



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

THURSDAY 10 APRIL 2008

9.30AM

COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES

AGENDA - OPEN



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

**Thursday 10 April 2008 at 9.30am
in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices**

Council: The Mayor, Bob Parker (Chairperson).
Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Ngaire Button, Barry Corbett, David Cox, Yani Johanson,
Claudia Reid, Bob Shearing, Gail Sheriff, Mike Wall, Sue Wells, Chrissie Williams and Norm Withers.

ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION
1.	APOLOGIES
2.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
3.	PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS
4.	REPORT OF THE AKAROA/WAIREWA COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 19 FEBRUARY 2008
5.	REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE AKAROA/WAIREWA COMMUNITY BOARD: (NO. 1)
6.	REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE AKAROA/WAIREWA COMMUNITY BOARD: (NO. 2)
7.	REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 3 MARCH 2008
8.	REPORT OF THE BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 10 MARCH 2008
9.	REPORT OF THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 5 MARCH 2008
10.	REPORT OF THE FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 18 MARCH 2008
11.	REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 20 FEBRUARY 2008
12.	REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 5 MARCH 2008
13.	REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD
14.	REPORT OF THE LYTTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 12 DECEMBER 2007
15.	REPORT OF THE LYTTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 21 FEBRUARY 2008
16.	REPORT OF THE RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 4 MARCH 2008
17.	REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN RICcarton/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD

10. 4. 2008

- 3 -

18.	REPORT OF THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 20 FEBRUARY 2008	125
19.	REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 19 FEBRUARY 2008	133
20.	REPORT OF THE SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 19 FEBRUARY 2008 – PUBLIC EXCLUDED	141
21.	COMMUNITY BOARD FUNDING DELEGATIONS	143
22.	NOTICES OF MOTION	-
23.	QUESTIONS	-
24.	RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC	179

10. 4. 2008

- 4 -

1. APOLOGIES

Leave of absence has been sought by Councillor Gail Sheriff for the period 9 July 2008 to 29 August 2008.

2. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

(a) **HALSWELL DOMAIN**

Speaking rights have been granted to Mr Peter Laloli, Chairperson, Riccarton/Wigram Community Board, who will attend together with representatives of the Halswell Domain Sports Association. (Clause 5 of the report of the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board meeting of 4 March 2008 refers.)

3. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

21. COMMUNITY BOARD FUNDING DELEGATIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8986
Officer responsible:	Community Support Manager
Author:	Catherine McDonald and Chris Gilbert

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This report is to provide Council with information with which to consider the Notice of Motion seeking to change the Community Board delegations in relation to funding schemes and implications for the processing of applications if the Notice of Motion is supported.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At the Council meeting of 13 March 2008 the following Notice of Motion was tabled:

“That Community Board funding be removed from the current round of Community Funding and the Boards be given full delegated authority to allocate their yearly funding of \$390,000.00. While accepting this delegation is to be carried out within the policies of the Council, Boards will have full discretion as to what projects, groups, and individuals will be funded within their ward. The funds to be expended throughout the year and must be fully committed by the end of the year.”

3. The Council **resolved** that “the notice of motion be received and that consideration be deferred to a subsequent Council meeting to allow for preparation of a staff report on this issue.”

BACKGROUND

4. Inquiries by the Office of the Controller and Auditor-General in 2003 and 2004 into funding practices led (in part) the Council to review its own funding practices. One of the key drivers for this was that the Community has equitable access to Board funding and that the allocation of Board funds is fair and transparent.
5. Another key driver for the review was to work towards a clearer, more structured and coherent alignment for the grant funding schemes and the Council’s Strategic Directions, strategies and priority areas of work in responding to, and delivering on the agreed outcomes approved in the 2006-2016 LTCCP.
6. The Community Grants Review, as part of the Strengthening Communities Strategy, was developed in accordance with the decision making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 and there was engagement with stakeholders, including Community Boards and an external reference group comprising people from community and voluntary organisations and relevant government agencies, which was then backed up by an extensive public consultation and information phase which culminated in the hearing of public submissions.
7. The general response from the engagement and consultation phase was that submitters welcomed the simpler structure and that the scope of the schemes offered opportunities for both large and small projects at the city and local levels.
8. On 12 July 2007 the Council adopted the new Community Grant Funding Programme when it **resolved** to *approve the Strengthening Communities Strategy*. The Strategy included a chapter (Chapter 8) on Community Group Grant Funding and Appendix IV that specifically refers to Metropolitan/Local Grants Definitions.
9. On 4 October 2007, staff presented a further report on policy, criteria and procedures as required following the July 2007 Council meeting (Appendix 1), and the Council **resolved** to:
 - (a) *approve the Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme Procedures (2007) (Appendix A)*

21 Cont'd

- (b) *Revoke the following policies:*
 - *Community Funding Policy (1990-2003) (Appendix B),*
 - *Discretionary Funding Policy (1990 and 2000) (Appendix C)*
 - *Metropolitan Funding Committee: Funding of Council Projects (1990). (Appendix D).*
 - (c) *Agree to review the delegations for Community Boards, in respect to the Community Grants programme, following the 2007 elections.*
 - (d) *Approve the amendments to the Delegations Register attached as Appendix E.*
 - (e) *Approve the Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Criteria as set out in Appendix F.*
10. On 13 December 2007 the following **resolutions** relating to financial delegations to the Community Boards were passed by Council:
- 7. *Absolute discretion over the implementation of the discretionary funding allocation of \$60,000 (subject to being consistent with any policies or standards adopted by the Council).*
 - 8 *For the two Banks Peninsula Community Boards the following provisions apply:*
 - *That the two Peninsula Boards have a discretionary spend of \$15,000 per annum per Board.*
 - *That the two Peninsula Boards have a power to recommend discretionary expenditure of \$20,000 from the reserve accounts to spend on peninsula reserves.*
11. In accordance with the implementation programme for the new Community Grant Funding Programme, the Strengthening Communities Fund has been advertised and information seminars held within the community and applications closed on Monday 31 March, 2008. Over 400 applications have been received for metropolitan and local (community board funds).
12. The Notice of Motion presented to Council seeks to do several things:
- (a) Amend the community grants funding schemes approved by Council in 2007 for implementation in the 2008/09 financial year.
 - (b) Amend the Council's existing delegated authority to the city based Community Boards from \$60,000 up to \$390,000.
 - (c) Amend the process to give the Community Boards total discretion to spend grant funding that has been specifically put in place to support the projects and services undertaken by non-profit community and voluntary groups.
13. There are a number of implications if the Notice of Motion is supported:
- Changing the process now for one part of the scheme would be confusing and create unfairness for Community Groups who have already made application under the Strengthening Communities Fund process and set of criteria adopted by the Council last year and would not be a clear, transparent and consistent process as recommended by the Controller and Auditor-General in recent reports.
 - Staff have already begun assessing both the metropolitan and local applications. This would have to be delayed as the differing processes and criteria was clearly identified for each fund. This would cause further delays and confusion in the process for elected members and community groups who have applied for funding.

21 Cont'd

- All the city Community Boards would lose \$35,000 being former Community Development fund and local groups would not be able to apply for this. This fund was removed and in its place a Small Projects fund was established with different criteria from the former scheme. It would be confusing for community groups, staff and elected members to have two similar but very different funds operating at the same time with different criteria and eligibility.
- The two peninsula-based boards would lose \$45,000 and \$35,000 respectively as they did not receive project funding under the previous scheme. Community groups of the peninsula have applied for this fund in the 2008/09 year. Supporting this notice of motion would remove that funding. The peninsula based boards would be left with \$15,000 each in discretionary funding.
- City community boards have never had financial delegated authority for discretionary funding for more than \$60,000. Under the previous scheme, recommendations were made by the boards to the Council either by way of a Part A report or included in the former draft annual plan for adoption by 30 June.

Community Grant Funding – Community Boards (excluding Banks Peninsula)					
Prior to Changes			Since Changes		
Fund	Decision	Amount	Fund	Decision	Amount
Project Funding	CB Part A to Council	\$330,000	Strengthening Communities	CB Part A to Council	\$280,000
Community Development	CB	\$35,000 (actually pro-rata)	Small Projects	CB Part A to Council	\$85,000
Discretionary	CB	\$60,000	Discretionary	CB	\$60,000
Total		\$425,000			\$425,000

14. It is the view of staff that supporting the Notice of Motion and amending the criteria and procedures, when community groups have already made application for funding under the one scheme, would not meet best practice for funding both in terms of the guide written by Local Government New Zealand and recent reports from the Controller and Auditor-General.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

15. None – the total amount of money available for funding remains the same.

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

16. N/A

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

17. Refer to paragraph 13 above.
18. Council may amend a previous resolution by revoking or altering such resolution. The procedure for amending or revoking a resolution is set out in the Council's standing orders, clause 2.18.14. This requires that the amendment process be by Notice of Motion that sets out:
- (i) *the resolution or part thereof which it is proposed to revoke;*
 - (ii) *the meeting date when it was passed;*
 - (iii) *and the motion, if any, that it is intended to move in substitution, therefore;*
19. The Notice of Motion as tabled is defective in terms of clause 2.18.14 as it does not refer to the resolution (or in this case, resolutions) that it is proposed to revoke or alter, or the meeting date when those resolutions were passed. However, the Notice of Motion does specify the motion that it is intended to move in substitution.

21 Cont'd

20. If the Notice of Motion is supported then the Council should first resolve to amend the Notice of Motion to satisfy these requirements. Council would need to amend the Notice of Motion so that it reads:

The Council amend and/or revoke the following resolutions:

- (i) made on 12 July 2007 to approve the Strengthening Communities Strategy by revoking that part that incorporates Chapter 8 Community Group Grant Funding and Appendix IV.
- (ii) made on 4 October 2007 to approve the Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme Procedures (2007) and revoke the Discretionary Funding Policy (1990 and 2000) by revoking that part of the Funding Programme Procedures that relates to Chapter 8 of the Strategy and by adopting the substituted motion.
- (iii) made on 13 December 2007, in relation to the financial delegations given to the Community Boards, by substituting the financial delegation in accordance with substituted motion, so as to increase the level of delegated authority for the community boards from \$60,000 to \$390,000.

The Council pass the following motion in substitution:

That Community Board funding be removed from the current round of Community Funding and the Boards be given full delegated authority to allocate their yearly funding of \$390,000.00. While accepting this delegation is to be carried out within the policies of the Council, Boards will have full discretion as to what projects, groups, and individuals will be funded within their ward. The funds to be expended throughout the year and must be fully committed by the end of the year.

21. Supporting this Notice of Motion would also mean that the Council would have to adopt a new recommendation for that part of the Strengthening Communities Strategy that relates to **Metropolitan** funding to allow for the **metropolitan** applications received to be processed in the new Funds that were agreed to as per the Strengthening Communities Strategy so that those applications can be processed for the 2008/09 financial year.

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

22. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

23. If the Notice of Motion is endorsed then there may be less direct or focused alignment or contribution with the Funding Outcomes and Funding Priorities encompassed in the new funding scheme framework, although it is accepted that there will still be a broad alignment.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

24. The recommendations in this report support the level of service in the Community Support Group of Activities in relation to the percentage satisfaction of quality of support provided to target community groups.

21 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

25. The report recommends that the Notice of Motion not be adopted by Council. The status quo position aligns to the Council's Strategic Directions, most notably in the Strong Communities area:

Help communities to meet their needs by:

- *Targeting those who are most disadvantaged*
- *Funding and supporting community organisations, initiatives and festivals that help to achieve the city's Community Outcomes*
- *Initiating and supporting community development projects*
- *Encouraging people to take part in community groups and voluntary activities*
- *Encouraging people to take responsibility for themselves and their families*

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

26. None

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council not support the Notice of Motion.

THURSDAY 10 APRIL 2008

COUNCIL

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely item 25

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED	REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER	GROUND(S) UNDER SECTION 48(1) FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION
25. REPORT OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD: MEETING OF 20 FEBRUARY 2008) GOOD REASON TO WITHHOLD EXISTS) UNDER SECTION 7	SECTION 48(1)(a)

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

Item 25 Conduct of Negotiations

(Section 7(2)(i))

Chairman's

Recommendation: That the foregoing motion be adopted.

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

- (a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
- (b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority.”