

**BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD  
AGENDA**

**MONDAY 17 MAY 2010**

**AT 5PM**

**IN THE BOARDROOM,  
CORNER BERESFORD AND UNION STREET,  
NEW BRIGHTON**

**Community Board:** David East (Chairman), Nigel Dixon, Tina Lomax, Gail Sheriff, Tim Sintes, Linda Stewart and Chrissie Williams.

**Community Board Adviser**  
Peter Dow  
Phone 941 5305 DDI  
Email: peter.dow@ccc.govt.nz

**PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**  
**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**  
**PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

**INDEX**

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES**
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 3 MAY 2010**
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
- PART B 4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
- PART B 5. NOTICES OF MOTION**
- PART B 6. CORRESPONDENCE**
- PART B 7. BRIEFINGS**
- PART C 8. BURWOOD/PEGASUS DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND 2009/2010 – APPLICATIONS – AGAPE TRUST, ARANUI EAGLES RUGBY LEAGUE CLUB AND PEGASUS BAY CHARITABLE TRUST**
- PART B 9. DRAFT STRUCTURES ON ROADS POLICY 2010**
- PART C 10. MARINE PARADE – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTIONS**
- PART C 11. WOODGROVE AVENUE - STREET RENEWAL PROJECT**
- PART C 12. PROPOSED ROAD AND RIGHT-OF-WAY NAMINGS**
- PART A 13. CHILDCARE CENTRE LEASES**

17. 5. 2010

- 2 -

- PART A 14. STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING – KEY LOCAL PROJECTS 2010**
- PART C 15. LOCAL GOVERNMENT “KNOW HOW” TRAINING WORKSHOP – FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE 101 AND DECISION MAKING – ATTENDANCES**
- PART C 16. BURWOOD/PEGASUS BYLAW REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE - MEETING MINUTES OF 21 APRIL 2010**
- PART B 17. RESIDENTS’ ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS**
- PART B 18. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER’S UPDATE**
  - 18.1 Upcoming Board Activity**
  - 18.2 Board Funding 2009/10 Update**
  - 18.3 Chief Executive’s April 2010 Council Update**
- PART B 19. BOARD MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS**
- PART C 20. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 3 MAY 2010**

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

The public excluded meeting minutes of 3 May 2010 have been **separately circulated** to Board members.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

5. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

7. **BRIEFINGS**

**8. BURWOOD/PEGASUS DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND 2009/2010 – APPLICATIONS – AGAPE TRUST, ARANUI EAGLES RUGBY LEAGUE CLUB AND PEGASUS BAY CHARITABLE TRUST**

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

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek consideration of funding requests from the Agape Trust, Aranui Eagles Rugby League Club, and Pegasus Bay Charitable Trust. Funding is sought from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The following table shows the organisation seeking funding, the project name, amount requested and staff amount recommended. Detailed information on each applicant's project is presented in a decision matrix (**attached**).

<b>Name of Group</b>	<b>Name of Project</b>	<b>Amount Requested \$</b>	<b>Amount Recommended \$</b>
Agape Trust	Three OSCAR workers to attend the national conference	1,643	1,643
Aranui Eagles Rugby League Club	New posts for juniors and sideline seating for seniors	4,411	4,411
Pegasus Bay Charitable Trust	New Zealand 1 <sup>st</sup> International Sand Castle Competition at New Brighton, Christchurch  Contribution is sought towards costs for the establishment of the Trust and the inaugural event.	10,250	9,000

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

3. The Board has **\$16,673** remaining available for allocation in its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund. Should the Board grant the recommended amounts to each organisation this will leave a fund balance of \$1,619 for allocation to 30 June 2010.

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

4. Yes, page 184 of the LTCCP refers.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

5. Yes. There are no legal issues to be considered.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

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

6. Yes. Strengthening Communities Funding and Community Board Funding.

**8. Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

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

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

8. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board give consideration to the projects detailed in the attached decision matrix and approve the staff recommended allocations from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.

## 9. DRAFT STRUCTURES ON ROADS POLICY 2010

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Asset and Network Planning Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Tina von Pein, Project Manager – Public Places Policies Review

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. To seek comments from Community Boards on the draft Structures on Roads Policy 2010 (**Attachment A**).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. At the 5 March 2010 meeting of the Regulatory and Planning Committee the Committee resolved: *“That this issue lie on the table until staff have briefed Community Boards, and that it return to the Committee in April in light of these discussions”*.
3. With the 2006 amalgamation of Banks Peninsula District Council (BPDC) and Christchurch City Council (CCC) some operational policies specific to each area remained in existence for the respective areas.
4. With the adoption of the Public Places Bylaw 2008 (the bylaw) the policies related to structures on roads were identified as needing review to ensure they appropriately give effect to the bylaw. The Council appointed Public Places Policies Working Party has worked with staff on the review of this and the other operational policies that relate to matters covered by the bylaw.
5. The proposed Structures on Roads Policy 2010 provides a single policy for the whole of the city and incorporates and replaces the following:

## (a) Current CCC policies:

- (i) Airspace over Public Roads - Granting Rights.
- (ii) Structures on Roads (Ramp, Retaining Walls, Garage, Parking Platform etc).

*Note: “Use of Legal Road as Licensed Premises policy”:* The ability of the Council to revoke a permit to occupy legal road as licensed premises as currently contained in this policy now forms part of each individual permit issued by the Council and is therefore not retained.

## (b) Current BPDC policies (all part of the Banks Peninsula roading Policy):

- (i) Structures on Legal Roads in Urban Areas - License to Occupy Policy.
- (ii) Retaining Walls - Responsibility Policy.
- (iii) Fencing Policy.

The proposed policy therefore provides clarity and consistency in the management of applications for structures on roads throughout the Council area.

6. For most of its content the proposed policy incorporates the current CCC policies with updated wording and minor changes. The provisions in the existing ‘city’ and ‘peninsula’ policies are overall similar in nature. There are also some additions e.g. the provisions relating to verandas and fences, and inclusion of the Banks Peninsula fences policy into the new policy for the whole city. Current provisions in both CCC and BPDC policies which address council operational procedures (and do not belong in policy statements) were not retained.

**9. Cont'd**

7. This policy addresses only structures of permanent nature on roads and therefore does not deal with temporary structures on roads such as those associated with restaurants and cafes occupying sidewalks, which is planned for consideration and consultation during 2011, nor with *'paper roads'* which is planned for consideration at a later stage.
8. In summary, the proposed policy achieves an overdue streamlining and consolidation of policies and introduces:
  - (a) Provisions relating only to verandas previously in the Public Places Bylaw 1992;
  - (b) Changed provisions relating to fences;
  - (c) New provisions on the use of airspace over roads for architectural features; and
  - (d) New provisions for infrastructural and other structures.

Key stakeholder groups were contacted in writing about the proposed review and no concerns were raised.

9. It is not proposed to have a Special Consultative Procedure for the Structures on Roads Policy. The policy will become operative once adopted by the Council, and relevant stakeholders will be notified in writing.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

10. Current policy enforcement is undertaken on a 'response to a complaint' basis. It is anticipated that this will remain the same with the adoption of a reviewed policy, with no anticipated additional expenses.

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

11. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

12. The Public Places Bylaw 2008 came into force on 1 July 2008. Clause 8 of that bylaw provides for operational policies to be formulated, relating to matters regulated by the bylaw. Such policies must be adopted by Council resolution, and may include information on application procedures, administrative arrangements, terms and conditions related to activities in public places, definition of terms and other guidance information.

The consideration and adoption of such policies must be done in accordance with the Council's usual decision-making processes under the Local Government Act 2002.

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

13. Initial analysis of this policy and the potential review requirements have been considered in relation to the CCC Policy on Determining Significance, and the level of formal consultation that may be required has also been considered.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

14. The following LTCCP chapters are relevant: 5.3 City Promotions – 5.3.2 Promoting the City as an attractive place to live, learn and work.– 9.0 Enforcement and Inspections – Protect public health and safety; enforce compliance.

**9. Cont'd**

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

15. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES OR OTHER BYLAWS**

16. The Structures on Roads Policy is aligned to the following Christchurch City Council strategies, plans and policies:

- (a) Central City Revitalisation Strategy.
- (b) Safer Christchurch Strategy.
- (c) Pedestrian Strategy.
- (d) Parking Strategy.

Equity and Access for People with Disabilities Policy  
Long Term Council Community Plan

17. This policy gives effect to the Public Places Bylaw 2008 and should be read in conjunction with the Council's General Bylaw 2008, Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008, Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008 and the relevant rules, policies and objectives in the District Plan/City Plan.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

18. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

19. During the drafting of this policy some initial discussion has been undertaken with key stakeholders including at a meeting of Community Board Chairpersons. Potentially affected external parties and associations were invited to provide feedback on any concerns and no concerns were raised.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Community Board provide comment on the attached draft Structures on Roads Policy 2010.



## 9. Cont'd

### BACKGROUND

20. On 1 July 2008 the Christchurch City Council Public Places Bylaw 2008 became operative.
21. The bylaw enables the management of public places in order to balance the various different, and sometimes competing, lawful uses for which public places may be used. It seeks to provide for reasonable controls to protect health and safety, to protect the public from nuisance and to provide for the regulation of trading in public places.
22. Following the adoption of the bylaw a new operational policy was proposed to be developed from a review of the 12 relevant existing policies and associated matters. The policies all relate to the clauses in the bylaw that regulate commercial activities and obstructions in public places (clauses 6 and 7). This report only deals with the specific policies of the 12 that deal with structures on roads. The remaining policies have either already been considered by the Council (*Trading and Events in Public Places* in February 2010) or will be considered later in 2010/2011.
23. The current policies were developed before the amalgamation of Banks Peninsula District Council and the Christchurch City Council, and all were developed before the adoption of the new bylaw. The policies need to be reviewed to ensure that they are still necessary, that they are appropriate and that they are fit for purpose. The review of the policies addresses the following criteria:
  - (a) Rationalise the current policies where needed;
  - (b) Establish whether current practice and needs align with the policies;
  - (c) Assess whether any new matters need to be included;
  - (d) Establish whether the policies align with the bylaw;
  - (e) Take account of internal (Council) needs and external (stakeholder) needs; and,
  - (f) Result in redrafted policies that are coherent, stand-alone documents.
24. In addition to these 12 policies, related operational issues have been identified that would benefit from being included in or adopted into the new operational policy, resulting in some new areas of consideration.
25. On 2 February 2009, the Regulatory and Planning Committee agreed to appoint a working party to work with staff to discuss the review of operational policies that relate to matters covered by the Public Places Bylaw 2008. The members of the Public Places Policies Working Party are Councillors Wells, Wall, Shearing, Reid and Johanson. The working party concluded its deliberations during 2009 with a meeting on 4 December 2009. Due to the considerable workload of reviewing all 12 policies, the Council on 24 September 2009 approved a timetable to split consideration of the 12 policies into a first group to be finalised by June 2010 (including those considered in this report), with the remainder to be considered in 2011 after the 2010 local government elections.

### Proposed Structures on Roads Policy:

26. The proposed policy achieves an overdue streamlining and consolidation of policies and introduces (1) provisions relating only to verandas previously in the 1992 Public Places Bylaw; (2) changed provisions relating to fences which are taken from the Banks Peninsula policy and is now proposed for the whole city, (3) new provisions on the use of airspace over roads for architectural features; and (4) new provisions for infrastructural and other structures. Key stakeholder groups were contacted in writing about the proposed review and no concerns were raised.

**9. Cont'd**

**THE OBJECTIVES**

27. The key objectives of the public places policy review are to:
- (a) Review and update, as appropriate, the policy clauses and to enable a working policy that is supported by the Council and the community.
  - (b) Bring together the current policies and practices for both the former BPDC and CCC.
  - (c) Align the policy with current CCC plans and strategies.
28. The key objective of this policy is to manage structures on street and to develop a single policy to assist the public in identifying what can happen where and under what conditions.

**THE OPTIONS**

29. Two options have been identified in relation to managing structures on roads.
- (a) The adoption of a new Council policy.
  - (b) Maintain the status quo with some editing to factually update current policies.

**THE PREFERRED OPTION**

30. The preferred option is the adoption of the proposed Council policy. The proposed policy is attached to this report.

## 9. Cont'd

**ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS****The Preferred Option**

33. The preferred option is the adoption of a new Council wide policy (as tabled with this report). In addition to updating the wording and minor changes to the text this policy brings together the key elements of current policies and practices and incorporates new policy clauses which will assist with developing clarity and consistency in policy understanding and application.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Clarity to community as to the policy, how to apply and how it applies.  Alignment of policies between the former Banks Peninsula DC policies and the CCC policies will assist clarity and ease of use and application.	Communication of policies is part of Council core business.
<b>Cultural</b>	None specific.	None specific.
<b>Environmental</b>	Policy will enable more robust and transparent management of structures on roads	None specific.
<b>Economic</b>	Consolidated policy.	None specific.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b>  This policy option aligns with the following Community Outcomes:  <b>-A Safe City</b> – we live free from crime, violence, abuse and injury. We are safe at home and in the community. Risks from hazards are managed and mitigated.  <b>-An Attractive and well designed City</b> – Christchurch has a vibrant centre, attractive neighbourhoods and well-designed transport networks. Our life styles and heritage are enhanced by our urban environment.  <b>-A City for recreation, fun and creativity</b> – We value leisure time and recognise that the arts, sports and other recreational activities contribute to our economy, identity, health and wellbeing.  <b>- A Prosperous City</b> – We have a strong economy that is based on a range of successful and innovative businesses. We value sustainable wealth creation, invest in ourselves and in our future.</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b>  The development of a consolidated policy will enable the Council to better manage structures on roads through more transparent and consistent processes and procedures.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b>  No specific effects noted.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b>  The policy pulls together the key elements of the current policies and practices of the Council into a consolidated policy document and incorporates some new provisions consistent with existing Council policies.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b>  No comments were received from relevant stakeholders invited to comment. As only minor changes are proposed from the existing policies and as there have been no issues with the operation of those policies it is not likely to have any significant effects.</p>		

## 9. Cont'd

**Maintain the Status Quo with some editing (not preferred option)**

34. The option of maintaining the status quo with some editing would mean maintaining the series of policies and current practices that apply to the post-amalgamation CCC area, and some specific policies that only apply to pre-amalgamation areas. Within this option it would be logical to update the policies (desk top activity) to ensure that historical and no longer relevant clauses are not included.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Communities should be aware of the current policies / practices as most have been operational since the early 1990's.	Continued segregation of the City / District Council areas as per pre-amalgamation.
<b>Cultural</b>	None specific.	None specific.
<b>Environmental</b>	Current status will continue to promote the areas of CCC and the former BPDC as two separate regions.	None specific.
<b>Economic</b>	None specific.	None specific.

**Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:**

This policy option aligns with the following Community Outcomes:

- **A Safe City** – we live free from crime, violence, abuse and injury. We are safe at home and in the community. Risks from hazards are managed and mitigated.
- **An Attractive and well designed City** – Christchurch has a vibrant centre, attractive neighbourhoods and well-designed transport networks. Our life styles and heritage are enhanced by our urban environment.
- **A City for recreation, fun and creativity** – We value leisure time and recognise that the arts, sports and other recreational activities contribute to our economy, identity, health and wellbeing.
- **A Prosperous City** – We have a strong economy that is based on a range of successful and innovative businesses. We value sustainable wealth creation, invest in ourselves and in our future.

**Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:**

Maintaining the status quo will mean business as usual for council enforcement and policy development.

**Effects on Maori:**

No specific effects noted.

**Consistency with existing Council policies:**

The current policies broadly align with existing council strategies and plans, however the factual update is recommended, should this option be chosen, as many of the clauses are either out of date or no longer relevant.

**Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:**

No comments were received from relevant stakeholders invited to comment.

**At Least one Other Option (or an explanation of why another option has not been considered)**

35. No other option has been considered as the Council has previously adopted (24 September 2008) the recommendations to review the policies.

**10. MARINE PARADE – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTIONS**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Lorraine Wilmshurst/Michael Thomson, Network Operations

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Marine Parade. Please refer to the **attached** plan.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Following the completion of the section of the Marine Parade Enhancement Project between Hood Street and Shackleton Street, the Council received a request that No Stopping restrictions be installed in a consistent manner with other completed sections of the Marine Parade Enhancement Project. The broken yellow lines have been marked on the road as part of the Enhancement Project but the no stopping restrictions have not been formally resolved by the Board.
3. Marine Parade is a collector road and is the closest road to the ocean, running parallel with the coastal sand dunes. The road runs from Waimairi Beach in the north to South New Brighton in the south. Over the last five years the Coastal Area Park Ranger Team (Coast Care Programme) has been progressively working along Marine Parade to enhance this connection between the roadside and beaches. The section between Hood and Shackleton Streets has now been completed.
4. The proposal will restrict parking on the eastern side of Marine Parade to the newly created indented parking bays by installing No Stopping restrictions between the parking bays from the carpark opposite Hood Street through to the bend opposite Shackleton Street. This is consistent with No Stopping restrictions at the existing indented parking bays along Marine Parade.
5. Board approval for the installation of the No Stopping restrictions will provide legal standing for these restrictions.
6. Consultation was carried out in December 2008 as part of the Marine Parade Enhancement Project. As no parking is being removed on the residential side of Marine Parade, no further consultation has been undertaken.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7. As the broken yellow lines have already been marked, there is no cost for this proposal.

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

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

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

9. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
10. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated April 2008. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.

**10. Cont'd**

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 Parking Strategy 2003, Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?**

16. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

17. Consultation was carried out in December 2008 as part of the Marine Parade Enhancement Project and this consisted of a seminar with Burwood/Pegasus Community Board and a public information leaflet being distributed to residents and key stakeholder groups. As no parking is being removed on the residential side of Marine Parade, no further consultation has been undertaken.

18. The Officer-in-Charge - Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

Revoke the following parking restrictions:

- (a) That any existing parking restrictions at any time on the east side of Marine Parade between Hood Street and Shackleton Street, be revoked.

Approve the following parking restrictions on Marine Parade:

- (b) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Marine Parade commencing at the prolongation of the southern kerbline of Shackleton Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 57 metres.
- (c) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Marine Parade commencing at a point eight metres north from the prolongation of the northern kerbline of Rodney Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 22 metres.
- (d) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Marine Parade commencing at a point 96 metres north from the prolongation of the northern kerbline of Rodney Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 25 metres.

**10. Cont'd**

- (e) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Marine Parade commencing at a point 186 metres north from the prolongation of the northern kerbline of Rodney Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 25 metres.
- (f) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Marine Parade commencing at a point 246 metres north from the northern kerbline of Rodney Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 19 metres.
- (g) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Marine Parade commencing at a point 296 metres north from the prolongation of the northern kerbline of Rodney Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
- (h) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Marine Parade commencing at a point 25 metres north from the prolongation of the northern kerbline of Hood Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 113 metres.

## 11. WOODGROVE AVENUE - STREET RENEWAL PROJECT

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Kim Swarbrick, Consultation Leader – Greenspace

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board for the Woodgrove Avenue Street Renewal project, as shown in **attachment 1**.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Woodgrove Avenue is a local road located in North New Brighton and is approx 290 metres long. The existing section with dish channel, which is to be renewed, is approximately 200 metres long and existing carriageway is 13.5 metres wide. Access to Woodgrove Avenue is from Pacific Road and is situated in a residential area.
3. The primary objectives for the project are as follows:
  - (a) To meet budget and achieve lowest overall cost solution.
  - (b) Maintain or improve user safety and level of service.
  - (c) To renew the kerbs and channels to suit drainage and adjacent street drainage needs as required.
  - (d) To renew carriageway(s) as required.
  - (e) To renew street drainage pipes as required.
  - (f) To renew footpaths as required.
  - (g) To renew berms as required.
  - (h) To renew streetlight assets as required.
  - (i) To renew signs and markings as required.
  - (j) To renew other Transport and Streets assets e.g. cycle, traffic signals, retaining walls, fences, railings, etc if required.
  - (k) To install traffic calming infrastructure to suit the speed environment required.
  - (l) To install new landscaping and street trees to meet the Council's Community Outcomes.
  - (m) To install additional assets to meet current standards and the new street layout.
4. A concept was developed to meet these objectives. Three options were considered:
  - (a) 'Do nothing';
  - (b) An option which realigned the carriageway to the east side of Woodgrove Avenue (this option would clash with some services on the east side and provide large berms on the west side which some residents might be reluctant to maintain);
  - (c) An option which centrally aligned the carriageway (the preferred option).



**11. Cont'd**

5. The concept was distributed with a Public Information Leaflet to the affected community. The consultation received 15 responses, which is a moderate to high response rate of 43 per cent. Submissions received were mostly from local residents. The proposal has a good level of community support from those who responded to the consultation, with 80 per cent indicating that they fully support the proposal. The remaining 20 per cent having not indicated support all had inquiries regarding driveway widths and planting. All of these respondents have been provided further information and their requests have been met.
6. The recommended concept for the Woodgrove Avenue Street Renewal project is included as attachment 1.
7. These works are scheduled for implementation between September and December 2010.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. Funding for the project is provided in Long Term Council community Plan (LTCCP) 2009-2019 Street Renewal Programme, page 245.
9. Based on current estimates, staff believe there is sufficient funding to complete the installation of this project. Pricing information is included in the public excluded section of this agenda.

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

10. Yes. Funding is provided from within the Transport and Greenspace Capital Programme in the 2009-19 LTCCP (refer page 245).

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

11. There are no land ownership issues associated with this project. The project is within existing land boundaries.
12. No Resource Consents are required.
13. 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.
14. The Community Boards have delegated authority from 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.
15. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

16. Funding for the proposed Woodgrove Avenue Street Renewal project is programmed in the 2009-19 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) Street Renewal Programme.

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

17. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

18. This project is consistent with key council strategies including the Parking Strategy, Road Safety Strategy and Pedestrian Strategy.

## 11. Cont'd

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

19. Yes, as above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT****Consultation Process**

20. Initial issues gathering surveys were distributed to local residents and other key stakeholders in September 2009. The responses assisted the project team in developing a proposed concept. The project team advised the Community Board of the upcoming public consultation with a seminar in February 2010. This advised of the proposed concept, consultation stakeholders, project timeline and provided an opportunity for Board members to comment on the consultation programme.
21. The formal public consultation period was open from 12 February to 5 March 2010. A public information leaflet and feedback form was delivered to residents on Woodgrove Avenue, adjacent homes on Pacific Road, absentee owners and other key stakeholders. This pamphlet included a summary of the concept, an initial concept plan, and a feedback form. The project team sought feedback from the community to see whether the proposal was generally supported and asked for any feedback. The proposal was advertised on the Christchurch City Council's 'Have Your Say' website.
22. Further informal discussions were held with four residents who sought clarification on the proposed plan or requested alterations.
23. Each submitter providing a return address, received an interim reply letter. The letter acknowledged that the submission had been received and considered by the project team. A final reply letter was sent to all submitters who provided contact details, advising the outcomes of consultation were provided and in this instance there were only minor changes to the recommended concept plan. The final letter informed respondents that a report would be presented to the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board for their approval. Details of the Board meeting were also provided so that any interested residents could attend or address the Board prior to the decision being made.

**Consultation Outcome**

24. The consultation received 15 responses which is a moderate response level. Most submissions were received from local residents.

<b>Community Feedback Option</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Responses</b>
YES: <i>"I fully support the proposal"</i>	12	80%
NO PREFERENCE EXPRESSED	3	20%
NO: <i>"I completely oppose the proposal"</i>	0	0%

25. The quantitative responses above clearly indicate support for the proposal, with no respondents checking the 'No' box and 80 per cent indicating that they fully support the proposal. Response level from residents was 43 per cent and considered a moderate to high response rate. Staff believe the majority support due to the fact that the proposed concept incorporated speed restrictions and removal of existing trees both of which were raised through the initial issues consultation and dealt with in the development of the concept plan.

**11. Cont'd**

26. The public consultation raised the following issues. These have been responded to by the project team, and changes made to the concept plan, as per below.
- (a) Two residents from Woodgrove Avenue raised concerns about mowing grass service strips in front of their properties. Council staff have agreed to the request by owners to leave two service strips at numbers six and 27 bare. Property owners have chosen to plant the service strips at their own expense.
  - (b) One resident highlighted they find it difficult to manoeuvre their vehicle into their driveway. The project team has agreed to splay the entrance way slightly to improve access.
  - (c) Two residents requested no street trees in front of their properties: at number. 23 due to proposed future redevelopment of property and driveway; and, number six, requesting retention of the existing cabbage tree instead. The project team is happy to oblige both these requests.
27. The project team has recommended that no-stopping lines be installed on Woodgrove Avenue at its intersection with Pacific Road. This proposal is supported by the adjoining neighbours.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board:

- (a) Approve the proposed plan for the Woodgrove Avenue Street Renewal (TP318501), as per attachment 1.
- (b) Revoke the existing no stopping restrictions, as follows:
  - (i) That the existing no stopping restrictions on both sides of Woodgrove Avenue commencing at Pacific Road and extending in a northerly direction to the cul-de-sac head, be revoked.
  - (ii) That the existing no stopping restrictions on the northwest side of Pacific Road commencing at Woodgrove Avenue and extending in a south-westerly direction for a distance of 21 metres, be revoked.
  - (iii) That the existing no stopping restrictions on the northwest side of Pacific Road commencing at Woodgrove Avenue and extending in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 20 metres be revoked.
- (c) Approve the following new no stopping restrictions:
  - (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Woodgrove Avenue commencing at its intersection with Pacific Road and extending 15 metres in a north direction.
  - (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Woodgrove Avenue commencing at its intersection with Pacific Road and extending 12 metres in a north direction.
  - (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Pacific Road commencing at its intersection with Woodgrove Avenue and extending nine metres in a southwest direction.
  - (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Pacific Road commencing at its intersection with Woodgrove Avenue and extending seven metres in a northeast direction.

**12. PROPOSED ROAD AND RIGHT-OF-WAY NAMINGS**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Environment Policy and Approvals Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Bob Pritchard, Subdivisions Officer

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to obtain the Board's approval to two new road names, and one new right-of way-name.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The approval of proposed new road and right-of-way names is delegated to Community Boards.
3. The Subdivision Officer has checked the proposed names against the Council's road name database to ensure they will not be confused with names currently in use.

**4. Cameo Grove Subdivision – K O'Donnell**

This subdivision creates 40 new residential allotments, with the access off Burwood Road via Cameo Grove (**Appendix 1**). Cameo Grove has been upgraded from a right-of-way to a legal road. The new allotments are served by two new internal roads, and a private right-of-way. The property was (at least as far back as 1966), the location of the "Premier Poultry Farm". In recognition of this, the development company proposes to name the two roads and right-of-way after breeds of poultry. The larger cul-de-sac is proposed to be named Araucana Way. The Araucana chicken originated in Chile and is known for the blue eggs it lays. The second cul-de-sac is proposed as Serama Place. The Serama is a bantam chicken originating from Malaysia and is known for being one of the lightest chickens in the world. The right-of-way is proposed as Minorca Lane. The Minorca chicken originated in Spain and is one of the larger Mediterranean chickens.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5. There is no financial cost to the Council. The administration fee for road naming is included as part of the subdivision consent application fee, and the cost of name plate manufacture is charged direct to the developer.

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

6. Not applicable.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

7. The Council has authority to approve right-of-way names.

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

8. Yes. There are no legal implications.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

9. Not applicable.

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

10. Not applicable.

**12. Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

11. Not applicable.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

12. Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

13. Where proposed road or right-of-way names have a possibility of being confused with names in use already, consultation is held with Land Information New Zealand and New Zealand Post.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board consider and approve the proposed road and right-of way-names as submitted for the Cameo Grove Subdivision off Burwood Road.

**12. Cont'd**

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

14. There are no issues.

**THE OBJECTIVES**

15. Approval by the Community Board of the road and right-of way-names proposed in this report.

**THE OPTIONS**

16. Decline the proposed names and require alternative names to be supplied.

**THE PREFERRED OPTION**

17. Approve the names as submitted by the applicant.


**13. CHILDCARE CENTRE LEASES**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Community Support Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Kathy Jarden, Leasing Consultant

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to provide information on the lease renewal process for 11 Council owned independently operated childcare facilities and seek recommendations from the relevant Community Boards to the Council for a resolution providing a delegation to staff to conclude new leases for each of them.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Council currently owns 11 childcare facilities independently operated under leases as detailed in the **attached** schedule. Two of the 11 centres are on land designated as reserve with the balance on fee simple land.
3. The properties are spread across six wards within the city. Therefore, to ensure consistent decision making and processes by the Council, this matter is being reported in this one generic report submitted to the relevant Boards for their recommendations to the Council for a single consideration and decision.
4. The leases for the 11 properties all expire on 30 June 2010. Negotiations have commenced with the existing individual lessees for a new lease. The rationale for dealing unilaterally with the existing lessees on expiry is set out in this report.
5. The proposed lease term is six years with one right of renewal for a further six years in the form of the Council's generic lease. This would result in a final expiry date of 30 June 2022, if the right of renewal is exercised.
6. The proposed rents are based on independent current market valuations. The decision to use market based rent was established by the Council in 2002 in response to a report on the setting of rents for childcare facilities.
7. This report recommends proceeding with the grant of new leases to the existing operators on the terms and conditions set out in the report and seeks a delegation to staff to finalise those leases.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. Independent valuation advice has been sought and the valuation for each childcare facility has taken a commercial view of the rental. Simes Ltd. has assessed each of the these centres acknowledging the improvements the centre has funded.
9. Each childcare centre currently receives an operating grant from the Council to cover the annual rent charged under the lease. For the period from 1 July 2010, the centres can apply for funding assistance using the Council's Strengthening Communities Grants process.
10. The proposed rents will ensure that Council properly manages its assets.

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

11. Yes.

**13. Cont'd**

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

12. The Community Boards do not have the delegated authority to authorise the granting of the proposed leases on fee simple land; that decision needs to be made by the full Council. The Community Board does have powers to make recommendations to the Council.
13. The Fendalton/Waimairi and Shirley/Papanui Community Boards do have delegated authority to enter into leases for the Bishopdale Community Crèche at 129 Farrington Avenue and Redwood Early Childhood Centre Incorporated at 339 Main North Road, respectively, as these two are on reserve land. However for the purposes of consistent decision making and process, staff are recommending that these two Community Boards attend to those two leases in a similar manner as the other nine leases on fee simple land and do not exercise their delegation; thus leaving all 11 lease renewals for a single decision by the Council.
14. On 13 May 2002, a report to the Strategy and Finance Committee was tabled that recommended *“that the Council confirm its requirement that a system of grants and leases as outlined in the report be put in place.”* That report stipulated that the rent for *“each building is assessed at a market rental level in accordance with current Council policy”*. The recommendation was adopted by the Council on 23 May 2002. The method of rent subsidy for the childcare centres in Council-owned buildings was by an internal transfer of funds. This method has subsequently been made more transparent with the childcare centres making application for funding through the Strengthening Communities fund.

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

15. The Council's Legal Services Unit has advised on all aspects of the leases and associated issues.
16. The Council's generic lease for early education childcare facilities will form the lease document.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

17. Yes.

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

18. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

19. The Council's support for the provision of childcare centres is highlighted in the Early Childhood Education Strategy 2001. The Council provides support to early childhood education through a variety of means. In these instances assistance is provided through the provision of a Council-owned building and a Council funded operating grant. As part of the Council's approved process for entering into formal lease arrangements with early childhood education providers the rent for the Council-owned building is assessed at a market rental. As part of a separate process, early childhood education providers are entitled to apply for financial assistance. Funding requests are assessed against a range of criteria including the location's socio-economic status and whether or not the provider may be able to pay rent. Funding requests are made through the Council's Strengthening Communities fund.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

20. Yes.



**13. Cont'd**

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

21. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommend that the Community Boards recommend to the Council that the Council adopts a resolution in the following form:

- (a) That the existing lessees for the childcare centres as listed in the attached schedule be offered a new lease upon expiry of their existing lease terms on 30 June 2010.
- (b) That the new leases be generally on the Council's generic lease terms and conditions.
- (c) That the initial term of the leases be six years with one right of renewal for a further six years, which provides for a final expiry date of 30 June 2022, if the right of renewal is exercised.
- (d) That the market rentals as set out in the attached schedule be adopted from lease commencement, with market related rent reviews at three yearly intervals.
- (e) That the Corporate Support Unit Manager be granted delegated authority to conclude and administer the leases, as generally set out in the above resolutions.

### 13. Cont'd

#### BACKGROUND

##### Burwood/Pegasus

22. The *Canterbury Westland Free Kindergarten Association Inc* is a not-for-profit society operating the Kidsfirst Early Learning Centre at 284 Breezes Road, Aranui. The land is described in Certificate of Title 11K/595 as being Lot 1 DP 27621 and was vested in the Christchurch City Council for the purpose of a crèche. The property is a 1940's bungalow that was converted by the Council. The childcare facility is currently licensed for 33 children.
23. The *New Brighton Community Preschool and Nursery Incorporated* is a not-for-profit society operating the New Brighton Community Preschool at 109 Beresford Street, New Brighton. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB26B/643 as Lot 25 DP 100 and held as fee simple for crèche purposes. The property is a traditional pre-war bungalow that has been extensively extended and converted by the tenant. The childcare facility is currently licensed for 39 children.
24. *North Beach Community Childcare Centre Incorporated* is a not-for-profit society operating the North Beach Community Childcare Centre at 102 Marriotts Road, North Beach. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB375/138 as Lot 3 DP 6151 and held as fee simple for crèche purposes. The building is a former church hall which has been converted to a childcare centre by the Council. The tenant has been responsible for the establishment of the outdoor play area. The childcare facility is currently licensed for 34 children.

##### Fendalton/Waimairi

25. *Bishopdale Community Preschool Association Incorporated* is a not-for-profit society operating the Bishopdale Community Crèche at 129 Farrington Avenue (13 Bishopdale Courts), Bishopdale. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB20F/1396 as Lot 10 DP 42896 and held as local purpose (community centre) reserve. The building is a 1970's concrete block building originally used as library storage. The tenant converted the building into a pre-school and it is licensed for 50 children.

##### Hagley/Ferrymead

26. *New Beginnings Preschool Incorporated* is a not-for-profit society operating the New Beginnings Preschool at 136 Aldwins Road, Linwood. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB245/193 as being Part Rural Section 347. The building is a modern, purpose-built pre-school constructed by the Council. The centre is currently licensed for 36 children.
27. *Woolston Preschool Incorporated* is a not-for-profit society operating the Woolston Community Child Care Centre at 52 Glenroy Street, Woolston. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB37B/959 as being Lot 1 DP 63343. The building is a purpose built preschool constructed by the Council. The centre is currently licensed for 39 children.

##### Riccarton/Wigram

28. *Springs Community Early Learning Centre Incorporated (SCELC)* became registered as a not-for-profit society in November 2009.
29. The land is described in Certificate of Title 18A/1036 as being Lot 1 DP 25336 and Part Lot 1 DP 23275 and is the site of a childcare centre and social housing complex.

**13. Cont'd**

30. The current lease is with Affinity Child and Family Services who operate the Springs Community Preschool at 10 Weaver Place, Sockburn through Springs Community Preschool. The preschool operations were handed over to SCEL C as a "going concern" in December 2009.
31. Springs Community Pre-School has operated for 21 years under the management of voluntary trusts and committees and church groups. The centre is currently licensed for 35 children.
32. SCEL C has not been able to provide financial information for the previous three years as that was filed by Affinity Child and Family Services. They have however provided a five-year cash flow projection and projected registrations. As this group, in various forms, has operated the childcare centre, it is believed they have the practical experience to carry forward but it would be recommended that their financial position and business plan are reviewed on a regular basis to ensure they can continue to operate.

**Shirley/Papanui**

33. *Redwood Early Childhood Centre Incorporated* is a not-for-profit society operating the childcare centre at 339 Main North Road, Redwood. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB244/204 as Rural Section 41271, Rural Section 41272 and Rural Section 42037 and held as recreation reserve. Rural Section 41271 is classified by way of Gazette Notice as a local purpose (community centre) reserve. The property is a 1970's building originally constructed as a hall and converted by the Council into a childcare centre. The centre is currently licensed for 40 children.
34. *St. Albans Edu-Care Centre Incorporated* is a not-for-profit society operating the childcare centre at 3 Thames Place, St Albans. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB293/37 as Part Lot 63-64 DP 3115 and held for crèche purposes. The property is a 1940's bungalow that was converted and extended by the Council in 1985. The childcare centre is currently licensed for 35 children.

**Spreydon/Heathcote**

35. *Hoon Hay Community Crèche Incorporated Society* is a not-for-profit society operating the Hoon Hay Community Preschool at 113 Mathers Road, Hoon Hay. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB17K/1312 as being Lot 2 DP 20805. The property is a 1970's community hall that was converted by the current tenant into a childcare centre. The centre is licensed for 36 children.
36. *The Sydenham Community Pre-school Incorporated* is a not-for-profit society operating the Sydenham Community Preschool at 113 Huxley Street, Sydenham. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB42A/668 as being Lot 1 DP 72739 for the purpose of a crèche. The property is a 1960's house that was converted into a childcare centre by the Council. The centre is licensed for 30 children.

**THE OPTIONS**

37. To enter into a new lease with the existing tenants as detailed in Schedule A.
38. Not enter into a new lease with the existing tenants and call for expressions of interest for the future use of these facilities.

**THE PREFERRED OPTION**

39. To enter into a new lease with each of the existing tenants who have maintained the building and land and are fulfilling an important community service.

**13. Cont'd**

40. The Council's normal practice is to deal in an open and transparent public manner, with the opportunity to lease the property made available to the general market through tender on expiry of any lease. The Council made a commitment in the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) to continue the provision of the early childhood facilities. To achieve this, the preferred option, for the reasons set out below, is to deal unilaterally with the childcare centres to negotiate a new lease and set a fair market rental for the property.
41. The Council has purpose-built some of the facilities and contributed to the upgrade of other facilities in conjunction with significant financial contributions made by the incumbent tenant and the Ministry of Education.
42. The current tenants are meeting the requirements of the Ministry of Education to maintain their childcare licence. The childcare centres own the business as the licences are specific to those organisations.
43. The Council is satisfied with the current operators and recent experience has shown that there is a limited market available if the Council were to seek expressions of interest for the 11 facilities.



## 14. STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING – KEY LOCAL PROJECTS 2010 REPORT

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Community Support Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Natalie Dally, Community Development Adviser

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board with the opportunity to consider the funding applications it wishes to nominate and recommend to the Council as Key Local Projects (KLP) for 2010/11.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In a public excluded seminar held on 3 May 2010, the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board considered the issue of Key Local Projects for 2010.
3. As part of the Strengthening Communities Fund process, Community Boards can recommend significant projects from their area to be nominated as Key Local Projects (KLPs). These are put forward to the Christchurch City Council for consideration for metropolitan funding.
4. The process for considering KLPs is as follows:
  - (i) Community Boards nominate and prioritise their KLPs and make a recommendation to the Christchurch City Council.
  - (ii) The Christchurch City Council makes decisions on Board recommended KLPs.
  - (iii) Successful KLPs are allocated funding from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund.
  - (iv) Unsuccessful KLPs are returned to the Community Board for consideration under the local Strengthening Communities Fund.
5. If a KLP is successful in receiving funding from the Christchurch City Council, then there can be no further call on the Board for that project, even if the project is funded to a lower level than has been recommended by the Board.
6. In 2008/09, the Burwood Pegasus Community Board recommended one project be funded as a Key Local Project – the Aranui Community Trust. This project received funding from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund for a three year period.
7. In 2008/09 a new reporting system, using a Results Based Accountability framework, was introduced. This system uses three key questions to measure the impact and efficacy of projects:
  - How much did you do?
  - How well did you do it?
  - Is anyone better off?
8. Based on the accountability reports that have been submitted, as well as staff knowledge of the group and the project, staff will recommend that the Board continue to support the existing project as a KLP for the final year of their three year funding agreement.
9. One new KLP was recommended by the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board in 2009/10 - Project Employment and Environmental Enhancement Programme (PEEEP), which was subsequently agreed to be funded by the Christchurch City Council.
10. All new KLPs in 2009/10 were funded for one year only due to the uncertain impact of the planned \$1.5 million reduction in Community Grants funding.

**14. Cont'd**

11. Staff will recommend that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board nominate Project Employment and Environmental Enhancement Programme again as a KLP in 2010/11. Attached is a Decision Matrix that provides information on the project (**Attachment 1**).
12. Staff have reviewed all applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund 2010/11 to identify if there are any projects that should be considered for recommendation to the Christchurch City Council as a Key Local Project for 2010/11.
13. Staff will recommend that no new projects be nominated from the Burwood/Pegasus ward as KLPs for 2010/11 and attached is a list of all of the applications to the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's Strengthening Communities Fund 2010/11 (**Attachment 2**).

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

14. If successful, a total of \$66,000 from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund will be spent on the Burwood/Pegasus KLPs for the third and final year which is \$7,000 more than in 2009/10.
15. In 2010/11, the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board will have \$238,918 to allocate in its Strengthening Communities Fund.
16. If recommended KLPs do not receive any funding at a metropolitan level, they will be returned to the Board for consideration with their remaining Strengthening Communities applications.

**Timeline and Process**

17. The KLPs as approved by the Board, will be put forward to the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Funding Committee for consideration at its meeting on 5 July 2010.
18. Any recommended KLPs will be considered for a one year funding period to ensure that all KLPs are kept in line with the three year KLP funding cycle which commenced in July 2008.

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

19. 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?**

20. 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?**

21. 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?**

22. Yes, the funding allocation process carried out by the Community Boards is covered in the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy.

**14. Cont'd**

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

23. Not required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended:

- (a) That the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board continue to support the Aranui Community Trust Aranui Community Co-ordinator wages and AFFIRM - Family Festival, as a KLP for the final year of the three year funding agreement.
- (b) That the Burwood Pegasus/Community Board again nominate the Project Employment and Environmental Enhancement Programme - Community Work and Training Project, as a KLP in 2010/11.
- (c) That no new projects be nominated from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board as KLPs for 2010/11.

14. Cont'd

**BACKGROUND**

24. 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 Projects Fund
  - (c) Discretionary Response Fund
  - (d) Community Organisations Loan Scheme.
25. The funding schemes enable the Council and its Community Boards to support and provide leverage opportunities for not-for-profit, community focused groups seeking funding in support of their community endeavours.
26. In October 2007, the Council adopted the Strengthening Communities Fund operational procedures, which included the process for nominating Key Local Organisations (KLOs), subsequently renamed Key Local Projects (KLPs).
27. Each Board may nominate Key Local Projects (KLPs) in its area that are put forward to the Christchurch City Council for consideration for metropolitan funding.
28. In the assessment process undertaken by staff, the following guidelines were used to assist staff in determining candidates for KLP funding consideration:
  - Proven track record with the Council in providing a high quality level of service.
  - Provides a significant contribution towards the Council's Funding Outcomes and Priorities.
  - Demonstrates leadership and innovation.
  - Demonstrates best-practice and collaboration.
29. Projects that are recommended by the Community Board as a KLP are considered for funding from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund. The agreed process to determine if a "local" funding application should be processed as a KLP was detailed as bullet point 16 in the report adopted by the Council on 4 October, 2007.
30. The process for considering KLPs is as follows:
  - (i) Community Boards nominate and prioritise their KLPs and make a recommendation to the Christchurch City Council.
  - (ii) The Christchurch City Council makes decisions on Board recommended KLPs.
  - (iii) Successful KLPs are allocated funding from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund.
  - (iv) Unsuccessful KLPs are returned to the Community Board for consideration under the local Strengthening Communities Fund.
31. The Christchurch City Council will make KLP decisions based on affordability and the following priorities:
  - Strengthening Communities Strategy Principles and Goals;
  - Funding outcomes and priorities as set out in Strengthening Communities Strategy;
  - Alignment to local Community Board objectives;

AND



## 14. Cont'd

- Projects deliver benefits to the city outside of the local Board area
- Key community issues contemplated under Goal 2 of the Strengthening Communities Strategy.

32. If a KLP is successful in receiving funding from the Christchurch City Council, then there can be no further call on the Board for that project, even if the project is funded to a lower level than has been recommended by the Board. This reflects the "Funding Constraints" criteria agreed by the Council in Appendix F of the October 4, 2007 report, which states that *"Groups receiving funding at a Metropolitan level may only receive Local level funding if the project is specifically local and no portion of it has been funded at the Metropolitan level"*.
33. In 2008/09, the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board recommended one project be funded as a Key Local Project from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund. This project, which was funded for a three year term, was:

Name of Group	Name of Project	Amount Funded
Aranui Community Trust Incorporated Society	Aranui Community Co-ordinator wages and AFFIRM - Family Festival	\$31,000

34. Each of the KLPs are required to submit twice-yearly accountability reports to the Council so that staff can monitor the progress of the projects. Attached, for the Board's information, is an update on the KLP (attachment 1).
35. It should be noted that funding for KLPs for 2009/10 was not released until staff were satisfied with the 2008/09 accountability report.
36. Staff will recommend that the Board continue to support the existing project as a KLP for the final year of their three year funding agreement.
37. In 2009/10, the Community Board recommended the following KLP, which was subsequently agreed to by the Christchurch City Council:

Name of Group	Name of Project	Amount Funded
Project Employment and Environmental Enhancement Programme	Community Work and Training	\$28,000

38. All new KLPs in 2009/10 were funded for one year only owing to the uncertain impact of the planned \$1.5 million reduction in Community Grants funding. PEEEP has again applied to the Community Board for funding for this project in the 2010/11 funding round.
39. Staff will recommend that the Community Board support this project again as a KLP in 2010/11. Attached is a Decision Matrix that provides information on the project (Attachment 1).

#### **New accountability measures – Results Based Accountability**

40. In 2008/09, a new accountability system, based on a Results Based Accountability framework developed by Mark Friedman, was implemented to better measure the impact and efficiency of the projects funded.
41. Results Based Accountability starts with the desired 'ends' and works backward, step by step, to the 'means'. For example – for communities, the ends are conditions of well-being for children, adults, families and the community as a whole such as residents with good jobs, a safe neighbourhood, or a clean environment.

**14. Cont'd**

42. The system uses three basic questions:
  - How much did you do?
  - How well did you do it?
  - Is anyone better off?
43. Mark Friedman is a speaker, consultant and author of the book '*Trying Hard Is Not Good Enough: How to Produce Measurable Improvements for Customers and Communities*'. Mr Friedman directs the Fiscal Policy Studies Institute (FPSI) in Santa Fe, New Mexico. His work has been used in over 40 states in America and countries around the world, including Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Ireland, the Netherlands and Norway.
44. Mark Friedman gave a presentation on the Results Based Accountability System to Elected Members on 10 June 2009 at Civic Chambers.
45. All groups that received funding in the 2008/09 year were invited to attend a seminar with Mark Friedman on 5 December 2008. The seminar explained the reasoning behind Results Based Accountability and showed groups how to measure their project's outcomes in this way.
46. Staff have also been trained on the Results Based Accountability System and are available to groups to help them to complete their accountability reports.

**New Key Local Projects for 2010/11**

47. Staff have reviewed all applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund 2010/11 to identify if there are any projects that should be considered for recommendation to the Christchurch City Council as Key Local Projects for 2010/11.
48. Staff will recommend that no new projects be nominated from the Burwood Pegasus Board as a KLP for 2010/11.
49. Attached is a list of all applications to the Burwood Pegasus Board Strengthening Communities Fund 2010/11 (Attachment 2).

## 15. LOCAL GOVERNMENT “KNOW HOW” TRAINING WORKSHOP – FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE 101 AND DECISION MAKING - ATTENDANCES

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

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's approval for interested members to attend Local Government New Zealand “Know How” Training Workshops – Financial Governance 101, to be held in Christchurch on Friday 2 July 2010 and Decision Making, to be held in Christchurch on Friday 9 July 2010.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Financial Governance 1010 course is designed to enhance fiscal knowledge in a way that will enable better financial decisions to be made. The Course consists of a series of workshops and group exercises, during which participants will gain a deeper understanding of:

- council finances
- how depreciation, capital expenditure and debt servicing work together
- the relevance of financial information to the planning and LTCCP process
- important financial, accounting and asset management concepts
- balance sheet and financing choices.

Further information is **attached**.

3. The Decision Making course will provide an overview of the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, including the purposes of local government and the role of local authorities. The workshop will incorporate decision-making information that has been developed by the Office of the Auditor General, case law on decision-making requirements, and a range of practical application ideas. The course consists of a series of workshops and group exercises, during which participants will gain a deeper understanding of:

- decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act, and the Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act
- the Auditor General's principles for good decision-making
- balancing the political and technical aspects of decision-making
- decisions which balance short-term and long-term objectives
- techniques and processes for making good decisions.

Further information is **attached**.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The cost of these Local Government workshop is \$350 plus GST per person per course for elected members from member councils. The Board's 2009/10 members' training budget currently has an unallocated balance of \$1,800.

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

5. Yes, provision for elected member training is made in the LTCCP, specifically under the Elected Member Representation activity.

**15. Cont'd**

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

6. Yes, there are no legal implications.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

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

7. Not applicable.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

8. Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

9. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board give consideration to approving the attendance of interested members at the Local Government New Zealand "Know How" Training Workshops – Financial Governance 101 and Decision Making to be held on Friday 2 and 9 July 2010 respectively, in Christchurch.

16. **BURWOOD/PEGASUS BYLAW REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE - MEETING MINUTES OF 21 APRIL 2010**

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

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to submit the following outcomes of the Board's Bylaw Review Subcommittee meeting held on Wednesday 21 April 2010 at 12 noon, in the Meeting Room, Shirley Service Centre, 36 Marshland Road.

The meeting was attended by Linda Stewart (Chairperson), David East, and Tim Sintes.

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Nigel Dixon and Tina Lomax.

**1. Environment Canterbury's Draft Annual Plan 2010/11 – Board Submission**

At its meeting on 29 March 2010 the Board resolved that the Bylaw Review Subcommittee, under delegated authority, consider Environment Canterbury's Draft Annual Plan 2010/11 and prepare a submission on behalf of the Board.

The Subcommittee considered the contents of the proposed Annual Plan and identified particular issues and perspectives for inclusion in a submission. The resulting submission is **attached**.

The Subcommittee **resolved** that the submission made on Environment Canterbury's Draft Annual Plan 2010/11 be received and noted for record purposes.

**2. Draft Climate Smart Strategy 2010-2025 – Board Submission**

At its meeting on 1 March 2010, the Board resolved that the Bylaw Review Subcommittee consider the Council's Draft Climate Smart Strategy 2010-25 with a view to preparing a draft submission on behalf of the Board.

The Subcommittee considered the proposed strategy and the resulting submission is **attached**.

**SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the submission made on the Christchurch City Council's Draft Climate Smart Strategy 2010-25, be adopted.

**3. Proposed Earthquake-prone, Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings Policy 2010 - Board Response**

The Subcommittee considered the Christchurch City Council's Proposed Earthquake-prone, Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings Policy 2010.

The resulting submission is **attached**.

**SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

That the submission made on the Christchurch City Council's Proposed Earthquake-prone, Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings Policy 2010, be adopted.

**16. Cont'd**

The meeting concluded at 1.15pm

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the meeting minutes be received and the Subcommittee's recommendations above, be adopted.

**17. RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS**

Representatives from the Northshore Residents' Association will update the Board on the activities of the group at 6pm.

**18. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**

**18.1 UPCOMING BOARD ACTIVITY**

**Tabled**

**18.2 BOARD FUNDING 2009/10 UPDATE**

**Attached**

**18.3 CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S APRIL 2010 COUNCIL UPDATE**

**Attached**

**19. BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

**20. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

**Attached**