

**RICCARTON WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

**TUESDAY 21 JUNE 2011
AT 2.00PM**

IN THE FENDALTON SERVICE CENTRE, CORNER CLYDE AND JEFFERIES ROAD, 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: 941-8279

Email: liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

	PAGE NO	CLAUSE	
PART B	2	1.	APOLOGIES
PART C	2	2.	CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 31 MAY 2011
PART B	2	3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
PART B	2	4.	PETITIONS
PART B	2	5.	NOTICES OF MOTION
PART B	2	6.	CORRESPONDENCE
PART B	2	7.	BRIEFINGS
PART C	5	8.	KINSELLA CRESCENT – REQUESTED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION
PART C	9	9.	APPLICATIONS TO RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD 2010/11 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – SALVATION ARMY AND LOCAL RESIDENTS GROUPS
PART C	13	10.	STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING – KEY LOCAL PROJECTS 2011
PART C	20	11.	RICCARTON WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING 2011/12 – BOARD BIDS
PART C	26	12.	APPROVAL OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD'S SUBMISSIONS ON THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL'S DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2011/12
PART B	27	13.	COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
PART B	27	14.	ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
PART B	27	15.	MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 31 MAY 2011**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Tuesday 31 May 2011 will be **separately circulated**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 31 May 2011 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **PETITIONS**

5. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

7. **BRIEFINGS**

8. KINSELLA CRESCENT – REQUESTED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Acting Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Paul Forbes, Assistant Traffic Engineer, DDI 941-6377

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Board regarding a resident's request to install no stopping lines, a centre line and parking limit lines between numbers 10 to 22 Kinsella Crescent.

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. Please refer to the **attached plan**.
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 kilometre 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. Centrelines are not usually installed on local roads in Christchurch. However centrelines can be installed on local roads where it is found that it would be advantageous to road users to clearly define the traffic lanes. Due to the narrow road width a centre line is not considered to be suitable at this corner. Experience shows that the installation of a centre line on this corner would most likely increase vehicle speeds resulting in a decreased level of safety on the road.
5. Currently there are no existing parking restrictions on this section of Kinsella Crescent, however no stopping lines have previously been installed for safety reasons near the child care facility and Kinsella Reserve further down Kinsella Crescent. These no stopping lines were approved by the Board at its meeting 27 April 2007.
6. Council Kerbside Parking Limit Lines Policy states: *Individual parking spaces may be marked on arterial or other roads within shopping centres where parking (P30, P60 etc) restrictions apply. If there are benefits to traffic management (including the marking of cycle ways) along arterial road, parking limit lines may be extended to areas outside the restricted parking zone. And As a matter of practice driveways are not to be individually marked with parking limit lines either side...* The Council resolved at its meeting on 24 June 2010 that *Community Boards be given delegated authority to approve exemptions to the installation or maintenance of parking limit lines for private driveways where the proposed installation falls outside the Council Policy.* Considering this policy and the fact that there is a parking bay offset from the carriageway, staff are not recommending that parking limit lines be installed between numbers 10 to 22 Kinsella Crescent.
7. 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 a centre line and 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.

8 Cont'd

8. 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.
9. Neighbouring residents were consulted on the requested 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 do not support the request. The Halswell Residents' Association were consulted on the proposal and support the proposed centreline but did not wish to make comment on the necessity of parking restrictions.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. The cost of the staff recommendation is \$nil.

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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?

15. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

16. 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?

17. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

18. 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?

19. As above.

8 Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

20. Refer to paragraph 8 and 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the no stopping lines, centre line or parking limit lines not be installed between numbers 10 to 22 Kinsella Crescent.

9. APPLICATIONS TO RICCARTON WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD 2010/11 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – SALVATION ARMY AND LOCAL RESIDENTS GROUPS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Community Support
Author:	Denise Galloway, Community Development Adviser Marie Byrne, Community Engagement Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board to consider applications for funding from its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund from the Salvation Army and from a collective of local residents associations (through the local Community Board). The Salvation Army request is for a Budget Advisor; the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board request is for Resident Group Administration Grants for 2011/12.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In 2010/11, the total pool available for allocation for the Discretionary Response Fund is \$51,197. The Discretionary Response Fund opens each year on 1 July and closes on 30 June the following year, or when all funds are expended.
3. The purpose of the Fund is to assist community groups where the project and funding request falls outside other council funding criteria and/or closing dates. This fund is also for emergency funding for unforeseen situations.
4. At the Council meeting of 22 April 2010, Council resolved to change the criteria and delegations around the local Discretionary Response Fund.
5. The change in criteria limited the items that the local Discretionary Response Fund does not cover to only:
 - (a) Legal challenges or Environment Court challenges against the Council, Council Controlled Organisations or Community Boards decisions;
 - (b) Projects or initiatives that change the scope of a Council project; and
 - (c) Projects or initiatives that will lead to ongoing operational costs to the Council.

Council also made a note that: *"Community Boards can recommend to the Council for consideration grants under (b) and (c)."*

6. Based on this criteria, the applications from the following groups for the following project are eligible for funding:
 - Salvation Army - Budget Advisor; and
 - Riccarton/Wigram Community Board - Resident Group Administration Grants.
7. Detailed information on the application and staff comments are included in the attached Decision Matrix. (**Attachment 1**)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. There is currently \$9,331 remaining in the Board's 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund.

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

9. Yes, see page 184 of the LTCCP regarding community grants schemes including Board funding

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. There are no legal considerations.

9 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, Community Support pages 172 and 176.

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

12. Yes, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Refer to the attached Decision Matrix.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Approve a grant of \$5,000 from the Riccarton/Wigram 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund to the Salvation Army as a contribution towards the Budget Advisor position; and
- (b) Approve a grant of \$4,200 from the Riccarton/Wigram 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board for Residents Group Administration Grants for 2011/12.

10. STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING – KEY LOCAL PROJECTS 2011

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Manager
Author:	Penelope Goldstone, Community Funding Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board to consider whether they wish to recommend any Key Local Projects to the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund for 2011/12.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In a public excluded workshop, held on 14 June 2011, the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board considered the issue of Key Local Projects for 2011/2012.
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. Previous KLPs for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board were:

Name of Group	Year/s	Name of Project	Amount
Te Puawaitanga ki Otautahi Trust (Community Development Worker)	2008/09-2010/11	Community Support Worker for Maori	\$51,800
Te Puawaitanga ki Otautahi Trust (Community Facilities Coordinator)	2008/09-2010/11	Community Facilities Coordinator	\$51,250

7. All previous funding for KLPs ended in the 2010/11 funding round. Staff have reviewed all applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund 2011/12 to identify if there are any projects that could be considered for recommendation to the Metropolitan Funding Committee as KLPs for 2011/12.
8. Staff recommend that the Community Board consider the following projects as KLPs in 2011/12. Attached is a decision matrix that provides information on the projects. (**Attachment 1**).

10 Cont'd

Name of Group	Name of Project	Total Project Cost	Amount Requested	Recommendation
SEEDS (RUR Trusy)	Young 1's and Shufflebumz	\$22,992	\$14,300	\$14,300
Community Development Network Trust	CDN Youth Work	\$232,778	\$65,000	\$50,000

Timeline and Process

9. KLPs that are approved by the Board will be put forward to the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Funding Committee for consideration at its meeting on 29 July 2011.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. In 2011/12, the draft annual plan includes \$238,918 for the Riccarton Wigram Community Board Strengthening Communities Fund.

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

11. 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?**

12. 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?**

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

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

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

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. Not required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

- a) Nominate the Community Development Network Trust as a key local project and recommend a grant of \$50,000 from The Metropolitan Funding Committee towards their youth work services.
- b) Nominate SEEDS (RUR Trust) as a key local project and recommend a grant of \$14,300 from the Metropolitan Funding Committee towards Young 1's and Shufflebumz.

10 Cont'd

BACKGROUND

16. 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).
17. Each Board may nominate (KLPs) in its area that are put forward to the Metropolitan Funding Committee for consideration for metropolitan funding.
18. The agreed process to determine if a "local" funding application should be processed as a KLP is detailed as bullet point 16 in the report that was adopted by the Council on 4 October, 2007:

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
19. 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.
 20. 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.
 21. 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"*.
 22. Previous KLPs for this Community Board are:

Name of Group	Year/s	Name of Project	Amount
Te Puawaitanga ki Otautahi Trust (Community Development Worker)	2008/09-2010/11	Community Support Worker for Maori	51,800
Te Puawaitanga ki Otautahi Trust (Community Facilities Coordinator)	2008/09-2010/11	Community Facilities Coordinator	51,250

23. All previous funding for KLPs ended in the 2010/11 funding round. Staff have reviewed all applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund 2011/12 to identify if there are any projects that could be considered for recommendation to the Metropolitan Funding Committee as KLPs for 2011/12.

10 Cont'd

24. Staff recommend that the Community Board nominate the following projects as KLPs in 2011/12. Attached is a Decision Matrix that provides information on the projects (**Attachment 1**).

Name of Group	Name of Project	Total Project Cost	Amount Requested	Recommendation
SEEDS (RUR Trusy)	Young 1's and Shufflebumz	22,992	14,300	14,300
Community Development Network Trust	CDN Youth Work	232,778	65,000	50,000

25. Attached is a list of all applications to the Riccarton Wigram Board Strengthening Communities Fund 2011/12 (**Attachment 2**).

11. RICcarton WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING 2011/12 – BOARD BIDS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services Group 941.8607
Officer responsible:	Manager Community Support Unit
Author:	Pen Goldstone, Community Funding Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton Wigram Community Board to agree to the projects that will be put forward on behalf of the Board to the Strengthening Communities Fund for 2011/12.
2. The Riccarton Wigram Community Board Strengthening Communities Fund decision meeting is scheduled for the 2 August 2011.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. Attachment 1 to this report is a table that outlines potential projects that the Board may wish to put forward for consideration for the 2011/12 Strengthening Communities Fund (**Attachment 1**). These were discussed by the Board in a workshop earlier in the year. These projects have been agreed as part of Council Units work programmes.
4. As a result of the earthquake, it may be that the Boards priorities for projects have altered. This meeting is the opportunity to update these projects.
5. Also attached is a list of local Board projects that have received funding from the Board in the three previous funding rounds (**Attachment 2**).
6. Subsequent to the Board identifying which projects it would like to put forward as applications, staff will assess each project and include these on the decision matrix along with the other applications received for Strengthening Communities Fund.
7. Due to the shortened timeframe for the funding process as a result of the earthquake, there will not be a Board Seminar prior to the decision meeting in August. Elected members will be provided with the decision matrix three weeks prior to the decision meeting in order to have time to consider the projects and staff recommendations. This will also allow time for elected members to have questions answered.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

8. 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?

9. 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?

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

11 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

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

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Not required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board give consideration to the projects detailed in Attachment 1 – Projects to Consider 2011/2012 and approve a list of projects to be submitted as applications to the 2011/12 Strengthening Communities Fund.

BACKGROUND

STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

13. The Council adopted the Strengthening Communities Strategy on 12 July 2007. The Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme comprises four funding schemes:

- (a) Strengthening Communities Fund
- (b) Small Projects Fund
- (c) Discretionary Response Fund
- (d) Community Organisations Loan Scheme.

14. The following funding outcomes have been used to evaluate and assess applications to the Strengthening Communities Fund:

- Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups
- Increase participation in and awareness of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups, programmes and local events
- Increase community engagement in local decision making
- Enhance community and neighbourhood safety
- Provide community based programmes which enhance basic life skills
- Reduce or overcome barriers to participation
- Foster collaborative responses to areas of identified need.

15. The following funding priorities have been taken into consideration when assessing applications:

- Older Adults
- Children and Youth
- People with Disabilities
- Ethnic and Culturally Diverse Groups
- Disadvantaged and/or Socially Excluded
- Capacity of Community Organisations
- Civic Engagement.

11 Cont'd

TIMELINE AND PROCESS

16. Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to make final decisions on the Strengthening Communities Funding for their respective wards. The Board's decisions will be actioned immediately following the decision meeting.
17. All funding approved is for the period of September to August each year, therefore grants will be paid out in early September 2011.

12. APPROVAL OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD'S SUBMISSION ON THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL'S DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2011/12

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The Board decided to develop a submission to the Council's Draft Annual Plan 2011-12. **(circulated separately).**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approve the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board's submission on the Christchurch City Council's Draft Annual Plan 2011/12.

13. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE

14. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short brief to other members on activities that have been attended or to provide information in general that is beneficial to all members.

15. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS