

**HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

WEDNESDAY 19 MAY 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 MEETING MINUTES – 5 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 A 8. CHILDCARE CENTRE LEASES**
- PART A 9. 244 - 250 DYERS ROAD - SALE OF A STRIP OF ROAD FRONTAGE**
- PART B 10. STRUCTURES ON ROADS POLICY 2010**
- PART C 11. HEBERDEN AVENUE – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION**
- PART C 12. MAIN ROAD – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION**
- PART C 13. FREEDOM CAMPING IN HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD WARD**
- PART C 14. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10
DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – HEATHCOTE VALLEY SCHOOL – PUBLICATION
OF HEATHCOTE AND HEATHCOTE VALLEY SCHOOL HISTORY**

We're on the Web!

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

- PART C 15. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – SUMNER BAYS UNION TRUST – WAGES AND ADMINISTRATION COSTS FOR 2010**
- PART A 16. STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING – KEY LOCAL PROJECTS**
- PART C 17. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – REDCLIFFS PUBLIC LIBRARY INC. – PURCHASE OF CHILDREN AND ADULTS READING BOOKS**
- PART C 18. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – JOSHUA WILLIAM GILLESPIE SMITH**
- PART C 19. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – FRIENDS AND FAMILY OF RICHMOND PRIMARY SCHOOL LEARN TO SWIM PROGRAMME**
- PART C 20. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – LINWOOD YOUTH FESTIVAL EXPERIENCE**
- PART C 21. MOA BONE CAVE FENCING**
- PART B 22. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER’S UPDATE**
- PART B 23. BOARD MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS**
- PART B 24. BOARD MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 5 MAY 2010**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 5 May 2010 are **attached**.

The public excluded minutes have been separately circulated to Board members.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 5 May 2010 (both open and public excluded), be confirmed.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

5. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

7. **BRIEFINGS**

8. CHILDCARE CENTRE LEASES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Unit Manager
Author:	Kathy Jarden, Leasing Consultant



PURPOSE OF REPORT

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

1. The Council currently owns 11 childcare facilities independently operated under leases as detailed in the schedule (refer **attached**). Two of the 11 centres are on land designated as reserve with the balance on fee simple land.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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

7. 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 centres acknowledging the improvements the centre has funded.
8. 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.
9. The proposed rents will ensure that the Council properly manages its assets.

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

10. Yes.

8 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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."* The 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?

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

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

16. Yes

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

17. Yes

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

18. 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.

8 Cont'd

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

19. Yes

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

20. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board recommend to the Council that it 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.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board recommend to the Council that it adopts a resolution in the following form:

- (a) That the existing lessees for the New Beginnings Preschool Incorporated and the Woolston Preschool Incorporated 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 for the New Beginnings Preschool Incorporated and the Woolston Preschool Incorporated 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.

BACKGROUND

Burwood/Pegasus

- 21. 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.

8 Cont'd

22. The New Brighton Community Preschool & 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.
23. 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

24. 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

25. 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.
26. 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

27. Springs Community Early Learning Centre Incorporated (SCELC) became registered as a not-for-profit society in November 2009.
28. 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.
29. 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 SCELC as a "going concern" in December 2009.
30. 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.
31. SCELC 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.

8 Cont'd

Shirley/Papanui

32. 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.
33. 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

34. 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.
35. 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

36. To enter into a new lease with the existing tenants as detailed in Schedule A (refer **attached**).
37. 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

38. 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.
39. 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.
40. 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.
41. 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.
42. 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.

9. 244 - 250 DYERS ROAD - SALE OF A STRIP OF ROAD FRONTAGE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Asset and Network Planning Unit Manager
Author:	Bill Binns, Property Consultant

PURPOSE OF REPORT



1. The purpose of this report is to advise that the Council has received a request from the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to acquire a strip of road frontage to improve a one kilometre section of Dyers Road between Maces Road and Metro Place to improve road safety and as a result, seek the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's recommendation to the Council to sell this strip of road frontage to NZTA for this purpose.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In May 2009 the Council received a letter from NZTA advising that it had engaged GHD Limited to carry out investigations to improve a one kilometre section of Dyers Road between Maces Place and Metro Place.
3. As part of this investigation land belonging to the Council (244-250 Dyers Road) had been identified as one of the parties to be affected by this project.
4. Dyers Road forms part of the Christchurch City ring road network designed to provide good access around the perimeter of Christchurch City and also provide direct access to the Port of Lyttelton for heavy commercial traffic from points north.
5. Dyers Road also forms part of the refuse vehicle route around Christchurch.
6. This one kilometre section of Dyers Road spans several intersections and has a deceptive "S" bend near Maces Road. The area is generally located within the established Dyers Road industrial area.
7. The Scheme Assessment Study has highlighted safety concerns with regards to sightlines for visibility to existing properties on the east side of the highway. To improve safety for property access some additional areas of private land will be required and these are shown on the plan (refer **attached**).
8. The Council land affected by this proposal is a narrow strip of road frontage crossing 250 Dyers Road (Lot 1 DP 37293 area of 17.755 square metres) and 244 Dyers Road (Lot 1 DP 2796 area of 174.537 square metres) totalling 192.306 square metres.
9. The City Water and Waste Unit is the titular owner of the property and are supportive of this NZTA initiative. They have advised that by NZTA acquiring this portion of land it will not affect the operation of the Metro Transfer Station and will improve the safety of the highway.
10. This report accordingly recommends that the Council sell this portion of road frontage to the NZTA.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

11. NZTA's property consultants and staff from the Council's property consultancy team have through an independent registered valuer agreed on a value of \$27,000.
12. All costs associated with the transfer of the land will be met by the NZTA (reinstating the fence, any driveways and all legal cost).

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

13. Yes.

9 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

14. As this strip of land is required for another public work, the Council is not faced with having to deal with section 40 Public Works Act (offering the strip required back to the original owner).
15. The Board does not have delegated authority to sell land or pass the consequent resolution on the sale. However, the Community Board does have recommendatory powers to the Council.

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

16. Yes, as above

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. Volume 1 Page 77 City Development - providing a well designed, and efficient transport system.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

19. Yes.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

20. Yes, to promote a safe and efficient transport system around Christchurch.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

21. No consultation is required outside of reporting process to the Community Board and the Council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board recommend to the Council that it adopt the following:

- (a) That the strip of road frontage in front of 250 and 244 Dyers Road be sold to the New Zealand Transport Agency for road widening.
- (b) That the Council's policy of selling property through a process of public tender is set aside in respect of 250 and 244 Dyers Road and the sale is achieved through dealing unilaterally with the New Zealand Transport Agency.
- (c) That the Corporate Support Unit Manager be given delegated authority to conclude the terms and conditions of sale for the property at 250 and 244 Dyers Road at a value of \$27,000.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

10. STRUCTURES ON ROADS POLICY 2010

General Manager responsible	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible	Asset and Network Planning Unit Manager
Authors	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 (refer **attached**).

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.
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.

10 Cont'd

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.

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

15. As above.

10 Cont'd

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 Boards 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.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

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:

10 Cont'd

- (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.

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 of current policies.

10 Cont'd

THE PREFERRED OPTION

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

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option

33. The preferred option is the adoption of a new Council wide policy (as **attached** to 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.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	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.
Cultural	None specific.	None specific.
Environmental	Policy will enable more robust and transparent management of structures on roads	None specific.
Economic	Consolidated policy.	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:
 The development of a consolidated policy will enable the Council to better manage structures on roads through more transparent and consistent processes and procedures.

Effects on Maori:
 No specific effects noted.

Consistency with existing Council policies:
 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.

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

10 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.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	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.
Cultural	None specific.	None specific.
Environmental	Current status will continue to promote the areas of CCC and the former BPDC as two separate regions.	None specific.
Economic	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 the 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.

11. HEBERDEN AVENUE – 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 parts of Heberden Avenue in Sumner.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Staff have received a request from a resident of Heberden Avenue that Stopping Restrictions be installed on both sides of Heberden Avenue near the Sumner Tennis & Squash Club (refer **attached**).
3. Heberden Avenue is a local street running predominantly north/south along the bottom of the hillside from Evans Pass Road to Scarborough Road. The 397 vehicles that were recorded as using the road in a 24 hour period in April 2005 appear to be predominantly Sumner residents.
4. The width of Heberden Avenue varies considerably along its length. The section between Colenso and Wiggins Streets, which this report relates to, varies between 8.5 metres and 12 metres in width. It is both the narrowing of the road and sharp corners with restricted visibility that has resulted in the request to install stopping restrictions.
5. The Sumner Tennis & Squash Club is situated at 18 Heberden Avenue on the western side of the roadway. At times there are a considerable number of vehicles parked outside the clubrooms, sometimes extending around the corners that are situated to the north and the south of the property.

Northern Corner

6. Approaching the corner near the northern boundary of the Tennis & Squash Club and the electrical sub-station at 16 Heberden Avenue from the south, the road narrows from 12 metres to less than 8.5 metres as it turns from north-east to north. The parking of vehicles on the western side of the approach to the corner not only restricts visibility of any vehicle travelling south, but also forces the northbound vehicles over the centreline to align up with the roadway north of the corner. This can put them into the pathway of any vehicle approaching from Wiggins Street.
7. The section of roadway from 16 Heberden Avenue to Wiggins Street is less than 8.5 metres wide with a fence bordering the road edge on the eastern side from Wiggins Street to opposite 16 Heberden Avenue. This fence can cause vehicles to be parked further out into the roadway (to allow passengers to alight) than is required for vehicles parked adjacent to the kerb. The result can be that the available width of roadway for through traffic is reduced so that only one vehicle at a time can traverse this section of Heberden Avenue. There is a footpath on the western side.
8. The installation of 15 metres of stopping restrictions on the western side of Heberden Avenue extending south from the northern edge of the vehicle entrance into the electrical sub-station at 16 Heberden Avenue, will improve visibility around the corner and prevent vehicles from needing to cross the centreline to drive through the narrow section of roadway.
9. The installation of 37 metres of stopping restrictions along part of the fence on the eastern side of Heberden Avenue south of the intersection with Wiggins Street will stop vehicles from parking in a position that severely restricts the road width in this narrow part of Heberden Avenue.

11 Cont'd

Southern Corner

10. At the southern end of the sporting complex heading south, Heberden Avenue turns from south-west to south around a rock bank. The road width in the vicinity of the corner varies from 8.7 metres north of the corner to 10 metres south of the corner. Vehicles parking on the eastern side do so alongside a rock face and alongside a gravel shoulder and drain. The rock face, gravel shoulder and drain cause the vehicles to extend some distance out into the roadway. Vehicles parked on the western side can park closer to the kerb and footpath on that side of the roadway.
11. The parking of vehicles on both sides of the approaches and on the corner can reduce the available carriageway width for both lanes of through traffic to six metres and less. The effect of this narrowing is accentuated by the reduction in width immediately after the corner (regardless of which way it is approached) and by the corner itself.
12. The installation of 33 metres of stopping restrictions on the eastern side of Heberden Avenue from 18 metres north of the apex of the corner to 15 metres south of the apex will ensure there is sufficient road width for vehicles to safely slow or to stop before the narrow sections of the roadway to allow approaching vehicles to pass. This should not result in an increase of traffic speed through the area due to the already narrow parts of the road, and due to the continuous series of corners along Heberden Avenue making speeding difficult.
13. This request to install stopping restrictions came from a resident of the area. Consultation was carried out with nearby residents, the Sumner Tennis & Squash Club, and the Sumner Residents Association. All respondents supported the proposed changes (see paragraph 24 for further details).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

14. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$125.

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

16. 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.
17. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations in this area as set out in the Register of Delegations dated 10 December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices in this area.
18. 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?

19. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

11 Cont'd

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

21. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

22. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003 and the Road Safety Strategy 2004.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

23. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

24. Nine consultation documents were distributed to nearby residents, organisations, and the Sumner Residents Association.
- (a) Seven or 78 per cent responded.
 - (b) All seven or 100 per cent supported the proposed changes.
 - (c) The Sumner Tennis & Squash Club and the Sumner Residents Association were amongst the respondents and the supporters.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

- (a) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the eastern side of Heberden Avenue commencing at a point 15.5 metres south from its intersection with Wiggins Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 37 metres.
- (b) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the eastern side of Heberden Avenue commencing at a point 111 metres south from its intersection with Wiggins Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 33 metres.
- (c) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the western side of Heberden Avenue commencing at a point 48.5 metres south direction from its intersection with Wiggins Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

12. MAIN 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 to change stopping restrictions on both sides of Main Road in Moncks Bay.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Staff have received a request from the Water and Waste Unit of the Council and from Orion New Zealand Limited to install a No Stopping Restriction outside the shared water pumping station and electrical substation situated near 284 Main Road Moncks Bay (refer **attached**).
3. The pumping station provides water to Clifton and Richmond Hills with the substation providing electricity to a similar area. The only entrance into the pump station part of the building is via a door opening onto the footpath. The only entrance into the Orion Electrical Substation part of the building is also via a separate door opening onto the footpath. Routine and emergency maintenance for both facilities must be done through these doorways. Should an occasion arise when a pump or electrical part need replacing, access directly in front of the doorways is needed for vehicle mounted lifting equipment to remove and replace the heavy machinery contained inside. Any delay in fixing or replacing the pump or substation could result in the above areas running out of water or electricity.
4. Above the doorways is an old superseded Council sign saying "Keep Clear At All Times." This sign has no legal standing and does not legally prevent vehicles from parking in front of the building. In addition, the Council has sometime in the past four to five years painted a 15 metre long vehicle parking "box" across the front of the building. There is space for three 'average' sized cars to park in this box.
5. Due to the location of the parking box, and due to the scarcity and demand for on-street parking spaces in this area, the parking spaces are often full. If a vehicle is parked in front of the building in the middle of this box, access for lifting equipment is denied. It is proposed therefore that a four metre length of no stopping restriction be installed across the front of the building to ensure that access is readily available. This will leave two times 5.5 metre parking spaces each end of the building.
6. It is further proposed to offset the loss of the four metres of parking space on the eastern side of Main Road by adding five metres of parking space to the northern end of parking area opposite the building on the western side of Main Road. This can be easily done by shortening the existing no stopping restrictions that extend around Shag Rock corner.
7. Consultation documents were distributed to nearby residences seeking opinions on the proposal to remove the one parking space. One hundred per cent of the respondents objected to the loss of the parking space hence the proposal to allay their concerns by creating an additional space directly opposite.
8. The Clifton Neighbourhood Group was consulted in relation to this proposal. They agree both with the proposal to prevent parking in the space in front of the building, and to create a parking space nearby to offset the loss of this parking space (see paragraphs 19 and 20).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$125.

12 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 the 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 10 December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices for this part of the Hagley/Ferrymead Ward.
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.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

18. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

19. Six consultation documents were distributed to residences near the water pumping station.
 - (a) Six or 100 per cent were returned.
 - (b) Six or 100 per cent objected to the requested change to the parking.
20. Some comments of the objectors were:
 - (a) Four mentioned that maintenance is infrequent, irregular or rare;
 - (b) Three suggested that Council staff could access the pump station by driving on the footpath (please note there is a electrical pole in the middle of the footpath that prevents this);
 - (c) Two believed that the loss of a parking space is more of an impediment to residents then restricted access is to Water and Waste and Orion staff;

12 Cont'd

- (d) Two suggested that a night time only no stopping restriction be installed;
- (e) Two suggested that a day time only no stopping restriction be installed;
- (f) Two suggested the use of temporary no stopping cones or signs.

21. This area comes within the Clifton Neighbourhood Support Group area. They support the installing of parking restrictions outside the pump/electrical building, and the installation of a parking space nearby.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board:

- (a) Revoke the following parking restriction:
 - (i) That the existing no stopping restrictions on the northern side of Main Road commencing at a point 430 metres west of its intersection with Clifton Terrace and extending west then south around the Shag Rock corner for 167 metres be revoked.
- (b) Approve the following parking restrictions:
 - (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited on the northern side of Main Road at any time commencing at a point 430 metres west of its intersection with Clifton Terrace and extending west then south around the Shag Rock corner for 162 metres.
 - (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited on the southern side of Main Road at any time commencing at a point 572 metres west then south of its intersection with Clifton Terrace and extending south for five metres.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

13. FREEDOM CAMPING IN HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD WARD

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941 8281
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Strong Communities
Author:	Vincie Billante, Policy Analyst

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To provide the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board with options to address any freedom camping occurring in Cranmer Square, Sumner, Redcliffs and Taylors Mistake in response to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's 6 December 2009 request to investigate making these Special Use Areas under the Public Places Bylaw 2008.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board 6 December 2009 meeting, staff were requested to report on the issues of freedom camping in Cranmer Square, Sumner, Redcliffs and Taylors Mistake and consider if declaring these areas as Special Use Areas prohibiting freedom camping under the Public Places Bylaw 2008 was a viable option to address said issues.
3. There have been some complaints made about freedom camping at Sumner and Redcliffs, but none at Taylors Mistake.
4. The areas concerned are covered by the Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008 that prohibits camping including residing in a caravan or campervan (but not other types of vehicles). However, currently there are no signs to indicate such an activity is prohibited.
5. To date enforcement activity has largely been one of educating those camping due to concerns that other enforcement, for instance injunctions or prosecutions, would likely move the activity to more problematic areas where public facilities are not adjacent.
6. The immediate options available include installing signage in the problematic areas advising the public of the prohibition of camping in reserve areas, and/or greater enforcement.
7. Currently, the long-term management plan for freedom camping is being developed. The initial research into the issues of nuisance and surveying of campers has been conducted, with a final research report due in mid-May. Staff attended the Freedom Camping Forum on 21 April 2010 and there are specific outcomes for Christchurch City Council to address. Key staff within various units have initiated discussions to identify options to consider as part of the long-term plan.

Current Bylaw Enforcement Options

8. To determine which enforcement option could be used regarding any specific area, it must be established if the area is a public place, a park or reserve, or a legal road as different bylaw regulations come into force for each. This requires careful investigation; for instance, areas that are tar-sealed for parking near a reserve may or may not be road reserve.

Public Places Bylaw 2008

9. There is no blanket regulation around freedom camping in public places within the Public Places Bylaw 2008. However, one option available to deal with freedom camping in specific areas is to declare them individually as Special Use Areas prohibiting a certain type of vehicle or activity. This bylaw is made under s145 of the Local Government Act 2002, which provides the Council with a limited range of enforcement options. It is important to note that these options are resource intensive for staffing, time and costs for the Council, and in the case of freedom campers who often are not in the area for extended lengths of time the enforcement options may be difficult to apply.

13 Cont'd

10. There is no power to issue infringement notices for breach of a s145 LGA02 Bylaw. Enforcement options are to **prosecute** under s239 or to **issue injunctions**¹ under s162. In both cases significant staff and other resources are required to collect the necessary evidence, there are considerations around whether the enforcement action is in the public good, is proportional to the offence being committed and a good use of court time. At a practical level, as those involved in freedom camping are often overseas visitors in the country for a relatively short period of time and there are difficulties being able to apply these enforcement tools rapidly enough.
11. Additionally, there is also s164 which provides the Council the authority for **seizure of property not on private land**. To exercise this power, the Council would always request Police involvement to actually seize the vehicle in question. In order to exercise the power to seize and impound property that is not on private land, the property must be materially involved in the commission of an offence - this can include an offence against the Act or a breach of a bylaw. It must also be reasonable in the circumstances to seize and impound the property. Before seizing and impounding the property, the enforcement officer must have;
 - (a) directed (orally or in writing) the person committing the offence to stop committing the offence; and
 - (b) advised (orally or in writing) the person committing the offence that, if he or she does not stop committing the offence, the enforcement officer has power to seize and impound the property; and
 - (c) provided the person with a reasonable opportunity to stop committing the offence.

Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008

12. Any camping on parks or reserves is prohibited as the Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008 states that "no person shall camp in any reserve except with the prior permission in writing from a Council-authorized officer, or in areas set aside specifically for the purpose of camping". "Camp" in the bylaw "means to reside in or sleep in a structure, tent, caravan, or campervan" and therefore applies to campervans, but not sleeping or residing in other types of vehicles.
13. If permission has been granted for people to camp on reserves, the person concerned must be able to produce on demand a letter signed by a Council-authorized officer granting permission to camp on the area they are found on.
14. Any person who uses that area in a way other than is prescribed has breached the bylaw. Like the Public Places Bylaw 2008, there is no power to issue infringement notices for breach of a s145 LGA02 Bylaw. Enforcement options again are to **prosecute** under s239, **issue injunctions** under s162 or to **seize property not on private land** under s164.

Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008

15. The Council may impose parking restrictions to any Council-controlled legal roads. This could be used where freedom camping occurs, thereby allowing parking enforcement options to be utilised.
16. Enforcement is carried out by the Parking Enforcement team and consists of **issuing infringement notices** for any breach and orders the person to pay the fees as set out in Schedule 2 of the Transport Act 1962, or on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$500.

¹ Issuing an injunction means having a court order to legally require someone to refrain from doing a certain act.

13 Cont'd

Sumner

17. Since 1 July 2008, eight complaints have been received from Sumner residents of the number of vans parked in the car park across from Clifton Terrace. These can vary from eight to over twenty recorded daily over the past six weeks. The issues that residents have raised involve the visual amenity of seeing the number of vans in one location, using multiple car parks (ie parking the vehicle in one and picnicking in the one adjacent) and the use of public toilets by the campers to do things such as wash dishes or clothing. However, the Surf Lifesaving Club itself does not see the freedom campers as a problem and feel it enhances the safety aspect of having "eyes on the street" to prevent issues such as vandalism at the clubhouse.
18. The car park itself is classified as reserve area, and is covered by the Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008 which prohibits camping (but not sleeping in a vehicle other than a caravan or campervan). The Coastal Care Ranger team prefers not to enforce this because doing so will relocate the freedom campers to other more problematic areas where there are no public toilet facilities, or where safety issues may be of concern.
19. Additionally, the Coastal Care Ranger has reported incidences of campers using soap and shampoo in the outside showers which have been provided to enable surfers or swimmers to rinse off sand. This creates issues for the storm water drainage system as these showers are not connected to the reticulated sewage drains and hence any runoff will go direct into rivers and the sea. This could be addressed through appropriate signage informing the public that no soaps are to be used in those showers.

Redcliffs

20. The number of complaints received in Redcliffs since the inception of the Public Places Bylaw 2008 is four, with these mainly pertaining to people sleeping in vehicles by Redcliffs Park. The road alongside the park is not reserve but is legal road, but the parking bay across from the park by the shoreline is reserve, where some of these complaints have pertained to.
21. No enforcement activity is currently operating and there is no signage indicating this prohibition at the parking bay.

Taylor's Mistake

22. No complaints have been received about any freedom camping in Taylor's Mistake, which is all reserve area and is therefore covered by the Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008.
23. To date there is no evidence of nuisance at Taylor's Mistake. Surfers are known to freedom camp at Taylor's Mistake, but the Coastal Care Ranger reports this has been occurring for years and is not an issue due to the provision of toilets and the Surf Lifesaving Club being made available for the surfers to use.

Freedom Camping Management Plan

24. At the 11 February 2010 meeting, the Council agreed to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's recommendation to commence the development of a long-term management plan to address freedom camping throughout Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula.
25. This is a national issue and a New Zealand Freedom Camping Forum (NZFCF) presentation was given at the 8 May 2008 Zone 5 meeting and a further presentation was delivered at Combined Zones 5 and 6 meeting on 9 May 2009 to address the issue at a national level, which elected members from the Council attended. The motion was passed that all Councils present at the 2009 Zones 5 and 6 meeting agreed to adopt the Freedom Camping General Principles. There are a number of outcomes from the Freedom Camping Forum designed to assist local authorities with communicating their unique regional information with freedom campers and other key stakeholders through the Camping Our Way website (www.camping.org.nz).

13 Cont'd

26. Other territorial authorities have attempted to address the issue of freedom camping through a variety of regulatory tactics and methods. These vary from regulating freedom camping in certain areas or having bylaws in place and issuing infringement notices (where the prohibitions are in place through traffic bylaws or legislation that can be enforced by using infringement notices) or by impounding vehicles. Other territorial authorities also face similar issues as the Council with limited enforcement options which are difficult to apply in regards to freedom camping. A few Councils have indicated they are starting to look at developing long-term strategies for their region and have expressed an interest in keeping communications open to share ideas and concepts.
27. The underlying principle of developing the long-term management plan for Christchurch and Banks Peninsula is to consider all regulatory and non-regulatory measures to address the various issues associated with freedom camping, as using regulation alone will most likely result in relocating the activity to other areas in the city and exacerbating the problems.
28. It is anticipated the drafting of the management plan will be occurring in May after attendance at the Freedom Camping Forum. A workshop for the Combined Community Boards is tentatively arranged for July, where Councillors and Community Board members will have an opportunity to provide input into the management plan.
29. Currently, data is being gathered via a research survey of freedom campers and an investigation into the associated issues throughout the area. This involves regular monitoring of the frequency and density of campervans at key areas identified throughout the city and Banks Peninsula.

Conclusion

30. As camping is already prohibited in the (mainly reserve) areas in Sumner, Redcliffs and Taylors Mistake where freedom camping is occurring, it is not necessary to impose additional restrictions such as declaring these Special Use Areas under the Public Places Bylaw 2008.
31. The options readily available to address the activity are around improved signage and enforcement activity. To enable enforcement to take place signage is required. In many cases conspicuous signage in its own right can be very effective in preventing freedom camping in the signed areas, however it largely has the effect of relocating the activity. As noted above the enforcement tools are limited and cumbersome. The threat of enforcement can be effective in moving freedom campers but again is likely only to result in its relocation.
32. Should the Council decide to enhance the enforcement under the Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008 in these areas, it will be necessary to install the necessary signage and commit resources to increased enforcement in these areas.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

33. Any increased signage or enhanced enforcement will incur costs to the Council.

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

34. Whilst parks signage is budgeted in the LTCCP it covers a wide range of different types of signs. Similarly enforcement is one role that Park Rangers play amongst many and more time spent on enforcement issues results in less time being spent on other activities. Budgets for the Freedom Camping Management Plan preparation are included in the City and Community Long-Term Policy and Planning Activity.

13 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

Reserves Act 1977

35. The areas identified at Sumner, Redcliffs and Taylors Mistake are all classified as reserves under the Reserves Act 1977. Freedom camping in these areas is already prohibited under section 44 of the Reserves Act 1977:

“Except with the consent of the Minister, no person shall use a reserve, or any building, vehicle, boat, caravan, tent, or structure situate thereon, for purposes of permanent or temporary personal accommodation.”

36. Furthermore, under the Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008, freedom camping is prohibited on any reserve unless prior consent has been obtained from the Council; this is granted for special groups such as scouts, school groups etc., to provide a unique camping experience.
37. Breaches to the Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008 could be enforced the same way as under the Public Places Bylaw 2008, in that either **prosecution, issuing injunctions** or **impounding vehicles** under the LGA02 are the only legal enforcement options available.

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

38. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

39. Page 126 of the LTCCP, level of service under parks, open spaces and waterways which states the Council will:

“Provide and manage regional parks to protect outstanding natural landscapes, preserve the social and cultural heritage of Christchurch and Banks Peninsula, and contribute to the Garden City image.”

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

39. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

40. Not applicable.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

41. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

42. As part of the development of the long term management plan on freedom camping within Christchurch City, a process of consultation will occur in accordance with the decision making requirements of LGA02.

13 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board:

- (a) Consider whether it wishes to request the Council erect signage and/or enhance enforcement activity in the reserve areas at Sumner, Redcliffs and Taylors Mistake.
- (b) Contribute to the formation of the freedom camping management plan to be presented to the Council for consideration of options available to deal with freedom camping throughout the city.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

14. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – HEATHCOTE VALLEY SCHOOL – PUBLICATION OF HEATHCOTE AND HEATHCOTE VALLEY SCHOOL HISTORY

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding from Heathcote Valley School to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.
2. The request is for \$3,000 towards printing of the history of Heathcote and Heathcote Valley School.
3. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has \$44,326 available in its Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4. Heathcote Valley School is an integrated school situated on 61 Bridle Path in Heathcote. In August this year, the school celebrates its 150th anniversary.
5. The Heathcote Valley School 150th Jubilee Committee is responsible for organising functions to celebrate 150 years of the school's existence. The celebrations will be over a weekend in August. Four hundred people are expected to attend the celebrations.
6. One aspect of the celebrations is publication of a book. The book, entitled *In the Shadow of the Rock*, is 432 pages long. A total of 500 copies of the book will be published and made available to all ex pupils and members of the community. A nominal fee will be charged to cover costs not met by grants received and funds raised.
7. Over the past two years, Mr. Paul Corliss, has embarked on research and written *In the Shadow of the Rock* voluntarily. Ex pupils of the school have contributed to the book and many photographs, some 150 years old, have been selected for inclusion in the book. There are a total of 51 chapters in the book which include early Maori history and land ownership, the Bridle Path, the first family to settle in the valley, early education at the Valley School, the Gondola and memories from past pupils.
8. While *In the Shadow of the Rock* is being published by the school to celebrate its 150th Jubilee, it will be an invaluable resource to the community and the city as it preserves a part of our city's history.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. Sound financial practices are in place. The school has its accounts audited annually.
10. Total cost of publishing the book is \$17,678. Eureka Trust has given a grant of \$10,620 towards this project. \$4,058 has been raised through various fund raising efforts. \$3,000 is needed to cover the cost of printing the book.
11. Heathcote Valley School is seeking a contribution grant of \$3,000 towards printing.
12. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has \$44,326 available in its Discretionary Response Fund.

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

13. Yes.

14 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

14. No legal implications have been identified.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

16. Yes, Strengthening Communities (page 172 of the 2009 - 19 LTCCP).

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

17. This application meets the following Council Community Grants Funding Outcomes:
- Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups.
18. It also helps to meet the following Community Board objectives:
- Acknowledge diversity and support measures for a vibrant, inclusive and strong communities.
 - Support/advocate for initiatives that support lifelong learning.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

19. Yes, Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

20. None required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board allocate \$3,000 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to Heathcote Valley School to assist with costs for printing of *In the Shadow of the Rock*.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

15. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – SUMNER BAYS UNION TRUST - WAGES AND ADMINISTRATION COSTS FOR 2010

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding from Sumner Bays Union Trust to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.
2. The request is for \$5,000 contribution towards wages and administration costs for June to August 2010 that include stationery, telephone/internet costs and marketing of their programmes.
3. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has \$44,326 available in its Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4. Sumner Bays Union Trust (SBUT) was incorporated as a charitable trust in October 2008. The Trust was set up in response to a study done by social work students on social needs within the Hagley/Ferrymead wards.
5. SBUT was formed to build capacity in the Sumner Redcliffs area through the implementation of a range of initiatives targeting the socially disadvantaged, in particular older adults affected by social isolation and further development of the Sumner Art and Craft Market.
6. The Trust works to support capacity building within the community, build relationships within the community and providing opportunities for adult education.
7. The Trust employs a community development worker who works 30 hours a week and is based at Redcliffs Union Church building, 4 Augusta Street, Redcliffs. The community development worker is responsible for coordinating activities that address community needs, networking, facilitating programmes and events.
8. The community development worker works closely with the community and currently the following programmes are being run:
 - Sumner Community Garden Project which has recently started. About ten families are involved including children;
 - Sumner lunch break project has about 15 regular participants. Sometimes guest speakers are invited to facilitate discussion on topics of interest;
 - Redcliffs Coffee and Conversation group which occurs on Thursdays and allows older adults time to interact amongst themselves and spend part of that time with children, parents and caregivers from the Mini Music project;
 - Mini Music is held every Thursday and has an enrolment of about 30 children;
 - Redcliffs Onion Patch is a community garden from which members of the community are already harvesting produce. The local kindergarten has a patch within the garden and maintain it on a regular basis.
9. Other projects in the pipeline include transitional community project, men's shed in Sumner and an arts and crafts weekly session.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. Sound financial practices are in place. Sumner Bays Union Trust has its accounts audited annually.

15 Cont'd

11. SBUT received \$3,000 for set up costs in 2009 from the Discretionary Response Fund, \$5,000 from the CCC sustainability fund for start up of community garden and \$536 towards set up costs for Mini Music.
12. SBUT have had grants from Ministry of Social Development, Canterbury Community Trust, Lotteries Community and CCC. The Trust was unable to secure enough funding to complete the year to September 2010. Applications have been made to the 2010/2011 Strengthening Communities Fund and other sources for the next financial year.
13. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has \$44,326 available in its Discretionary Response Fund.

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

14. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

15. No legal implications have been identified.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

17. Yes, Strengthening Communities (page 172 of the 2009-19 LTCCP).

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

18. This application meets the following Council Community Grants Funding Outcomes:
 - Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups.
19. It also helps to meet the following Community Board objectives:
 - Acknowledge diversity and support measures for a vibrant, inclusive and strong communities.
 - Support/advocate for initiatives that support lifelong learning.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

20. Yes, Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

21. None required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board give a grant of \$3,500 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to Sumner Bays Union Trust towards wages and administration costs for June to August 2010.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

16. STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING – KEY LOCAL PROJECTS 2010

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board to consider whether there will be any new Key Local Projects (KLPs) recommended to the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund for 2010/11.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In a public excluded seminar, held on 14 April 2010, the Hagley/Ferrymead 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 as Key Local Projects to be funded from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund.
4. In 2008/09, the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board recommended five projects be funded as Key Local Projects. These projects all received funding from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund for a three year period. No new KLPs were recommended by Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board in 2009/10.
5. Based on the accountability reports that have been submitted, as well as the staff's wider knowledge of the group and the project, staff recommend that the Board continue to support the existing projects as KLPs for the final year of their three year funding agreement.
6. Following discussion at the Board seminar held on 14 April 2010, and after reviewing the list of applications for 2010/11, staff recommend that no new projects be recommended by the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board as KLPs for 2010/11.
7. A list of all applications to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board Strengthening Communities Fund 2010/11 is attached (refer **attached**).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. There are no new financial implications. A total of \$150,500 from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund will be spent on the Hagley/Ferrymead ward KLPs for the third and final year.
9. In 2010/11, the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board will have \$238,918 to allocate in its Strengthening Communities Fund.

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

10. 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?**

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

16 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?

12. 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?

13. The funding allocation process carried out by Christchurch Community Boards is covered in the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. Not required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that no new projects be recommended by the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board as KLPs for 2010/11 Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

BACKGROUND

15. 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).
16. 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.
17. 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.
18. The process for considering KLPs is as follows:
- (i) Community Boards nominate and prioritise their KLPs and make a recommendation to the Metropolitan Funding Sub-Committee
 - (ii) The Metropolitan Funding Sub-Committee 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

16 Cont'd

19. If a KLP is successful in receiving funding from the Metropolitan Funding Subcommittee, 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"*.
20. In 2008/09, the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board recommended five projects be funded as Key Local Projects from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund. These projects, which were all funded for a three year term, were:

Name of Group	Name of Project	Amount Funded
Te Whare Roimata	Linwood Community Arts Centre Project	\$52,000
Te Whare Roimata	Smith Street Community Gardens Project	\$27,500
Te Whare Roimata	Older Persons Project	\$27,500
Te Whare Roimata	Bromley Project	\$27,500
Shoreline Youth Trust	Fuse Café	\$16,000

21. 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.
22. It should be noted that funding for KLPs for 2009/10 was not released until staff were satisfied with the 2008/09 accountability report.

New accountability measures – Results Based Accountability

23. 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.
24. 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.
25. The system uses three basic questions:
- How much did you do?
 - How well did you do it?
 - Is anyone better off?
26. 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.
27. Mark Friedman gave a presentation on the Results Based Accountability System to Elected Members on 10 June 2009 at Civic Chambers.
28. 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.

16 Cont'd

29. Staff have also been trained on the Results Based Accountability System and are available to help groups to complete their accountability reports.

New Key Local Projects for 2010/11

30. Staff have reviewed the applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund 2010/11 to identify if there are any projects that should be considered for recommendation to the Metropolitan Funding Committee as Key Local Projects for 2010/11.
31. A list of all applications to Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board is attached (refer **attached**). This list of all applicants was previously provided to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board to inform their discussions at the public excluded seminar that was held on 14 April 2010.
32. Staff recommend that no new projects be recommended from Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board as KLPs for 2010/11.

17. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – REDCLIFFS PUBLIC LIBRARY INC. – PURCHASE OF CHILDREN’S AND ADULTS READING BOOKS

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding from Redcliffs Public Library Inc. to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.
2. The request is for \$1,500 towards the purchase of new books for children and adults.
3. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has \$44,326 available in its Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4. Redcliffs Public Library Inc. opened in 1952 and is situated at 91 Main Road in Redcliffs. The library is run by a group of volunteers who live in the community.
5. The library opens during the week from 10am to 4pm and from 7pm to 8pm on three week nights. On Saturdays the library is open from 10am to 12.30pm.
6. The library’s main objective is to provide books for a wide range of readers from children to older adults. Emphasis is placed on ensuring that large print books are made available for older adults.
7. The library tries to keep a current collection of books. This ensures that the community is kept interested in reading and accessing resources that are available to them locally. Mothers with young children are able to borrow books that they can read to their children or for the children to learn to read.
8. Many of these books are printed overseas, so as a result, the costs associated with importing books to keep the library well stocked with the latest books are high.
9. The Council Libraries and Information Unit provides support to the voluntary libraries as part of their contribution to Community Outcomes. They however are cognisant of the fact that the voluntary libraries are separate legal entities. As such the voluntary libraries provide books depending on what they deem to be most relevant to their communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. Sound financial practices are in place. Redcliffs Public Library has its accounts audited annually.
11. The library seeking a grant of \$1,500 towards purchase of new books for children and adults.
12. In 2007/08 and 2008/09 Redcliffs Public Library received two grants of \$1,250 each towards purchase of new books from the Strengthening Community Fund. The library also received \$2,560 and \$1,000 for books and maintenance in 2008/09 and 2009/10 from the Christchurch City Council Libraries.
13. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has \$44,326 available in its Discretionary Response Fund.

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

14. Yes.

17 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

15. No legal implications have been identified.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

17. Yes, Strengthening Communities (page 172 of the 2009-19 LTCCP).

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

18. This application meets the following Council Community Grants Funding Outcomes:
- Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups.
 - Provide community based programmes which enhance basic life skills.
19. It also helps to meet the following Community Board objectives:
- Acknowledge diversity and support measures for a vibrant, inclusive and strong communities.
 - Support/advocate for initiatives that support lifelong learning.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

20. Yes, Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

21. None required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board make a grant of \$1,250 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to Redcliffs Public Library Inc. towards purchase of new books.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

18. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – JOSHUA WILLIAM GILLESPIE SMITH

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Recreation and Sports Unit Manager
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's 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant Joshua Smith, a 13 year old resident of Redcliffs, has been selected as a piper in the St Andrews College A band to compete in the World Pipe Band Championships in Glasgow in August 2010. He will be in Scotland for two weeks leading up to the World Championships playing in a number of competitions, festivals and performances including a week to compete in the Glen Isla highland games as a soloist.
3. Joshua is currently a Year 9 student at St Andrews College. Prior to this he attended Redcliffs School until Year 6. Joshua has represented St Andrews in cricket, soccer and snow skiing. His main interests outside of school are snow skiing in winter and water skiing in summer. He is also a keen tramper and has completed the Kepler track.
4. Joshua has been playing the bagpipes since he started at St Andrews in Year 7 and this year was successful in winning a piping scholarship from the school. He is now a member of the A Band. In March, this year Joshua competed at the National Championships in Masterton with the band where the band successfully retained the National Juvenile (Under 18) Championship. The band has held this title for the last five years and is the premier Juvenile grade band in New Zealand. Joshua practices the bagpipes most days and typically plays with the band two to three times a week. It is tremendous achievement to be competing at such a high level at such a young age and the international experience will be a highly rewarding experience for Joshua.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. There will be an estimated 40 students attending this trip (pipers and drummers). Each band member has been advised to budget \$5,000 for the trip by the school. The band is aiming to raise \$2,000 per band member through fundraising activities such as performance fees where they play at events such as the Council's Summertimes event in Victoria Square and the World Ploughing Championships. Joshua also performs in and sells tickets for the band's "Stac Attack" concert at the town hall and the College Ceiligh Dance. Individually, Joshua has done some busking in Golden Bay and he is in the process of applying for a busking license from the Council.

EXPENSES PER STUDENT	Cost (\$)
Airfare	2,900
Accommodation	820
Meals	440
Edinburgh Tattoo	120
Buses/travel	250
Travel Insurance	60
General including staff support	400
Total	4,990

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

18 Cont'd

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

7. Yes. This application is seeking funding from the 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 \$5,000 in the Community Board's 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

9. 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?

10. Yes. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

11. 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?

12. Yes. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

13. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approve the application and allocate \$500 funding from the Board's 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme for Joshua Smith to compete in the World Pipe Band Championships in Glasgow in August 2010.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

19. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – FRIENDS AND FAMILY OF RICHMOND PRIMARY SCHOOL LEARN TO SWIM PROGRAMME

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Recreation and Sports 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 an application for funding by Friends and Family of Richmond Primary School from the 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant, Friends and Family of Richmond Primary School aims to enhance the students learning experiences through fundraising for activities considered important for the well-being and development of each child. Richmond Primary is a Decile 2 school with 75 students of over 20 different ethnicities. A high proportion of the students are Maori.
3. The project that Friends and Family of Richmond Primary School is applying for aims to provide all students with learn to swim lessons in Term 3 2010. The desired outcome is for students to learn water safety and swimming skills that will contribute to the children's physical health, develop a recreation skill and may help reduce the rate of death by drowning. The drowning incidence rate is particularly high for Maori and Pacifica due to low swimming ability.
4. Richmond Primary School struggles to provide anything beyond the most essential programmes for the children due to extreme financial constraints. There are multiple learning priorities but limited fund raising opportunities and the majority of parents are on very low incomes. It is the aim of Friends and Family of Richmond Primary School to provide the swimming lessons free of charge.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. Aqua Gym or Centennial Recreation and Sport Centre are able to provide the swimming lessons. The cost of Aqua Gym providing 10 swimming lessons for 85 children is \$4,675 and the cost of Centennial providing 10 lessons for 85 children is \$2,125. The cost of transport is \$1,600 and will be covered by the Sport Canterbury transport fund.
6. This is the third time the applicant has approached the Community Board for funding support within the last three years. In 2007, \$2,252 was granted for the 'Books in Homes' project and in 2009 \$3,500 was granted for a learn to swim programme. All funding has been accounted for as required.

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

7. This application seeks funding from the Community Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Funding Scheme. There is a balance of \$44,326 remaining for distribution.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

9. Aligns with Council Activities and Services, Community Support, Community Grants and Grants, pages 176 and 184, in the 2009 -19 LTCCP.

19 Cont'd

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

10. Yes. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

11. Application aligns with the Council's Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy, the Aquatic Facilities Plan, the Strengthening Communities Strategy and local Community Board objectives.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

12. Yes. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

13. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board does not fund the Friends and Family of Richmond Primary School learn to swim lessons, as the funding is to deliver an aquatics programme that the school has decided to include in their Physical Education programme and is therefore "curriculum".

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

20. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – LINWOOD YOUTH FESTIVAL EXPERIENCE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Recreation and Sports Unit Manager
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's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund for the Linwood Youth Festival Experience.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LYFE (LINWOOD YOUTH FESTIVAL EXPERIENCE)

2. The Linwood Youth Festival Experience (LYFE) was initiated in 1998 as a result of young people and community agencies coming to the Board to seek support for a project that would profile Linwood and the youth in a positive way and build a sense of pride. This need is still considered a priority for the Linwood community and LYFE is still regarded as a significant means for contributing to positive youth and community wellbeing and development.
3. The Board has maintained a constant level of support that provides a foundation for the project to be viable. The project is an opportunity for youth to develop event management and leadership skills, participate in the arts, sport and recreation and develop ongoing positive links with community clubs and organisations. Many groups, clubs and organisations for community, sport and recreation, health, education and careers are involved in LYFE through the running of activities and providing information. LYFE brings the Linwood and wider community together to experience and enjoy what is on offer, promote healthy lifestyle choices, and enhance and develop social connections, community pride and a sense of belonging.
4. The process of involving young people in all aspects of planning the five hour festival is the most significant feature of the project. It takes a coordinator and the LYFE Advisory Group nine months on a part time basis to facilitate young people through this process. Contracting a suitable coordinator and providing administrative support to help the coordinator and team of young people plan the event, is vital to the project's success. Other essential event costs that require funding include promotions (web site development and maintenance, posters, signage, advertisements), venue costs (staging, marquees, sound, power, toilets, security), activity and entertainment costs. The timeline and date for the next LYFE will be determined by the LYFE Advisory group in consultation with young people.
5. LYFE is managed by a dedicated Advisory Group including representatives from Linwood Resource Centre, White Elephant Trust, Sport Canterbury, Youth and Cultural Development, Linwood Ave Community Corner Trust, Phillipstown Community Centre, CHART, 24/7 Youth Workers, Linwood Youth Development Worker and the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Recreation Adviser. Interested community members are also welcome to be part of the advisory group as are representatives from local intermediate and secondary schools. In recent years Avebury House has been the umbrella organisation responsible for finances and the LYFE coordinator has been based at the Linwood Resource Centre. This year, the Linwood Resource Centre has agreed to be the organisation that provides the financial umbrella required for managing finances. Linwood Resource Centre has an established relationship in place with the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board and has robust management and financial systems in place. There are sound systems in place for the delivery of the project and these are reviewed on an annual basis by the LYFE Advisory Group in consultation with Council staff.

20 Cont'd

6. LYFE is considered, by many, to be the most popular youth event in the city. Numbers have steadily increased over the years with an estimated attendance of over 7,000 in March 2010. The festival includes a diverse mix of quality cultural, music and dance performances, a wide range of interactive sport, recreation and art activities and over 50 organisations promoting their services. It provides an affordable, fun filled, informative day for the local community and surrounding suburbs on the eastern side of Christchurch, which have a high proportion of families on low incomes and a higher than average Maori and Pacific population. It also attracts young people from across the city which is positive promotion for Linwood and Linwood youth.
7. There has been widespread and positive coverage of LYFE including newspaper, television, radio and social media. LYFE '10 may also feature in a documentary on youth culture. Another major outcome of the project is capacity building which is evident through ongoing networking, information sharing and youth initiatives that take place throughout the year between community groups and organisations that have been involved in LYFE.
8. LYFE meets expressed youth and community needs and is supported by informal and formal feedback and local research including participant surveys, Hagley/Ferrymead Leisure Parks and Waterways Study 2003 and Evaluation of LYFE - Linwood Youth Festival Experience (Wylie, 2004) which reinforces that the process of LYFE is as important as the event with youth gaining valuable skills and acknowledges important contribution that the Board makes to ensure viability.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The Board has supported the LYFE project with a grant of \$15,000 since inception. The project costs for LYFE is expected to increase from \$30,000 to \$32,000 as a result of maximising the use of the website www.lyfe.co.nz throughout the year, more effective promotions and additional health and safety services required to meet the increasing numbers attending the event. Consequently, \$17,000 is being requested towards the overall costs of the project.

Projected Expenditure	Cost(\$)
LYFE Co-ordinator	10,000
Administration Expenses	1,500
Promotions	6,500
Activities/entertainment costs	8,000
Venue, Health and Safety	6,000
TOTAL	32,000

10. The LYFE 2010 project was completed at the end of April 2010 and the LYFE 2011 project is expected to begin in June 2010. Given the timing of the project, funding is being sought from the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's Discretionary Response Fund. In future, the Board may wish to consider how the project may possibly be aligned to the Strengthening Communities Fund.
11. Other funding bodies and supporters with a sound history of supporting LYFE will also be approached to meet budget requirements in funding or kind. This may include but is not exclusive to NZ Lottery Community Grants Board, Meridian Energy, Deflux, Eastgate Shopping Centre, Tahu FM, MAINZ, Phantom and Frequency Advertising plus the possibility of site fees for stall holders.
12. All project objectives have been met for LYFE 2010 which is consistent with previous years. Robust accountability, management and delivery systems are in place with an experienced advisory group from youth focused organisations working in partnership to manage the LYFE project. Linwood Resource Centre has agreed to act as an umbrella organisation to manage the finances.

20 Cont'd

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

13. Yes. There is currently \$44,326 in the Discretionary Response Fund.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

15. 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?

16. Yes. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

17. 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?

18. Yes. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

19. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approve the application and allocate \$17,000 from the Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund as a contribution towards the LYFE '11 (Linwood Youth Festival Experience) project.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

21. MOA BONE CAVE FENCING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Malcolm Park, Maintenance Operations and Contracts Manager

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board on the issues surrounding fencing adjacent to the Moa Bone Caves, and to seek confirmation from the Board regarding the fencing.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In 2004, the Christchurch City Council took action to protect the public from rock falls by erecting a protective fencing barrier from the cave cliff face and entrance. This work was of a temporary nature.
3. In June 2007, the footpath deviation and protective fencing was formalised with semi-permanent kerbs, paths and a safety fence was put in place. The security fence at the cave entrance was tidied up and made more secure. All of the work conducted to date is temporary, until the completion of investigation, land purchase, design, tendering and construction of a permanent solution during the financial years 2011/12 and 2012/13.
4. An advantageous rental fee was arranged at \$72 per month. This was contingent on advertising on each fence panel. Unfortunately, the proliferation of the fencing owner's advertising drew attention to the fence. The fencing owner has very recently (29 April 2010) agreed to have the majority of advertising removed.

5. The approximate costs to date for fencing and protection issues are:

Temporary fencing	\$5,200	Still in place
Water barriers	\$46,000	From 2005 to 2007
Kerb and Channel	\$38,000	Installed 2007

6. In November 2009, Council staff were requested to improve the aesthetic qualities of the security and protective temporary fencing. Estimates received for this work total approximately \$30,000. Because this is significantly more than anticipated, and there is a big differential between the cost of this and the status quo, staff felt the Board needed to be informed and confirm whether they wish to proceed.



21 Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The funding of replacement temporary fencing is budgeted.

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

8. Yes

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Christchurch City Council has a legal responsibility to promote the safety of pedestrians and motorists. Until the permanent fencing solution has been installed, together with the stabilization of the cliff-face, the current temporary fencing protects pedestrians and motorists from falling debris.

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

10. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Aligns with page 77 of the LTCCP, Streets and Transport:
- (a) Active Travel - The Council promotes active travel, including the provision of safe footpaths.
 - (b) Road Network - The council is responsible for the city's roading, including building and maintaining roadway.
12. Aligns with page 194 of the LTCCP, City Planning and Development:
- (a) Heritage Protection - Research and promote the heritage of Christchurch and Banks Peninsula. Work with developers, landowners and other stakeholders to consider the heritage areas, buildings, and other items.

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

13. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. Pedestrian Strategy - The Christchurch City Council will work to create a City in which:
- (a) The pedestrian environment is friendly, safe and accessible.
 - (b) More people walk, more often.
 - (c) All pedestrians are able to move about freely and with confidence.
15. Road Safety Strategy - to create safer roads and safer road user behaviour.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

16. Yes

21 Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. Consultation was not carried out for the original fencing or barriers as they were of an urgent safety nature. Consultation is not strictly necessary, but would be prudent for Option 1 as there are numerous interested parties. Option 2 would require no consultation.

THE OPTIONS

18. Option 1

Replace the current silver coloured cave face security fencing with a more aesthetically pleasing coloured product. Replace the current orange coloured footpath protective fencing with a more aesthetically pleasing coloured product. Provide suitable foundations and fixings for such fencing on the road reserve. Total estimated cost for remaining 2 year life - \$30,000.

Option 2

Maintain the status quo. Retain the current silver security and orange protective fencing until land has been purchased, consultation, resource consent and permanent design solutions have been achieved in 2011/12 and the permanent construction has been completed in 2012/13. Current rental costs \$72 per month. Total estimated cost for remaining 2 year life - \$2,000.

The Preferred Option

19. The preferred option is Option 2 - Maintain the status quo.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the current temporary fencing adjacent to Moa Bone Caves is retained until the permanent solution is completed.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

20. The Moa Bone Cave has national heritage significance and has been assessed as a Group A heritage place. The cave is of spiritual and cultural significance as it illustrates a past way of life of Maori. It is also likely to be held in high esteem by some Maori for these historical associations.
21. The cave is of contextual significance as one of a number of caves and other rock formations that constitute major features of the natural environment of Sumner and is a well-known landmark on the Main Road to the area.
22. The cave is also of archaeological significance. Maori archaeological sites are relatively rare in the Christchurch area and the cave is part of a group of sites that have provided the most important and substantial body of evidence about the 'archaic' or 'moa-hunter' period of Maori culture in the area. The cave is of geological interest as a 'bubble' cave in lava later enlarged by wave action. Its form and appearance are of aesthetic value.
23. The cave is seen by some as being the gateway to the Redcliffs/Sumner area. There is local community, Iwi and New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) interest in the cave from both a heritage and cultural aspect. Moa Bone Cave also features on the CCC web site as an educational heritage trail item relating to Christchurch before 1850.

21 Cont'd

24. These issues may require consultation if Council were to change the current fencing. This necessary consultation must occur for the permanent solution to be completed in 2012/13.
25. Any fencing work undertaken at the cliff face and footpath edge now would be made redundant with the work required on the permanent solution.
26. CCC has a responsibility to keep the public safe. This is accomplished by the current fence.
27. At \$72 per month, the current fencing is cost effective. While the public sometimes question the cost of this fencing, when informed of the low rental costs, they are satisfied.
28. There is a significant difference between the cost of the status quo and the cost of the proposed improved fencing.

22. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE

22.1 Council April 2010 Update of Current Projects (refer **attached**).

23. BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

24. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE