



**Christchurch City Council**

**RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD -  
COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE AGENDA**

**TUESDAY 19 FEBRUARY 2008**

**AT 5PM**

**IN THE BOARDROOM  
AT SOCKBURN SERVICE CENTRE  
149 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, SOCKBURN**

**Community Board:** Judy Kirk (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen, Beth Dunn, Peter Laloli, Mike Mora and Bob Shearing.

**Community Board Adviser**

Liz Beaven

Telephone: 941-6501

Email: [liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz)

**PG NO CLAUSE**

- |   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| 1 | 1. | <b>APOLOGIES</b>  |
| 1 | 2. | <b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>   |
| 1 | 3. | <b>PETITIONS</b>  |
| 1 | 4. | <b>BRIEFINGS</b>  |
| 1 | 5. | <b>HORNBY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH MARRIAGE COURSE</b>                             |
| 4 | 6. | <b>RICCARTON WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD YOUTH DEVELOPMENT<br/>SCHEME CRITERIA</b> |

**We're on the Web!**

[www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/](http://www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/)

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
3. **PETITIONS**
4. **BRIEFINGS**
5. **HORNBY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH MARRIAGE COURSE**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	Acting General Manager Jason Rivett, DDI 941-+
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Ian Burn, Community Development Adviser
<b>Author:</b>	Ian Burn, Community Development Adviser

#### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. This report relates to a funding application from the Hornby Presbyterian Church who are requesting funding of \$4,000 from the Boards 07/08 discretionary fund for a Marriage Course.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The focus of this proposal is on the provision of two courses to assist couples to develop or strengthen key skills to build strong, sustainable, healthy, marriages (couples not married but in committed relationships will also be accepted onto the course). It is anticipated that up to 50 people will attend these courses in a year. Trained resource people are available to give assistance to couples if deeper needs arise throughout the course. It is anticipated that stronger marriage relationships will impact positively on family relationships and contribute towards improved childrearing.
3. The course takes place over meals over eight evenings. The funding requested from the Board is to assist with some set up costs for the programme and to reduce the cost of the programme from \$70 per couple to \$10. It is anticipated this will enable more low income people in need of this course to participate.
4. The target group for these courses is people from outside of the Hornby Presbyterian Church. The Church anticipates drawing participants from the community who are already involved through, coffee mornings, bread run, counselling, and other activities. It is expected that in the two courses during this year a percentage of the attendees will be from the church itself. The Board may wish to consider to what extent it is prepared to fund courses which will partially be for the benefit of this organisations own members.
5. A number of organisations provide relationship counselling for families and/or couples and/or individuals. These include Relationship Services, the Salvation Army, Petersgate, Presbyterian Support, and the Home and Family Trust. These tend to work with people when there has already been some degree of relationship breakdown.
6. In contrast to this the aim of the marriage course is more preventative, 'a fence at the top of the cliff'. Parents Inc. (also known as Attitude, who will be presenting to the Committee later this year) are however also active in the Riccarton/Wigram Board area and also specifically provide marriage courses. There is not a Parents Inc. course operating in Christchurch at this time. The Presbyterian Church Marriage Course can also be seen to have an advantage over Parents Inc. in that it is operating from a local base and already has other activities in the community through which it can contact possible attendees to this course.

7. The pamphlet for the course notes that 'The course, while based on Christian principles, is very helpful for any couple with or without a Christian faith or church background.' The course does involve the leader of each session briefly praying with the group each session. Feedback from previous attendees of the course included the following:
- "as a non-religious person I was not put off by the level of spiritual content";*  
*"Totally comfortable with it, we don't come to church but thought it was totally non-threatening"*
8. In the Greater Hornby area the percentages of people in the married (40%), never married (34%), and separated/divorced/widowed (17%) categories are similar to the rest of Christchurch city. Fourteen percent of those never married are however in partnerships in the nature of marriage. The percentage of people in the separated/divorced/widowed category rises to 20% when the lower socio economic areas Hornby North, Hornby South, Broomfield and Islington are considered on their own.
9. While being supportive of this application staff are concerned that costs associated with the storage cabinets, tables and other furniture represent a gain to the church, in their ministry work (e.g. the women's café), some of it could also benefit the church in its private capacity.

#### FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. The following table indicates the contribution that the organisation is making to this project the amount they are requesting from the Council, and the amount staff are recommending.

Item	Total Cost	Amount Requested	Staff Recommendation
Portable tables, chairs and other furniture	2,750	1,450	0
Materials for storage cabinets for tables (labour supplied)	250	250	0
Course Books (for 50 couples per annum)	1,000	1,000	1,000
Advertising Publicity	500	500	500
Initial course presentation material and licences	300	300	300
Small items for catering and hospitality	500	500	500
Hospitality costs (all food for meals is donated, these costs are just tea/coffee/nibbles)	300	0	0
Venue hire (incl power)	1,400	0	0
Administration/stationary and general expenses	200	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,200</b>	<b>\$4,000</b>	<b>\$2,300</b>

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

15. Yes see page 172, regarding the Board funding

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

17. Yes application aligns with Council Strengthening Communities Strategy – Goal 8 Improving Basic Life Skills that all residents can participate fully in society.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

18. All appropriate consultation has been undertaken

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

19. It is recommended that the Committee recommend to the Board to approve \$2,300 for the Hornby Presbyterian Marriage Course from the Board's 2007/2008 Discretionary Fund.

6. **RICCARTON WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME CRITERIA**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	Acting General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support
<b>Author:</b>	Ian Burn, Community Development Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report for the Riccarton/Wigram Community Services Committee to make a recommendation to the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board in regard to the Youth Development Scheme concerning the issue raised by the Committee on 26 April 2007 of the eligibility of a young person who had only recently started residing in Christchurch.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. **Background**  
The Riccarton/Wigram Community Board chose to allocate \$5,000 of its 2007/2008 Discretionary Funding towards a Youth Development Scheme.

An application to the Youth Development Scheme was received by the Community Services Committee (CSC) at its meeting on 26 April 2007 from a university student who had come to Christchurch from another part of New Zealand. Committee members were concerned that funds should be allocated from its youth development scheme to a person when apparently neither he nor his family had ever paid rates in Christchurch City, either directly or through paying rental or other payments to landlords, a proportion of which would subsequently be allocated to rate payment. The term 'paying rates' in the remainder of this report should be taken to refer to both of these situations. The Committee requested a report with recommendations regarding the matter for their consideration.

3. **Options**  
Staff consider that there are three options that the Board/Committee should consider in regard to this situation. These with a summary of the benefits and negative aspects of each of these are outlined below:

**Option 1: Status quo:**

The positive aspect of this option is that it allows equal access to the fund irrespective of where the applicant has lived over time. It does not penalise applicants who would otherwise have a strong case to receive funding simply because they have only recently moved into the area. It should be noted that the option of applying to the local body where they or their family have paid rates is unlikely to be successful because firstly most Council's don't have such a fund, and secondly, the young person no longer lives in that area.

The negative aspect of this option is that Christchurch ratepayers would be paying for young people when neither they nor their parents/guardians have ever paid rates in Christchurch. This maybe a particular issue for the Riccarton/Wigram Ward given the large number of students who are at the university who don't pay rates, and whose parents/guardians have also not paid rates.

It should be noted however that while the students or the parents/guardians do not pay rates, their landlords (including halls of residences) do, and an argument could be made that students contribute to these for the period they are here through paying rent or board. Similarly educational institutions such as universities also pay rates and students could be seen as contributing to these through paying their fees.

**Option 2:** Don't fund tertiary students whose parents/guardians do not live in Christchurch  
The positive aspect of this is that it prevents a large number of students being funded from this scheme when neither they nor their parents/guardians have paid rates.

The negative aspects is that it specifically targets tertiary students on the grounds that they have not paid rates and are likely not to stay in Christchurch beyond the period of their education, when other young people and their families may similarly have only recently come to Christchurch and may only be staying here a short time.

**Option 3:** Take into account the length of time a young person or their family has been paying rates when assessing the application:

The positive aspect of this is that it allows consideration to be given when assessing the application to the length of time an applicant or their family has been paying rates in Christchurch. This allows this matter to be considered by the Board along with the other factors without penalizing any particular group (as described in option 2).

The negative aspect is that as noted in option 1 it penalizes applicants who would otherwise have a strong case to receive funding simply because they have only recently moved into the area.

4. Inter-ward transfers

Staff have considered the issue raised by the Committee of young people now living in Riccarton/Wigram who are eligible for this fund whose parents/guardians have previously paid rates in other wards. It was considered that this would be considerably offset by young people traveling to attend tertiary institutions in other wards (notably CPIT in Hagley/Ferrymead). Working out the exact number of young people transferring between each ward was considered to be excessively complex relative to the benefits to be gained from accessing this information. Consequently, staff are not recommending that this matter be taken into account when assessing applications to this fund.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5. There are no financial implications

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

6. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

7. There are no legal issues to be considered.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

8. Aligns with page 170 LTCCP, regarding Community Board Project funding.

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

9. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

14. Yes, page 33 Strengthening Communities Strategy under the principal of Social Justice.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

15. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

16. It is recommended that the Community Services Committee recommend to the Board that when considering Youth Development Scheme Fund Applications that the Board/Committee take into account the length of time a young person, or their family, has been paying rates.