

**RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

TUESDAY 17 JULY 2012

AT 5.30PM

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

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

Community Board Adviser

Liz Beaven

Telephone: 941 6501 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 CLAUSE

PART B	1.	APOLOGIES
PART C	2.	CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 3 JULY 2012
PART B	3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
PART B	4.	PETITIONS
PART B	5.	NOTICES OF MOTION
PART B	6.	CORRESPONDENCE
PART B	7.	BRIEFINGS 7.1 Passenger Services Environment Canterbury
PART C	8.	APPLICATION TO RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD 2012/13 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – RICCARTON LEAGUES CLUB
PART C	9.	WAIMAIRI ROAD / KILTIE STREET INTERSECTION PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION
PART C	10.	RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING 2012/13 ALLOCATIONS
PART C	11.	APPLICATION TO RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD 2012/13 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – LA VIDA YOUTH TRUST
PART C	12.	APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – LUCY TOTHILL
PART C	13.	LESLIE STREET – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION

We're on the Web!

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

17. 7. 2012

- 2 -

- PART B 14. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
 14.1 Update On Recovery Discussions**
- PART B 15. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B 16. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 3 JULY 2012

The report of the Board's ordinary meeting of 3 July 2012 has been circulated **separately**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

4. PETITIONS

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. BRIEFINGS

7.1 PASSENGER SERVICES ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY

Edward Wright from Environment Canterbury will be giving the Board a briefing to update members on the current public consultation about proposed changes to a number of Christchurch bus routes.

8. APPLICATION TO RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD 2012/13 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – RICcarton LEAGUES 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 – Community Recreation Advisor

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board to consider Riccarton Leagues Club application (Split 70/30 with Fendalton/Waimairi) for funding of \$3,500 from its 2012/13 Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Budget provision is in the LTCCP and is currently under review in the 2012/13 Annual Plan. 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.

The 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 Riccarton Leagues Club for insulation of clubrooms (split 70/30 with Fendalton/Waimairi) 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. Budget provision is in the LTCCP and is currently under review in the 2012/13 Annual Plan.

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.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, page 172 and 176

8 Cont'd

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:

- (a) Approve a grant of \$2,450 from its 2012/13 Discretionary Response Fund to Riccarton Leagues Club for the insulation of clubrooms.

9. WAIMAIRI ROAD/KILTIE STREET INTERSECTION PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Steve Dejong, Traffic Engineer - Transport

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Transport and Greenspace Committee's recommendation to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board, that it approve the installation of a No Stopping Restriction at the intersection of Waimairi Road and Kiltie Street.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Waimairi Road is classified as a collector road in the City Plan and therefore has a dual function of distributing traffic and providing property access. Kiltie Street is classified as a local road and this has a primary function of providing property access.
3. The Council has received a request to investigate the visibility problems caused by commuter vehicles parking in close proximity to the Waimairi Road and Kiltie Street intersection.
4. Kiltie Street forms an uncontrolled T-intersection with Waimairi Road, Waimairi Road being the top of the T (**attached**). The existing road environment is characterised by high kerbside parking demand during weekday business hours. This often includes cars parking in close proximity to the intersection which is resulting in poor sight lines for both vehicles entering and exiting Kiltie Street.
5. Installing the proposed No Stopping Restriction around the curves at this intersection will prevent the kerbside parking that currently occurs within close proximity of the intersection and will increase visibility for vehicles entering and exiting Kiltie Street. Although it is illegal to park within six metres of an intersection, the proposed No Stopping Restriction will extend the sight lines thus improving safety.
6. On 16 May 2011 staff visited the residents of 47 and 53 Waimairi Road – these being the two properties that immediately adjoin the proposed no stopping restrictions. Both residents raised no concerns with the measures proposed.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The estimate cost of this proposal is \$80.

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. 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.
10. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and traffic control devices.
11. The installation of any signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

12. As above.

9 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. 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?

14. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

15. The recommendations align with the Council Road Safety Strategy 2004 and Parking Strategy 2003.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

16. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

17. On 16 May 2011 staff visited the residents of 47 and 53 Waimairi Road – these being the two properties that immediately adjoin the proposed no stopping restrictions. Both residents raised no concerns with the measures proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Transport and Greenspace Committee recommends that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board approve:

- (a) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the western side of Waimairi Road commencing at its intersection with Kiltie Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 21 metres.
- (b) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southern side of Kiltie Street commencing at its intersection with Waimairi Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 17 metres.
- (c) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the western side of Waimairi Road commencing at its intersection with Kiltie Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 21 metres.
- (d) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northern side of Kiltie Street commencing at its intersection with Waimairi Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 18 metres.

10. RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING 2012/13 ALLOCATIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, Ph 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Carolyn Gallagher, Unit Manager Community Support
Author:	Ruby Tiavolo – Grants Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board to allocate the Riccarton/Wigram Strengthening Communities Fund for 2012/13.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This report provides information to Community Board Members on the applications received for the Strengthening Communities Fund.
3. The total pool available for allocation in 2012/13, as outlined in the LTCCP, is \$238,918. There are no pre existing commitments. Applications totalling \$582,101 were received. Current staff recommendations total \$230,418.
4. Attached (**as Attachment 1**) is a decision matrix, which outlines the projects that funding is being sought for. Following staff collaboration meetings, staff have ranked all projects as either Priority 1, 2, 3 or 4 and have made recommendations as to funding.
5. The Riccarton/Wigram Community Board Funding Workshop on 19 June provided Community Board Members the opportunity to go through the applications received in order to clarify any issues or questions about applications.
6. The Riccarton/Wigram Community Board has put forward two projects as Key Local Projects in 2012/13 amounting to \$64,300. These have been recommended for funding from the Metropolitan funding pool.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

7. 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?

8. 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 2006-16 LTCCP?

9. 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?

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

10 Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

11. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

12. It is recommended that the Board give consideration to the projects detailed in the attached decision matrix and approve allocations from the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board Strengthening Communities Funding for 2012/13.

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. For detailed information on the Strengthening Communities Strategy's Outcomes and Priorities, please see **Attachment 2**. The specific criteria for the Strengthening Communities Fund is also attached, as **Attachment 3**.

The Decision Matrix

15. Information on the projects is presented in a Decision Matrix, attached as Attachment 1. To ensure consistency, the same Decision Matrix format and presentation has been provided to the Metropolitan Funding Committee and all Community Boards.
16. Applications are project-based; information is provided that relates specifically to the project for which funding is being sought, not the wider organisation.
17. All applications appearing on the Decision Matrix have been assigned a Priority Rating. The Priority Ratings are:
- Priority 1** Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes significantly to Funding Outcomes and Priorities. Highly recommended for funding.
 - Priority 2** Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities. Recommended for funding.
 - Priority 3** Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities but to a lesser extent than Priority 2 applications. Not recommended for funding.
 - Priority 4** Meets all eligibility criteria and has minimum contribution to Funding Outcomes and Priorities; or insufficient information provided by applicant (in application and after request from Advisor); or other funding sources more appropriate. Not recommended for funding.
18. Staff have used the following criteria to determine whether an application is a Priority One:
- Impact the project has on the city
 - Reach of the project
 - Depth of the project
 - Value for Money
 - Best Practice
 - Innovation
 - Strong alignment to Council Outcomes and Priorities

10 Cont'd

- Noteworthy leverage or partnership/match funding from other organisations or government departments.

19. The matrix was presented to the Board at a workshop on 19 June, no decisions were made at the workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to enable the Board and staff to discuss the projects, clarify any issues and seek further information, if necessary.

Key Local Projects

20. 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.

21. The Riccarton/Wigram Community Board has put forward two projects as Key Local Projects in 2012/13. The Council makes KLP decisions on 13 July 2012

22. These are:

Name of Group and Project	Amount Recommended
SEEDS (RUR Trust) (<i>Young 1's and Shufflebumz</i>)	\$14,300
Community Development Network Trust (<i>CDN Youth Work</i>)	\$50,000

Timeline and Process

23. 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. All groups will then be informed of the decisions and funding agreements will be negotiated where relevant. All funding approved is for the period of September to August each year, therefore grants will be paid out in early September 2012 with the provision of a signed funding agreement.

11. APPLICATION TO RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD 2012/13 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – LA VIDA YOUTH TRUST

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Community Support Unit Manager Carolyn Gallagher
Assessment undertaken by:	Denise Galloway – Strengthening Communities Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. Budget provision is in the LTCCP and is currently under review in the 2012/13 Annual Plan. The purpose of this report is for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board to consider La Vida Youth Trusts application for funding of \$6,000 from its 2012/13 Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. 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 After School Programmes 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. Budget provision is in the LTCCP and is currently under review in the 2012/13 Annual Plan.

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.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, page 172 and 176

11 Cont'd

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:

- (a) Approve a grant of \$5,000 from its 2012/13 Discretionary Response Fund to La Vida Youth Trust for the facilitation of their After School Programmes for children attending Riccarton Primary School.

12. APPLICATION TO THE RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – LUCY TOTHILL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
Author:	Marie Byrne, Strengthening Communities Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Community Board approval for an application for funding from the 2012/13 Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The applicant, Lucy Tothill, is a 16 year old Riccarton resident and St Margaret's College Student, seeking Community Board support to participate in the Young Blake Expedition to the Kermadecs. This trip will take place 8 – 19 August 2012.
3. Lucy Tothill has been accepted as one of thirty secondary school students from around New Zealand to travel on board HMNZ Canterbury on this expedition. The expedition has been planned by a collaboration between the Sir Peter Blake Trust, the Ministry for the Environment, the Royal New Zealand Navy, the Department for Conservation, Pew Environment Group, Experiencing Marine Reserves and LEARNZ.
4. This expedition is considered to be a once-in-a-lifetime adventure where delegates will have the opportunity to gain an understanding of the marine biodiversity of the Kermadecs, to experience life on Raoul Island with the Department of Conservation, and to develop leadership skills.
5. Lucy attended the 9th annual Sir Peter Blake Youth Enviroleaders' Forum in Auckland in April which gave staff the opportunity to select the students. Fifty were chosen to attend that forum. There she impressed the forum staff and delegates with her passion for the environment, her leadership style and the way she conducted herself through the week.
6. Lucy is passionate about drawing and writing and sees these mediums as an excellent way of communicating her experiences on the trip with her school and the wider community. She also sees this experience as an opportunity for discovery about herself and others.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The following outlines budgetary requirements for Lucy's trip.

Lucy Tothill	
Total Cost	\$500
Funds raised to date	\$0
Amount Requested from Community Board	\$500

8. It was Sir Peter Blake's vision that the best way for team members to show their commitment to a campaign was to contribute to its success. As such the Trust are asking a \$500 contribution for participants and that they work to raise the required money. This fundraising they feel will also raise awareness of the work the Trust does within her school and community.
9. Because of this, the staff recommendation is that the Community Board only partially fund the required amount and that Lucy initiates some fundraising initiatives within her school in order to fulfil the vision of Sir Peter Blake and the Trust as stated in her acceptance letter. Lucy has done no other fundraising to date, but has said that she will undertake selling baking, chocolate and drinks if necessary.
10. This is the first time the applicant has applied for funding from the Community Board.

12 Cont'd

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

11. Yes, see page 172, regarding the Board funding.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. There are no legal issues to be considered.

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

13. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

14. Yes.

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

15. Yes, see page 172, regarding the Board funding

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

16. Yes, in alignment with the Strengthening Communities Strategy

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

17. Yes, application aligns with Council Youth Strategy and local Community Board objectives.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Community Board support the application and allocate \$100 to Lucy Tohill as a contribution towards her expenses for her expedition to the Kermadecs from the 2012/13 Youth Development Fund.

13. LESLIE STREET – PROPOSED NO STOPPING RESTRICTION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Transport and Greenspace
Author:	Steve Dejong, Traffic Engineer - Transport

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Riccarton/Wigram Transport and Greenspace Committee's recommendation to the Board that it approve a No Stopping Restriction in Leslie Street.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Leslie Street is classified as a local road in the Christchurch City Plan and therefore has a primary function of providing property access. This road bisects a Business 2 zone (District Centre) on the southern side and Living 2 zone (Inner Suburban) on the northern side.
3. Council have received complaints from motorists requesting the installation of a No Stopping Restriction along both sides of the road outside Joe's Garage café. This is where the road narrows creating a pinch point for two-way traffic.
4. Although the adjoining land uses on both sides of the road is mixed, the area is predominantly characterised by commercial activities. Most noticeable is the wide expanse of car parking on the southern side of the road. Given that Leslie Street provides access to this commercial centre, traffic volumes are relatively high for a local road. Road narrowing and speed humps have previously been installed along this road to reduce traffic speeds. No Parking restrictions have also been installed on the immediate approach and departure legs to the Waimairi Road intersection. These No Parking restrictions however do not extend further westward through to where the road narrowing commences. Accordingly, kerbside car parking (particularly outside Joes Garage café) is restricting two-way traffic flow along Leslie Street (**attachment 1**).
5. Prior to the establishment of Joe's Garage café, the building on the site was occupied by a Taylor shop which had on-site parking directly in front for two or three vehicles. Vehicles therefore rarely parked kerbside outside the site because of the presence of the vehicle crossing and kerb cut-down. Given that this on-site parking has since been converted into café/seating space, the vehicle crossing is no longer required. This has provided the opportunity for some drivers to park directly outside the site. The resulting effect of this is the restriction of two-way flow on this section of Leslie Street.
6. Extending the existing no-stopping restriction on both sides of Leslie Street from the Waimairi Road intersection through to a point where the road narrows would enable two opposing vehicles to safely pass each other without either vehicle having to cross into the line of oncoming traffic. Although the presence of kerbside parking often has the effect of reducing vehicle speeds, the carriageway width between the proposed No Stopping Restrictions on both sides of Leslie Street would still provide a width of 6.5 metres. This is considered to be a sufficient width for two opposing vehicles to pass at a slow, yet safe speed and is proportionate with the speed ideals promoted with the remainder of the street.
7. On the 16 May 2012 staff visited 7 Leslie Street (Joes Garage café) which could be affected by this proposal. They indicated that they had no concerns regarding the parking restrictions outside their property. Furthermore, it is noted that this property has its own on-site car parking. The properties located on the northern side of the road (8 and 10 Leslie Street) are also provided with on-site garaging and are not considered to be affected by the proposal.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The estimate cost of this proposal is \$50.00.

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

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

13 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. 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.
11. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and traffic control devices.
12. The installation of any signs and / or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

13. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

14. 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?

15. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

16. The recommendations align with the Council Road Safety Strategy 2004 and Parking Strategy 2003.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

17. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. On the 16 May 2012 staff visited 7 Leslie Street (Joes Garage café) which could be affected by this proposal. They indicated that they had no concerns regarding the parking restrictions outside their property. Furthermore, it is noted that this property has its own on-site car parking. The properties located on the northern side of the road (8 and 10 Leslie Street) are also provided with on-site garaging and are not considered to be affected by the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Transport and Greenspace Committee recommends that the Board approve:

- (a) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the southern side of Leslie Street, commencing at its intersection with Waimairi Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 37 metres, be revoked.
- (b) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southern side of Leslie Street commencing at its intersection with Waimairi Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 62 metres.
- (c) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the northern side of Leslie Street commencing at its intersection with Waimairi Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 54 metres be revoked.

13 Cont'd

- (d) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northern side of Leslie Street commencing at its intersection with Waimairi Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 66 metres.

17. 7. 2012

- 18 -

14. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE

14.1 Update on Recovery Discussions

15. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

16. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS