

**RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

TUESDAY 29 JUNE 2010

AT 5PM

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

Community Board: Peter Laloli (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen, Beth Dunn, Judy Kirk, Mike Mora and Bob Shearing.

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

- | | | |
|---------------|------------|---|
| PART B | 1. | APOLOGIES |
| PART C | 2. | CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 15 JUNE 2010 |
| PART B | 3. | DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT |
| PART B | 4. | PETITIONS |
| PART B | 5. | NOTICE OF MOTION |
| PART B | 6. | CORRESPONDENCE |
| PART B | 7. | BRIEFINGS |
| PART A | 8. | DAWSONS ROAD - PROPOSED PROHIBITED TIMES OF ACCESS AND PARKING ON ROAD |
| PART A | 9 | PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES |
| PART B | 10. | REVIEW OF CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANT FUND |
| PART C | 11. | ESTABLISHMENT OF THE 2010/11 RICCARTON/WIGRAM YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME |
| PART C | 12. | APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – SAM RAYNER STEELE |

29. 6. 2010

- 2 -

- PART C 13. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – AMY ROSE PFEIFER
- PART C 14. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – JOSHUA GARMONSWAY
- PART C 15. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – DAVID BELLAMY
- PART C 16. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – DEBIE JOI PAULL
- PART C 17. RICCARTON/WIGRAM TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE COMMITTEE MEETING REPORT – 21 JUNE 2010
- PART B 18. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
- PART B 19. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
- PART B 20. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
- PART C 21. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 15 JUNE 2010**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Tuesday 15 June 2010 are **attached**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 15 June 2010 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **PETITIONS**

5. **NOTICE OF MOTION**

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

7. **BRIEFINGS**

8. DAWSONS ROAD - PROPOSED PROHIBITED TIMES OF ACCESS AND PARKING ON ROAD

General Manager responsible:	General Manager of City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Paul Forbes, Network Operations and Traffic Systems Team

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board' recommendation to the Council to prohibit motor vehicles weighing less than 3,500 kilograms from entering and/or being used on Dawsons Road, between West Coast Road and Jones Road, from 9pm to 5am Monday to Sunday (refer **Attachment 1**).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council has received a request from Selwyn District Council (SDC) to add Dawsons Road to the "Prohibited Roads" under Clause 15 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008. SDC have added the section of Dawsons Road between Jones Road and Maddisons Road to their Bylaw and intend to include the remainder of Dawsons Road (Maddisons Road to West Coast Road) in the near future. To allow enforcement to be carried out, both Councils must include the road on their respective Traffic and Parking Bylaw.
3. Dawsons Road is a boundary road between the Christchurch City Council (CCC) and SDC. Being a reasonably remote rural road it attracts anti-social drivers (boy racers) at night that behave badly, doing burn-outs, racing, vandalising property and leaving broken bottles and rubbish. The fact that very few people reside in Dawsons Road contributes to this group congregating in this area.
4. The Police are aware of these issues on Dawsons Road but without Dawsons Road being added to the CCC bylaw there is little they can do to deter this behaviour. The Police have powers to deal with offences relating to the lack of traction of vehicles and the speed of vehicles. However, this behaviour will usually have stopped by the time the police arrive on the scene and can start up again minutes after they leave. By prohibiting both the spectators and the participants from taking their cars on the road, the problems go away.
5. The most effective way to achieve this is to prohibit those vehicles from using or parking on the road unless they are business/residential owners/occupiers, employees, service or emergency personnel, or bona fide visitors of properties within Dawsons Road.
6. The times that this prohibition operates in the SDC's "Traffic and Parking Bylaw" is 9pm to 5am Monday to Friday. This varies from the times that the CCC's policy states for a residential road which is 10pm to 5am Thursday to Sunday and 10pm to 5am on public holidays. For police to be able to enforce the recommendation in this report the hours of prohibition have been adjusted to match SDC hours.
7. Refer to paragraphs 17, 18 & 19 for consultation details.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. An estimated cost for this work is \$5,400. Selwyn District Council has agreed to pay half of the above cost.

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

9. The installation of road signs and markings are within the LTCCP Transport and Greenspace operational budgets.

8. Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. Clause 15 (1) of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides that "The Council may by resolution specify any road or part of a road and the days and times during which motor vehicles weighing less than 3,500 kilograms are prohibited from being used on the road or part of that road or roads."
11. The installation of any restriction signs and/ or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

12. As noted in paragraphs 10 and 11.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. Aligns with the Transport and Greenspace activities by contributing to the Council's Community outcomes Safety and Community.

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

14. This contributes to improve the level of service for safety and access.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

15. The recommendations align with the Council's Safer Christchurch Strategy and Litter Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

16. As noted in paragraph 15.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. The Police support the proposal.
18. The six residences on Dawsons Road that are within the Christchurch City Council boundaries were consulted on the proposal. Four replies were received, all of which were in support of the proposal.
19. The Templeton Residents' Association support the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board recommend to the Council that pursuant to the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008, Part 2, clause 15, motor vehicles weighing less than 3,500 kilograms are prohibited from being operated on Dawsons Road between West Coast Road and Jones Road between 9pm and 5am, Monday to Sunday.

TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

9. PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941- 8608
Officer responsible:	Manager Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Shane Moohan, City Arborist

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to request that the Board consider and provide comments to refer to the Council on the proposed amendments to the Council's existing delegations on trees.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Workshops with Councillors were held in June and September 2008 to discuss suggested changes to the current tree delegations.
3. The Combined Community Board Chairs Forum on 13 October 2008 requested that a working party made up of both staff and one nominated member from each Community Board be formed to work through issues relating to a City wide Tree Policy.
4. Since then the Tree Policy Working Party has met five times to prepare the Proposed Tree Policy document (**attachment 1**). Issues that arose during these discussions that were outside of the scope of the Working Party are documented and were presented to Council in a Memorandum on 10 December 2010.
5. An initial draft policy was developed which encompassed suggested changes to the current delegations as well as operational issues for planting, maintaining and removing trees. It did not cover future direction for trees in Christchurch as this would be more appropriately addressed in a strategic document.
6. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs Forum recommended –
 - (a) That this initial draft Proposed Tree Policy be presented to Council for adoption.
 - (b) That the Working Party Memorandum be presented to Council for consideration.
7. The Council workshop on 23 February 2010 requested that an amended Proposed Tree Policy be presented to Council with the recommendation that it be adopted for consultation with Community Boards.

The amendments to the Proposed Tree Policy included changes to –

- (a) 3.1 Tree Management
- (b) 3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces, clauses (i) (k) and (m).
- (c) 6 Definitions, Affected Community and Publicly Owned Land.
- (d) 4 Relevant Delegations, Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to Council for a decision.

A full break down of the amendments is found in paragraph 43.

8. On 25 March 2010 the Council adopted the amended Proposed Tree Policy for consultation with Community Boards.

9. Cont'd

9. The amended Proposed Tree Policy is now **attached**, together with a comments form template (**attachment 6**), tree removal process map (**attachment 3**), tree maintenance process map (**attachment 4**) and tree planting process map (**attachment 5**) to assist Boards with their discussions.
10. The recommendation is that the amended Proposed Tree Policy be adopted subject to formal consideration of the comments offered by all of the Community Boards.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

11. Adoption of the Proposed Tree Policy is not expected to have significant effects on operational or capital budgets.
12. The Proposed Tree Policy suggests that there is a "user pays" process for some tree planting (3.3.1 Commemorative Trees), some tree pruning (3.7 Pruning Trees in Public Spaces) and some tree removals (3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces, 3.5 Requests to Remove Trees in Public Spaces, 3.6 Cost of Removal of Trees in Public Spaces). This involves the actual cost to complete the work and the cost incurred in gathering sufficient information for Community Boards to make an informed decision where the requested service is not considered 'business as usual' and falls outside of approved Activity Management Plan levels of service .
13. The Proposed Tree Policy also suggests that for some tree removals that applicants pay for the value of the tree (3.6 Cost of Removal of Trees in Public Spaces). The value of the tree is based on the Standard Tree Evaluation Method (STEM) which is the nationally recognised system for evaluating and valuing trees (see "Definitions" in Proposed Tree Policy).
14. Should the suggested "user pays" process for tree removal and pruning be adopted, this will have financial implications for some members of the public.
15. Should the suggested user pays system be adopted this will need to be incorporated into the Council's Fees and Charges Schedule under Section 12 Local Government Act 2002.

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

16. The recommendations align with the current LTCCP budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

17. Alignment with Principal legislation –
 - (a) Resource Management Act 1991.
 - (i) Banks Peninsula District Plan.
 - (ii) City of Christchurch City Plan.
 - (b) Reserves Act 1977.
 - (c) Biosecurity Act 1993.
 - (d) Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992 plus amendments and regulations.
 - (e) Electricity Act 1992 plus regulations.
 - (f) Telecommunications Act 2001.
 - (g) Property Law Act 2007.

9. Cont'd

- (h) Public Works Act 1981.
- (i) Local Government Act 1974 and 2002.
- (j) Christchurch City Council Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008.

18. The following Council Policies will need to be rescinded –

- (a) Tree Planting in Streets Policy.
- (b) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404.
- (c) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636.
- (d) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236.
- (e) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178.

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

- 19. The Council has the legal right to adopt the Proposed Tree Policy.
- 20. Irrespective of Council Policies and Strategies the District Court can order the pruning or removal of trees under The Property Law Act 2007.
- 21. Irrespective of Council Policies and Strategies some pruning and removal of protected trees may require a Resource Consent be granted prior to work to being undertaken.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

- 22. Recommendation aligns with current LTCCP and Activity Management Plans.

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

23. Supports the following Levels of Service –

- (a) 6.0 Neighbourhood Parks.
6.06 Planted areas and trees.
- (b) 6.1 Sports Parks.
6.1.8 Maintain planted areas and trees.
- (c) 6.2 Garden and Heritage Parks.
6.2.9 Planted areas and trees.
- (d) 6.3 Regional Parks
6.3.2 Protecting biodiversity values
- (e) 6.4 Cemeteries.
6.4.8 Maintain planted areas and trees.
- (f) 6.5 Waterways and Land Drainage
6.5.3 Cost of maintaining waterways and land drainage system.

9. Cont'd

- (g) 10.0 Road Network.
10.0.11 Road landscaping and street trees.

24. Supports the Capital tree replacement programmes for street and park trees.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

25. There is currently no overarching city wide policy for vegetation management. In the Memorandum from the Tree Policy Working Party (**attachment 2**) it is suggested that funding for the commencement of a City wide policy be included for consideration in the next LTCCP.

26. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with the following Strategies–

- (a) New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy.
- (b) Christchurch City Council Biodiversity Strategy 2008-2035.

27. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with Council Policies –

- (a) Traffic Calming Policy.
- (b) Sponsorship of Trees and Other Plantings on Reserves.
- (c) Proposed Central City Street Tree Plan.
- (d) Central City Streetscape Plan.
- (e) Consultation Policy.

28. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with the following sections of the Christchurch City Plan -

Volume 2: Section 4 City Identity.

4.2.1 Policy: Tree Cover.

To promote amenity values in the urban area by maintaining and enhancing the tree cover present in the City.

Tree cover and vegetation make an important contribution to amenity values in the City. Through the redevelopment of sites, existing vegetation is often lost and not replaced. The City Plan protects those trees identified as “heritage” or “notable” and the subdivision process protects other trees which are considered to be “significant”. The highest degree of protection applies to heritage trees.

Because Christchurch is largely built on a flat plain, trees and shrubs play an important role in creating relief, contributing to visual amenity and attracting native birds.

The amount of private open space available for new planting and to retain existing trees is influenced by rules concerning building density and setback from boundaries. The rules do not require new planting for residential development but landscaping is required in business zones.

4.2.2 Policy: Garden City

To recognise and promote the “Garden City” identity, heritage and character of Christchurch.

9. Cont'd

A key aspect of achieving this policy will be maintaining and extending environments and vegetation types which compliment this image. A broad range of matters influence and contribute to this image, including the following:

- (a) Tree-lined streets and avenues.
- (b) Parks and developed areas of open space.

14.3.2 Policy: "Garden City" image identity.

To acknowledge and promote the "Garden City" identity of the City by protecting, maintaining and extending planting which compliments this image.

Volume 3: Part 8 Special Purpose Zone

14.3.5 Street Trees

Nearly half the length of streets within the city contains street trees, but the presence of very high quality street trees which add considerable presence to streets and neighbourhoods is confined to a relatively small proportion of the road network. These streets add particular character and amenity of the city, either in the form of avenues which form points into the city, or an important part of the local character of particular streets.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

- 29. All eight Community Boards appointed representatives to the Tree Policy Working Party to ensure their Ward's views and concerns were represented.
- 30. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs Forum recommended that the Proposed Tree Policy be presented to Council for adoption.
- 31. No public consultation has been undertaken as this document is intended for internal use.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Board:

- (a) review and provide comment on the attached Proposed Tree Policy and the proposed changes to delegations.
- (b) recommend to the Council that the Proposed Tree Policy be adopted subject to formal consideration of the comments offered by all of the Community Boards.
- (c) recommend to the Council that the following policies be rescinded:
 - (i) Tree Planting in Streets Policy.
 - (ii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404.
 - (iii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636.
 - (iv) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236.
 - (v) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178.

9. Cont'd

- (d) recommend to the Council that the following delegations be rescinded:

Greenspace Manager:

"In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control. (CR 23.10.96)"

Community Boards:

"To plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council. (CR 13.12.07)"

- (e) recommend to the Council that the following changes to delegations be made -

That the following delegations for the policy be made:

- (i) The Transport and Greenspace Manager on the recommendation of the City Arborist and relevant infrastructure Manager where appropriate has delegated authority for the planting of trees under Section 3.3 and the removal of trees under Section 3.4 and the pruning of trees under Section 3.7 of this policy.
- (ii) The relevant Community Board has delegated authority in consultation with the Transport and Greenspace Manager and relevant infrastructure Manager to decide on any tree matter that either falls outside of the Transport and Greenspace Manager's delegation or, after consultation with affected parties, has remained contentious and is unable to be resolved by the Transport and Greenspace Manager.
- (iii) In emergency situations, the Transport and Greenspace Manager or the City Arborist have full delegated powers to negate immediate danger.
- (iv) Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to the Council for a decision.

TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That the matter lay on the table until such time as an additional seminar can be conducted to complete the Committee's discussion on the proposed Tree Policy for Trees on Publicly Owned Land or Spaces, then the report to be represented to the Transport and Greenspace Committee for a recommendation to the Board.

9. Cont'd

BACKGROUND

32. On 12 June 2008 a workshop was held to discuss potential changes to the tree delegations.

Currently delegations are:

Greenspace Manager -

"In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control. (CR 23.10.96)"

Community Boards -

"To plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council. (CR 13.12.07)"

33. Changes were suggested to enable:
- (a) Clear parameters over what decisions staff can make.
 - (b) Greater clarity over when decisions are to be made by Community Boards.
 - (c) Timely and pragmatic decisions for residents requesting tree removals.
34. As a result of this meeting a Memo was issued to the Mayor, Councillors and Community Board Members on 1 August 2008 outlining the current tree delegations for the Community Boards and the Greenspace Manager, suggesting changes to the delegations, the reasons why the changes were being suggested and safe guards.
35. On 29 September 2008 a further workshop was held providing an outline of issues faced by the arborists. These included -
- (a) Removal, replacement, removing otherwise healthy trees.
 - (b) Pruning trees under power lines causing disfigurement to the tree.
 - (c) Removing trees which are overcrowded.
 - (d) Removing trees of poor shape.
 - (e) Removing trees which pose a health and safety risk.
36. Proposals to clarify staff delegations were mainly around tree removal and tree planting. Some guidelines around staff decisions on tree removal and planting were suggested. These included the significance of the tree to be removed and the agreement of affected parties. Guidelines around tree planting included aligning to strategies or plans or direction, maintaining design integrity (e.g. Living Streets), maintaining existing levels of service for provision of street and park trees, and agreement of affected parties.
37. On 13 October 2008 the Combined Community Board Chairs forum requested that a working party made up of both staff and one nominated member from each Community Board be formed to work through issues relating to a tree policy.
38. The Working Party was made up of the following Community Board Members –
- | | |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| Paula Smith | Lyttleton/Mt Herbert (Chairperson) |
| Matt Morris | Shirley/Papanui (Deputy Chairperson) |

9. Cont'd

Tim Carter	Hagley/Ferrymead
Mike Mora	Riccarton/Wigram
Val Carter	Fendalton/Waimairi
Stewart Miller	Akaroa/Wairewa
Linda Stewart	Burwood/Pegasus
Karolyn Potter	Spreydon/Heathcote
Tim Scandrett	Spreydon/Heathcote (proxy)

39. The following Terms of Reference were drawn up to guide the Working Party in its discussions -
- (a) Clarify understanding around proposed changes to the tree delegations.
 - (b) Clarify staff and Community Board roles in tree maintenance i.e. business as usual vs pruning for views or shade or light and cost recovery with pruning for views or shade or light.
 - (c) Clarify staff and Community Board roles in tree planting and removals and cost recovery with tree removal and replacement planting.
 - (d) Consider the application of STEM (Standard Tree Evaluation Method) in its application to tree maintenance and removal decision making.
 - (e) Recommend any changes to existing delegations or the implementation of a Tree Policy following on from discussions over the above.
40. During Working Party discussions matters that were outside of the scope were raised. These were detailed in a Memorandum from the Working Party and presented to Council.
41. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs recommended that the Proposed Tree Policy be forwarded to the Council for adoption.
42. On 10 December 2009 the Proposed Tree Policy went to the Council for adoption with the following recommendations –
- a) Rescind the following Policies –
 - (i) Tree Planting in Streets Policy.
 - (ii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404.
 - (iii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636.
 - (iv) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236.
 - (v) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178.
 - b) Adopt the Proposed Tree Policy including the following delegations:
 - (i) The Transport and Greenspace Manager on the recommendation of the City Arborist and relevant infrastructure Manager where appropriate has delegated authority for the planting of trees under Section 3.3 (Planting and Planting of Trees in Public Spaces) and the removal of trees under Section 3.4 (Removal of Trees in Public Spaces) and the pruning of trees under Section 3.7 (Pruning Trees in Public Spaces) of this policy.

9. Cont'd

- (ii) The relevant Community Board has delegated authority in consultation with the Transport and Greenspace Manager and relevant infrastructure Manager to decide on any tree matter that either falls outside of the Transport and Greenspace Manager's delegation or, after consultation with affected parties, has remained contentious and is unable to be resolved by the Transport and Greenspace Manager.

43. At a February 2010 workshop Council requested that an amended Proposed Tree Policy be brought to Council with the recommendation that it be adopted for consultation with Community Boards.

The suggested amendments were –

3.1 Tree Management

Delete - "ecology - by"

Insert - "Enhancing and protecting the surrounding environment and safeguarding biodiversity"

3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces

- (i) Delete - "significant" and insert "have only a minor detrimental effect".
- (k) Insert - "Control of roadside pests that are listed in the Canterbury Regional Pest Management Strategy 2005-2015 in Banks Peninsula remain the responsibility of the adjacent land owner".
- (m) Insert - "that is not listed as a threatened or endangered species either locally or nationally or internationally".

Section 4 - Relevant Delegations

Insert - paragraph 3.

"Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to Council for a decision".

6. Definitions

Affected Community table – delete - "<" and insert - "approximate maximum"

Affected Community table Local Park – delete - "key stakeholders e.g. sports groups, lessees"

Affected Community (a) – delete - "significant" and insert - "important"

Publicly owned land - delete "regional parks, sports parks, cemeteries" after "road reserve either formed or unformed" insert "excluding arterial roads"

44. On 25 March 2010 the Council adopted the amended Proposed Tree Policy for consultation with Community Boards.

10. REVIEW OF CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANT FUND

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Liveable Cities
Author:	Katie Smith, Neighbourhood Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This report is to review the existing Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy and propose a revised policy for consideration by the eight Community Boards for grant funding of maintenance of character houses located within Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula. The views of the Community Board's will be reported back to the Council's Regulatory and Planning Committee.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In March 2004 the Council resolved to provide grant funding towards the external maintenance of pre-1945 character houses to assist in their retention and continuing contribution to the residential amenity and identity of their local areas. This was implemented for a period of four years from July 2006 to run until July 2010. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy required a review of the success of the grants after this initial four year period.
3. The historic fabric of Christchurch comprises both heritage listed and non-listed character buildings in both residential and commercial use. City Plan Listed Heritage Buildings and Items are protected by the rules set out in the City Plan and entitled to grants for internal and external repairs and maintenance under the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy. Listed heritage, however, makes up a small proportion of the older housing stock that contribute to the character and heritage of the city.
4. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants fulfil an important role in the retention of non-listed heritage buildings which contribute to the character and heritage of Christchurch. Without these maintenance grants there is no other source of financial help or encouragement for property owners to retain these buildings and the loss of such buildings has been noted in many areas of the city as eroding the character of the older suburbs.
5. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants were intended to provide a small financial contribution towards the external upgrading and maintenance of homes which have a distinctive visual character and make a key contribution to the quality of the local streetscape and the community identity. In 2009/10 a total of \$47,500 was available through the Character Housing Grant Fund with an average grant approval of \$1,408 over the 25 applications approved. Staff time on administration of the grants is approximately 0.3 of a full time equivalent position.
6. The objectives of the review are to ensure the Fund operates effectively both for the Council and the applicants, that it supports the retention of character homes, and to raise awareness of this grant fund.
7. The policy sets out the criteria by which the effectiveness of the grant scheme will be assessed and includes community acceptance, improvements in street amenity and local identify and retention of character houses. The policy also requires the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Panel to consider each annual round against these criteria. Those annual discussions have led to a number of the recommendations in this report aimed at making the Character Housing Maintenance Grants more effective. Feedback has also been received from some of the grant applicants.
8. The effectiveness of the grants against the criteria is assessed in the following:
 - *Community acceptance*; there has been a significant interest in the grant scheme as shown by the receipt of 154 applications, and numerous enquiries each year.

10 Cont'd

- *Improvements in street amenity and local identity; of the 154 applications, 72 (approximately 50 per cent) have uplifted grant funding in the past four years. These grants have been for a range of works including external painting, window and roof replacement and replacement/repair of building features such as veranda details. These improvements have all contributed to the amenity of the street scene and the identity of the local area.*
 - *Retention of character houses in an area including those that have not received grants; the grant process requires the applicant to commit to non demolition or relocation of the property for the next 10 years thereby ensuring the property continues to contribute to the street scene and local identity. It is difficult to quantify the impact upon the retention of character properties that have not received a grant as there are many other factors that would influence their retention including market conditions over the past four years.*
 - *Effectiveness of the management and administration of the programme; each year the grant fund has not been fully allocated nor all grants uplifted. The review identifies that there are three main factors that limit the success of the grants: the low quantum of grant funding; the restrictive grant conditions and criteria; the administrative process. All of these issues are explained in more detail in the background section of this report.*
9. On the basis of this assessment, the Character Housing Maintenance Grants have been a cost effective mechanism for recognising the contribution that character homes make towards street scene and local identity. The additional recommendations in this report are aimed at reinforcing the intention of the grants to focus at the local level and further supporting that effectiveness and administrative efficiency.
10. The background section of this report contains a summary of the effectiveness of the grant process, a review of the selection criteria, conditions of the grant and options for a revised policy.
11. Three options have been considered:
- the status quo;
 - continuing with the current Character Housing Maintenance Grants with minor changes to the existing policy and process;
 - applications being approved by each Community Board with the fund allocated between the eight Community Boards who can determine applications throughout the year, along with minor changes to the existing policy and process.

It is recommended that the third option is progressed. The share of the fund will be based on the number of residential properties within each ward built before 1945 (source: *Christchurch City Council Valuation Hub Database*).

12. The proposed revisions to the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy, should the preferred option be adopted, are shown in **Attachment 1**. The revised Policy will be reviewed in three years to monitor the effectiveness of the revised grants system.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

13. Provision has been made for a Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund of \$45,310 per annum for 2010/11. Each property is restricted to a total maximum grant funding of \$5,000. Staff time is provided for in operational budgets.
14. The current policy has one pool of funding and is allocated by the Character Housing Grants Panel. In the preferred option outlined in this report each Community Board is allocated a proportion of the Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund. Allocating a proportion of the grant fund to each of the Community Boards will enable each Board to be responsible for making decisions on the grant applications it receives, reinforces an original intention of the grants scheme was to focus at the local level and would provide a stronger mechanism to encourage applications. The proportion for each Community Board is based on the number of properties located within its ward that were built before 1945. Table 1 below details the proposed distribution of funding between the Community Boards (note that figures have been rounded).

10 Cont'd

Table 1: Character Housing Maintenance Grants Community Board Funding Allocation

Community Board	Number of properties pre 1945	% of properties pre 1945	Budget
Lyttelton-Mt Herbert	760	4.1%	\$1,860
Akaroa-Wairewa	221	1.2%	\$540
Burwood-Pegasus	1,571	8.5%	\$3,845
Fendalton-Waimairi	1,977	10.7%	\$4,835
Hagley-Ferrymead	5,311	28.7%	\$12,990
Riccarton-Wigram	797	4.3%	\$1,950
Shirley-Papanui	2,966	16.0%	\$7,260
Spreydon-Heathcote	4,918	26.6%	\$12,030
Total Christchurch	18,521	100.0%	\$45,310

15. The current policy requires that grants not uplifted within the financial year lapse.
16. The preferred option allows a period of 11 months for applicants to complete the works and uplift the grant. This will require the end of year carry forward of funds for those grants that will not be uplifted until the following financial year.
17. The current policy restricts the grant funding to a maximum of 10 per cent of the total costs of the external maintenance works (excluding GST) up to a maximum of \$5,000 per property.
18. The preferred option will give each Community Board the discretion to award applicants between 10 per cent to 20 per cent of the external maintenance cost (excluding GST) up to a maximum of \$5,000 per property. This increases from a maximum of 10 per cent in the current policy. It will also allow for additional applications for properties to be submitted once the original grant has been uplifted and will be dependent upon available funds and to a maximum limit of \$5,000 in total grants per property.

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

19. Yes, the Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund is provided for in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

20. The current policy requires the non-demolition and non-relocation of the property for a period of ten years. This condition has been dealt with through a written agreement from the applicant not to demolish or relocate the property and is monitored by placing a property note on the Land Information Memorandum (LIM). Whilst this does not have the legal standing of a covenant, it does require the owner to state their intention to retain the property and the agreement will be highlighted to the Council's consent planners should any application for demolition or relocation be received.
21. The preferred option will retain this need for the property owner to agree in writing not to relocate or demolish the property within 10 years of the uptake of the grant and will continue to be monitored through the LIM note on the property file. This is considered an appropriate form of agreement for implementing the non-demolition and non-relocation requirements of the policy given the low value of the individual grants.
22. The current policy is not explicit about grant payback should demolition or relocation occur within the ten-year period. The preferred option is to include a clause requiring payback under these circumstances. Should the grant recipient decide not to pay back the grant money upon demolition or relocation of the building then consideration would need to be taken on a case-by-case basis as to what, if any, legal proceedings should follow.

10 Cont'd

23. The existing Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy also requires that should the property be sold within five years of the grant payment then the applicant must repay the grant to the Council for future reallocation. There have been a number of grants paid back due to applicants selling their properties within five years, yet post-sale these properties continue to contribute to the street scene. This approach is also inconsistent with the Heritage Incentive Grants, where there is no requirement for grants to be paid back should the property be sold.
24. The preferred option will not require the payback of the grant should the property be sold. The intent of the policy is around the character of the property and the contribution of the property to the street environment. This revision will not impact upon the intent of the policy and may encourage more applications.

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

25. Yes, see above

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

26. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants are accounted for in the 2009-2019 LTCCP and align with the Activity Management Plans, Activity 1.4: Heritage Protection by providing grants in order to maintain and protect heritage items and values which contribute to a unique city and community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past.

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

27. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

28. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants align with the Liveable City Strategic Directions and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy in that it maintains and enhances the quality of the development and renewal of the city's built environment by protecting Christchurch's heritage buildings and neighbourhood character.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

29. Yes, the recommendations will enable the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Fund to operate effectively.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

30. Each of the eight Community Boards will be consulted with in regards to the proposed changes to the policy and process and a summary of the Community Boards comments and recommendations will be provided to the Council.
31. Comments from the Character Housing Grant Panel and grant applicants have been taken into consideration in formulating the revised policy.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Consider the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Fund Review report and provide feedback for staff to report to the Council's Regulatory and Planning Committee; and
- (b) Note the preferred option, Option C, for the allocation of the Character Housing Maintenance Grants to be determined by the individual Community Boards and the process as set out in the revised Operational Policy attached as **Attachment 1**.

10 Cont'd

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

32. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants have been available to owners of character dwellings in Christchurch and Banks Peninsula since July 2006 and have offered grants of 10 per cent (up to a maximum of \$5,000 excluding GST) for external maintenance works to upgrade the external appearance of residential properties that make a key contribution to the quality and identity of local streets.
33. The existing policy has been operating for the past four years with a budget of \$100,000 in the first three years and \$47,500 in the final year. The allocation of funds for each year are as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Annual allocation of Character Housing Grants

Financial Year	Number of grants approved	Total value of grants approved	Total number of grants uplifted	Total value of grants uplifted
2006/07 Fund available \$100,000	42 of 64 applications	\$47,573 (average \$1,133)	22	\$22,883 (average \$1,040)
2007/08 Fund available \$100,000	26 of 28 applications	\$33,039 (average \$1,271)	17	\$19,844 (average \$1,167)
2008/09 Fund available \$100,000	27 of 36 applications	\$43,573 (average \$1,614)	17	\$25,893 (average \$1,523)
2009/10 Fund available \$47,500	25 of 26 applications	\$35,192 (average \$1,408)	TBC	TBC

34. Decisions on grant applications are currently made by the Character Housing Grants Panel (comprising one member from each Community Board), following consideration and a recommendation by the relevant Community Board. This means that for each grant there is a two step process. This has resulted in a lengthy time from application to decision-making, and for the size of the fund and scale of the grants, increased the associated administration. The intention of this grants scheme was for this to remain focused at the local level. The preferred option reinforces this intention, recommending responsibility for decision making lies with each Community Board based upon an annual allocation of grant funds.
35. Operation of the grant system over the past four years has highlighted a number of weaknesses and disincentives associated with the current policy that provide areas for consideration in this review, including the following:
36. **Financial incentive**
- The grant fund has not been fully allocated.
 - Uptake of grants approved has been low, on average this is less than 25 per cent of total grant fund.
 - The maximum of 10 per cent of the total cost of the project excluding GST (maximum \$5,000) is too little to act as an effective incentive to promote retention of character houses. Average grants are \$1,243.
37. **Grant conditions and criteria**
- If ownership changes within five years the applicant is required to pay back the grant, although the property will continue to make a contribution to the character of the area and street scene.
 - The Policy requires a non-demolition or relocation clause for 10 years.

10 Cont'd

- (c) The Policy only allows for one grant per property, there is no time limit after which further applications may be considered.
- (d) The criteria requires that the proposed works must be visible from a public place which excludes character houses on rear sections and essential maintenance works such as piling which are important to the retention of the building.
- (e) The policy excludes non-residential buildings which can make a significant contribution to the streetscape, character and history of the local area.

38. **Administrative process**

- (a) The grant process from opening the fund and receipt of applications through to completion of works spans just one financial year. The process results in only one window of opportunity for applicants to apply for a grant each year.
 - (b) The decision making process can take up to four months and restricts time for completion of works to a maximum of seven months in order to claim the grant before the end of the financial year.
 - (c) If works are not complete by the end of the financial year the grant offer lapses and the applicant either foregoes the grant or has to reapply to another funding year.
 - (d) There are no opportunities to consider grants for urgent repair works or retrospective applications where works have been completed between the cut off in one financial year and the opening date in the next.
 - (e) The Policy does not allow for funding to be carried forward to the next financial year even for those grants offered but where work is unable to be completed within the timeframe, even if the work has commenced.
39. These issues have been considered in light of the original intent of the policy and operational guidelines and that the Community Board involvement be retained as an important part of the decision making process.
40. Following recognition of these weaknesses and a review process a number of solutions were considered that would improve grant effectiveness including; making the grants more of an incentive by offering a greater quantum of funding; amending conditions; allowing access to the grants throughout the year and improving the process to allow for greater uplift of the grants.
41. Giving the Community Boards the discretion to award grants for between 10 per cent to 20 per cent would enable the opportunity to provide more of an incentive for those applications considered to make more of a contribution to the street scene and identity of the local area and will be more in line with the quantum of grant funding offered by the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy and should provide for a full allocation of the fund. This will also give the Community Boards the opportunity to make the decisions for properties within their wards and promote the grants within their ward.
42. Removing the condition to repay the grant should the property be sold within five years of the issuing of the grant, allows owners to sell a property. The grant funding is provided to retain the character house, irrespective of who owns the property and is consistent with the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy. The non demolition and relocation clause will be retained with a payback requirement.
43. Providing the opportunity for applicants to apply for subsequent grants after the first grant is uplifted, and dependent upon available funds, allows applicants to stage their maintenance works and manage their budgets for such works.
44. The criteria restricts the funding to properties that make a contribution to the street scene or public space therefore excluding character houses on rear sections and buildings in commercial use. Due to the reduction in the overall fund it is considered these conditions are appropriate.
45. Currently there is one opportunity for grant applications to be submitted each year. Allowing applications for grants to be submitted throughout the year will provide greater accessibility to the fund and enable applicants needing to undertake urgent repair works to access the grants within an appropriate timeframe. These changes to the process will allow for greater accessibility to the grants and will improve speed in decision making.

10 Cont'd

46. Changing the requirement for works to be completed within the same financial year that the grant was offered and allowing applicants 11 months for the uplift of their grant will provide greater accessibility to the fund and facilitate uptake and allocation of the fund. There are numerous examples whereby applicants have been unable to complete the works within the current prescribed timeframe. This makes the fund more inline with the Heritage Incentive Grants that are allowed 18 months for uplift their grant.
47. An amended policy has been formulated to address these issues to enable a more effective and efficient use of the grant funding. A revised policy is set out in **Attachment 1**.

THE OBJECTIVES

48. To efficiently and effectively administer the Character Housing Maintenance Grants to provide a real incentive to property owners to maintain and enhance character houses that display character elements and contribute to the street scene and the character and identity of the area.

THE OPTIONS

- (a) Maintain the Status Quo with the addition of a new review clause.
To continue the Character Housing Maintenance Grants as per the current policy.
- A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to the Council
- (b) Continue the Character Housing Maintenance Grants with minor changes to the existing policy and process to:-
- Allow applications to be submitted twice a year dependent upon available funds.
 - Require the Grants Panel to sit twice a year.
 - Increase potential grant funding for each application to 10 per cent – 20 per cent (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Grants Panel.
 - Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.
 - Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once first grant completed dependent upon available funds and limited to a maximum of \$5,000 per property.
 - Remove the payback clause if the property is sold as the property still retains a relationship with the street scene or public open space.
 - Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with an added payback requirement .
 - A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to the Council.
- (c) Fund allocation to be determined by the Community Boards with the fund allocated between the eight Community Boards who can determine applications throughout the year by altering the policy and process to:-
- Allow decisions on grants to be taken at Community Board level.
 - Allow applications to be submitted throughout the year.
 - Allocation of fund to Community Boards is based on the number of pre-1945's houses in each ward.
 - Increasing potential grant funding for each application to 10 per cent – 20 per cent (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Community Board.
 - Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.
 - Remove the payback clause if property sold as property still retains relationship with street scene or public open space.
 - Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with an added payback requirement.
 - A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to the Council

10 Cont'd

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option - Option C

49. Each Community Board will be given a share of the overall Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund to allocate to applicants of properties located within their ward. The share of the fund will be based on the number of residential properties within their ward built before 1945 (source: *Christchurch City Council Valuation Hub Database*,

The Community Boards will take responsibility for decision making for Character Housing Maintenance Grants in their ward based on the policy guidelines.

- (a) Applications can be submitted throughout the year and taken before the relevant Community Board for a decision on the quantum of grant funding dependent upon available funds.
- (b) Increasing potential grant funding for each application to 10 per cent – 20 per cent (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the individual Community Board on the merits of each application.
- (c) Applicants be permitted 11 months from approval of the grant to complete works and uplift the grant.
- (d) Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once first grant completed dependent upon available funds and limited to a maximum of \$5,000 per property.
- (e) Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with a payback requirement.
- (f) Remove the payback clause if the property is sold as the property still retains a relationship with the street scene or public open space.
- (g) A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to the Council.

10 Cont'd

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Community Board take responsibility for allocation of grants within their ward and support promotion of this grant scheme.	Potential for inconsistent application of the guidelines and grant approvals.
Cultural	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing.	
Environmental	Community Boards can promote improved amenity and character for streetscapes within each of their wards.	
Economic	Equitable distribution of funds across the city. Sustainable maintenance of a broader city housing stock. Expected to result in improved allocation and uplift of grants.	Reduces administrative complexity with simplified process. Will involve an accrual of funds for grants not uplifted within financial year.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Aligns with Liveable City outcomes Contributes to a Cultural City</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Improves the Council's contribution to the community and neighbourhood identity in a consistent process for improvements to local residential streetscapes.</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Improved consistency with Heritage Incentive Grant Fund Process.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>The process allows more direct input by the Community Boards into applications within their own ward area. This report seeks feedback from the Community Boards on the revised process. Addresses feedback from applicants and the Grants Panel on the current process. No extra administrative work for Community Boards but retains administrative tasks currently undertaken by the Strategy and Planning Group.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>This brings the Character Housing Maintenance Grants process more in line with Community Board initiatives to promote positive outcomes for their ward. The focus remains on the retention of older character houses which make a contribution to the local streetscape and identity of the residential area through their street presence as perceived by the local community.</p>		

10 Cont'd

Maintain the Status Quo (if not preferred option) – Option A

50. The Community Boards recommend applications to the Character Housing Grants Panel who consider and determine grant approvals. A new review clause is added to allow for a three year review of the grant scheme.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Community Boards retain their input into the decision making process via the Grants Panel.	
Cultural	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing.	Limited success of current policy and process to date.
Environmental	Shared responsibility between Community Boards for improved amenity and character for streetscapes across the whole city.	Limited success of system to date with poor awareness of the grant scheme.
Economic	Sustainable maintenance of a broader city housing stock.	Administrative complexity and high costs when compared to limited success of policy and process so far. Limited allocation of fund and uplift of grants.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Alignment with community outcomes for a Liveable City. Contributes to a Cultural City</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Maintains the Council's contribution to the community and neighbourhood identity in a consistent process for improvements to local residential streetscapes.</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Some conditions of the grants are more onerous than the Heritage Incentive Grants Fund and process more complex.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Community Boards to retain a limited influence over grants within their ward. Applicants feedback on current process will not be addressed.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>The focus remains on the retention of older character houses which make a contribution to the local streetscape and identity of the residential area through their street presence as perceived by the local community.</p>		

10 Cont'd

Continue with the Character Housing Maintenance Grants with minor amendments to Policy and Process. – Option B

51. To make minor changes to the existing policy and process by:
- Increasing potential grant funding for each application to between 10 per cent to 20 per cent (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Grants Panel.
 - Allow applications to be submitted twice a year dependent upon available funds.
 - Require the Grants Panel to sit twice a year.
 - Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.
 - Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once the first grant has been uplifted and dependent upon available funds.
 - Remove the payback clause if the property is sold as the property still retains a relationship with the street scene or public open space.
 - Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with a payback requirement.
 - A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to the Council.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Community Boards retain their input into the decision making process in a similar way to previous process but now biannually.	
Cultural	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing	
Environmental	Shared responsibility between Community Boards for improved amenity and character for streetscapes across the whole city.	
Economic	Will enable a more flexible process for applicants to apply for and to uplift grants. Will improve allocation and uplift to a limited degree.	Will double the administrative process and the time involvement for the Community Boards and Grants Panel. Will involve an accrual of funds for grants not uplifted within the financial year.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Alignment with community outcomes for a Liveable City. Also contributes to a Cultural City.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Greater commitment to scheme with biannual process shows a greater commitment to enhancing residential identity and amenity.</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Emphasis on local and Community Board participation.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Greater input from Community Boards and Grants Panel as process will need to undertaken twice a year and will address some of the feedback from applicants and Grants Panel.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>The focus remains on the retention of older character houses which make a contribution to the local streetscape and identity of the residential area through their street presence as perceived by the local community.</p>		

10 Cont'd

Continue with the Character Housing Maintenance Grants with minor amendments to Policy and Process. – Option B

52. To make minor changes to the existing policy and process by:
- (a) Increasing potential grant funding for each application to between 10%-20% (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Grants Panel.
 - (b) Allow applications to be submitted twice a year dependent upon available funds.
 - (c) Require the Grants Panel to sit twice a year.
 - (d) Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.
 - (e) Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once the first grant has been uplifted and dependent upon available funds.
 - (f) Remove the payback clause if the property is sold as the property still retains a relationship with the street scene or public open space.
 - (g) Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with a payback requirement.
 - (h) A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to Council.

10 Cont'd

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Community Boards retain their input into the decision making process in a similar way to previous process but now biannually.	
Cultural	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing	
Environmental	Shared responsibility between Community Boards for improved amenity and character for streetscapes across the whole city.	
Economic	Will enable a more flexible process for applicants to apply for and to uplift grants. Will improve allocation and uplift to a limited degree.	Will double the administrative process and the time involvement for the Community Boards and Grants Panel. Will involve an accrual of funds for grants not uplifted within the financial year.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Alignment with community outcomes for a Liveable City. Also contributes to a Cultural City.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Greater commitment to scheme with biannual process shows a greater commitment to enhancing residential identity and amenity.</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>NA.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Emphasis on local and Community Board participation.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>Greater input from Community Boards and Grants Panel as process will need to undertaken twice a year and will address some of the feedback from applicants and Grants Panel.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p> <p>The focus remains on the retention of older character houses which make a contribution to the local streetscape and identity of the residential area through their street presence as perceived by the local community.</p>		

11. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE 2010/11 RICCARTON/WIGRAM YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Recreation and Sports
Author:	Lisa Gregory Community Recreation Adviser, Community Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Board to set aside funding from the Board's 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund for the purpose of establishing a 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Youth Development Scheme provides small grants to eligible young individuals and youth not-for-profit groups. The purpose of the scheme is to celebrate and support young people living positively in the local community by providing financial assistance for their development. Applications to the fund will be considered in the following categories:
 - Educational Studies – This can include personal development opportunities such as leadership skills, career development and skills training, or community based educational studies.
 - Cultural Studies – This can include courses or seminars such as Te Reo lessons, musical training, arts colloquiums etc. It could be for attendance at cultural events taking place locally, nationally or internationally.
 - Representation at Events – It will provide support or assistance if you have been selected to represent your school, team or community at a local, national or international event. This includes sporting, cultural and community events.
 - Recreational Development – Assistance to attend or take part in one off or ongoing recreational events or participation at recreation or sporting development. For example – advance ballet classes in Wellington, representing Canterbury at rugby.
 - Capacity Building – Providing support for personal development or growth. For example – leadership training.
3. Applicants to be eligible will also need to meet the following criteria.
 - Age groups 12 to 25 years.
 - Projects must have obvious benefits for the young person and if possible the wider community.
4. Applicants will also be required to complete the application form (**attached**) and provide the additional material noted on this.
5. Applicants will also be asked how long they and their parents/caregivers have lived in Christchurch. This will allow Board members to take into consideration whether the funding requested is commensurate with the historic contribution of the applicant and their family, to rates in this city.
6. It is recommended that the Board delegate authority to allocate this funding to the Community Services Committee, to the end of minimising the amount of time between successful application and payment.
7. It is recommended that individuals only be allowed to apply once per financial year.

11. Cont'd

8. In making recommendations to the Board staff will make comment on the following matters:
- The extent of additional funds that the individual or group has sourced from other funders, and the amount of fundraising undertaken.
 - The level at which the group or individual is performing in their chosen field.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. This proposal transfers funds from the Board's Discretionary Response Fund into a separate Youth Development Scheme Fund. This will in turn decrease the funding available for other applicants to the Board's Discretionary Response Fund. The Board may also allocate funding from the Board's Strengthening Communities Fund to the proposed Youth Development Scheme.

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

10. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

11. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Aligns with page 184 in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

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

13. Yes, see page 172, Community Support, Council Activities and Service, Grants.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Aligns with the Strengthening Community Strategy goals:
- Increase participation in community recreation and sports programmes and events.
 - Improve basic life skills so that all residents can participate fully in society.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. No external consultation needs to be undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board:

- (a) Establish a Youth Development Scheme for the 2010/11 financial year.
- (b) Approve the transfer of funds up to \$10,000 from its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund to the Riccarton/Wigram Youth Development Scheme Fund.
- (c) Delegate authority to allocate this funding to the Board's Community Services Committee.

12. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – SAM RAYNER STEELE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-6807
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Recreation and Sport
Author:	Lisa Gregory Community Recreation Adviser, Community Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an application for funding from the Riccarton/Wigram 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant, Sam Rayner Steele is a 20 year old Halswell resident who is seeking support to travel to America to train and compete in a New Zealand based semi-professional cycling team. This trip will take place from 1 July to 14 September 2010.
3. Sam has been racing for six years and in that time has gained a top five placing at the World Championships in 2007 and 2008. Sam also won a silver medal at the Youth Olympics in Sydney and a gold medal at the Oceania Championships in 2007 as well as winning six national titles and gaining numerous placings. Sam was named the New Zealand Senior Rider of the Year in 2009, which was based on points gained over a series of races held at different meetings over the summer.
4. Sam's future goals include being selected to compete at the 2012 London Olympics, winning a world championship and riding for a professional team. This trip is the first step in gaining a professional contract as he will be riding with the team New Zealand Professional Cycling and he will be racing in professional events, against professional teams during his stay.
5. Sam will once again dedicate his earnings from his two jobs into his sport and will continue to fundraise for his trip until he leaves. Sam has raised approximately \$2,000 to date.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

SAM RAYNER STEELE	
EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
Airfares and Insurance	2,700
Race Entry Fees	800
Equipment Maintenance	500
Excess baggage	600
Car / Van hire	500
Total Cost	5,100
Amount Requested from the Community Board	\$600

7. The applicant has previously received \$800 in 2007/08 and \$500 in 2008/09 from the Riccarton/Wigram Youth Development Scheme for international cycling trips away. All accountability for these trips has been received.

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

8. Yes, see page 172, Community Support, Council Activities and Service, Grants.

12. Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

9. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

10. Aligns with page 184 in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

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

11. Yes, see page 172, Community Support, Council Activities and Service, Grants.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

13. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board support the application and allocate \$500 to Sam Rayner Steele as a contribution towards his expenses from the 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme, subject to the Board establishing such a fund.

13. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – AMY ROSE PFEIFER

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-6807
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Recreation and Sport
Author:	Lisa Gregory Community Recreation Adviser, Community Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an application for funding from the Riccarton/Wigram 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant, Amy Rose Pfeifer is a 17 year old Ilam resident who is seeking support to travel to Tasmania to compete in the CP Maddern Trophy – Australian Junior International. This trip will take place from 3 to 7 July 2010.
3. Amy has been playing badminton for seven years and currently competes in the interclub A Grade competition as well as various provincial tournaments. She has represented Canterbury for the past five years. Amy currently trains three times a week for up to six hours, has coached her school team for the past three years and also coaches a squad of junior beginner players.
4. Amy's achievements include the Canterbury age group champion 2004 to 2009 in singles, mixed and doubles, South Island age group champion 2005 to 2009 (a variety of titles singles, doubles, mixed in each year). Amy has also achieved a top eight finish at the 2009 Under 17 Nationals (singles and mixed) and a top eight finish at the 2009 Australian Under 17 Nationals (mixed doubles).
5. Amy feels she will benefit as both a player and coach attending this tournament due to the exposure of top level competition that she will experience. Amy has raised approximately \$900 towards her costs through raffles, part time work, sausage sizzles and would appreciate any assistance from the Community Board.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

AMY ROSE PFEIFER	
EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
Airfares and Accommodation	2,190
Entry Fees and Training Fees	275
Food	400
Uniform	130
Transport	65
Total Cost	3,060
Amount Requested from the Community Board	\$500

7. This is the first time the applicant has applied to the Riccarton/Wigram Youth Development Scheme.

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

8. Yes, see page 172, Community Support, Council Activities and Service, Grants.

13. Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

9. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

10. Aligns with page 184 in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

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

11. Yes, see page 172, Community Support, Council Activities and Service, Grants.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

13. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board support the application and allocate \$500 to Amy Rose Pfeifer as a contribution towards her tournament expenses from the 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme, subject to the Board establishing such a fund.

14. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – JOSHUA GARMONSWAY

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-6807
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Community Support
Author:	Denise Galloway Community Development Adviser, Community Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an application for funding from the Riccarton/Wigram 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant, Zhan Ming (Keith) Cheok is a 17 year old who lives in Riccarton and is planning travel to Shanghai in July 2010 as part of a the Shanghai Technological Expo team at Christchurch Boys' High School
3. Zhan is a student at Christchurch Boys' High School. He is one of a team from Christchurch Boys' High School, comprising six members of different cultural backgrounds, who are representing New Zealand in the 2010 Shanghai International Youth Science and Technology Expo. The Expo runs from 9 July to 19 July 2010.
4. Other secondary schools from all over the world will be participating at the Expo. Each participating school is allocated an exhibition area to display their work and is required to bring a piece of scientific creation work and multimedia animation work. Each participant is required to submit a thesis on Climate Change with a Power Point presentation for the selection.
5. The Christchurch Boys' High Group was selected as the only group to represent New Zealand in this important international event. As a member of the team Zhan will not only get to visit a foreign country, he will also experience six unique opportunities:
 - Public speaking in front of hundreds of overseas students to present his uniquely New Zealand view of climate change.
 - Work as a team to sell the group's idea of a Green Controller.
 - Use his knowledge in Science to complete set tasks.
 - Think creatively to find novel ways to combat climate change.
 - Interact with students from many different countries.
 - Represent Christchurch Boys' High School and New Zealand at an international event.
6. Zhan's future goals are to own and operate his own information technology business company and to be involved in international work, both business and charity. He believes that by representing New Zealand at the Expo, he and his team are benefiting the community as well as the whole of New Zealand, as they are the only school participating at this event.
7. Zhan has also applied to the Asian Foundation for \$500, the Christchurch Gwandong Society for \$500, and the New Zealand Charitable Association for \$1,000 towards his trip. However, all of these applications were declined. Zhan is contributing \$1,000 of his personal savings towards his trip and he is able to borrow money from his family to cover any funding shortfall, on the understanding that he repays the debt when he returns from the trip. He is also continuing to seek funding elsewhere.
8. Zhan is requesting \$1,000 from the Board's Youth Development Scheme.

14. Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

ZHANG'S APPLICATION	
EXPENSES	COST (\$)
Total Cost (Airfare, accommodation, food, transport)	3,500
Amount Requested from Community Board	\$1,000

10. This is the first time the applicant has applied to the Riccarton/Wigram Youth Development Scheme

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-19 LTCCP budgets?

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

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

12. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. 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 2006 -19 LTCCP?

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

16. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board grant Zhan Ming Cheok \$500 as a contribution towards his trip to the Shanghai International Youth Science and Technology Expo from the Riccarton/Wigram 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme, subject to the Board establishing such a fund

15. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – DAVID BELLAMY

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 Riccarton/Wigram 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant, David Bellamy is a 16 year old who lives in Upper Riccarton and is seeking Community Board support to compete for New Zealand at the 2010 International Chemistry Olympiad. in Tokyo, on the 19-28 July 2010. David attends Christ's College.
3. New Zealand first competed in the International Chemistry Olympiad in 1992, then in 2009, in Cambridge, England the New Zealand team won one silver and three bronze medals. In 2010 the Olympiad will be held in Tokyo, Japan on 19-28 July.
4. The New Zealand Chemistry Olympiad Trust organises participation by New Zealand secondary school students in the International Chemistry Olympiads. The activities organised included:
 - A training group selection examination held in November
 - A training selection camp for about 20 students held in the April vacation at which the team of four students and a non-travelling reserve was selected
 - Training of the team prior to the International Olympiad
5. In November 2009, David sat a preliminary entrance exam. Over the Christmas holidays and during term one, he also completed preparatory work and assignments. As a result he was selected to attend a training camp of 24 students in April. Four students from the camp were selected to go to Tokyo, one of whom was David.
6. David has always been interested in science and has achieved academically in this area and in 2009, he received the Award of Excellence in Australian National Chemistry Quiz. His future goal is to study science at University. David believes that this trip will benefit the community and New Zealand as he is going to Tokyo to represent New Zealand.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

DAVID BELLAMY	
EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
Airfares /Accommodation	750
Living Expenses	200
Uniform	150
TOTAL	\$1,100
Amount Requested from Community Board	\$1,000

8. This is the first time the applicant has applied to the Board's Youth Development Scheme..
9. David has not applied to any other funding organisations towards this event. He has raised \$80 to date through income from tutoring students.

15. Cont'd

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

- 11 There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. 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 2006-16 LTCCP?

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

- 15 As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board grant David Bellamy \$500 from the 20010/11 Youth Development Scheme as a contribution towards his trip to Tokyo in July 2010, as part of a team representing New Zealand at the International Chemistry Olympiad, subject to the Board establishing such a fund

16. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2010/11 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – DEBIE JOI PAULL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Unit
Officer responsible:	Recreation and Sport Unit Manager
Author:	Lisa Gregory, Community Recreation Advisor

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an application for funding from the Riccarton/Wigram 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant, Debie Joi Paull is a 15 year old Riccarton resident who is seeking Board support to travel to Australia to compete at the Southern Skies touch football tournament. This trip will take place from 4 July – 10 July 2010.
3. Debie has been involved in various sports since a young age and through school excelled in basketball, soccer and touch football. Debie has played competitive basketball and touch football for her school Middleton Grange and last season Debie was awarded the MIP of her team (most improved player).
4. Debie is excited about her selection for this trip and feels that competing against the best in her age group, will not only help develop her skills as a player, but also teach her more about effective teamwork on a different level.
5. To date Debie has raised approximately \$300 for her trip and will continue to fundraise until she goes away. Debie would appreciate any financial assistance from the Community Board.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

DEBIE JOI PAULL	
EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
International flights and transfers	500
Accommodation, meals, registration fees.	1,000
Travel insurance	50
Total Cost	\$1,550
Amount Requested from the Community Board	\$300

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

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

8. Yes, see page 172, Community Support, Council Activities and Service, Grants.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

9. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

10. Aligns with page 184 in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

16. Cont'd

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

11. Yes, see page 172, Community Support, Council Activities and Service, Grants.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

13. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board support the application and allocate \$300 to Debie Joi Paull as a contribution towards her trip expenses from the Riccarton/Wigram 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme, subject to the Board establishing such a fund

**17. RICcarton/WIGRAM TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE COMMITTEE MEETING REPORT –
21 JUNE 2010**

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the Transport and Greenspace Committee meeting held on Monday 21 June 2010.

The meeting was attended by Mike Mora (Chairperson), Jimmy Chen, Beth Dunn and Judy Kirk.

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Helen Broughton, Peter Laloli and Bob Shearing.

The meeting adjourned at 10.06am and recommenced at 10.11am.

1. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

Nil.

2. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

3. BRIEFINGS

- 3.1 Tony Spowart, Regional Traffic and Safety Manager, New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA), was in attendance and updated the Committee on the NZTA projects within the Riccarton/Wigram Ward.

4. PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES

The Committee considered and provided comments to the Board to refer to the Council on the proposed amendments to the Council's existing delegations on trees.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 11.1 of this report.

5. DAWSONS ROAD - PROPOSED PROHIBITED TIMES OF ACCESS AND PARKING ON ROAD

The Committee considered a report and recommend to the Board to recommend to the Council to prohibit motor vehicles weighing less than 3,500 kilograms from entering and/or being used on Dawsons Road, between West Coast Road and Jones Road, from 9pm to 5am Monday to Sunday.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 11.2 of this report.

6. RATIONALISATION OF NICHOLLS ROAD BUS STOPS

The Committee considered a report and recommended to the Board to rationalise the bus stops in Nicholls Road, Halswell and to install no stopping lines to improve the safety of road users and vehicles entering and leaving the adjacent shopping complex.

17.6 Cont'd

Committee Note:

Staff tabled a second proposal for consideration to rationalise the bus stops in Nicholls Road, Halswell. Staff confirmed that the consultation on the proposal was completed with Foodstuffs and the Halswell Residents Association.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 11.3 of this report.

7. PURIRI STREET - STREET RENEWAL

The Committee considered a report and recommended to the Board on the Puriri Street Renewal Plan.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 11.4 of this report.

8. LYNDON STREET - STREET RENEWAL

The Committee considered a report and recommended to the Board on the Lyndon Street Renewal Plan.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 11.5 of this report.

9. PLAYGROUND DEVELOPMENT - DE LANGE RESERVE

The Committee considered a report and recommended to the Board on to the proposed plan for the De Lange Reserve Playground.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 11.6 of this report.

10. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Nil.

11. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES

The Committee's recommendation is recorded under Clause 9 of this agenda.

11.2 DAWSONS ROAD - PROPOSED PROHIBITED TIMES OF ACCESS AND PARKING ON ROAD

The Committee's recommendation is recorded under Clause 8 of this agenda.

11.3 RATIONALISATION OF NICHOLLS ROAD BUS STOPS

It is recommended that the Board approve:

- (a) to remove the existing bus stop on the south side off Nicholls Road commencing at a point 48 metres south west of Halswell Road and extending for a distance of 12 metres in a south westerly direction.

17.11 Cont'd

- (b) to remove the no stopping lines on the south side of Nicholls Road commencing at a point 13 metres south west of Halswell Road and extending for a distance of 31 metres in a south westerly direction.
- (c) to install no stopping lines on Nichols Road commencing at a point 13 metres south west of Halswell Road and extending for a distance of 48 metres in a south westerly direction.
- (d) to place a bus stop on the south side of Nicholls Road starting at a point 79 metres south west of Halswell Road and extending for a distance of 72 metres in a south westerly direction.
- (e) to place no stopping lines on the south side of Nicholls Road starting at a point 142 metres south west of Halswell Road and extending for a distance of 21 metres.

11.4 PURIRI STREET - STREET RENEWAL

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Approve the Puriri Street Renewal Plan, TP317401 Issue 1.
- (b) Approve the following parking restrictions to take effect following completion of construction.

Revocation of Existing Restrictions:

- (i) That all existing parking restrictions on the east side of Puriri Street between Hinau Street and Riccarton Road be revoked.
- (ii) That all existing parking restrictions on the west side of Puriri Street between Hinau Street and Riccarton Road be revoked.
- (iii) That the existing no stopping restriction on the north side of Riccarton Road commencing at its intersection with Puriri Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of seven metres be revoked.
- (iv) That the existing no stopping restriction on the north side of Riccarton Road commencing at its intersection with Puriri Street and extending in an westerly direction for a distance of 12.5 metres be revoked.

Revoke Existing Give-Way control

- (v) That the existing give-way control on Puriri Street on the approach to the intersection with Riccarton Road be revoked.

Revoke Existing Stop control

- (vi) That the existing stop control on Puriri Street on the southern approach to the intersection with Hinau Street be revoked.

New No Stopping restrictions

Hinau Street to Totara Street

- (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Puriri Street commencing at its intersection with Hinau Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.

17.11 Cont'd

- (viii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Puriri Street commencing at its intersection with Totara Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 19 metres.
- (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Puriri Street commencing at its intersection with Hinau Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
- (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Puriri Street commencing at its intersection with Totara Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.

Totara Street to Riccarton Road

- (xi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Puriri Street commencing at its intersection with Totara Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 21 metres.
- (xii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Puriri Street commencing at a point 40 metres north from its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 13 metres.
- (xiii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Puriri Street commencing at its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 21 metres.
- (xiv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Puriri Street commencing at its intersection with Totara Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
- (xv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Puriri Street commencing at a point 43 metres north from its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
- (xvi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Puriri Street commencing at its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 7.5 metres.

Totara Street

- (xvii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Totara Street commencing at its intersection with Puriri Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 22 metres.
- (xviii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Totara Street commencing at its intersection with Puriri Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
- (xix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Totara Street commencing at its intersection with Puriri Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
- (xx) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Totara Street commencing at its intersection with Puriri Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.

Riccarton Road

- (xxi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Riccarton Road commencing at its intersection with Puriri Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 10 metres.

17.11 Cont'd

- (xxii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Riccarton Road commencing at its intersection with Puriri Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.

New Parking Restriction – P5

- (xxiii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of five minutes at any time on the west side of Puriri Street commencing at a point 7.5 metres north from its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 28 metres.

New Parking Restriction – Motorcycle

- (xxiv) That a Motorcycle Park with a time limit of 60 minutes be created on the west side of Puriri Street commencing at a point 35.5 metres north from its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 2.5 metres.

New Give-way

- (xxv) That a give way control be placed against the Puriri Street approach at its intersection with Riccarton Road.

New Stop

- (xxvii) That a stop control be placed against Puriri Street on the southern approach to its intersection with Hinau Street.

11.5 LYNDON STREET - STREET RENEWAL

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Approve the Lyndon Street Renewal Plan, TP317501 Issue 2.
- (b) Approve the following parking restrictions to take effect following completion of construction.

Revocation of existing restrictions:

- (i) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited on the north side of Lyndon Street between Division Street and Picton Avenue be revoked.
- (ii) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited on the south side of Lyndon Street between Division Street and Picton Avenue be revoked.

Revoke existing stop controls:

- (iii) That the existing stop control on Lyndon Street on the western approach to the intersection with Clarence Street be revoked.
- (iv) That the existing stop control on Lyndon Street on the eastern approach to the intersection with Clarence Street be revoked.

New stopping restrictions:

Division Street to Clarence Street

- (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Lyndon Street commencing at its intersection with Division Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 16 metres.

17.11 Cont'd

- (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Lyndon Street commencing at its intersection with Division Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 12 metres.
- (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Lyndon Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
- (viii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Lyndon Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 12.5 metres.

Clarence Street to Picton Avenue

- (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Lyndon Street commencing at its intersection with Picton Avenue and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
- (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Lyndon Street commencing at its intersection with Picton Avenue and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 17 metres.
- (xi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Lyndon Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 15.5 metres.
- (xii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Lyndon Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 15.5 metres.

New Stop

- (xiii) That a stop control be placed against Lyndon Street on the western approach to its intersection with Clarence Street.
- (xiv) That a stop control be placed against the Lyndon Street on the eastern approach to its intersection with Clarence Street.

11.6 PLAYGROUND DEVELOPMENT - DE LANGE RESERVE

That the Board approve the proposed plan for the De Lange Reserve Playground as shown in Plan LP328902, Issue 1.

The meeting concluded at 10.58am.

29. 6. 2010

- 50 -

18. **COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
19. **ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
20. **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
21. **RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

Attached