

RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD

AGENDA

TUESDAY 30 AUGUST 2011

AT 5PM

**IN THE BOARDROOM
FENDALTON SERVICE CENTRE
CNR JEFFREYS AND CLYDE ROADS, CHRISTCHURCH**

Community Board: Mike Mora (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen, Ishwar Ganda, Sam Johnson, Judy Kirk, and Peter Laloli.

Community Board Adviser

Liz Beaven

Telephone: 027 434 7541

Email: liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

	CLAUSE	
PART B	1.	APOLOGIES
PART C	2.	CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 23 AUGUST 2011
PART B	3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
PART B	4.	PETITIONS
PART B	5.	NOTICES OF MOTION
PART B	6.	CORRESPONDENCE
PART B	7.	BRIEFINGS
PART A	8.	REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS TO COMMUNITY BOARDS
PART A	9	153 MAIN SOUTH ROAD - RETENTION OF PROPERTY IN COUNCIL'S OWNERSHIP
PART C	10	KINSELLA CRESCENT – PROPOSED NO STOPPING LINES
PART C	11.	APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/ WIGRAM 2011/12 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – CANTERBURY ALPINE ICE SKATING CLUB
PART C	12.	APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON WIGRAM 2011/12 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – ASHLEIGH LAVINIA O'NEILL
PART C	13.	LOCAL GOVERNMENT “KNOW HOW” TRAINING WORKSHOP – COMMUNITY BOARDS
PART C	14.	COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
PART B	15.	ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
PART B	16.	MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 23 AUGUST 2011**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Tuesday 23 August 2011 will be **circulated separately**.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 23 August 2011 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **PETITIONS**

5. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

7. **BRIEFINGS**

8. REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS TO COMMUNITY BOARDS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Legal Services Manager
Author:	Vivienne Wilson, Solicitor and Chris Gilbert, Legal Services Unit Manager

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to submit to each Community Board, for review, the current delegations from the Council. The current delegations are set out in **Attachment 1** and **Attachment 2**.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. On 9 June 2011, the Council resolved to delegate to Community Boards the matters set out in **Attachment 1**. However, the Council also resolved that the Community Boards be asked to review the delegations and bring them back to the Council by November 2011.
3. This report sets out the terms of the current delegations to Community Boards. Each Community Board is asked to review the current delegations and identify any issues they may have with the current provisions.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. The Local Government Act 2002 provides that "... for the purposes of efficiency and effectiveness in the conduct of a local authority's business, a local authority may delegate to a committee or other subordinate decision-making body, community board, or member or officer of the local authority any of its responsibilities, duties, or powers" except for certain specified responsibilities, duties and powers. The Council is also able to impose any conditions, limitations or prohibitions on any delegations it may make.
5. The Local Government Act 2002 also provides that the Council must consider whether or not to delegate to a Community Board if the delegation would enable the Community Board to best achieve its role.
6. Section 52 of the Act defines the role of Community Boards as follows:
 - (a) *represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of its community; and*
 - (b) *consider and report on all matters referred to it by the territorial authority, or any matter of interest or concern to the community board; and*
 - (c) *maintain an overview of services provided by the territorial authority within the community; and*
 - (d) *prepare an annual submission to the territorial authority for expenditure within the community; and*
 - (e) *communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community; and*
 - (f) *undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to it by the territorial authority.*
7. The Act provides that once a delegation has been made by the Council to a Community Board then that Board is legally able to make a decision within the delegations as if it were the Council itself. This means that decisions made by a Community Board within the delegations legally bind the Council. If a matter or issue does not fall within these delegations, as a default position, a decision on that matter or issue is one for the Council itself.

8. Cont'd

8. The Act provides that the Council itself cannot rescind or amend a decision made by a Community Board made under delegated authority. However, the Council can at any time amend or revoke a delegation so as to apply any future decisions.

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

9. Yes. The delegations comply with the Local Government Act 2002.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

10. Staff from the Legal Services Unit discussed the delegations with the chairs of each Community Board on 22 July 2011 at the Community Board Chair Forum. The Chairs raised a number of issues in relation to delegations set out below. Comments on those issues follow immediately after:

(a) *From time to time, Community Boards would like the opportunity to make, on their own account, submissions on notified resource consent hearings.* **Comment:** Following legal advice, the Council's position is that Community Boards are not able to make submissions on notified resource consent hearings on their own account unless this power has been delegated to them. The delegations currently provide that Community Boards have the power to make submissions on behalf of the Council, on applications for resource consents, to other territorial authorities or the Canterbury Regional Council, where the application is of particular concern to the local community.

(b) *Thought needs to be given to the role of Community Boards following the earthquakes, ie Suburban Recovery Planning.* **Comment:** At the 23 June 2011 meeting of the Council, the Council considered a report outlining a proposed Suburban Centres programme. The aim of the Suburban Centres programme of work is to assist in the recovery and rebuild of earthquake damaged commercial centres through: assisting with planning, design and transport related matters; facilitating discussions with property owners and commercial ventures; and providing contact details for other agencies. The work programme consists of two streams of work:

- masterplans for the larger, more damaged centres; and
- case management for smaller centres

Prior to taking the 23 June 2011 report to the Council, the Community Boards were individually consulted on the proposed work to ensure they were aware of this initiative and to provide an opportunity for discussion. Their feedback was sought on whether the centres identified in their area should be treated as masterplans or through case management.

There will be further opportunities for community involvement in the masterplan process. Each masterplan will have an approximately five month project design phase involving community and stakeholder engagement. The project aims to provide the stakeholders (including businesses, community groups and local residents) with information and an opportunity to engage and partake in the rebuild of centres. The process for developing each masterplan includes focus group discussions with key stakeholders, technical workshops, public meetings and elected member presentations. The outputs include an agreed vision and masterplan for each centre, together with an implementation plan.

8. Cont'd

- (c) *With respect to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board, could there be some explanation / justification for the approach of not permitting the Board to exercise its delegated functions in the Central City Area.* **Comment:** the Community Board delegations under the heading of "Roads, Parks and Leases" do not apply to that part of the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board area situated within the "Central City Area" marked on the plan (**Plan A**) attached. Delegations for those "Roading and Parks issues" in that "Central City Area" are to be exercised by the Council with reports on those matters coming directly to the Council. Prior to the earthquakes in 2010 and 2011, the rationale for this approach was that the central city area was of metropolitan significance to the well-being and growth of the city as a whole. (This is currently recognised in the City Plan, the Central City Revitalisation Strategy and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy.) There was therefore a need to both consider issues within this area on a city-wide basis and to be able to respond without undue delay. It was considered that it would quicken the process for dealing with central city issues if matters went directly to the Council without first proceeding to the Board.
- (d) *The Community Boards would like to be involved at much earlier stage with respect to proposed Council works in reserves in their local areas. This relates to maintenance, renewals and capital projects.* **Comment:** The delegations currently provide that Community Boards have the powers of the Council (except the hearing of submissions/objections) in relation to preparation, review and change of management plans for reserves. Under section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977, management plans are to provide for and ensure the use, enjoyment, maintenance, protection, and preservation, as the case may require, and, to the extent that the administering body's resources permit, the development, as appropriate, of the reserve for the purposes for which it is classified. Management plans must also incorporate and ensure compliance with the principles set out in section 17, section 18, section 19, section 20, section 21, section 22, or section 23, as the case may be, of the Reserves Act for a reserve of that classification.
- At present, reserve management plans are not in place for all reserves in the district, or some reserve management plans are at a high level. As reserve management plans are prepared or reviewed, there is scope for the plans to provide in more detail for proposed works. However, capex and opex expenditure are considered as part of the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes. Recent management plans have indicated that developments mentioned in the plans are dependent on the Long Term Plan process.
- (e) *Boards have the responsibility to make submissions on the Annual Plan. Six years ago, it was the practice for Boards to have input into the draft of the Annual Plan before it was consulted on. Can that be specified in the delegations?* **Comment:** There is a very tight timeframe each year for the preparation of the Annual Plan. It would be difficult to build in extra time for Community Boards to comment on the draft Annual Plan before it is signed off by the Council to start the formal consultation process. Once the special consultative procedure starts, Community Boards are able to participate fully in making a submission and providing quality feedback to the Council on the draft Annual Plan. It is acknowledged that under section 52(d) of the Local Government Act 2002, the role of Community Boards includes preparing an annual submission to the Council for expenditure within the community. However, it is considered that this role is ordinarily provided for in the current Annual Plan process.
- (f) *With abundance of local Reserve Management Committee on the peninsula, there is the opportunity when reserve planning takes place to involve all stakeholders – the Council, the Community Board and land owners. In general a clearer pathway is needed for consultation.* **Comment:** The Community Boards have specific delegated powers for local projects but not all local projects. This means that not all local projects will be referred to Community Boards for a decision. However, there is scope within the current delegations dealing with reserves and reserve management plans for discussions about reserve planning in the future, as discussed at paragraph (d) above.

8. Cont'd

- (g) *When matters are considered in public excluded before the Community Board, Board members are subsequently excluded from the public excluded part of the meeting when the matter comes before Council. Could this be clarified? Comment:* As you will be aware, under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the Council (and Community Boards) may by resolution exclude the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting only on one a number of specified grounds. Under section 48(5), any such resolution may provide for one or more specified persons to remain after the public has been excluded if that person, or persons, has or have, in the opinion of the local authority, knowledge that will assist the authority. Section 48(6) states that the resolution must state the knowledge possessed by that person or those persons which will be of assistance in relation to the matter to be discussed and how it is relevant to that matter. It would be open to the Council to resolve that members of a Community Board may stay in the public excluded part of the meeting if this is appropriate.

11. The comments from each Community Board will in due course be reported back to the Council. It is anticipated that before the Council considers the report with the Community Board comments there will be a workshop between the Councillors and Community Board members.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Community Board consider each of its current delegations and indicate whether it would like to see any amendments.

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

12. After each local authority election, it is the practice of the Council to reconsider and resolve the delegations it makes to the Community Boards. Following the disruption caused by the earthquakes on 4 September 2010 and 22 February 2011, the Council delegated various responsibilities, duties and powers to the Community Boards on 9 June 2011. However, the Council also resolved that the Community Boards be asked to review the delegations and bring them back to the Council by November 2011.
13. It should be noted that even though the Council did not resolve the delegations until 9 June 2011, the previous delegations continued in force over that period. There was no question that, in the interim, the Boards acted without delegated authority.
14. The current delegations, as set out in **Attachment 1**, cover a wide range of matters, including financial delegations, roads, sale of liquor, resource management, parks, leases and other miscellaneous matters. There are some specific provisions relating to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board, the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board, and the Akaroa/Wairewa Community Board.
15. It should be noted that it has been the Council's procedure for many years that any exercise of the Board delegations must be within any policies or standards set by the Council. So if the Council has resolved a particular position then it is not open to a Community Board to make a decision which conflicts with that Council position.
16. Experience has also shown it is not feasible to write delegations which cover every permutation of a subject. The question may arise as of whether a matter falls within a Board's delegated authority.
17. To assist in these situations a decision on whether or not a Board has delegated authority on a particular matter will be a matter for joint decision by the General Manager, City Environment (as most matters are considered to be delegated are operational issues that fall within that group) and the General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services Manager. This is provided for in **Attachment 1**.

8 Cont'd

18. Where there is a matter outside a Board delegation, such as a metropolitan facility which has a city wide impact but is situated in a particular Community Board area, and where the Board historically has taken an interest in the activities on that facility within their community, the issue has been addressed in the following way: a report on a particular matter involving the metropolitan facility is forwarded to the Community Board for comment before referring the final report to Council.
19. Following the report to Council on 9 June 2011, it has come to the attention of staff that there are some further delegations that have been made by the Council to Community Boards that have not been reflected in Attachment A. These delegations relate to the Council's Road Stopping Policy and are set out in **Attachment 2**. The road stopping delegations were made on 9 April 2009 and are still in force. However, it would be desirable for these delegations to be contained in the Council's Delegation Register with the other delegations.

THE OBJECTIVES

20. The purpose of the review is to provide an opportunity for each Community Board to consider and comment on their current set of delegations with respect to any issues that they may have.

THE OPTIONS

21. There are two options;

Option 1 – consider the current set of delegations but provide no comments.

Option 2 - consider the current set of delegations and provide comments to the Council with respect to any issues the Board may have.

THE PREFERRED OPTION

22. The preferred option is option 2. The Council has expressed a desire for the Community Boards to review their current delegations and provide feedback to the Council.

9. RETENTION OF PROPERTY IN COUNCIL'S OWNERSHIP - 153 MAIN SOUTH ROAD

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-73058
Officer responsible:	City Water and Waste Unit Manager
Author:	Tom Lennon, Property Consultant,

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This report is submitted to the Board for recommendation to the Council for consideration and resolution to retain in the Council's ownership the property located at 153 Main South Road, Sockburn also identified as Pt Lot 1 DP 3343.
2. The property has been identified by City Water and Waste as a suitable site for the provision of additional wells at Sockburn to allow the Council to run the water pumps for longer periods of time during peak demand.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. The subject property was identified as potentially redundant as a result of no longer being required for the purpose for which it was originally acquired for by the former Paparoa County Council.
4. A process to determine the future use for the property, including the transfer and reclassification for another Council use or ultimate sale has been completed. This process involved consultation with a number of the Council units who were given the opportunity to identified a possible future use for the site based on current Area and LTCCP strategies and objectives.
5. Unless the Council had a known identified use for the property that the Council was authorised to undertake as a public work, the property would be declared surplus to requirements and firstly offered back to the previous owner to purchase at current market value as required under the Public Works Act.
6. A proposal to retain a property which is no longer required for the purpose for which it was originally acquired must satisfy the Council that the proposed new use for the property is considered to be "Public Work" in accordance with legislation.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. There are no identified financial implications associated with retaining the property for the proposed use.

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

8. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. The provision of a water well within the site is consistent with the definition of a "Public Work" as described under the Public Works Act. Consequently, the Council have the rights to retain ownership of the property for as long as a public work, as defined within the Act, is provided within the site.

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

10. Yes, legal implications associated with retaining ownership of the property for the provision of a public work have been considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Water Supply Strategy 2009 – 2039.

9. Cont'd

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

12. Yes. Page 67 of the 2009-19 LTCCP, Water Supply "The water supply system (reticulation, pumping etc.) will be extended as demand requires over the life of the plan."

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Christchurch City Council Water Supply Strategy 2009 – 2039.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

14. Retention of this property meets the Council infrastructure strategies and LTCCP initiatives.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. There is no requirement for statutory consultation to be carried out.

9. Cont'd

BACKGROUND

16. The property identified as 153 Main South Road comprises of 1725 metres squared land on which a 159 metres squared house is situated. The four bedroom house is constructed of summerhill stone brick work and requires extensive remedial work and repairs, following vacation of the previous tenants, to bring it back to a habitable state. On it's own this would be uneconomic in the normal course of events, let alone now that there is a higher and better use identified for infrastructure purposes. There appears to be no earthquake damage. However, if it was resolved to retain the dwelling a structural report would needed to confirm the soundness or otherwise of the house.
17. The legal description for the property is Part Lot 1 DP 3343 contained in Certificate of Title CB277/83 and has a rating valuation of \$736,000.
18. The subject property adjoins 157 Main South Road to the east, which is under the ownership of Ngai Tahu Property Limited and the Sockburn Service Centre to the west. The property was acquired by the former Paparoa County Council for roading purposes and has been in the Council's ownership since June 1950. Over latter years it has been rented out through the Council's Community Services Housing Unit, in addition to the economic and better use issues, retention for that purpose no longer fits with their strategies.
19. City Water and Waste have determined that two wells would need to be constructed to deal with the anticipated demand. Construction of the wells is likely to be undertaken in 2020.
20. As a result of the poor state of repair of the existing dwelling and the significant expenditure required to bring the property to a liveable standard, it has been determined that the most suitable option is its demolition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board recommends that the Council:

- (a) Approve the retention in Council's ownership of the property situated at 153 Main South Road contained in Certificate of Title CB277/83.
- (b) Approve the demolition of the existing dwelling at the earliest possible time.

10. KINSELLA CRESCENT – PROPOSED NO STOPPING LINES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941-7305
Officer responsible:	Acting Unit Manager Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Steve Dejong, Traffic Engineer - Transport

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide a vehicle for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board to resolve that No stopping lines be installed around the bend outside number 9 Kinsella Crescent, as directed by the Board at its meeting of 21 June 2011.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Board received a letter from a resident of Kinsella Crescent requesting that no stopping lines, a centre line and parking limit lines be installed on the road outside his property. Staff first received a request for no stopping lines from this resident in July 2005. Staff responded to the resident at the time and explained that road marking would not be installed because it would not reduce the speed of vehicles at the corner as the resident expected. At its meeting on 31 August 2010, the Board requested that staff report on the feasibility of the installation of no stopping restrictions, a centre line and parking limit lines on Kinsella Crescent.
3. Kinsella Crescent is a local road within the Christchurch City Urban Traffic Area and as such is subject to the default speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour (km/h). Kinsella Crescent is approximately 560 metres in length. There are parking bays installed intermittently along the road. The road width including these parking bays is approximately 8.4 metres; the road width where there are no parking bays is 5.6 metres wide.
4. A speed count has been conducted recording the speeds of vehicles negotiating the corner. The mean speed of vehicles at the corner was 31 kilometres per hour (km/h) and data showed that 95% of traffic are travelling at 34 km/h or less when negotiating the corner. This data does not indicate that there is a speed issue at the corner. Experience has shown that the installation of no stopping lines can encourage greater speeds as an open traffic lane will be created and local traffic will become accustomed to cars not being parked near the corner. By allowing vehicles to park near the corner, local traffic will not be anticipating a clear carriageway and therefore (anticipating the possibility that they may have to avoid a parked car) will not enter the corner as fast.
5. At the meeting of the Board on the 21 June 2011, staff presented the initial Kinsella Crescent report, recommending that the status quo remain. The Board however resolved; (A) That the centre line and parking limit lines not be installed between numbers 10 to 22 Kinsella Crescent, and (B) "That staff be requested to provide a report on the installation of no stopping lines outside number 9 Kinsella Crescent".
6. Staff do not support the installation of no stopping lines outside number 9 Kinsella Crescent. It is felt that they are not required on this relatively new residential street.
7. Parking enforcement have no record of receiving any parking complaints relating to vehicles parking on the corner. On this basis parking enforcement do not support the request for no stopping lines at this stage.
8. Neighbouring residents were consulted prior to the presentation of the 21 June 2011 report to the Board, following the request for no stopping lines. Of the fourteen households consulted, ten replies were received. Eight respondents support the request for no stopping lines. The remaining two respondents did not support the request. The Halswell Residents' Association were consulted but did not wish to make comment on the necessity of parking restrictions. The owner of the property at number 9 Kinsella Crescent was consulted via mail; receiving a letter and plan. They replied by email stating: "I did look at the proposed no stopping and have no problem on that issue".

10. Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The estimated cost of the requested no stopping lines is approximately \$50.00.

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

14. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

16. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

18. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

19. Neighbouring residents were consulted prior to the presentation of the 21 June report to the Board, following the request for no stopping lines. Of the fourteen households consulted, ten replies were received. Eight respondents support the request for no stopping lines. The remaining two respondents did not support the request. The Halswell Residents' Association were consulted but did not wish to make comment on the necessity of parking restrictions. The owner of the property at number 9 Kinsella Crescent was consulted via mail; receiving a letter and plan. They replied by email stating: "I did look at the proposed no stopping and have no problem on that issue".

10. Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board:

- (a) Retain the status quo on Kinsella Crescent, or,
- (b) Approve that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Kinsella Crescent commencing at a point 73 metres north west of its intersection with Bibiana Crescent and extending initially in a north westerly direction and then around the bend to the south west for a distance of 40 metres.

11. APPLICATION TO THE RICcarton/WIGRAM 2011/12 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – CANTERBURY ALPINE ICE SKATING CLUB

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an application for funding from the Riccarton/Wigram 2011/12 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Canterbury Alpine Ice Skating Club have two athletes that reside in the Riccarton/Wigram ward, who are seeking Community Board support to travel to Melbourne to compete in the Australian National Short Track Championships. This trip will take place 5 – 9 October 2011.
3. Representatives from Riccarton/Wigram ward :
Courtney Lucinda Coburn aged 13 years.
Shaun James Robert Coburn aged 15 years.
4. The Canterbury Alpine Ice Skating Club is based at the Alpine Ice Sports facility on Brougham Street and 10 short track skaters have been selected to represent their club at the Australian National Short Track Championships. Athletes were selected based on their previous results at the 2010 Australian Championships and more recently their record breaking results at the Canterbury Championships. These athletes have also shown continued commitment to their club with them taking on extra training both on and off the ice.
5. Both Courtney and Shaun began skating since a very young age and have been members of the Canterbury Alpine Ice Skating Club for several years. They both placed 5th in their respective races at the Australian National Short Track Championships in 2010 and Shaun placed 2nd in the Junior Boys South Island Championships. Shaun was also named the Canterbury Alpine Ice Skating Club's Highest Male Achiever. Both skaters have shown personal commitment, enthusiasm and a very high standard in training and this has resulted in improvements in their speed.
6. The total cost per person to compete at the Championships is \$1,725 and all skaters are committed to fundraising leading up to the trip with garage sales and raffles.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

CANTERBURY ALPINE ICE SKATING CLUB – cost per player	
EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
Airfares and Insurance	\$ 600.00
Accommodation	\$ 380.00
Uniforms	\$ 300.00
Ground transport	\$ 80.00
Ice time training costs (22 weeks)	\$ 220.00
Entry Fees	\$ 145.00
Total Cost	\$ 1725.00
Amount Requested from Community Board	Not Indicated

8. This is the first time the applicants have applied to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board for funding.
9. At the time of writing this report there was an unallocated balance of \$11,788 in the Riccarton/Wigram 2011/12 Youth Development Scheme.

11. Cont'd

DO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS REPORT ALIGN WITH 2009-19 LTCCP BUDGETS?

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

11. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

15. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board support the application and allocate \$300 to each of the applicants from the Canterbury Alpine Ice Skating Club (totalling \$600), as a contribution towards their expenses for their attendance to the Australian National Short Track Championships from the Riccarton/Wigram 2011/12 Youth Development Scheme.

12. APPLICATION TO THE RICcarton WIGRAM 2011/12 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – ASHLEIGH LAVINIA O'NEILL

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an application for funding from the Community Board's 2011/12 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant, Ashleigh Lavinia O'Neill is a 14 year old student who lives in Halswell and is seeking Community Board support towards expenses related to her upcoming rhythmic gymnastics season. Ashleigh is travelling to Auckland in December for the NZ team trials, she is travelling to Washington DC in March 2012 to compete in the Pacific Rim International event and is also basing herself in Russia for three months from April – June 2012 to train and compete in several international competitions.
3. Ashleigh has been competing at an elite level in her sport since 2006 and has continued to excel in rhythmic gymnastics. In 2009 and 2010 Ashleigh was selected for the NZ National Talent ID Squad and she became NZ National Champion in the International category 2010. More recently Ashleigh placed 1st overall in the Canterbury and South Island Championships and 2nd overall in the NZ Championships. She was also the recipient of the trophy for the 'Highest Junior Apparatus Score of Competition' at the National Championships.
4. In 2009 Ashleigh based herself for three months in Kazan, Russia to attend training and development camps. Ashleigh has recently returned there again in August 2011 and will return again in April 2012. This overseas based training is an essential part of Ashleigh's elite preparation as she receives training and choreography of the highest standard. It is also the most expensive component of her training, but one that is vital if she is to reach her goals of competing at World Cup Events, Commonwealth Games and World Championships.
5. Due to the high costs involved in Ashleigh's sport, she is predominantly supported by her family, but Ashleigh is hoping to raise funds through an upcoming garage sale and also from her part time work at Olympia gym. She would appreciate any financial assistance from the community board.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

ASHLEIGH LAVINIA O'NEILL	
EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
NZ team trials in Auckland Airfares, rental car, accommodation, entry fee	\$490
Pacific Rim Competition in Washington DC Airfares, accommodation, entry fee, internal travel	\$4100
Overseas based training in Kazan, Russia Airfares, coaching fees, entry fees, internal transport, accommodation, equipment and uniforms	\$7,320
Total Cost	\$11,910
Amount Requested from the Community Board	\$1000.00

7. The applicant received \$500 in 2009/10 and \$300 in 2010/11 from the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board's Youth Development. All accountability was returned.
8. At the time of writing this report there was an unallocated balance of \$11,788 in the Riccarton/Wigram 2011/12 Youth Development Scheme.

12. Cont'd

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

10. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Community Board support the application and allocate \$750 to Ashleigh Lavinia O'Neill as a contribution towards her expenses related to her upcoming rhythmic gymnastics season from the 2011/12 Youth Development Scheme.

13. LOCAL GOVERNMENT “KNOW HOW” TRAINING WORKSHOP – COMMUNITY BOARDS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services, DDI 027 434 7541
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board’s approval for interested members to attend Local Government New Zealand “Know How” Training Workshop – Community Boards, to be held at the Waimakariri District Council on Friday 16 September 2011.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This workshop is a one day event and is aimed at helping Board members understand and value the role of the Board. It will cover in detail the role of the community board and how to build strong trust-based relationships. As well as working through relevant legislation, the workshop will review various success stories from across New Zealand.

Discussions include:

- The decision making processes
- Identifying personal action points
- Statutory roles and responsibilities
- Proactive and reactive roles
- How to advocate for the interests of your community

Further information is **attached**.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3. The cost of this Local Government workshop is \$350 plus GST per person.

As at 18 August 2011 the Board’s 2011/12 training, conference and travel budgets currently has an unallocated budget of \$2,301.

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

4. 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?**

5. Yes, there are no legal implications.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?**

6. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**Do the recommendations align with the Council’s strategies?**

7. Not applicable.

13 Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

8. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board give consideration to approving the attendance by interested members at the Local Government New Zealand "Know How" Training Workshop Community Boards, to be held at the Waimakariri District Council on Friday 16 September 2011.

30. 8. 2011

- 20 -

- 14. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
- 15. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- 16. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**