

LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

**TUESDAY 18 MAY 2010
AT 9.30 AM**

**IN THE MEETING ROOM
LYTTELTON SERVICE CENTRE
33 LONDON STREET, LYTTELTON**

Community Board: Paula Smith (Chairperson), Jeremy Agar (Deputy Chairperson), Douglas Couch; Ann Jolliffe, Dawn Kottier and Claudia Reid,

Community Board Adviser

Liz Carter

Telephone: 941 5682

Fax: (03) 304-7731

Email: liz.carter@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

KARAKIA

- | | | |
|---------------|------------|--|
| PART C | 1. | APOLOGIES |
| PART C | 2. | CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING HELD 13 APRIL 2010 |
| PART B | 3. | DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT |
| | 3.1 | Maddi Naylor |
| PART B | 4. | CORRESPONDENCE |
| PART B | 5. | PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS |
| PART B | 6. | NOTICES OF MOTION |
| PART B | 7. | MINUTES OF ALLANDALE RESERVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 30 MARCH 2010 |
| PART B | 8. | MINUTES OF LYTTELTON RESERVES MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD 19 APRIL 2010 |

- PART B 9. MINUTES OF WHAKARAUPU LYTTTELTON HARBOUR ISSUES GROUP MEETING HELD 20 APRIL 2010**
- PART B 10. STRUCTURES ON ROADS POLICY 2010**
- PART C 11. STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING – KEY LOCAL PROJECTS 2010 REPORT**
- PART C 12. APPLICATION TO THE LYTTTELTON/MOUNT HERBERT 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – MICHAEL ANDERSON**
- PART C 13. APPLICATION TO THE LYTTTELTON/MOUNT HERBERT 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – LYTTTELTON GAOL TRUST**
- PART C 14. LOCAL GOVERNMENT “KNOW HOW” TRAINING WORKSHOP – FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE 101 AND DECISION MAKING**
- PART A 15. LYTTTELTON AREA – RESOLUTION OF PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES**
PART C
- PART B 16. BRIEFINGS**
15.1 Terry Howes, Unit Manager, Asset and Network Planning
- PART B 17. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER’S UPDATE**
17.1 Board Funding Balances
17.2 Customer Service Requests 1 February – 30 April 2010
17.3 Submissions
17.4 April Update on Local Capital Projects
- PART B 18. ELECTED MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B 19. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 13 APRIL 2010

The Minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 13 April 2010 are **attached**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting held on 13 April 2010 be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 MADDI NAYLOR – STODDART COTTAGE

Ms Naylor wishes to address the Board regarding the Draft Management Plan for Stoddart Point.

4. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

5. PRESENTATIONS OF PETITIONS

Nil.

6. NOTICES OF MOTION

Nil.

7. MINUTES OF ALLANDALE RESERVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 30 MARCH 2010

A copy of the minutes from the 30 March 2010 meeting of the Allandale Reserve Management Committee is **attached** for members' information.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Allandale Reserve Management Committee meeting held on 30 March 2010 be received.

8. MINUTES OF LYTTTELTON RESERVES MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 19 APRIL 2010

A copy of the minutes from the 19 April 2010 meeting of the Lyttelton Reserves Management Committee is **attached** for members' information.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Lyttelton Reserves Management Committee meeting held on 19 April 2010 be received.

**9. MINUTES OF WHAKARAUPU LYTTTELTON HARBOUR ISSUES GROUP MEETING HELD
20 APRIL 2010**

A copy of the minutes from the 20 April 2010 meeting of the Whakaraupo Lyttelton Harbour Issues Group is **attached** for members' information.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Whakaraupo Lyttelton Harbour Issues Group meeting held on 20 April 2010 be received.

10. STRUCTURES ON ROADS POLICY 2010

General Manager responsible	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible	Asset and Network Planning 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 (**Attachment A**).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

(a) Current CCC policies:

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

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

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

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

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

6. For most of its content the proposed policy incorporates the current CCC policies with updated wording and minor changes. The provisions in the existing ‘city’ and ‘peninsula’ policies are overall similar in nature. There are also some additions e.g. the provisions relating to verandas and fences, and inclusion of the Banks Peninsula fences policy into the new policy for the whole city. Current provisions in both CCC and BPDC policies which address council operational procedures (and do not belong in policy statements) were not retained.
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 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 & 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 Board Chairpersons. Potentially affected external parties and associations were invited to provide feedback on any concerns and no concerns were raised.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

10. Cont'd

BACKGROUND

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

10. Cont'd

THE OBJECTIVES

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

THE OPTIONS

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

THE PREFERRED OPTION

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

10. Cont'd

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option

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

	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.
<p>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.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities: The development of a consolidated policy will enable Council to better manage structures on roads through more transparent and consistent processes and procedures.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: No specific effects noted.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		

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.
<p>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.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities: Maintaining the status quo will mean business as usual for council enforcement and policy development.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: No specific effects noted.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: No comments were received from relevant stakeholders invited to comment.</p>		

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. STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING – KEY LOCAL PROJECTS 2010 REPORT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Manager
Author:	Maryanne Lomax, Community Development Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board to consider whether they wish to recommend Project Lyttelton - Time Bank as a Key Local Project to the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund for 2010/11.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In a public excluded seminar, held on 13 April 2010, the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board considered the issue of Key Local Projects for 2010.
3. As part of the Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme, each Board may nominate Key Local Projects (KLPs) in its area that are put forward to the Metropolitan Funding Committee for consideration for metropolitan funding.
4. The Metropolitan Funding Committee will make KLP decisions based on affordability and the following priorities:
 - Strengthening Communities Strategy Principles and Goals;
 - Funding outcomes and priorities as set out in Strengthening Communities Strategy;
 - Alignment to local Community Board objectives;AND
 - Projects deliver benefits to the city outside of the local Board area;
 - Key community issues contemplated under Goal 2 of the Strengthening Communities Strategy.
5. In addition, staff recommendations for Key Local Projects are also based on whether the project meets the following criteria:
 - The organisation undertaking the project has a proven track record with the Council in providing a high quality level of service;
 - Significantly contributes towards the Council's Funding Outcomes and Priorities;
 - Demonstrates leadership and innovation;
 - Demonstrates best-practice and collaboration.
6. In 2009/10, the Community Board recommended the following KLP, which was subsequently agreed to by Metropolitan Funding Committee:

Name of Group	Name of Project	Amount Funded
Project Lyttelton	Capacity Building Project	\$13,520

7. All new KLPs in 2009/10 were funded for one year only owing to the uncertain impacts of the planned \$1.5m reduction in Community Grants funding.
8. Staff recommend that the Community Board support this organisation again as a KLP in 2010/11. Attached is a decision matrix that provides information on their Time Bank project they are seeking funding for. (**Attachment 1**)
9. Staff have also reviewed all applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund 2010/11 to identify if there are any projects that should be considered for recommendation to the Metropolitan Funding Committee as Key Local Projects for 2010/11. (**Attachment 2**)
10. Staff recommend that no other projects be recommended from the Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Community Board as KLPs for 2010/11.

11. Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

11. In 20010/11, the Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Community Board will have \$38,398 to allocate in its Strengthening Communities Fund.

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

12. 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?

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

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

14. 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?

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

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. Not required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board recommends Project Lyttelton's Time Bank project as a Key Local Project to be considered by the Metropolitan Funding Committee for the 2010-11 Strengthening Communities Fund.

BACKGROUND

17. The Council adopted the Strengthening Communities Strategy on 12 July 2007. The Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme comprises four funding schemes:
 - (a) Strengthening Communities Fund
 - (b) Small Grants Fund
 - (c) Discretionary Response Fund
 - (d) Community Organisations Loan Scheme
18. The funding schemes enable the Council and its community boards to support and provide leverage opportunities for not-for-profit, community focused groups seeking funding in support of their community endeavours.
19. Each Board may nominate Key Local Projects (KLPs) in its area that are put forward to the Metropolitan Funding Committee for consideration for metropolitan funding.
20. The agreed process to determine if a "local" funding application should be processed as a KLP is detailed in the report that was adopted by the Council on 4 October, 2007.

11. Cont'd

21. The Metropolitan Funding Committee will make KLP decisions based on affordability and the following priorities:
- Strengthening Communities Strategy Principles and Goals;
 - Funding outcomes and priorities as set out in Strengthening Communities Strategy;
 - Alignment to local Community Board objectives;
- AND
- Projects deliver benefits to the city outside of the local Board area
 - Key community issues contemplated under Goal 2 of the Strengthening Communities Strategy.
22. The process for considering KLPs is as follows:
- i) Community Boards nominate and priorities their KLPs and make a recommendation to the Metropolitan Funding Committee.
 - ii) The Metropolitan Funding 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.
23. Community Boards are advised that where candidates for KLP funding consideration are successful in receiving funding from the Metropolitan Funding Committee, then there can be no further funding call on the Board for that project.
24. This is also the case, where a successful candidate is funded to a lower level than has been recommended by the Board. This reflects the "funding constraints" criteria agreed by Council in Appendix F of the 4 October 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"*.
25. In 2009/10, the Community Board recommended the following KLP, which was subsequently agreed to by Metropolitan Funding Committee:

Name of Group	Name of Project	Amount Funded
Project Lyttelton	Capacity Building	\$13,520

26. All new KLPs in 2009/10 were funded for one year only owing to the uncertain impacts of the planned \$1.5m reduction in Community Grants funding. Project Lyttelton has again applied to the Community Board for funding in the 2010/11 funding round.
27. Staff recommend that the Community Board support this organisation again as a KLP in 2010/11.

Additional Key Local Projects for 2010/11

28. Staff have reviewed all applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund 2010/11 to identify if there are any projects that should be considered for recommendation to the Metropolitan Funding Committee as Key Local Projects for 2010/11.
29. A list of all applications to the Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Board Strengthening Communities Fund 2010/11 is attached. (**Attachment 2**)
30. Staff recommend that no other projects be recommended from Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Community Board as KLPs for 2010/11.

12. APPLICATION TO THE LYTTTELTON/MOUNT HERBERT 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – MICHAEL ANDERSON

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services Group DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Community Support Unit
Author:	Community Development Adviser Philipa Hay

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding of \$500 from Michael Anderson to the Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Community Board from its 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme.
2. The request is for \$500 towards the cost of competing with the New Zealand Sea Scout team at the William I. Koch International Sea Scout Cup.
3. There is currently a balance of \$1,000 remaining in the Board's Youth Development Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4. The applicant, Michael Anderson, is a 15 year old who lives in Corsair Bay. He has been around yachts all his life, but has been sailing for six seasons since he was nine years old as a member of the Naval Point Yacht Club. Michael is currently in Year 12 (6th Form) at school studying for NCEA Level Two, aiming for a career in engineering. He is actively involved in the life of his school as a cast member for the school production, and a member of the school Underwater Hockey team. Michael has also completed his Duke of Edinburgh (Bronze) and is currently working towards the Silver Service Award. His interests outside school include sailing, skiing, tramping and Lyttelton Sea Scouts - Venturers which has 30 members locally.
5. Michael volunteered locally at the National Regatta held in Lyttelton last January and he has started helping with the local scout group which has 25 members. In Easter 2009, Michael was selected to represent New Zealand Sea Scouts which will be held in August 2010. This is the first time Michael has approached the Board for funding.
6. Michael is seeking Community Board support to contribute towards costs of competing in the fifth biennial 'William I. Koch International Sea Scout Cup' which will be held from 1-7 August 2010. This regatta is provided for the benefit of youth sailing and international Scouting and is open to young people between the ages of 14-21 who are actively registered in the Sea Scout programme. The six-day event will be held in New London, Connecticut, USA. Teams from 20 countries will sail Vanguard 420's, testing their seamanship and leadership skills as they sail. Prizes for camaraderie and sportsmanship will be awarded in addition to the sailing prizes which earn the winning sailors the right to have their names permanently engraved on one of youth sailing's top prizes.
7. Michael considers his attending this regatta will be of huge benefit to him both for the development of his sailing and for the opportunity of meeting young people from all over the world and the links he will make. He feels this will help him in his sailing and volunteer work within the community.
8. In preparation for this event to help cover costs, Michael has had a part time job during the holidays with an arborist, he has worked night security at the Sea Scout National Regatta (Easter 2009), has provided babysitting services and Michael will help with the Venturer Scouts' fundraiser – the proceeds of which will contribute towards costs of the event.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The following table provides a breakdown of funding requested, and funds in hand:

12. Cont'd

MICHAEL ANDERSON	
EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
Registration for William I. Koch International Sea Scout Cup – US \$180.00	\$ 260.00
Air fare to event	\$3500.00
Total Cost	\$3760.00
Less fund raising (approximate)	\$1200.00
Mander Trust – (less than \$500)	\$ Pending
Applications closed 1 April. Notification prior to August.	
Balance of funds to raise	\$2560.00
Amount Requested from Community Board	\$ 500.00

10. This is the first time the applicant has applied for funding from the Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Community Board.

11. Michael is committed to this project whether or not Community Board funding is forthcoming.

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

12. Yes page 184

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

13. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

14. Aligns with 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?

15. Yes Strengthening Communities page 172 (2009-19 LTCCP).

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

16. This application aligns with the Council's Youth Strategy, the Strengthening Communities Strategy and the Council Community Grants Funding Outcome:

- Reduce or overcome barriers to participation

DO THE RECOMMENDATIONS ALIGN WITH COUNCIL

17. Strengthening Communities Strategy

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Community Board agree to grant \$500 from its 09/10 Youth Development Scheme to Michael Peter Anderson as a contribution towards the cost of competing with the New Zealand Sea Scout team at the William I Koch International Sea Scout Cup.

13. APPLICATION TO THE LYTTTELTON MOUNT HERBERT 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – LYTTTELTON GAOL TRUST

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services Group DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
Author:	Philipa Hay, Community Development Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding from the Lyttelton Gaol Trust to the Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Community Board from its Discretionary Response Fund.
2. The request is for \$2,250 towards the collation of historical stories and information associated with the Lyttelton Gaol site.
3. There is currently a balance of \$6,624 remaining in the Boards Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4. The Lyttelton Gaol Trust was incorporated in February 2005. The aims of the Trust are “*to promote cultural, historic and leisure activities of the Lyttelton Harbour area and preserve this historic resource for present and future generations through restoration of the building and completing work outlined in the Conservation Plan, plus providing interpretive displays showing the history*”. Since its incorporation, the Trust members have donated their time and effort by telling the stories of the past to groups as well as providing materials used in tidying and cleaning the area – this has included graffiti removal.
5. The Lyttelton Gaol Trust is requesting funding for Dr. John Wilson's professional services to review and collate the history and stories of the Lyttelton Gaol from available historic records and writings, producing text which can be used in a variety of ways; and available electronically and in hard copy through various outlets (Lyttelton Resource and Information Centre, the Lyttelton Museum). The Trust envisages this information will be especially valuable to groups wanting to educate or promote interest in this history and will be of lasting value to the community in general.
6. The Lyttelton Gaol Site is a significant archaeological site, situated in Oxford Street, Lyttelton, immediately north of the Lyttelton Main School and was registered in December 1996 as an Historic Place – Category 1. This site is within the Lyttelton Historic Area registered in August 2009.
7. Christchurch City Council staff produced a detailed Lyttelton Gaol Trust Interpretation (process) in 2008 which is consistent with those for other such projects across the city. These Interpretations aim to inform the public about the historical significance of a site, to ensure the information is relevant and available in the form(s) that will be most beneficial and that resources are best utilised. In addition, a comprehensive Conservation Plan for the site is currently in progress as the previous plan developed in the 1990s is outdated. It is planned to have the first draft of the Conservation Plan completed by mid May 2010. Dr. Wilson has been engaged to document the history of the site as part of the Conservation Plan. The Plan will also address the form(s) any fixed displays will take. Staff advice has been sought in the preparation of this report from Council's Transport and Greenspace, and Urban Design and Heritage Units
8. The collation of the Lyttelton Gaol 'stories', if undertaken, would provide a welcome complementary narrative to and without repetition of the work Dr. Wilson is currently undertaking as part of the Conservation Plan, and could be started at any time. In addition, this work could then be made available to the public in a variety of ways (excluding fixed displays) and this would not be dependent upon completion of the Conservation Plan.
9. Dr. Wilson's work will cover at least some of the historical portion of the Gaol Trust's proposed review project. To ensure prudent use of both time and financial resources it is advised that the Trust waits until this work is complete to identify further work to be undertaken on the historical aspects it considers desirable.

13. Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

LYTTELTON GAOL TRUST	
PROJECT QUOTATION	Cost (GST incl)
Review of written information and other sources	\$ 900.00
Writing of text (after consultation with Trust)	\$1,350.00
Total Cost	\$2,250.00
Amount Requested from Community Board	\$2,250.00

11. The Lyttelton Gaol Trust has not applied for funding assistance elsewhere for this project.
12. The Lyttelton Gaol Trust has received no Community funding in the past three years.
13. All effort and materials used by the Lyttelton Gaol Trust since its incorporation have been donated. In 2005 an initial seed grant of \$1,000 was allocated by the Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Community Board. The group have tagged this funding to go towards the presentation of the compiled 'stories'.
14. To best utilise time and financial resources, staff recommend that the Lyttelton Gaol Trust focuses on collating the 'stories' associated with the Lyttelton Gaol and delays collating additional historical information until after the completion of the Conservation Plan.

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

15. Yes page 184

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

16. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

17. 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?

18. Yes Strengthening Communities page 172 (2009-19 LTCCP).

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

19. 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 environmental groups
- Increase participation in and awareness of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environmental groups, programmes and local events

It also helps to meet the following Community Board objective:

- Enhancing the culture, heritage and identity of Banks Peninsula communities through its built, natural and working environments

13. Cont'd

DO THE RECOMMENDATIONS ALIGN WITH COUNCIL

20. Strengthening Communities Strategy

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

21. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mount Herbert Community Board agree to grant \$2,250 from its 09/10 Discretionary Response fund to the Lyttelton Gaol Trust as a contribution towards the cost of collation of historical stories and additional information to the completed Conservation plan associated with the Lyttelton Gaol site.

14. LOCAL GOVERNMENT “KNOW HOW” TRAINING WORKSHOP – FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE 101 AND DECISION MAKING

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Financial Governance 101 course is designed to enhance fiscal knowledge in a way that will enable better financial decisions to be made. The Course consists of a series of workshops and group exercises, during which participants will gain a deeper understanding of:

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

Further information is **attached**.

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

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

Further information is **attached**.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The cost of these Local Government workshop is \$350 plus GST per person per course for elected members from member Councils. The Board's 2009/10 training and travel budgets currently have an unallocated budget of \$2,783.

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

6. Yes, there are no legal implications.

14. 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?

7. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

8. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

9. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

15. LYTTTELTON AREA – RESOLUTION OF PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Jon Ashford/Mark Millar, Network Operations

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - (a) Seek the Board's approval of the Schedule of Resolutions for the Parking Restrictions and Traffic Control Devices as currently marked and / or signed in the Lyttelton area (refer **Attachment 2**)
 - (b) Seek a recommendation from the Board to the Council for the approval of the Schedule of Resolutions for the Parking Restrictions and Traffic Control Devices on Norwich Quay (State Highway 74) – (refer **Attachment 3**)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. On 6 March 2006, the Banks Peninsula District was amalgamated with Christchurch City. The records of the resolutions for the existing parking restrictions and traffic control devices as currently marked and / or signed in the Lyttelton area have not been located.
3. To be legally enforced, parking restrictions and traffic control devices must be resolved by Council or a delegated authority. As noted in Paragraph 8, the Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council for the resolution of parking restrictions and traffic control devices on City Council roads. The New Zealand Transport Agency has delegated parking restrictions on State Highways to the Council. Therefore the resolutions for Norwich Quay (which is a State Highway) have to be approved by the Council.
4. To allow the existing parking restrictions and traffic control devices to be legally enforceable, staff have recorded all existing parking restrictions and traffic control devices in the Lyttelton area and drafted resolutions as part of this report for the Board's approval. Any parking restrictions and traffic control devices installed after 1 January 2007 are not included as a record of their resolution by the Board is available.
5. Approval of the Schedules of Resolutions for the Lyttelton Area and Norwich Quay – Parking Restrictions and Traffic Control Devices (**Attachments 2 and 3**) will allow the Council to hold a record of the resolutions of parking restrictions and traffic control devices in the Lyttelton area. These can then be enforced by Police and Parking Enforcement Officers and any infringement notice that is issued can be easily defended if challenged in court.
6. No consultation has been undertaken with local residents or businesses as these are all existing parking restrictions and traffic control devices.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

7. The installation of road markings and signs is within the Streets and Transport Operational Budgets – Page 86 of the 2009-19 LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and traffic control devices on roads under the control of the Council. The New Zealand Transport Agency has delegated parking restrictions on State Highways to the Council.

15. Cont'd

9. The installation of any signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

10. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. 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?

12. Yes – Pages 76 to 87 of the 2009-19 LTCCP.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

14. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. No consultation has been undertaken with local residents or businesses as these are all existing parking restrictions and traffic control devices.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Approve the Schedule of Resolutions for the Lyttelton Area Parking Restrictions and Traffic Control Devices (**Attachment 2**).
- (b) Recommend to the Council that it approve the Schedule of Resolutions for Norwich Quay (State Highway 74) Parking Restrictions and Traffic Control Devices (**Attachment 3**).

16. BRIEFINGS

16.1 TERRY HOWES – UNIT MANAGER, ASSET AND NETWORK PLANNING

Unit Manager briefing.

17. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISERS UPDATE

17.1 BOARD FUNDING BALANCES

A copy of the Board's funding balances as at 30 April 2010 is **attached** for members' information.

17.2 CUSTOMER SERVICE REQUESTS 1 FEBRUARY – 30 APRIL 2010

Attached Appendices for members' information.

17.3 SUBMISSIONS

The following submissions have been made during the last month.

- (a) Environment Canterbury Annual Plan 2010/11 – **Attachment 1**
- (b) Climate Smart Strategy 2010/2025– **Attachment 2**
- (c) Annual Plan 2010/11 – **Attachment 3**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board endorse the aforementioned submissions.

17.4 APRIL UPDATE ON LOCAL CAPITAL PROJECTS

The April update on local capital projects is **attached** for members' information.

18. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

19. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS