle must not stop, stand, or park the vehicle on a road, whether attended or unattended, without due care or without reasonable consideration for other road users.*

This rule can be difficult to enforce because if two drivers park their vehicles opposite each other restricting access to the street, each driver could argue that they were parked there first and therefore were parking with due care and consideration at the time that they parked.

5. Removing the legal ability to park on both sides of the street would greatly reduce the possibility of access to Calverton Place being restricted due to parking on both sides of the road.
6. Calverton Place is a cul de sac approximately 95 metres long. The width of the carriageway on Calverton Place is 5.6 metres. At present, if two drivers choose to park their vehicles opposite each other in Calverton Place, the lane width between the two vehicles would be insufficient to allow other vehicles access to the rest of the street. This has the potential to cause significant safety issues if emergency services vehicles were prevented from accessing residents of Calverton Place.
7. There are no current parking restrictions on Calverton Place.
8. Calverton Place has pedestrian access to a reserve at the northern end of the street.
9. Staff have consulted residents of Calverton Place on the proposed parking restrictions. Nine submissions were received. Four submissions fully support the proposal. Four submissions do not support the proposal. The remaining submission does not 100 percent support the proposal but agrees that there are issues accessing Calverton Place when vehicles are parked on both sides of the road.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$100.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with current LTCCP budgets?

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

11 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. 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.
13. 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
14. 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?

15. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

16. 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 current LTCCP?

17. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

19. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

20. Refer to paragraph 9 for details of consultation.
21. The Officer in Charge - Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the western side of Calverton Place commencing at its intersection with Patterson Terrace and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 60 metres.

12. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – JESSICA FITZGERALD

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
Author:	Denise Galloway, Community Development Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an application for funding from the Community Board's 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme. There is currently a balance of \$600 remaining in the Board's Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant Jessica Fitzgerald is 15 years and lives in Avonhead. Jessica is seeking a grant towards costs associated with travelling to Auckland as part of team that was selected to attend the New Zealand Future Problem Solving Nationals.
3. Jessica has been involved with Future Problem Solving Programme since 2005. While the length of time spent preparing for such an event varies, during school, those students who are participating in the programme, generally spend half an hour meeting together, per week. Prior to qualifying for a competition, this extends into several half hour meetings, as well as hours of school prepping which involves research and memorising categories.
4. The mission of the Future Problem Solving Programme International is to develop the ability of young people globally to design and promote positive futures using critical, creative thinking. Over 2000,000 students from around the world are involved and New Zealand teams have been highly successful at a number of international finals they have attended.
5. This year in New Zealand there are over 300 teams from schools around the country involved in the programme. Jessica's Future Problem Solving group won the practice competition this year and was selected to attend the Nationals in which they are amongst the top 10 of over 100 school teams. The group that Jessica is a part of was also placed sixth in the Nationals Competition in 2007.
6. Jessica believes that the Future Problem Solving Programme has taught her to think logically, as well as the importance of time management and organisation, and she considers that the Nationals would further enhance these skills. In particular, Jessica would like to put the skills she has developed back into the community through her coaching role with junior hockey teams.
7. Jessica was given extremely short notice regarding this event and was unable to undertake any fund raising at the time of her application to the Community Board on the 13th October. The event was held on the 29th October till the 31st October 2010.
8. The application was received prior to the event taking place which means it is eligible but at a time when the Board was not active due to the elections. It was held over until the new Board could consider it.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The following table provides a breakdown of funding requested:

12 Cont'd

JESSICA FITZGERALD	
EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
Airfares	348.00
Accommodation (Backpackers)	215.05
Shuttle Bus to accommodation and back, per person	38.00
Total	601.05

10. This is the first time that the applicant has applied to the Community Board's Youth Development Scheme.

11. Jessica has applied for \$400 towards costs associated with the trip.

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

12. Yes, see page 172, Youth Development Scheme and Discretionary Fund

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

13. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

14. Aligns with page 170 LTCCP, regarding Community Board Project funding.

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

15. Yes, see page 172, Youth Development Scheme and Discretionary Fund.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

16. Application aligns with the Council's Youth Strategy and local Community Board objectives.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

17. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board grant Jessica Fitzgerald \$200 from the 2010/11 Riccarton/Wigram Youth Development Scheme as a contribution towards her attendance at the 2010 New Zealand Future Problem Solving Nationals in Henderson.

13. GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS FOR NEW TERM

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Riccarton/Wigram Community Board has in the 2007/10 term operated with two standing committees: Transport and Greenspace and Community Services. Additionally the Board has maintained two Board meetings per month; one for main items of business and to receive the recommendations of the two Board committees, and the other as a Board minute confirmation meeting for the main Board meeting and any urgent items. In addition to the decision-making Board meetings, seminar meetings were scheduled prior to each Board and committee meeting if necessary. 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.
3. There are two options for the Board to consider for its governance structure for the new term.

Option One

4. A number of community boards over the previous term of the Council developed a programme of having two ordinary meetings in a calendar month. This allows for all items of business to be progressed on a regular basis and only debated on one occasion. The report of the Board meeting is then confirmed at the following fortnightly board meeting and then progressed to the next appropriate Council meeting.
5. In addition to meeting twice a month the Board could also decide to set up ad hoc committees to meet on an as required basis. These would not be standing committees. An ad hoc committee may be established to consider a particular issue that needs more consideration, e.g. the commissioning of a public artwork in the ward.

Option Two

6. A second option is to decide to operate with a standing committee structure where committees have specific subject areas and consider all reports first. The Board would then have one ordinary meeting a month to which the reports of the committee meetings are put along with any urgent issues; the second Board meeting to act purely as a minute confirmation meeting for the main Board meeting. If the Board adopts a committee structure then some reports where Council is making the decision but the matter has also been referred to the Board (Part A reports), could be debated at three separate meetings by elected members. Variances include: giving one or more of the committees delegated authority (power to act); establishing the committees as a committee of the whole with all members being on the committees; or establishing the committees with three or four members only.

Previous Structure

7. This is the structure that the Riccarton/Wigram Board operated in the previous term. All Board members were members of each committee.

13 Cont'd

Committee	Areas of Responsibility
Transport and Greenspace (meetings generally monthly)	All issues relating to roads (traffic management, cycleways, pedestrian facilities), street works and (major) infrastructure activities and capital works implementation and overseeing, all aspects of "environment" (air, water, etc) and parks/open space, wetland and waterways, biodiversity, reserve management plans, parks and waterways capital works implementation and overseeing. The Committee had no delegated authority.
Community Services (meetings generally monthly)	People/community activities, including facilities, community advocacy for children, elderly etc, arts, community events, heritage, school activity programmes, social initiatives, sport and leisure, cultural. The Committee had delegated authority to approve Riccarton/Wigram Youth Development Scheme grants.

Structure for 2010/13

8. For this term, the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Board are proposing that the Board has three standing committees: Transport and Greenspace, Community Services and Planning & Regulatory. The proposed committee structure and areas of responsibility are set out below:

Committee	Areas of Responsibility
Transport and Greenspace (meetings generally monthly)	All issues relating to roads (traffic management, cycleways, pedestrian facilities), street works and (major) infrastructure activities and capital works implementation and overseeing, all aspects of "environment" (air, water, etc) and parks/open space, wetland and waterways, biodiversity, reserve management plans, parks and waterways capital works implementation and overseeing.
Community Services (meetings generally monthly)	All issues relating to people/community activities, including facilities, community advocacy for children, elderly etc, arts, community events, heritage, school activity programmes, social initiatives, sport and leisure, and cultural.
Planning & Regulatory	All issues relating to strategies, policies, and bylaws, plan changes, subdivisions, designations, boundary adjustments, liquor licensing, and sale of Council assets.

9. The Board may wish to trial the governance structure for six months from February 2011 and carry out a review in August 2011.

13 Cont'd

10. In addition, staff are proposing 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. Each Community Board will have a Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee to allocate their Small Grants Fund (SGF). Total \$72,529 for this Board.
14. 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
 - Knowledge of various communities of interest.
 - The ability to be articulate and assertive.
15. After nominations have been received, staff will report back to the Community Board (Public Excluded Report) with details of nominees in order for the Board to decide upon their chosen representatives.
16. The membership of the Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee needs to be set 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.
17. The term of appointment for community representatives will be for three years, i.e. until 2013/14, and will be on a voluntary basis.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

18. Provision is made in the 2009 – 19 LTCCP on page 115 for the elected member representation and governance support.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

19. Clause 30 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 provides that community boards may appoint committees that it considers appropriate and clause 32 (3) of the same schedule provides for community boards to delegate powers to a committee.

13 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

20. Page 111 of the LTCCP level of service under democracy and governance.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

21. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

22. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Decide on its governance structure for the 2010/13 term.
- (b) In the event of establishing any standing committees as part of its decision under (a) above, appoint a Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of any such committee.
- (c) Establish the Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee with the following Term of Reference:
 - (i) allocate annually under delegated authority, the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board's Small Grants Fund – Local, in accordance with the Council policy and the LTCCP.
- (d) Decide whether or not to appoint community representatives to the Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee.
- (e) Appoint up to five Board members to the Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee for the funding rounds 2011/12, 2012/13 and 2013/14.
- (f) Authorise the Riccarton/Wigram 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 Riccarton/Wigram Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee, one of whom must be an elected member.
- (h) Review the Board's governance structure in July 2011.

14. NEW ZEALAND LOCAL BOARDS AND COMMUNITY BOARDS CONFERENCE 2011 – BOARD MEMBERS ATTENDANCE

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for a number of Riccarton/Wigram Community Board members to attend the 2011 New Zealand Local Boards and Community Boards Conference in Rotorua on 5 to 7 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 (**Attachment 1**).
3. The programme includes key-note speakers and inter-active 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 17 August 2010 this Board made a recommendation to the incoming Board to:
 - (a) *consider submitting an entry or entries to the New Zealand Community Boards' Best Practice Awards 2011 by 4 February 2011 and*
 - (b) *that the following projects be put forward as suggestions that the incoming Board may wish to consider: Mandeville Park Mural, Riccarton Service Centre relocation, C L Smith Fountain Restoration, 24/7 Youth Workers, Zebedees Night Club for Youth, Halswell Domain extension, or Riccarton High School Cycle Bubble Project*

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. The conference registration cost for each appointed delegate is \$591 excluding GST, noting this is the earlybird rate until close of business on 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 \$3,632.67 has the necessary conference and training funding available to fund two Board members to attend.

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

14 Cont'd

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.

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 number of Board members to the 2011 New Zealand Local Boards and Community Boards Conference in Rotorua from 5 to 7 May 2011.

15. RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD - RECESS COMMITTEE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Liz Beaven, 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 14 December 2010) up until the Board resumes normal meetings proposed to commence in February 2011.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In past 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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- (a) That a Recess Committee comprising the Board Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson (and two Board members) be authorised to exercise the delegated powers of the Board for the period following its 14 December 2010 meeting up until the Board resumes normal business in February 2011.
- (b) That the application of any such delegation be reported back to the Board for record purposes.

14.12.2010

- 29 -

- 16. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
- 17. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- 18. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**