

**RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

TUESDAY 17 APRIL 2012

AT 5.30PM

**IN THE COMMUNITY ROOM,
UPPER RICCARTON LIBRARY, 71 MAIN SOUTH ROAD
UPPER RICCARTON**

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

Community Board Adviser

Liz Beaven

Telephone: 941 5133 or 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

- PART B 1. APOLOGIES**
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 3 APRIL 2012**
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
 - 3.1 St Columba’s Anglican Church**
 - 3.2 La Vida Youth Trust**
- PART B 4. PETITIONS**
- PART B 5. NOTICES OF MOTION**
- PART B 6. CORRESPONDENCE**
- PART B 7. BRIEFINGS**
 - 7.1 Western Interceptor**
- PART C 8. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2011/12 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – ROBERT MICHAEL LORD**
- PART C 9. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2011/12 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – LA VIDA YOUTH TRUST**
- PART C 10. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2011/12 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – ST COLUMBA’S ANGLICAN CHURCH**
- PART C 11. COLMAN RESERVE – REMOVAL OF TREES**

17. 4. 2012

- 2 -

- PART C 12. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2011/12 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - HALSWELL RUGBY FOOTBALL LEAGUE CLUB**
- PART B 13. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
- PART B 14. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B 15. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 3 APRIL 2012

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Tuesday 3 April 2012 (circulated **separately**).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 3 April 2012 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 ST COLUMBA'S ANGLICAN CHURCH

Tracey Buunk, Hei Hei Broomfield Community Development) and Julie Harker, Vicar's Warden, Parish of Hornby, Templeton and West Melton, will discuss with the Board St Columba's Church funding application to Riccarton/Wigram 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund.

3.2 LA VIDA YOUTH TRUST

Carl Crocker, Trust Manager, and Emma Burgess ,Youth Worker and After School Programme Manager, will discuss with the Board La Vida Youth Trust's funding application to Riccarton/Wigram 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund.

4. PETITIONS

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. BRIEFINGS

7.1 Western Interceptor - Peter Brocklehurst

Colin Currie, Project Manager – Beca Consultants, will update the Board on the Western Interceptor Project.

8. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM BOARD 2011/12 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – ROBERT MICHAEL LORD

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 applicant, Robert Michael Lord, is a 22 year old Ilam resident who is seeking Board support to travel to Spain to represent New Zealand and compete in the I.T.U Long Distance Triathlon World Championships. This trip will take place from 22 July – 2 August 2012.
3. Robert has been involved in various sports throughout his schooling years where he excelled in gymnastic and swimming as well as athletics. He worked hard to earn his New Zealand ranking in men's hurdles by the age of 18. Once Robert left school he concentrated on rugby and was selected to play rugby in the Colts Premier grade. From here Robert went on to make the New Zealand Institute of Sport rugby team.
4. In recent years, Robert turned to longer distances in swimming and running, where he also excelled and then also developed his cycling skills. Robert coached himself and developed links with swim and cycle squads where he was able to learn while supporting himself and working a full time job. It has only taken Robert two years in the sport to gain selection in the New Zealand team for both the sprint and long distance triathlon.
5. Robert pays for all of his sporting expenses and will be allocating his savings to cover a majority of this trip. He has also applied to Sport Canterbury for assistance.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

Robert Michael Lord	
EXPENSES	Cost (\$)
Airfares	2,800
Accommodation and food	1,279
Entry Fee + Race License	195
Uniform	300
Misc	65
Total Cost	\$ 4,639
Amount Requested from the Community Board	Not indicated

7. This is the first time the applicant has applied to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board's Youth Development Scheme.
8. At the time of writing this report, there was a balance of \$5,803 in the 2011/12 Youth Development Fund.

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

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

8. Cont'd

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 Board support the application and allocate \$600 to Robert Michael Lord, as a contribution towards his trip to Spain to attend the I.T.U Long Distance Triathlon World Championships , from the 2011/12 Youth Development Scheme..

9. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2011/12 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – LA VIDA AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMME

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Unit Manager
Assessment undertaken by:	Denise Galloway

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board to consider La Vida Youth Trust's application of \$18,717 for the La Vida After School Programme towards the first two terms of an After School Programme for funding from the Riccarton/Wigram 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In 2011/12, the total budget available for allocation in the Riccarton/Wigram Discretionary Response Fund is \$51,197. Further funding of \$15,172 has been added to this amount as a result of an under spend from the Metropolitan Small Grants Fund. 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 application from La Vida Youth Trust for La Vida After School Programme is eligible for funding.
7. Detailed information on the application and staff comments are included in the attached Decision Matrix. (**Attachment 1.**)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. There is currently \$24,736 remaining in the Board's 2011/12 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 Con't

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, page 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, including Board funding.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Refer to the attached Decision Matrix.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board approve a grant of \$10,000 from the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund to La Vida Youth Trust for La Vida After School Programme as a contribution towards the cost of the first two terms of an After School Programme.

10. APPLICATION TO THE RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD 2011/12 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – ST COLUMBIA’S ANGLICAN CHURCH

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Unit Manager
Assessment undertaken by:	Denise Galloway

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board to consider St Columba's Anglican Church application for funding of \$4,833 for the Roof Replacement Project for St Aidans Church from the Riccarton/Wigram 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In 2011/12, the total budget available for allocation in the Riccarton/Wigram Discretionary Response Fund is \$51,197. Further funding of \$15,172 has been added to this amount as a result of an under spend from the Metropolitan Small Grants Fund. 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 application from St Columba's Anglican Church for Roof replacement for St Aidans Church is eligible for funding.
7. Detailed information on the application and staff comments are included in the attached Decision Matrix. (**Attachment 1.**)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. There is currently \$39,536 remaining in the Board's 2011/12 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.

10 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, page 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, including Board funding.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Refer to the attached Decision Matrix.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board approve a grant of \$4,000 from the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund to St Columba's Anglican Church towards the replacement of St Aiden's Church roof, on the condition that the total recommended grant of \$4,000 be released to the church once Council staff are satisfied with the structural integrity of the hall or have provided a Detailed Engineering Evaluation assessment.

11. COLMAN RESERVE – REMOVAL OF TREES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Tony Armstrong, Arborist – Parks

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide information and a recommendation to the Board on a request by residents for the removal of two cedar trees (*Thuja plicata* and *Cedrus deodara*) from Colman Reserve.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. On the 30 May 2011 the Board received a request to resolve an issue concerning trees in Colman Reserve causing shading, in particular during the winter months.
3. As the two cedar trees were assessed as healthy, the request has therefore been referred back to the Community Board for a decision.
4. A public meeting held on 8 June 2010 revealed there was a consensus to have two trees removed and replaced with smaller growing deciduous trees. This is reflected in the staff recommendation.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. The cost to remove the two trees and replace them with PB95 (or equivalent) grade trees is estimated at \$2,065.98 which includes watering and maintenance for one year following planting.
6. The STEM (Standard Tree Evaluation Method) evaluation including the nuisance factor is 96 for the *Thuja* tree.
7. The STEM evaluation without the nuisance factor is 114 for the *Thuja* tree.
8. The STEM evaluation including the nuisance factor is 84 for the *Cedrus* tree.
9. The STEM evaluation without the nuisance factor is 96 for the *Cedrus* tree.
10. The STEM valuation including the nuisance factor is \$10,100 for the *Thuja* tree.
11. The STEM valuation without the nuisance factor is \$11,000 for the *Thuja* tree.
12. The STEM valuation including the nuisance factor is \$9,500 for the *Cedrus* tree.
13. The STEM valuation without the nuisance factor is \$10,100 for the *Cedrus* tree.
14. The nuisance factor is a consideration of the negative effects of a large evergreen tree located on a northern aspect to and in relatively close proximity to a residential dwelling.
15. STEM is the New Zealand national arboricultural industry standard for evaluating and valuing amenity trees by assessing their condition and contribution to amenity along with other distinguishable attributes such as stature, historic or scientific significance.

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

16. Removing and replacing the tree without obtaining reimbursement from the applicant is inconsistent with the current LTCCP as funding has not been allocated in the Transport and Greenspace Unit tree maintenance budget for the removal of structurally sound and healthy tree that are not causing health and safety problems.

11. Cont'd

17. Obtaining reimbursement from the applicant to remove and replace a structurally sound and healthy tree is consistent with the current LTCCP.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

18. The Greenspace Manager has the following delegation with respect to trees:
"In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of tree from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control".
19. While the Transport and Greenspace Manager has the delegation to remove the trees, current practice is that in most cases requests to remove healthy and structurally sound trees that are not causing other health and safety or infrastructure damage concerns are placed before the appropriate Community Board for a decision.
20. Under the delegations to Community Boards, the Board has the authority to "plant, maintain and remove tree on reserves, parks and roads" under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council.
21. Protected trees can only be removed by a successful application under the Resource Management Act. The trees in question are not listed as protected under the provision of the Christchurch City Plan.
22. The following City Plan Policies may be of some benefit when considering the options:

Volume 2: Section 4 City Identity

4.2.1 - Policy: Tree Cover

To promote amenity values in the urban area by maintaining and enhancing the tree cover present in the City.

- (a) Tree cover and vegetation make an important contribution to amenity values in the City. Through the redevelopment of sites, existing vegetation is often lost and not replaced. The City Plan protects those tree identified as "heritage" or "notable" and the subdivision process protects other tree which are considered to be "significant". The highest degree of protection applies to heritage tree.
- (b) Because Christchurch is largely built on a flat plain, tree and shrubs play an important role in creating relief, contributing to visual amenity and attracting native birds.
- (c) The amount of private open space available for new planting and to retain existing tree is influenced by rules concerning building density and setback from boundaries. The rules do not require new planting for residential development but landscaping is required in business zones.

4.2.2 - Policy: Garden City

To recognise and promote the "Garden City" identity, heritage and character of Christchurch.

- (d) A key aspect of achieving this policy will be maintaining and extending environments and vegetation types which compliment this image. A broad range of matters influence and contribute to this image, including the following:
 - (i) Tree-lined streets and avenues.
 - (ii) Parks and developed areas of open space.

11 Cont'd

14.3.2 - Policy: "Garden City" image identity

To acknowledge and promote the "Garden City" identity of the City by protecting, maintaining and extending planting which compliments this image.

23. An application to prune or remove the tree may be made to the District Court under The Property Law Act 2007.
24. The District Court can order the pruning or removal of a tree under the Property Law Act 2007.
25. Any work carried out in relation to the trees is to be completed by a Council approved contractor.

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

26. Yes, as per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

27. LTCCP 2009-19.

Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Pg. 117

- (a) Governance – By enabling the community to participate in decision making through consultation on plans and projects.
 - (b) City Development – By providing a well-designed, efficient transport system and attractive street landscapes.
28. Funding is available in the Transport and Greenspace Unit Park Tree Capital Renewals budget for the removal and replacement of trees which are no longer appropriate species or no longer appropriate in their current position.
 29. Retention of the trees is consistent with the Activity Management Plan provided the trees are structurally sound and healthy.
 30. Removal and replacement of the trees is consistent with the Activity Management Plan.
 31. Removing and not replacing the trees is not consistent with the Activity Management Plan.

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

32. Yes, as per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

33. Removing and replacing the trees would be consistent with the following strategies:
 - (a) Biodiversity Strategy
 - (b) Christchurch Urban Design Vision
 - (c) Garden City Image as per the City Plan.

34. There is currently no policy for the pruning or removing of tree in public places.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

35. Yes, as per above.

11. Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

36. A public meeting was held in the reserve on Saturday 15 October 2011, with members from the Community Board and local residents to discuss the residents' request to remove the three cedar trees along with other tree maintenance proposals.
37. The consensus from the meeting was to make amendment to the request to remove three trees and revise to only two. These are identified on the plan (refer **Attachment 1**) and photographs (refer **Attachment 2**) and are:
 - *Thuja plicata* (western red cedar) Tree ID No. 110733
 - *Cedrus deodar* (Atlantic cedar) Tree ID No. 110735
38. Note, as the resident from number 8 Impala Place was absent, a separate meeting was held to discuss the proposal and it was resolved not to remove the three trees adjacent to their property at this time.
39. Should the Community Board approve the removal and replacement of the two trees, an amended plan will be circulated as part of the Start Work Notice prior to commencement of works.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approve the removal of the two cedar trees on the north eastern boundary of 18 Gladson Avenue as identified in **Attachments 1 and 2** and replace them with two smaller, deciduous trees.

11. Cont'd

BACKGROUND

40. Residents of 18 Gladson Avenue wrote to the Board to remove three large conifer (evergreen) trees on their north east boundary due to ongoing and adverse shading of their properties. The trees in question are three mature cedars located on the far south west boundary of the reserve. Previous requests have also been made by residents of number 22 Gladson Avenue.
41. Requests to remove the trees date back to 2004.
42. Staff and representatives from the Community Board met on the morning of 8 June 2011 to view the trees.
43. It was resolved at the site meeting to write up a plan for the trees in the park and invite residents to a site meeting to discuss the proposed plan.
44. All the trees in the park were surveyed and assessed over winter and a plan prepared to present to the Community Board and residents on Saturday 15 October 2011 (see Consultation Fulfilment).
45. Following this site meeting, the tree removal request was revised to only two of the trees.
46. Colman Reserve is a small local purpose reserve situated in a residential area of Upper Riccarton. Trees and shrub borders planted around the perimeters of the reserve provide added amenity to the reserve.
47. There are 52 trees located inside the reserve, predominantly exotic/deciduous with birch and oak/cherry as the most common species. The age/size range is mostly semi mature to mature trees, with medium sized being most common with only a few very large (15 metre plus) trees. The majority of trees are in average overall condition with only two trees noted for high priority work.
48. In December 2010 26 trees were pruned and ten trees removed due to their poor or declining condition. Ten spaces within the reserve have been identified for replacement tree planting.
49. The trees in question have been assessed as healthy and requiring routine maintenance only e.g. pruning to remove dead branches, diseased and defective branches and any minor canopy lifting/reduction where required. Any pruning of this nature is unlikely to satisfy the needs of the adjacent residents with regard to shading. Only significant pruning e.g. major height reduction/thinning would successfully alleviate the shading issue.

OPTIONS

50. Decline the request to remove the two cedar trees and continue to maintain them to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural practices, standards and procedures.
51. Remove the two cedar trees and replace them with two smaller, deciduous trees.

12. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD 2011/12 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – HALSWELL RUGBY FOOTBALL LEAGUE CLUB

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Unit Manager Carolyn Gallagher
Assessment undertaken by:	Lisa Gregory, Recreation and Sport Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board to consider Halswell Rugby Football League Club application for \$4,467 towards its mentoring and volunteer recognition programme for funding from its 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In 2011/12, the total budget available for allocation in the Riccarton/Wigram Discretionary Response Fund is \$51,197. Further funding of \$15,172 has been added to this amount as a result of an under spend from the Metropolitan Small Grants Fund. 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 application from Halswell Rugby Football League Club for Mentoring and Recognition for Club Referees is eligible for funding.
7. Detailed information on the application and staff comments are included in the attached Decision Matrix. (Refer **Attachment 1.**)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. There is currently \$24,736 remaining in the Board's 2011/12 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.

12. Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, page 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, including Board funding.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Refer to the attached Decision Matrix.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

14. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Board approve a grant of \$4,000 from its 2011/12 Discretionary Response Fund to the Halswell Rugby Football League Club towards its mentoring and volunteer recognition programme.

17. 4. 2012

- 17 -

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