

**HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

WEDNESDAY 17 MARCH 2010

AT 3PM

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

Community Board: Bob Todd (Chairperson), Rod Cameron, Tim Carter, David Cox, John Freeman, Yani Johanson, and Brenda Lowe-Johnson.

Community Board Adviser

Jo Daly
Phone: 941 6601 DDI
Email: jo.daly@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

- | | | |
|---------------|------------|---|
| PART C | 1. | APOLOGIES |
| PART C | 2. | CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – 3 MARCH 2010 |
| PART B | 3. | DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT |
| PART B | 4. | PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS |
| PART B | 5. | NOTICE OF MOTION |
| PART B | 6. | CORRESPONDENCE |
| PART B | 7. | BRIEFINGS |
| PART C | 8. | BARNETT PARK BIKE AND SKATE AREA |
| PART C | 9. | 1000 FERRY ROAD – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION |
| PART C | 10. | LINWOOD AVENUE – PROPOSED ALTERATION TO EXISTING MOBILITY AND P5 LOADING ZONE RESTRICTIONS. |
| PART C | 11. | HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD SMALL GRANTS FUND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE - COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES |
| PART C | 12. | HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING 2010/11 - BOARD BIDS |
| PART C | 13. | APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME - CHELSEA PATRICIA ELIZABETH RICHDALÉ |

We're on the Web!

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

17. 3. 2010

- 2 -

- PART C 14. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10
DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – ANZAC WREATHS**
- PART B 15. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER’S UPDATE**
- PART B 16. BOARD MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS**
- PART B 17. BOARD MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 3 MARCH 2010

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 3 March 2010 are **attached**.

The minutes of the Board's public excluded section of the meeting of 3 March 2010, have been circulated separately to Board Members.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 3 March 2010 (both open and public excluded sections) be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

- 3.1 Rebecca Wolt, representing R and C Romeril and others, regarding clause 8, Barnett Park Bike and Skate Area.
- 3.2 Scott Buckner, regarding clause 8, Barnett Park Bike and Skate Area.
- 3.3 Marie Honeybone and Jack Taylor, regarding clause 8, Barnett Park Bike and Skate Area.
- 3.4 Susan Cooke, regarding clause 8, Barnett Park Bike and Skate Area.
- 3.5 Zachary Cooper and Astrid Neumann, regarding clause 8, Barnett Park Bike and Skate Area.
- 3.6 Richard Carey, regarding Clause 8, Barnett Park Bike and Skate Area.
- 3.7 Neralie Brittenden, regarding clause 8, Barnett Bike and Skate Area.
- 3.8 Jo Hooker, regarding clause 8, Barnett Park Bike and Skate Area.
- 3.9 Don Harrison, representing the Redcliffs Residents Association, regarding clause 8, Barnett Park Bike and Skate Area.
- 3.10 Wilton Gray, representing the Wakatu Ave Neighbourhood Support Group, regarding clause 8, Barnett Park Bike and Skate Area.

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. BRIEFINGS

8. BARNETT PARK BIKE AND SKATE AREA

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Joanne Walton, Consultation Leader, Greenspace

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approval for the concept plan for the Barnett Park bike and skate area amended as a result of consultation with the local community, and to install no stopping restrictions along the entire length of the western side of the entrance road into Barnett Park.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Board members will recall that options for the location of a proposed Sumner-Redcliffs youth recreational facility were presented to a Board seminar on 17 December 2008. The draft concept plan for a bike and skate area at Barnett Park was then presented to a Board seminar on 15 April 2009, prior to the Capital Development Unit carrying out consultation with the local community.
3. The public information leaflet was distributed to approximately 870 households and absentee property owners in the vicinity of Barnett Park, along with 36 identified key stakeholders groups and individuals. The leaflet was also distributed to local schools in hard copy form or as a website link, and was made available in local libraries, and via the Council's Have Your Say website. There was a good response from the local community with a total of 281 returning the comment form, or responding by email or telephone.
4. Overall we received a very positive response from the community with 210 (75 per cent) of respondents clearly indicating their support for the plan with many making general positive comments and suggestions, indicating their preference for the type of skate elements to be included, and offering additional feedback on a variety of issues. Further details are provided under the "Consultation Fulfilment" section of this report.
5. In recognition of the feedback received, and further technical advice and design planning, the Transport and Greenspace Unit proposes to make some changes to the original proposed concept plan (refer **attached**). The amendments proposed by staff are:
 - (a) The paved bike and skate area has been reduced to approximately 600 metres squared in area and 65 metres in length.
 - (b) All the skate design elements proposed in the consultation have been included in the final concept plan design for the skate area; transition and street style elements including rolling mounds, rails, fun box, and a transition bowl that functions as a mini-ramp and quarter pipe.
 - (c) Coloured pigments will be added to the concrete to complement the surrounding landscape environment, improve visual amenity and reduce glare.
 - (d) Additional seating will be provided for parents and caregivers and other spectators.
 - (e) Five cycle parks will be provided.
 - (f) Entry/exit points to the bike and skate area from the entrance road will be limited to two clearly defined points for traffic safety reasons.
 - (g) The yellow "No Stopping" lines along the entrance road will be extended.

8 Cont'd

6. Overall, it is the opinion of staff that the proposed bike and skate area will play a valuable role in addressing the need for recreational facilities for young people in the Sumner-Redcliffs area, and is generally well supported by the community. It is not considered that the facility will result in an increase in anti-social behaviour in the area. There is a balance to be achieved by the Council in ensuring that the large majority of our community have access to parks and recreational facilities and opportunities, and are not denied this because of the activities of a small anti-social minority of park visitors.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The current Greenspace Capital Works Programme has funding to undertake this development including design, consultation and construction.

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

8. Yes, as above.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. The area of Barnett Park in which the proposed bike and skate facility is to be located is zoned Open Space 2 under the Christchurch City Plan.
10. The Project Information Memorandum (ABA 10095738 dated 22 October 2009) obtained for project, using the original proposed concept plan, has identified that five covered cycle parks are required under the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan. A resource consent will be required to install the five cycle parks without a covering roof.
11. Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides the Council the authority to install parking restriction by resolution.
12. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations as at April 2008. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes parking restrictions.
13. Installing any associated signs and markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

14. Yes, no other legal implications have been identified.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

15. The project aligns with the 2009-19 Long Term Council Community Plan:

Parks, open spaces and waterways

- Safety: By ensuring that our parks, open spaces and waterways are healthy and safe places.
- Community: By providing spaces for communities to gather and interact.
- Environment: By enabling people to contribute to projects that improve our environment.
- Governance: By involving people in decision making about parks, open spaces and waterways.
- Health: By providing areas for people to engage in healthy activities.

8 Cont'd

- Recreation: By offering a range of recreational opportunities in parks, open spaces and waterways.
- City Development: By providing an inviting, pleasant and well cared-for environment.

Measures

- Sports parks are satisfactorily maintained.
- Customers are satisfied with the range of recreation facilities available, including playgrounds, skateboard ramps, tennis and petanque courts, BMX tracks, and fitness equipment.
- Overall customer satisfaction with sports parks.

Streets and transport

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

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

16. Yes, as above. This also contributes to improve the level of service for safety and provides improved access to facilities.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

17. This project has primary alignment with the following Council strategies and policies:
- Skateboarding, Inline Skating and Freestyle BMX Cycling Strategy.
 - Youth Strategy.
 - Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy.
 - Safer Christchurch Strategy.
 - Parks and Waterways Access Policy.
 - Environmental Policy Statement.
 - Children's Policy.
 - Social Wellbeing Policy.
 - Christchurch Road Safety Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

18. Yes, as above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

19. Extensive consultation was undertaken with the community on the proposed concept plan for the completion of the Skate Park facility.

8 Cont'd

20. The public information leaflet was distributed to approximately 870 households and absentee property owners in the vicinity of Barnett Park, along with 36 identified key stakeholders groups and individuals. The leaflet was also distributed to local schools in hard copy form or as a website link, and was made available in local libraries, and via the Council's Have Your Say website. A meeting was held on site with parents and staff of Moa Kids Early Learning Centre and was attended by three people. There was a good response from the local community with a total of 281 residents returning the comment form, or responding by letter, email or telephone.
21. Overall we received a very positive response from the community with 210 residents (75 per cent) clearly indicating their support for the proposal, and many offering additional feedback on a variety of issues.

	Support for proposal				
	Yes	No	Mixed views	Not indicated	Total
Number of responses	210	28	30	13	281
%	75%	10%	11%	4%	100%

Although 13 submitters did not indicate their preference, written or verbal comments indicate that 10 are clearly in support of the plan, and others have expressed reservations or raised issues.

22. Rather than presenting a detailed skate park design in the public information leaflet, people were asked which of a number of different skate features they liked to use. Many submitters indicated their preferences for the different types of skate elements to be included, with some making suggestion for technical and other design improvements.

Type of skate element	Number
Rolling mounds	82
Transition style elements	64
Street style elements	65
Fun box	74
Rail	64
Quarter pipe	87

23. All respondents who provided contact details have been sent a final letter of reply thanking them for their input. The letter has also informed respondents that the final amended plan would be presented to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board for approval. Meeting details were provided so that any interested people could attend.
24. On 2 December 2009 the Board considered this report and heard eleven deputations on this matter. At that time the Board resolved that this matter lie on the table until the Board has had an opportunity to visit the sites considered for a bike and skate facility in the Sumner/Redcliffs area, and that this be organised with urgency. This visit took place in early February.
25. On 3 February 2010, the Board considered this report, and were advised that staff are seeking a peer review of the Project Information Memorandum obtained for this project. At that time the Board resolved that consideration of this item be deferred until a peer review is undertaken on the Project Information Memorandum, and the outcome reported back to the Board. This information has been circulated under separate cover.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approve:

- (a) The proposed concept design plan for the Barnett Park bike and skate area, amended as a result of public consultation.

8 Cont'd

- (b) That the stopping of vehicles prohibited at any time on the western side of the entrance road to Barnett Park, commencing at the intersection with Main Road and extending in a southerly direction for 59 metres, be revoked.
- (c) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the western side of the entrance road to Barnett Park commencing at the intersection with Main Road and extending in a southerly direction for 145 metres.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

Project history

- 26. The need for a skate facility in Sumner was first identified in Sumner/Monck's Bay Area Profile Research (2000) and reconfirmed in the Hagley Ferrymead Leisure Parks and Waterways Plan (2003). The Skateboarding, Inline Skating and Freestyle BMX Cycling Strategy (2004) also noted there was a gap in provision of skate facilities in the Sumner area with local research identifying there was a demand. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board allocated funding in the 2004/05 financial year for investigations and planning for a skate park, however a suitable location for the facility could not be identified at that time, and the funding was subsequently lost.
- 27. Funding was then allocated for a Sumner Redcliffs Youth Recreational Facility with \$7500 in 2008/09 for planning, and a further \$75,000 in 2009/10 for construction.

Re-investigation of potential locations

- 28. New skate facilities need to be sited in locations that optimise accessibility, safety and attractiveness, in turn maximising usage levels, but also minimise inconvenience and noise to neighbours. Facilities should be sited in areas with significant youth and child population densities, and central to several child and youth populated suburbs rather than on the edge of a populated area, to maximise the user catchment. Facilities should also be sited in areas which are attractive to young people and able to attract a significant proportion of the skating community, and should be matched to demand in that particular area, catering to skating style and facility preferences.
- 29. Council officers have subsequently re-evaluated 15 parks situated on the flat from Sumner to McCormack's Bay to identify a suitable location that will meet the aspirations of both the park users and the local community, along with technical requirements. Parks situated on hill sites in the area were excluded due to topography and accessibility. The possibility of installing a skate area in the grounds of one of the local schools, in partnership with the Ministry of Education, was also considered, but was not pursued due to issues in relation to building a Council owned asset on private land, and the need for an occupation agreement.
- 30. The parks evaluated were: Sumnervale Reserve, Finnarsby Reserve, Wakefield Reserve No. 1, Wakefield Reserve No. 2, St Leonard's Park, Bernie Hansen Reserve, Sumner Croquet Club, Scarborough Park, Sumner Beach adjacent to Sumner Surf Life Saving Club, Sumner Coronation Garden (Clifton Bay), Peacock's Gallop, Barnett Park, Beachville Reserve, Redcliffs Park, and McCormack's Bay Reserve.

8 Cont'd

31. The suitability of each park within the area was evaluated according to a range of selection criteria:

(a) Visibility-

Sites should have good visibility without trees, plantings or structures obstructing the view of users on site. Sites should be easily visible to passing traffic, and to the surrounding area, to maximise user awareness and spectator enjoyment as well as user safety. Facilities should be developed in ways which minimise "places to hide" and which are aesthetically appealing.

(b) Natural surveillance/multi-use area-

Sites should be located in an area which has good visibility and a regular flow of traffic and pedestrians that would enable a degree of self monitoring. Sites should be overlooked by neighbouring activities and properties. Sites may be within an area of multiple use, for example, other groups and activities are based there. Skate facilities should be sited in close proximity to other youth recreation facilities to provide a range of recreational opportunities, to raise the profile of facilities to that of other sports and to provide shared amenities such as drinking water, toilets, seating and shaded areas. Skate facilities targeted at younger skaters should be sited close to playgrounds and picnic facilities to encourage family participation. Facilities should be designed to minimise negative impact on existing amenities.

(c) Zoning-

The activity is consistent with Christchurch City Plan zoning and provisions for this site.

(d) Proximity to neighbouring properties-

The site has sufficient separation from neighbouring residential properties to avoid noise issues, but still maintain natural surveillance.

(e) Topography-

The natural and physical characteristics of the site need to be suitable, including the underlying soil/land type natural contour, drainage, stability, risk of rock fall, vegetation cover, and access to sunlight. The topography should allow a variety of elements to be incorporated into design.

(f) Space/size-

There must be adequate space for the bike and skate area and associated landscaping. There should be room for expansion of the facility.

(g) Compatibility with other users-

The skate area must be complementary to other adjoining recreation uses in the park, and other users are not displaced.

(h) Traffic-

The site needs sufficient separation from roads for safety of park users and vehicle traffic.

8 Cont'd

(i) Transport accessibility-

Sites should be accessible by walking, cycling or public transport, with preference given to sites located on cycleways or on routes which are safer for cyclists. Sites should allow easy drop-off and pick-up by car and parking should be available nearby.

(j) Shops and other facilities-

There are shops located within 400 metres for food and drink, and there are public toilets on site or close by.

32. Barnett Park was determined to be the most suitable location based on these criteria because:

- (a) It is centrally located within the Sumner to Mount Pleasant area and on a bus route.
- (b) The natural and physical features of the site, such as the contour of land, vegetation cover, and exposure to sun and wind, are suitable.
- (c) It is already a multi-use park with a playground, barbeque picnic area, sports fields, walking tracks and early learning centre on site.
- (d) The bike and skate area is compatible with these other uses of the park, and enhances the recreational and play experience by providing a larger area for children to exercise and play, and another activity. The area will also allow for adults to be involved with children as they play much as Thomson Park does.
- (e) The bike and skate area is able to be positioned so that it is in the open and clearly visible from within the park, playground, playing fields, play centre, the road, and many of the neighbouring houses. This improves safety by providing natural surveillance – “see and be seen”.
- (f) Although the bike and skate area is clearly visible, it is also able to be situated far enough from the neighbouring houses to avoid issues with noise.
- (g) The bike and skate area can be sited far enough away from the road to avoid being a safety risk when in use to either traffic or users.
- (h) There are toilets on site and shops within easy walking distance.

Issues raised during public consultation**Support for proposal**

33. There was a high level of support for the proposed bike and skate area with approximately 110 respondents making general positive comments, and many of these providing additional comments about the proposal. The positive aspect most frequently identified by submitters was that the bike and skate area would now provide a local facility in the Sumner-Redcliffs area for local children, something that is lacking at present. Not having to travel to another area of the City, and being accessible by bus or walking, were identified as major benefits for submitters. Another key positive aspect was how the bike and skate area would encourage children to participate in physical activity and sport, and similarly, would provide a positive activity that caters to young people and offers opportunities to make friends. Other positive comments in favour of the proposal included:

- (a) Identifying biking and skating as popular sports, that are fun to take part in, and inclusive (not cost prohibitive for young people).
- (b) Providing for activities that are environmentally friendly, reducing traffic and pollution on the roads.

8 Cont'd

- (c) Providing for family activity and a safe environment in which to learn and practice skills.
 - (d) Providing children with a safe alternative to using footpaths, reducing the potential for accidents due to vehicles backing out of driveways and conflicts with pedestrians.
34. Some submitters in support of the proposal also expressed concerns about the project which have been discussed later in the report.

Technical design elements and concerns

35. Many submitters provided suggestions for technical design aspects of the bike and skate area, most of which have been taken into account in the final design process. However there were some concerns identified:
- (a) Seven submitters suggested that the park needed to be larger or more fully developed, not just for younger children.
 - (b) Similarly twelve submitters questioned the target age group believing that it needed to cater to intermediate and teen aged children and more competent riders.
 - (c) A total of 22 submitters also suggested that a half pipe should be provided with some believing that the proposed elements are not challenging enough.
 - (d) Another six submitters identified concerns about the need to achieve separation of younger and older children.
 - (e) Four submitters did not want the area to be used by bikes or scooters at all.
36. Staff acknowledge that many skaters would like to see a larger facility catering to older or more advanced skaters in their local area, however current planning and budgets do not provide for this. The key objectives of this project are to provide a small skate area for younger children to learn to skateboard, roller blade, or ride BMX bikes or scooters, and to provide scope for learning basic skills and tricks prior to graduating to a full skate park facility. It also will provide for primary school aged local children who are unable to travel independently outside of the area to go skating. This is consistent with the direction given in Council's *Skateboarding, Inline Skating and Freestyle BMX Cycling Strategy* (2004) which identified the development of small local scale facilities as a longer term objective. The ward based 'Leisure, Parks and Waterways Studies' identified a desire for more dispersed skateboard parks of small and diverse scale with only a few low grinds and bowls. The development of 'mini skate parks' with small scale, basic, and relatively low challenge features, targeted at young skateboarders was recommended.

Conflicts between users of the bike and skate area

37. Three submitters have raised concerns about possible conflicts between different user groups, that is, bikers and skaters. Skate facilities are shared by a broad range of users, and in the main, facilities are shared well and problems are rare. There can be safety issues when BMXers ride on skate facilities where there are high numbers of other users or when in use by skaters of beginner level. However, in this case, the facilities are aimed at a lower age group and level of skill than trick biking, and it is the view of staff that user conflicts are unlikely to arise. Entry points on to the paved area are also restricted and clearly defined.
38. The question of how to ensure that older children do not use the proposed bike and skate area, or dominate its use, or bully younger children, was identified as a concern for 17 submitters. While play equipment and facilities in public parks are generally designed for specific age ranges, it is generally not practical to impose or enforce age limits on their use. It is the view of staff that imposing an age limit on the use of the bike and skate area would also restrict the involvement of parents and other caregivers, and prevent slightly older beginners from enjoying the activities in a safe smaller-scale environment.

8 Cont'd

Opposition to the proposal

39. The main issues identified by those expressing opposition to the proposal, and by those with mixed views, and also by some of those in favour, related to the potential for various anti-social behaviours. The main issue identified by the 28 submitters who clearly indicated their opposition to the proposal, was the potential of the bike and skate area to attract a particular type of person, in particular teenagers, who would engage in various anti-social behaviours. Of greatest concern was the probability of a resultant increase in vandalism and graffiti, to the park and surrounding properties, and increased generation of noise, particularly at night. Also of concern was the potential for intimidation of younger children using the new bike and skate area, and the playground, and of other park users. Other concerns raised related to traffic safety, loss of visual amenity and open green space, conflicts with other users, and the choice of park location.

Selection of Barnett Park

40. The selection of Barnett Park as the preferred location was a concern for seven submitters with some suggesting alternative parks, schools, or industrial areas away from residential properties. The criteria used in assessing potential sites, and the reasons for selecting Barnett Park as the preferred location, have been discussed earlier in this report.

Improved design layout to address issues

41. Staff acknowledge that vandalism and graffiti to parks and recreational facilities, and the ongoing costs associated with maintenance and repair, is a major issue and are continually working to address this by a variety of means. A key tool is using the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) to improve the design and location of parks, buildings and equipment so that there is both improved safety for users and reduced opportunities for vandalism and other crime. Accordingly, the proposed concept design of the completed skate park has taken into account these issues and principles to maximise safety and minimise any adverse effects.
42. The position of the bike and skate area within the park itself was chosen primarily because it is easily visible from within the park and from the busy main road, allowing for natural surveillance, or "see and be seen". It is situated close to other activities and the road entrance for visibility but far enough away from the road to avoid being a safety risk when in use, to either traffic or users. Although it is clearly visible, it is situated a minimum distance of 45 metres from the nearest residential boundaries on Main Road, and 30 metres from those on Cave Terrace above, to minimise noise. It has been located close to the sealed path and driveway through the park for easy access, but away enough from the car park to reduce the risk of it becoming a 'hang out' for people in vehicles. It is not practical to close off a park, or an area of a park, at night. Closing a reserve car-park overnight incurs significant costs, and while it may remove the opportunity for people who are not legitimate park users to congregate in cars in the car park, it does not prevent people from walking into the park.

Visual amenity and landscaping

43. There were ten comments from submitters concerned about the loss of visual amenity, natural beauty and open green space as a result of paving an area of the park for biking and skating. Other submitters were also concerned about the aesthetics of a large expanse of concrete, suggesting that coloured or painted concrete be used, along with adequate landscape planting.

8 Cont'd

44. A key objective of this project is to integrate the proposed bike and skate area into the surrounding park landscape and with other park activities. The area will be a continuation of the existing path to provide smooth paved areas and sloping mounded paths to roll around on. It will comprise low scale elements that work in with the contours of the existing landscape. The total paved surface area has now been reduced to approximately 600 metres squared and coloured pigments will be added to the concrete to complement the surrounding landscape environment. This will improve visual amenity, and also reduce glare for both users and onlookers. The paved area will also be visually screened with raised grassed mounds and landscape plantings which, in accordance with CPTED principles, will be kept at a lower height to maintain good sight lines and visibility into the playground areas and improve safety.
45. The bike and skate area has been kept clear of the well established planting of native trees and shrubs on the slope rising up to the Cave Terrace boundary. This existing vegetation has many values including maintaining visual amenity and buffering of noise, and will be unaffected by the proposed works. Although playing in this vegetation would not be encouraged from a CPTED point of view, this area will remain accessible to the public, as requested by one submitter.

Conflicts with other park users

46. Twelve submitters have raised concerns about conflicts with other park users, mainly walkers, including those with prams and dogs, in the area proposed for the bike and skate facility. Some have noted that the grassed area is currently used by pedestrians to avoid walking along the entrance road which is considered unsafe, and some that the park already has many activities present. Others have indicated that a bike and skate area is not appropriate in a park where young children are using a playground or attending an early learning centre.
47. The fact that Barnett Park is already a multi-use park with sports fields, a playground, barbeque picnic area, walking tracks and early learning centre, is a key factor in its selection as the preferred location for the proposed bike and skate area. Natural surveillance in a park can also be increased by providing facilities for activities that attract people into parks and encourage them to stay longer, and providing a range of recreational opportunities and spaces in order to ensure activity throughout the day and a range of users, for example, passive open areas, as well as active areas such as skating or biking elements. The bike and skate area is compatible with the existing uses of the park, and enhances the recreational and play experience by providing another activity, and a larger area for children to exercise and play. Overall, this section of Barnett Park comprises 7.2813 hectares of land for the primary purpose of recreation, and additional recreational activities can be expected to occur over time as community needs change. The remainder of Barnett Park provides an additional 35.0645 hectares of regional park for use as public open space.
48. The bike and skate area has been located so as not to conflict with the use of the open space for sports, and also the use of the playground, early learning centre and picnic areas, and with other park users such as walkers. The skate and bike area is separated from the playground so that users do not conflict with the use of this equipment, but children are still able to use both areas for play activity. Parents and caregivers are also able to see and supervise children using both the playground, and the bike and skate area. These activities are considered to be complementary, rather than incompatible. Currently there are 16 parks throughout the City that have a skate park, and of these, 15 also have playground equipment in close proximity. With the reduction in the overall size of the bike and skate area, there is over 30 metres of separation between the facility and the outermost fence of the early learning centre.
49. The reduction in the size of the bike and skate area also allows sufficient grassed area for pedestrians to use as an alternative to the entrance road when walking to and from the early learning centre, or the wider park beyond. In addition, pedestrians will still be able to walk through the bike and skate area during most of the day at most times of the year, as the majority of bikers and skaters will be primary to intermediate aged children who will be absent from the park during school hours.

8 Cont'd

50. A further nine submitters have expressed concern that the public barbeque facilities appear to have been removed to allow for the proposed bike and skate area, and a further two have indicated that the presence of skaters is not conducive to enjoying a barbeque picnic. The barbeque facilities will remain in their current position. In the amended concept plan, the bike and skate area has been reduced in overall length, so there is now greater separation between the two areas. The bike and skate area is also physically separated from the barbeque picnic area by low grassed mounds and other landscape planting, but clear sight lines into this area, and the playground, are still maintained. Again, the existing barbeques and picnic tables provide for family-oriented activity, encourage adults to go there and to stay longer, and enable parents and caregivers to be able to see and supervise children using the bike and skate area, and are also well placed to encourage social interaction and casual surveillance.
51. The need for more seating was also identified as an issue for eleven submitters. Additional seating will be installed around the bike and skate area, providing for parents and caregivers and other spectators, and increasing supervision of the area.

Traffic safety and car-parking issues

52. Several submitters have raised a range of issues related to vehicle movements and traffic safety on the entrance road, and inadequate car-parking.
53. There were concerns expressed about containing children and skateboards within the bike and skate area while in use. The detailed design and different gradients of the bike and skate area provides for movement in a linear direction along the pavement, but not outward movement into the park entrance road. The raised mounds and landscape planting will also assist in containing movement. In addition, it is proposed to replace the existing low fence between the proposed skate area and the entrance road with a higher 1200 millimetres post and twin cable fence in a position closer to the sealed driveway. The greater height also discourages jumping the fence as a short cut into the paved area.
54. The greatest concern was for the safety of children crossing between the bike and skate area, and the playground, on opposite sides of the entrance road, particularly if visibility is obscured by parking and queuing vehicles. The entrance road within the park currently has three speed hump traffic calming devices and a 20 km/hr speed limit sign. The Board also approved the installation of yellow "no stopping" lines along the entire length of the eastern side of the entrance road, and along part of the western side, in 2008. This aimed to address safety issues with vehicles parking on both sides of the entrance road during sports games, and preventing movement of through traffic including emergency vehicles. Increased vehicle movements in the entrance road occur during sports games and training, and peak pick up/drop off times at the early learning centre. The existing car parking area caters for approximately 95 vehicles, and parking congestion is evident only during Saturday sports games.
55. Pedestrian access between the bike and skate area, and the playground, can be managed by limiting entry/exit to the bike and skate area to two clearly designated points along the entrance road fence, with corresponding openings in the fencing on the playground side (refer **attached**). Staff are also investigating the installation of additional speed humps either side of these designated crossing points. Visibility along the entrance road will be further improved when the fencing is relocated, as this will reduce opportunities to park vehicles with wheels on the grassed verge. However with a road width of 5.1 to 5.4 metres, it is likely that some vehicle owners may still attempt to park along the unrestricted section of the western side, obstructing the defined entry/exit point to the bike and skate area at its southern end. It is therefore proposed to install additional yellow "no stopping" lines along the remainder of the western side of the entrance road to provide greater visibility and unobstructed access. It is appropriate for legal reasons to revoke the original resolution prohibiting parking along part of this western side of the entrance road.

8 Cont'd

56. After the concept plan for the proposed bike and skate area has received Board approval, staff will consider the installation of a P5 Restricted Car Parking Area on Main Road in front of Barnett Park to provide a safe drop-off and pick-up area without entering the car park.
57. A number of other traffic issues raised by respondents were considered to be outside the scope and budget of this particular project, including widening the entrance of Barnett Park, installing yellow "no stopping" lines on Main Road, installing a right-turning lane into the park from Main Road, and safety issues in the Redcliffs area. These issues have been referred to other teams within the Transport and Greenspace Unit for investigation.

Lighting

58. Four submitters have suggested either that inadequate lighting encourages anti-social behaviour, or that the area should have night time lighting to prevent such behaviour, however another three have requested that there be no lighting to encourage night time activity. In accordance with the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), the use of parks at night is discouraged, and in general lighting is only provided in parks where the use of a particular path as a designated route is essential at all times. Therefore lighting would not be provided for the use of the bike and skate area at night. However in Barnett Park, the driveway and car park currently have lighting poles that are connected to the main street lighting circuit, and staff are investigating the desirability of maintaining this longer term.

Noise

59. A total of 20 comments have been made about the potential for the proposed bike and skate area to generate noise, including:
 - (a) The noise generated by children using the bike and skate area, and;
 - (b) The potential for noise generated by older youths congregating in the park, particularly at night, having been attracted by the bike and skate area.
60. However there were also two other comments that there would be more noise from the sports games than from the skate area, and that the trees make a good noise buffer.
61. This part of Barnett Park is in a Group 1 Zone (the most noise sensitive zone) in relation to noise standards in the Christchurch City Plan, and proposed activities in the park must comply with these. Spontaneous social activities and children's play, along with non-commercial private social gatherings and most sports events are however, exempt.
62. It can be expected that activities will occur on the park that are consistent with its primary purpose of recreation. Use of the proposed bike and skate area can be expected to generate some noise from the sound of skate boards travelling over, and impacting on, the paved surfaces, and from voices. It is the view of staff that, due to the limited size and type of use of the proposed bike and skate area, in conjunction with the separation distance from the nearest residential properties, the level of noise at the park boundaries will be low. Any noise from the bike and skate area is mitigated by the high ambient noise level in this area from the vehicle traffic on Main Road. It is also buffered to some extent by the existing vegetation along the Cave Terrace boundary.

8 Cont'd**Maintenance issues**

63. Littering, including broken glass, was identified as an issue for several submitters, with five suggesting more rubbish bins, and more frequent servicing, were needed. This park currently has rubbish bins located in high use areas next to the clubrooms, barbeque area and the playground, and parks staff have not identified any problems with rubbish in this park. The situation will be monitored once the bike and skate area is in use, and additional rubbish bins installed if needed. It is considered that it is a more environmentally sustainable practice to encourage people to take responsibility for their own rubbish by taking it away for recycling rather than leaving it behind in the park. Recent trials have shown that sites without bins tend to clear of rubbish as people do take their rubbish away.
64. The facilities in Barnett Park are currently serviced on a regular basis, including the cleaning of the toilets, and servicing of rubbish bins. On completion of the development works, the bike and skate park will be serviced under the Transport and Greenspace Unit maintenance contracts. There are specified levels of service that set the required maintenance standards to be adhered to within all parks across the city.

Resource consent issues

65. Several matters in relation to the Christchurch City Plan have been raised by one submitter. A Project Information Memorandum (ABA 10095738) obtained for this project has identified that five covered cycle parks are required under the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan. This is the only non-compliance with the Christchurch City Plan that has been identified. It is proposed to install the five cycle parks without a covering roof. Children who have cycled to Barnett Park to skate are unlikely to continue to do so in rainy conditions, as water reduces the skater's grip on the board surface, and causes damage to the skateboard itself.
66. Further consideration of any resource consent for this project is outside the scope of this report. The process of public consultation, and Council decision making, under the Local Government Act 2002 is a separate process from that of obtaining any necessary Resource Consents under the Resource Management Act 1991. At this stage in the process, approval of the proposed concept plan, amended as a result of public consultation, is being sought from the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board prior to proceeding with detailed design and construction. Detailed design and construction plans (as required for Resource Consent and building consent applications) are not prepared until after this approval has been given, to avoid the unnecessary expense of detailed design work on a concept design plan that may then be extensively revised as a result of public feedback. However, in developing a draft concept plan for any project, careful consideration is given to the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan and other relevant legislation to ensure that the project is either fully compliant or that the necessary consents will be able to be obtained at a later stage.

Additional features requested

67. A number of submitters suggested the provision of additional equipment, facilities and activities within the reserve which have not been able to be incorporated into the amended concept plan. The current funding under the LTCCP is for the construction of the bike and skate area and does not extend to the provision of these services, therefore additional facilities such as basketball courts, climbing walls, sports field drainage, café and track upgrades are outside the scope and budget of this project. Parks staff have advised that a water supply for filling bottles is to be installed on the exterior of the sports club building. This will also serve the bike and skate area in lieu of providing a new drinking fountain as was requested by three submitters

9. 1000 FERRY ROAD – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Steve Hughes, Traffic Engineer – Community

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's approval that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on a section of the south side of Ferry Road (refer **attached**).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. As a consent condition for development on the north side of Ferry Road, a pedestrian crossing point was installed outside 1000 Ferry Road near the middle of the Ferrymead commercial area. The pedestrian crossing point comprises kerb cut-downs or ramps to assist access of pedestrian and wheelchairs onto and from the road surface level. There is also a central pedestrian island where users can wait for gaps in the traffic before crossing the remaining part of the road. It is not a "zebra" crossing where pedestrian have priority. People using this facility have to give way to vehicles.
3. On the northern side of Ferry Road the parking of vehicles over or near the kerb cut-down for the crossing is prohibited by no stopping/parking markings. On the south side of the road these are absent, resulting in vehicles often parking over or near the access point. The effect of this is often to make it use by pedestrians difficult and its use by wheelchair users impossible. Even if no vehicles are actually parked over the kerb crossing, by parking close to it they can restrict the view of approaching vehicles to its users. This is a particular problem to wheelchair users who may be looking for oncoming vehicles from a height that is lower than the top of the nearby parked vehicles.
4. This section of Ferry Road is a Minor Arterial road, which carries on average over 16,500 vehicles per day (as at September 2009). The existing pedestrian crossing point provides the best possible facilities to enable users to safely cross the road. To do this, the parking of vehicles in front of and beside the access point on the southern side of Ferry Road should be prohibited as it is on the northern side.
5. The installation of no stopping restrictions for five metres on the eastern side of the southern kerb cut-down/access point will not only ensure its easier use, but will also improve the view of approaching east bound traffic to its users. On the western side of the crossing there is a vehicle entrance nine metres from the kerb cut-down/access point, and if parking was prohibited for five metres it would leave a three metre gap that is too small for most vehicles to legally park in. it is appropriate therefore to extend the stopping restrictions nine metres to the vehicle entrance.
6. The only property affected by this proposal is Kovacs Furniture Manufacturers at 1000 Ferry Road. They have been consulted and support the proposed stopping restrictions in the interests of providing a safe crossing point for pedestrians. Two parking spaces would be lost as a result of this proposal.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$50.

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

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

9 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides the Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
10. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated April 2008. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices
11. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

12. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

14. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

16. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. The only property affected by this proposal is Kovacs Furniture at 1000 Ferry Road as the central pedestrian island is outside their property. They support the proposed installation of stopping restrictions as it provides a safer crossing point for pedestrians.
18. No consultation was carried out with the Ferrymead-Brookhaven Residents Association.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approve that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 193 metres east from its intersection with Waterman Place and extending east for a distance of 15 metres.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

10. LINWOOD AVENUE – PROPOSED ALTERATION TO EXISTING MOBILITY AND P5 LOADING ZONE RESTRICTIONS.

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Unit Greenspace Manager
Author:	Steve Hughes, Traffic Engineer - Community

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's approval to revoke the existing parking restrictions outside 218 Linwood Avenue and resolve new parking restrictions associated with this change.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Council staff have received a request from the Salvation Army Shop to change both the layout and the time restrictions outside their shop at 218 Linwood Avenue (refer **attached**).
3. 218 Linwood Avenue is on the south-east corner of the intersection of Linwood Avenue with Cashel Street. It was previously occupied by Work and Income New Zealand but is now a Salvation Army second hand household goods shop.
4. Incorporated into the corner threshold outside the premises there is a 13.5 metre length of parking divided into a 7.5 metre mobility parking space and a 5 metre P5 Loading Zone. For some unknown reason, there is a one metre gap between these two parking areas. The 7.5 metre length of the mobility parking space is considerably larger than the 5.5 metres that is the size for a mobility parking space, while the five metre long P5 Loading Zone is considerably smaller than the standard size for a Loading Zone.
5. The Salvation Army shop has two entrances at the front of the building with the two parking areas in front of them. They have no other entrances, therefore all goods entering or leaving the shop have to be taken through these two entrances/exits. Having a loading zone that is large enough to accommodate cars with trailers and light trucks is desirable. Most car and trailer combinations, as well as the light truck that the Salvation Army uses for deliveries, are considerably longer than five metres and therefore cannot fit within the existing P5 Loading Zone. Therefore an increase in the size of the loading zone to accommodate these larger vehicles has been requested.
6. The loading and unloading of goods can also take considerably longer than the current five minute limit in the loading zone. Therefore the Salvation Army have also requested that the P5 time restriction be changed to a P15 time restriction to better reflect the amount of time that it can take to load or unload the goods that they sell.
7. The changing of the 13.5 metres of available parking to an eight metre P15 restricted parking area and a 5.5 metre mobility parking space will better reflect the need of the customers of the Salvation Army. Parking will still be provided in this area as was catered for before, but with a different allocation of space to suit their needs.
8. Consultation was carried out with businesses and residents nearby. One hundred percent of the respondents supported the proposed changes. The Linwood Neighbourhood Committee, being the residents association for the area was also consulted, and support the proposed changes. Refer to clauses 19 and 20 below for full details.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The estimated cost of moving the road markings and installing new signs is approximately \$400.

10 Cont'd

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
12. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated April 2008. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
13. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/ or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

14. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

16. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

18. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

19. 10 Consultation Documents were distributed to nearby businesses and residents. Three or 30 per cent responded, with all three supporting the proposed changes.
20. The Linwood Neighbourhood Committee was consulted and support this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board:

- (a) Revoke any and all existing parking restrictions applying at any time on the southern side of Cashel Street outside 218 Linwood Avenue commencing six metres west from the western kerbline of Linwood Avenue and extending in a westerly direction for 13.5 metres.

10 Cont'd

- (b) Approve the following parking restrictions on Cashel Street:
- (i) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 15 minutes on the south side of Cashel Street commencing at a point 11.5 metres west from the western kerblines of Linwood Avenue and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of eight metres. This restriction to apply At Any Time.
 - (ii) That a Mobility Park be installed on the south side of Cashel Street commencing at a point six metres west from the western kerblines of Linwood Avenue and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 5.5 metres. This restriction to apply At Any Time.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

11. HAGLEY/FERRYMead COMMUNITY BOARD SMALL GRANTS FUND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE - COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Acting Community Support Unit Manager
Author:	Shupayi Mpunga, Community Development Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek a decision from the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board regarding the appointment of Community Representatives to the Board's Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee for the 2010/11 funding round.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. On 10 December 2009, a report to the Council from the Grants Working Party on Community Funding Criteria Changes recommended that:

Recommendation H: Small Grants Fund - Community Representation on Small Grants Funding Committees

No community representatives on Small Grants Fund Metropolitan decision making body.

Individual Community Boards to decide if they wish to retain community representatives.

Recommendation I: Small Grants Fund - Metropolitan Small Grants Funding Committee

Metropolitan Small Grants Subcommittee be comprised of a maximum of five Councillors, with full delegated authority.

As per the Recommendation H, the Committee would not include any Community Representatives.

3. As a result of these recommendations, the Council resolved to:

"Disestablish the Metropolitan Small Grants Funding Subcommittee comprising both Councillors and community representatives from 31 May 2010";

"Establish a Metropolitan Small Grants Fund Subcommittee comprising Councillors Johanson, Shearing, Wall, Button, Corbett and Buck (with the Deputy Mayor as ex officio) to take effect from 1 June 2010 to allocate the Small Grants Fund – Metropolitan, to eligible applicants whose projects are consistent with the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy and LTCCP."

4. As per recommendation H (above) in the Grants Working Party Criteria Changes Report, Community Boards have the opportunity to decide if they wish to continue to appoint community representatives to the Board's Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee for the 2010/11, funding rounds.
5. If the Board wish to appoint community representatives to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee, staff will begin the nomination process for representatives. After nominations have been received, staff will report back to the Community Board (public excluded report) with details of nominees in order for the Board to decide upon their chosen representatives.
6. If the Board wish to appoint community representatives to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee, it is recommended that four to six community representatives be appointed for a one year term for the 2010/11 funding round.

11 Cont'd

7. It is further recommended that in considering the appointment of community members to this Committee, the Board should consider the make up of the local community. In the past, the following involvement areas/skills have been advertised when calling for community nominations and are seen as a guideline to assist in covering the various sectors within your local community:
- Disabled, sport and recreation, arts and culture, welfare and social services, Maori, ethnic groups, environment and heritage.
 - Interest and involvement in community issues/groups.
 - Some experience in committee processes.
 - Knowledge of various communities of interest.
 - The ability to be articulate and assertive.
8. The Board, in 2008, established its Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee and appointed five community representatives for the period June 2008 to May 2010. At that time four Community Board Members, Bob Todd, Brenda Lowe-Johnson, Rod Cameron and Yani Johanson, were appointed to the Committee with a term of three years, for the 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11 funding rounds.

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

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

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

10. Yes. Under the 2002 Local Government Act, a Council, or Community Board, may appoint committees, subcommittees other subordinate decision making bodies and joint committees (clause 30, Schedule 7). Council's and Community Board's also have the power to appoint or discharge any member of a committee (clause 31(1)). Such committees, etc are ***"subject in all things to the control of the local authority [or read community board], and must carry out all general and special directions of the local authority given in relation to the committee or other body or the affairs of the committee or other body"*** (clause 30(3)).
11. The minimum number of members for a "committee" is three, with a quorum being two (One of whom must be an elected member), or the quorum can be a greater number, as determined by the Community Board. At least one member of a committee must be an elected member of the Community Board, but an employee of the local authority cannot be a member (if they are acting in the course of their employment). Clause 31 also provides:
- "(3) The members of a committee or subcommittee may, but need not be, elected members of the local authority [community board], and a local authority or committee may appoint to a committee or subcommittee a person who is not a member of the local authority or committee if, in the opinion of the local authority, that person has the skills, attributes, or knowledge that will assist the work of the committee or subcommittee."*
12. Clause 26(3) is also relevant, as it provides that the Council/Community Board may appoint a member of a committee to be the Chairperson of the committee, or if a Chairperson is not appointed then the power of appointment may be exercised by the committee. A Deputy Chairperson can also be appointed to act in the absence of a chairperson (clause 26(4)). This person will preside at any meeting if the Chairperson is absent from a meeting. However, if a Deputy Chairperson has not been appointed or if they are also absent then the members of the committee that are present must elect one of their number to preside at the meeting.

11 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

13. Yes. Strengthening Communities Funding and Community Board Funding, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. The funding allocation process carried out by Christchurch community boards is covered in the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. Not required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board decide whether or not they wish to appoint community representatives to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board Small Grants Fund Assessment Committee for the 2010/11 funding round.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

12. HAGLEY/FERRYMead COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING 2010/11 – BOARD BIDS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Acting Community Support Unit Manager
Author:	Diana Saxton, Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board to consider the projects that will be put forward on behalf of the Board to the Strengthening Communities Fund for 2010/11.
2. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board decision making meeting is scheduled for 21 July 2010.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. At the Council meeting on 10 December 2009 the Council resolved to amend the Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme Operational Procedures for the Strengthening Communities Fund, Small Grants Fund and Discretionary Response Fund Local, effective for the 2010/11 Funding round, by adding the following:

“That the Council officers be instructed that as a matter of future policy they are not to apply for funding from this source for Council projects.”

4. In previous years, Units have made applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund for local projects including community events and various recognition awards. Following the decision by the Council, applications to the fund for these types of projects will now need to come from the Elected Members.
5. Attached to this report is a table that outlines potential projects that the Board may wish to put forward for consideration for the 2010/11 Strengthening Communities Fund (refer **Attachment 1**). These projects have been agreed as part of Unit work programmes. Also attached is a list of local Board projects which received funding from the two previous years funding rounds (refer **Attachment 2**).
6. Subsequent to the Board identifying which projects it would like to put forward as applications, staff will assess each project and include these on the decision matrix along with the other applications received for Strengthening Communities Funding.
7. The Hagley/Ferrymead Board Funding Seminar on 16 June 2010 will give Community Board Members the opportunity to go through all applications received from the community and Elected Member bids, in order to clarify any issues or seek further information about any of the projects. This seminar is public excluded.
8. If an Elected Member would like to put forward other local projects for consideration as part of the Strengthening Communities Fund, the Elected Member will need to complete an Elected Member Bid Application Form. This application will then be assessed by staff and considered at the Strengthening Communities Fund workshop and decision meetings, alongside all other applications. Staff will be available to assist Elected Members in completing the application form, if required.
9. At the Council meeting on 10 December 2009 the Council further resolved to amend the Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme Operational Procedures with the following:

“Amend the Strengthening Communities Strategy and the criteria for the Strengthening Communities Fund - Local to allow Community Boards to create a Youth Development Fund to allocate funding for Youth Development Grants.”

12 Cont'd

“Amend the Strengthening Communities Strategy and the criteria by removing the “cap” of up to \$10,000 for the Youth Development Fund.”

10. In previous years Boards' have been able to establish a Youth Development Fund (YDF) of up to \$10,000 from their Discretionary Response Fund.
11. Most Boards fully spent their allocation with some Boards further topping it up during the year dependant on demands on the fund.
12. From 2010 Boards can choose to establish a YDF from their Strengthening Communities Fund and the option still remains to also use their Discretionary Response Fund for this purpose.
13. Boards desiring to have a YDF for 2010 from the Strengthening Communities Fund should include this as a Board bid following the process outlined above.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

15. Yes. Community Board funding decisions are made under delegated authority from the Council.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

16. Yes. Strengthening Communities Funding and Community Board Funding, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

17. The funding allocation process carried out by Christchurch community boards is covered in the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. Not required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board give consideration to the projects detailed in **Attachment 1** – Projects to Consider 2010/2011 and approve a list of projects to be submitted as applications to the 2010/11 Strengthening Communities Fund.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

12 Cont'd

BACKGROUND

STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

19. The Council adopted the Strengthening Communities Strategy on 12 July 2007. The Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme comprises four funding schemes:
 - (a) Strengthening Communities Fund
 - (b) Small Grants Fund
 - (c) Discretionary Response Fund
 - (d) Community Organisations Loan Scheme

20. The following funding outcomes have been used to evaluate and assess applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund:
 - Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups
 - Increase participation in and awareness of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups, programmes and local events
 - Increase community engagement in local decision making
 - Enhance community and neighbourhood safety
 - Provide community based programmes which enhance basic life skills
 - Reduce or overcome barriers to participation
 - Foster collaborative responses to areas of identified need

21. The following funding priorities have been taken into consideration when assessing applications:
 - Older Adults
 - Children and Youth
 - People with Disabilities
 - Ethnic and Culturally Diverse Groups
 - Disadvantaged and/or Socially Excluded
 - Capacity of Community Organisations
 - Civic Engagement

22. The following criteria must be met by all applicants:
 - A community based not-for-profit community, recreation, sporting, arts, social service, environment or heritage organisation.
 - All groups applying for more than \$2,000 must be incorporated under the Incorporated Societies Act 1908 or the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 or be a legal entity registered for charitable purposes.
 - Be based in the Christchurch City Council area with funded programmes or services being provided primarily for Christchurch City Council residents.
 - Must have provided accountability reports for all previous Council funding and have no unresolved or outstanding accountability issues including outstanding debt to the Council.
 - Must have had the funding application approved at a properly convened committee meeting and in writing.
 - Must provide evidence of the need for the project.
 - Have appropriate financial management, accounting, monitoring and reporting practices.
 - Have sound governance and appropriate operational capability and capacity to deliver to the level as agreed.

12 Cont'd

- Be able to commit to collaboration and partnering, where appropriate.
- Groups receiving Council funding at a metropolitan level may only apply for local funding if the project is specifically local and no portion of it has been funded at the metropolitan level.
- Community Boards may decide in conjunction with Council Units to deliver activities to their local communities.

TIMELINE AND PROCESS

23. Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to make final decisions on the Strengthening Communities Funding for their respective wards. The Board's decisions will be actioned immediately following the decision meeting. All groups will then be informed of the decisions and funding agreements will be negotiated where relevant. All funding approved is for the period of September to August each year, therefore grants will be paid out in early September 2010.

13. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – CHELSEA PATRICIA ELIZABETH RICHDAL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Recreation and Sports
Author:	Diana Saxton, Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an application for funding from the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant Chelsea Richdale, an 18 year old resident of Sumner, has been selected as a member of the Synchronised Ice Figure Skating Team to represent New Zealand at the World's Synchronised Ice Skating Championships in Colorado Springs, United States of America from 8 to 10 April 2010. The team will also be travelling to Denver for 10 days of intensive training preceding the World Championships.
3. Chelsea has been involved in figure skating for eight years and has coached kiwi-skate to new skaters as a volunteer for three years. This year Alpine Ice has provided a paid position for three sessions a week with Chelsea continuing one session as a volunteer. Chelsea also volunteers at Alpine Ice competitions helping introduce the younger skaters to competitions. Chelsea is now working towards a level one accreditation for coaching and really enjoys working with her peers and being supportive of younger skaters throughout the season.
4. At the end of last year Chelsea was named New Zealand Ice Skating Association Sportsperson of the Year 2009 and at the start of this year was chosen to be Club Captain of the Centaurus Ice Skating Club. This is a great opportunity for Chelsea to give something back to the sport she is passionate about.
5. When Chelsea was named in the New Zealand Synchronized Skating to go to the World Championships she realised that this was a very special opportunity and has decided to put her studies on hold to concentrate on fitness training until she returns from the competition. The World Championship is the highest level of competition for synchronised skating, and for Chelsea this experience is a once in a life time opportunity to represent New Zealand. It will also give Chelsea an insight into competition at an international level and will teach her skills that she can pass onto skaters she may coach in the future.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6. Each skater is expected to contribute \$6,500 towards the trip expenses. The following table provides a breakdown of the costs for all expenses related to this application. It is based on costs for 18 skaters and two team managers to attend the World Championships and 10 day intensive training. Income is from individual instalments, fundraising including Showcase in Dunedin and Auckland, grants from the International Skating Union and the New Zealand Ice Skating Association, raffles, quiz nights, movie nights and part time jobs.

EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
Venue hire NZ and USA	27,982
Coaching Expenses	25,500
International travel	63,403
Meals and accommodation	24,100
Costume Expenses	20,680
Warm-up Dance Instructor	887
Audition Expenses	622
Bank Fees	250
Total cost	163,424

13 Cont'd

7. This is the first time that the applicant has applied to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board for financial support.

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

8. Yes. This application is seeking funding from the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme which was established as part of the Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Funding. There is a balance of \$6,000 in the Community Board's 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

9. There are no legal implications in regards to this application.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

10. Aligns with Council Activities and Services, Community Support, Community Grants and Grants, pages 176 and 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. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

13. Yes. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approve the application and allocate \$500 funding from the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme for Chelsea Richdale to represent New Zealand at the World's Synchronised Ice Skating Championships in Colorado Springs, USA from 8 to 10 April 2010.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

14. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – ANZAC WREATHS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941 8462
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Unit Manager
Author:	Jo Daly, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for a funding application to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund for the purchase of two ANZAC Day Wreaths.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. For a number of years the Community Board chosen to purchase two wreaths to be laid by Board Members on ANZAC memorials, one in Sumner and one in Heathcote. The cost of each wreath in 2009 was \$100.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

3. Yes. There are no financial implications outside existing budgets.
4. At the time of writing this report there is an unallocated balance of \$44,461 in the Board's Discretionary Response Fund.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

5. Yes, there are none.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

6. Yes. The Board's discretionary funding is part of the Community Grants schemes on page 176 of the 2009-19 LTCCP.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

7. The recommendation in this report aligns with the Strengthening Communities Strategy.
8. The recommendation also specifically aligns with the Community Board objective: Acknowledge diversity and support measures for a vibrant, inclusive and strong communities.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

9. Not required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve \$200 from the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund for the purchase of two ANZAC Wreaths.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

17. 3. 2010

- 32 -

15. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE

15.1 February update of current Projects (refer **attached**).

16. BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

17. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE