

**SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD**

**AGENDA**

**TUESDAY 29 JUNE 2010**

**AT 5.30PM**

**AT BECKENHAM SERVICE CENTRE  
IN THE BOARDROOM,  
66 COLOMBO STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**

**Community Board:** Phil Clearwater (Chairperson), Oscar Alpers, Barry Corbett, Chris Mene, Karolin Potter, Tim Scandrett and Sue Wells.

**Community Board Adviser**

Jenny Hughey

Telephone: 941-5108

Email: [jenny.hughey@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:jenny.hughey@ccc.govt.nz)

**PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**

**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

**INDEX**

	<b>CLAUSE</b>	
<b>PART B</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 15 JUNE 2010</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>3.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>4.</b>	<b>PETITIONS</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>5.</b>	<b>NOTICE OF MOTION</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>6.</b>	<b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>7.</b>	<b>BRIEFINGS</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>8.</b>	<b>ALBERT TERRACE – PROPOSED REVOCATION OF MOBILITY PARK</b>
<b>PART A</b>	<b>9.</b>	<b>PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>10.</b>	<b>REVIEW OF CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANT FUND</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>11.</b>	<b>APPLICATION TO SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – MANNING INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>12.</b>	<b>APPLICATION TO SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – ROWLEY AVENUE SCHOOL SAMOAN LANGUAGE TRIP</b>

**We're on the Web!**

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

29. 6. 2010

- 2 -

**CLAUSE**

- |               |            |  |
|---------------|------------|--|
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>13.</b> | <b>APPLICATION TO SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD<br/>2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – SINGLE MUMS SUPPORT</b> |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>14.</b> | <b>COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE</b>  |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>15.</b> | <b>ELECTED MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE</b>  |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>16.</b> | <b>MEMBERS QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS</b>   |

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 15 JUNE 2010**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Tuesday 15 June 2010 are **attached**.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the minutes of the Board's meeting of 15 June 2010 be **confirmed**.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

4. **PETITIONS**

5. **NOTICE OF MOTION**

6. **CORRESPONDENCE**

7. **BRIEFINGS**

8. **ALBERT TERRACE – PROPOSED REVOCATION OF MOBILITY PARK**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Jon Ashford / Steve Dejong, Network Operations DDI 941-6428

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board’s approval that an existing Mobility Park on the west side of Albert Terrace be revoked.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Council have received a request from a local resident that an existing Mobility Park in front of number 2 Albert Terrace be removed, as it is no longer required. (refer to the **attached plan**).
3. Albert Terrace is a local road, running south from the Centaurus Road / Wilsons Road South roundabout.
4. The mobility park in question is currently marked as rectangular box on the road with yellow dashed lines. It has no mobility symbol painted on the road or posts with mobility signs to indicate it is a Mobility Park.
5. Staff understand that this mobility park was installed a long time ago to provide parking for a disabled resident of number 2 Albert Terrace. The current owner of number 2 Albert Terrace has advised staff that they have no need for a Mobility Park and they believe the existing mobility park was installed approximately 20 years ago.
6. As there is no further need for a mobility park in this location and it is not currently marked with a mobility symbol or signage, staff propose that the road markings be removed. Staff are unsure of the legal status of the existing mobility park and recommend that it be formally revoked before the markings are removed.
7. Consultation was carried out by phone with the current owner of number 2 Albert Terrace. The current owners advised staff that they have no need for a Mobility Park.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$180.

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

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

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

10. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 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 parking restriction signs and/ or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

**8 Cont'd**

**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 2006-16 LTCCP?**

15. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

16. The recommendation aligns with the Council Parking Strategy 2003.

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

17. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

18. Consultation was carried out by phone with the current owner of number 2 Albert Terrace. The current owners advised staff that they have no need for a Mobility Park.

19. There is no residents association for this area.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board:

Revoke

- (a) The existing Mobility Park on the west side of Albert Terrace commencing at a point 35 metres south from its intersection with Centaurus Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of eight metres.

**CHAIRPERSONS RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be supported.

**9. PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941- 8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Transport & Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Shane Moohan, City Arborist, DDI 941- 8030

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to request that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board consider and provide comments to the Council on the proposed amendments to the Council's existing delegations on trees.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Workshops with Councillors were held in June and September 2008 to discuss suggested changes to the current tree delegations.
3. The Combined Community Board Chairs Forum on 13 October 2008 requested that a working party made up of both staff and one nominated member from each Community Board be formed to work through issues relating to a City wide Tree Policy.
4. Since then the Tree Policy Working Party has met five times to prepare the Proposed Tree Policy document (refer **Attachment 1**). Issues that arose during these discussions that were outside of the scope of the Working Party are documented and were presented to the Council in a Memorandum on 10 December 2010.
5. An initial draft policy was developed which encompassed suggested changes to the current delegations as well as operational issues for planting, maintaining and removing trees. It did not cover future direction for trees in Christchurch as this would be more appropriately addressed in a strategic document.
6. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs Forum recommended –
  - (a) That this initial draft Proposed Tree Policy be presented to the Council for adoption.
  - (b) That the Working Party Memorandum be presented to the Council for consideration.
7. The Council workshop on 23 February 2010 requested that an amended Proposed Tree Policy be presented to the Council with the recommendation that it be adopted for consultation with Community Boards.

The amendments to the Proposed Tree Policy included changes to –

- (a) 3.1 Tree Management
- (b) 3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces, clauses (i) (k) and (m)
- (c) 6 Definitions, Affected Community and Publicly Owned Land
- (d) 4 Relevant Delegations, Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to Council for a decision.

A full break down of the amendments is found in paragraph 43.

8. On 25 March 2010 Council adopted the amended Proposed Tree Policy for consultation with the Community Boards.

**9 Cont'd**

9. The amended Proposed Tree Policy is now attached (refer to **Attachment 1**), together with a comments form template (refer **Attachment 5**) and tree removal, maintenance and planting process maps (**Attachments 2, 3 and 4**) to assist Boards with their discussions.
10. The recommendation is that the amended Proposed Tree Policy be adopted subject to formal consideration of the comments offered by all of the Community Boards.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

11. Adoption of the Proposed Tree Policy is not expected to have significant effects on operational or capital budgets.
12. The Proposed Tree Policy suggests that there is a “user pays” process for some tree planting (3.3.1 Commemorative Trees), some tree pruning (3.7 Pruning Trees in Public Spaces) and some tree removals (3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces, 3.5 Requests to Remove Trees in Public Spaces, 3.6 Cost of Removal of Trees in Public Spaces). This involves the actual cost to complete the work and the cost incurred in gathering sufficient information for Community Boards to make an informed decision where the requested service is not considered ‘business as usual’ and falls outside of approved Activity Management Plan levels of service .
13. The Proposed Tree Policy also suggests that for some tree removals that applicants pay for the value of the tree (3.6 Cost of Removal of Trees in Public Spaces). The value of the tree is based on the Standard Tree Evaluation Method (STEM) which is the nationally recognised system for evaluating and valuing trees (see “Definitions” in Proposed Tree Policy).
14. Should the suggested “user pays” process for tree removal and pruning be adopted, this will have financial implications for some members of the public.
15. Should the suggested user pays system be adopted this will need to be incorporated into the Council’s Fees and Charges Schedule under Section 12 Local Government Act 2002.

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

16. The recommendations align with the current LTCCP budgets.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

17. Alignment with Principal legislation –
  - (a) Resource Management Act 1991
    - (i) Banks Peninsula District Plan
    - (ii) City of Christchurch City Plan
  - (b) Reserves Act 1977
  - (c) Biosecurity Act 1993
  - (d) Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992 plus amendments and regulations
  - (e) Electricity Act 1992 plus regulations
  - (f) Telecommunications Act 2001
  - (g) Property Law Act 2007
  - (h) Public Works Act 1981

**9 Cont'd**

- (i) Local Government Act 1974 and 2002
  - (j) Christchurch City Council Parks & Reserves Bylaw 2008
18. The following Council Policies will need to be rescinded –
- (a) Tree Planting in Streets Policy
  - (b) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404
  - (c) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636
  - (d) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236
  - (e) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178

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

- 19. The Council has the legal right to adopt the Proposed Tree Policy.
- 20. Irrespective of the Council's Policies and Strategies the District Court can order the pruning or removal of trees under The Property Law Act 2007.
- 21. Irrespective of the Council's Policies and Strategies some pruning and removal of protected trees may require a Resource Consent be granted prior to work to being undertaken.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

- 22. Recommendation aligns with current LTCCP and Activity Management Plans.

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

- 23. Supports the following Levels of Service –
  - (a) 6.0 Neighbourhood Parks 6.06 Planted areas and trees
  - (b) 6.1 Sports Parks 6.1.8 Maintain planted areas and trees
  - (c) 6.2 Garden and Heritage Parks 6.2.9 Planted areas and trees
  - (d) 6.3 Regional Parks 6.3.2 Protecting biodiversity values
  - (e) 6.4 Cemeteries 6.4.8 Maintain planted areas and trees
  - (f) 6.5 Waterways and Land Drainage 6.5.3 Cost of maintaining waterways and land drainage system
  - (g) 10.0 Road Network 10.0.11 Road landscaping and street trees
- 24. Supports the Capital tree replacement programmes for street and park trees



9 Cont'd

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

25. There is currently no overarching city wide policy for vegetation management. In the attached Memorandum from the Tree Policy Working Party (refer to **Attachment 6**) it is suggested that funding for the commencement of a City wide policy be included for consideration in the next LTCCP.
26. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with the following Strategies--
  - (a) New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy
  - (b) Christchurch City Council Biodiversity Strategy 2008-2035
27. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with Council Policies --
  - (a) Traffic Calming Policy
  - (b) Sponsorship of Trees and Other Plantings on Reserves
  - (c) Proposed Central City Street Tree Plan
  - (d) Central City Streetscape Plan
  - (e) Consultation Policy
28. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with the following sections of the Christchurch City Plan -

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.

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 trees identified as "heritage" or "notable" and the subdivision process protects other trees which are considered to be "significant". The highest degree of protection applies to heritage trees.

Because Christchurch is largely built on a flat plain, trees and shrubs play an important role in creating relief, contributing to visual amenity and attracting native birds.

The amount of private open space available for new planting and to retain existing trees 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.

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:

- (a) Tree-lined streets and avenues
- (b) Parks and developed areas of open space

**9 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

Volume 3: Part 8 Special Purpose Zone

14.3.5 Street Trees

Nearly half the length of streets within the city contains street trees, but the presence of very high quality street trees which add considerable presence to streets and neighbourhoods is confined to a relatively small proportion of the road network. These streets add particular character and amenity of the city, either in the form of avenues which form points into the city, or an important part of the local character of particular streets.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

29. All 8 Community Boards appointed representatives to the Tree Policy Working Party to ensure their Ward's views and concerns were represented.
30. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs Forum recommended that the Proposed Tree Policy be presented to Council for adoption.
31. No public consultation has been undertaken as this document is intended for internal use.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Community Board review and provide comment on the Proposed Tree Policy and the proposed changes to delegations

That the Board recommend to the Council that the Proposed Tree Policy be adopted subject to formal consideration of the comments offered by all of the Community Boards

That the Board recommends to Council that the following policies be rescinded -

- (a) Tree Planting in Streets Policy
- (b) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404
- (c) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636
- (d) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236
- (e) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178.

That the Board recommends to Council that the following delegations be rescinded:

- (f) Greenspace Manager:

"In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control. (CR 23.10.96)"

- (g) Community Boards:

"To plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council. (CR 13.12.07)"

**9 Cont'd**

That in undertaking the review of delegations the Board recommend to the Council that the following matters be adopted

That the following delegations for the policy be made:

- (h) The Transport and Greenspace Manager on the recommendation of the City Arborist and relevant infrastructure Manager where appropriate has delegated authority for the planting of trees under Section 3.3 and the removal of trees under Section 3.4 and the pruning of trees under Section 3.7 of this policy.
- (i) The relevant Community Board has delegated authority in consultation with the Transport and Greenspace Manager and relevant infrastructure Manager to decide on any tree matter that either falls outside of the Transport and Greenspace Manager's delegation or, after consultation with affected parties, has remained contentious and is unable to be resolved by the Transport and Greenspace Manager.
- (j) In emergency situations, the Transport and Greenspace Manager or the City Arborist have full delegated powers to negate immediate danger.
- (k) Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to Council for a decision.

**CHAIRPERSONS RECOMMENDATIONS**

For discussion.

**BACKGROUND**

32. On 12 June 2008 a workshop was held to discuss potential changes to the tree delegations.

Currently delegations are:

Greenspace Manager -

*"In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control. (CR 23.10.96)"*

Community Boards -

*"To plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council. (CR 13.12.07)"*

33. Changes were suggested to enable:

- (a) Clear parameters over what decisions staff can make
- (b) Greater clarity over when decisions are to be made by the Community Boards
- (c) Timely and pragmatic decisions for residents requesting tree removals

34. As a result of this meeting a Memo was issued to the Mayor, Councillors and Community Board Members on 1 August 2008 outlining the current tree delegations for the Community Boards and the Greenspace Manager, suggesting changes to the delegations, the reasons why the changes were being suggested and safe guards.

9 Cont'd

35. On 29 September 2008 a further workshop was held providing an outline of issues faced by the arborists. These included -
- (a) Removal, replacement, removing otherwise healthy trees
  - (b) Pruning trees under power lines causing disfigurement to the tree
  - (c) Removing trees which are overcrowded
  - (d) Removing trees of poor shape
  - (e) Removing trees which pose a health and safety risk
36. Proposals to clarify staff delegations were mainly around tree removal and tree planting. Some guidelines around staff decisions on tree removal and planting were suggested. These included the significance of the tree to be removed and the agreement of affected parties. Guidelines around tree planting included aligning to strategies or plans or direction, maintaining design integrity (e.g. Living Streets), maintaining existing levels of service for provision of street and park trees, and agreement of affected parties.
37. On 13 October 2008 the Combined Community Board Chairs forum requested that a working party made up of both staff and one nominated member from each of the Community Boards be formed to work through issues relating to a tree policy.
38. The Working Party was made up of the following Community Board Members –
- |                |                                      |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Paula Smith    | Lyttleton/Mt Herbert (Chairperson)   |
| Matt Morris    | Shirley/Papanui (Deputy Chairperson) |
| Tim Carter     | Hagley/Ferrymead                     |
| Mike Mora      | Riccarton/Wigram                     |
| Val Carter     | Fendalton/Waimairi                   |
| Stewart Miller | Akaroa/Wairewa                       |
| Linda Stewart  | Burwood/Pegasus                      |
| Karolyn Potter | Spreydon/Heathcote                   |
| Tim Scandrett  | Spreydon/Heathcote (proxy)           |
39. The following Terms of Reference were drawn up to guide the Working Party in its discussions -
- (a) Clarify understanding around proposed changes to the tree delegations
  - (b) Clarify staff and Community Board roles in tree maintenance i.e. business as usual vs pruning for views or shade or light and cost recovery with pruning for views or shade or light
  - (c) Clarify staff and Community Board roles in tree planting and removals and cost recovery with tree removal and replacement planting
  - (d) Consider the application of STEM (Standard Tree Evaluation Method) in its application to tree maintenance and removal decision making
  - (e) Recommend any changes to existing delegations or the implementation of a Tree Policy following on from discussions over the above.
40. During Working Party discussions matters that were outside of the scope were raised. These were detailed in a Memorandum from the Working Party and presented to Council.
41. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs recommended that the Proposed Tree Policy be forwarded to Council for adoption.

9 Cont'd

42. On 10 December 2009 the Proposed Tree Policy went to the Council for adoption with the following recommendations –
- (a) Rescind the following Policies -
    - (i) Tree Planting in Streets Policy
    - (ii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404
    - (iii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636
    - (iv) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236
    - (v) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178
  - (b) Adopt the Proposed Tree Policy including the following delegations:
    - (i) The Transport and Greenspace Manager on the recommendation of the City Arborist and relevant infrastructure Manager where appropriate has delegated authority for the planting of trees under Section 3.3 (Planning & Planting of Trees in Public Spaces) and the removal of trees under Section 3.4 (Removal of Trees in Public Spaces) and the pruning of trees under Section 3.7 (Pruning Trees in Public Spaces) of this policy.
    - (ii) The relevant Community Board has delegated authority in consultation with the Transport and Greenspace Manager and relevant infrastructure Manager to decide on any tree matter that either falls outside of the Transport and Greenspace Manager's delegation or, after consultation with affected parties, has remained contentious and is unable to be resolved by the Transport and Greenspace Manager.
43. At a February 2010 workshop the Council requested that an amended Proposed Tree Policy be brought to Council with the recommendation that it be adopted for consultation with Community Boards.

The suggested amendments were –

3.1 Tree Management

Delete "ecology - by"

Insert "Enhancing and protecting the surrounding environment and safeguarding biodiversity"

3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces

- (i) Delete "significant" and insert "have only a minor detrimental effect".
- (k) Insert "Control of roadside pests that are listed in the Canterbury Regional Pest Management Strategy 2005-2015 in Banks Peninsula remain the responsibility of the adjacent land owner".
- (m) Insert "that is not listed as a threatened or endangered species either locally or nationally or internationally".

**9 Cont'd**

Section 4 Relevant Delegations

Insert paragraph 3

“Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to Council for a decision”.

6 Definitions

Affected Community table - delete “<” and insert “approximate maximum”

Affected Community table Local Park - delete “key stakeholders e.g. sports groups, lessees”

Affected Community (a) - delete “significant” and insert “important”

Publicly owned land - delete “regional parks, sports parks, cemeteries” after “road reserve either formed or unformed” insert “excluding arterial roads”

44. On 25 March 2010 the Council adopted the amended Proposed Tree Policy for consultation with Community Boards.

**10. REVIEW OF CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANT FUND**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Programme Manager Liveable Cities
<b>Author:</b>	Katie Smith, Neighbourhood Planner

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to review of the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy. This review contains a revised policy for consideration by the eight Community Boards for grant funding of maintenance of character houses located within Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula. The views of the Board will be reported back to the Regulation and Planning Committee for report to the Council.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. In March 2004 the Council resolved to provide grant funding towards the external maintenance of pre-1945 character houses to assist in their retention and continuing contribution to the residential amenity and identity of their local areas. This was implemented for a period of four years from July 2006 to run until July 2010. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy required a review of the success of the grants after this initial four year period.
3. The historic fabric of Christchurch comprises both heritage listed and non-listed character buildings in both residential and commercial use. City Plan Listed Heritage Buildings and Items are protected by the rules set out in the City Plan and entitled to grants for internal and external repairs and maintenance under the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy. Listed heritage, however, makes up a small proportion of the older housing stock that contribute to the character and heritage of the city.
4. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants fulfil an important role in the retention of non-listed heritage buildings which contribute to the character and heritage of Christchurch. Without these maintenance grants there is no other source of financial help or encouragement for property owners to retain these buildings and the loss of such buildings has been noted in many areas of the city as eroding the character of the older suburbs.
5. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants were intended to provide a small financial contribution towards the external upgrading and maintenance of homes which have a distinctive visual character and make a key contribution to the quality of the local streetscape and the community identity. In 2009/10 a total of \$47,500 was available through the Character Housing Grant Fund with an average grant approval of \$1,408 over the 25 applications approved. Staff time on administration of the grants is approximately 0.3 of a full time equivalent position.
6. The objectives of the review are to ensure the Fund operates effectively both for Council and the applicants, that it supports the retention of character homes, and to raise awareness of this grant fund.
7. The policy sets out the criteria by which the effectiveness of the grant scheme will be assessed and includes community acceptance, improvements in street amenity and local identify and retention of character houses. The policy also requires the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Panel to consider each annual round against these criteria. Those annual discussions have led to a number of the recommendations in this report aimed at making the Character Housing Maintenance Grants more effective. Feedback has also been received from some of the grant applicants.
8. The effectiveness of the grants against the criteria is assessed in the following:
  - *Community acceptance*; there has been a significant interest in the grant scheme as shown by the receipt of 154 applications, and numerous enquiries each year.

10 Cont'd

- *Improvements in street amenity and local identity*; of the 154 applications, 72 (approx 50%) have uplifted grant funding in the past four years. These grants have been for a range of works including external painting, window and roof replacement and replacement/repair of building features such as veranda details. These improvements have all contributed to the amenity of the street scene and the identity of the local area.
  - *Retention of character houses in an area including those that have not received grants*; the grant process requires the applicant to commit to non demolition or relocation of the property for the next ten years thereby ensuring the property continues to contribute to the street scene and local identity. It is difficult to quantify the impact upon the retention of character properties that have not received a grant as there are many other factors that would influence their retention including market conditions over the past four years.
  - *Effectiveness of the management and administration of the programme*; each year the grant fund has not been fully allocated nor all grants uplifted. The review identifies that there are three main factors that limit the success of the grants: the low quantum of grant funding; the restrictive grant conditions and criteria; the administrative process. All of these issues are explained in more detail in the background section of this report.
9. On the basis of this assessment the Character Housing Maintenance Grants have been a cost effective mechanism for recognising the contribution that character homes make towards street scene and local identity. The additional recommendations in this report are aimed at reinforcing the intention of the grants to focus at the local level and further supporting that effectiveness and administrative efficiency.
10. The background section of this report contains a summary of the effectiveness of the grant process, a review of the selection criteria, conditions of the grant and options for a revised policy.
11. Three options have been considered:
- the status quo;
  - continuing with the current Character Housing Maintenance Grants with minor changes to the existing policy and process;
  - applications being approved by each Community Board with the fund allocated between the eight Community Boards who can determine applications throughout the year, along with minor changes to the existing policy and process.

It is recommended that the third option is progressed. The share of the fund will be based on the number of residential properties within each ward built before 1945 (source: *Christchurch City Council Valuation Hub Database*).

12. The proposed revisions to the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy, should the preferred option be adopted, are shown in the attachment, Appendix A. The revised Policy will be reviewed in three years to monitor the effectiveness of the revised grants system.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

13. Provision has been made for a Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund of \$45,310 per annum for 2010/11. Each property is restricted to a total maximum grant funding of \$5,000. Staff time is provided for in operational budgets.



## 10 Cont'd

14. The current policy has one pool of funding and is allocated by the Character Housing Grants Panel. In the preferred option outlined in this report each Community Board is allocated a proportion of the Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund. Allocating a proportion of the grant fund to each of the Community Boards will enable each Board to be responsible for making decisions on the grant applications it receives, reinforces an original intention of the grants scheme was to focus at the local level and would provide a stronger mechanism to encourage applications. The proportion for each Community Board is based on the number of properties located within its ward that were built before 1945. Table 1 below details the proposed distribution of funding between the Community Boards (note that figures have been rounded).

**Table 1: Character Housing Maintenance Grants Community Board Funding Allocation**

Community Board	Number of properties pre-1945	% of properties pre-1945	Budget
Lyttelton-Mt Herbert	760	4.1%	\$1,860
Akaroa-Waiwera	221	1.2%	\$540
Burwood-Pegasus	1,571	8.5%	\$3,845
Fendalton-Waimairi	1,977	10.7%	\$4,835
Hagley-Ferrymead	5,311	28.7%	\$12,990
Riccarton-Wigram	797	4.3%	\$1,950
Shirley-Papanui	2,966	16.0%	\$7,260
Spreydon-Heathcote	4,918	26.6%	\$12,030
<b>Total Christchurch</b>	<b>18,521</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$45,310</b>

15. The current policy requires that grants not uplifted within the financial year lapse.
16. The preferred option allows a period of 11 months for applicants to complete the works and uplift the grant. This will require the end of year carry forward of funds for those grants that will not be uplifted until the following financial year.
17. The current policy restricts the grant funding to a maximum of 10 per cent of the total costs of the external maintenance works (excl GST) up to a maximum of \$5,000 per property.
18. The preferred option will give each Community Board the discretion to award applicants between 10%-20% of the external maintenance cost (excl GST) up to a maximum of \$5,000 per property. This increases from a maximum of 10 per cent in the current policy. It will also allow for additional applications for properties to be submitted once the original grant has been uplifted and will be dependent upon available funds and to a maximum limit of \$5,000 in total grants per property.

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

19. Yes, the Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund is provided for in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

20. The current policy requires the non-demolition and non-relocation of the property for a period of ten years. This condition has been dealt with through a written agreement from the applicant not to demolish or relocate the property and is monitored by placing a property note on the Land Information Memorandum (LIM). Whilst this does not have the legal standing of a covenant, it does require the owner to state their intention to retain the property and the agreement will be highlighted to the Council's consent planners should any application for demolition or relocation be received.

**10 Cont'd**

21. The preferred option will retain this need for the property owner to agree in writing not to relocate or demolish the property within 10 years of the uptake of the grant and will continue to be monitored through the LIM note on the property file. This is considered an appropriate form of agreement for implementing the non-demolition and non-relocation requirements of the policy given the low value of the individual grants.
22. The current policy is not explicit about grant payback should demolition or relocation occur within the ten-year period. The preferred option is to include a clause requiring payback under these circumstances. Should the grant recipient decide not to pay back the grant money upon demolition or relocation of the building then consideration would need to be taken on a case-by-case basis as to what, if any, legal proceedings should follow.
23. The existing Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy also requires that should the property be sold within five years of the grant payment then the applicant must repay the grant to the Council for future reallocation. There have been a number of grants paid back due to applicants selling their properties within five years, yet post-sale these properties continue to contribute to the street scene. This approach is also inconsistent with the Heritage Incentive Grants, where there is no requirement for grants to be paid back should the property be sold.
24. The preferred option will not require the payback of the grant should the property be sold. The intent of the policy is around the character of the property and the contribution of the property to the street environment. This revision will not impact upon the intent of the policy and may encourage more applications.

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

25. Yes, see above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

26. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants are accounted for in the 2009-2019 LTCCP and align with the Activity Management Plans, Activity 1.4: Heritage Protection by providing grants in order to maintain and protect heritage items and values which contribute to a unique city and community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past.

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

27. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

28. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants align with the Liveable City Strategic Directions and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy in that it maintains and enhances the quality of the development and renewal of the city's built environment by protecting Christchurch's heritage buildings and neighbourhood character.

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

29. Yes, the recommendations will enable the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Fund to operate effectively.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

30. Each of the eight Community Boards will be consulted with in regards to the proposed changes to the policy and process and a summary of the Community Boards comments and recommendations will be provided to Council.

**10 Cont'd**

31. Comments from the Character Housing Grant Panel and grant applicants have been taken into consideration in formulating the revised policy.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board:

- a) Consider the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Fund Review report and provide feedback for staff to report to the Council's Regulatory and Planning Committee; and
- b) Note the preferred option, Option C, for the allocation of the Character Housing Maintenance Grants to be determined by the individual Community Boards and the process as set out in the revised Operational Policy **attached as Appendix A.**

**CHAIRPERSONS RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

32. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants have been available to owners of character dwellings in Christchurch and Banks Peninsula since July 2006 and have offered grants of 10 per cent (up to a maximum of \$5,000 excl GST) for external maintenance works to upgrade the external appearance of residential properties that make a key contribution to the quality and identity of local streets.
33. The existing policy has been operating for the past four years with a budget of \$100,000 in the first three years and \$47,500 in the final year. The allocation of funds for each year are as shown in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Annual allocation of Character Housing Grants**

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Number of grants approved</b>	<b>Total value of grants approved</b>	<b>Total number of grants uplifted</b>	<b>Total value of grants uplifted</b>
<b>2006/07</b> Fund available \$100,000	42 of 64 applications	\$47,573.00 (ave \$1,133.00)	22	\$22,883.00 (ave \$1,040.00)
<b>2007/08</b> Fund available \$100,000	26 of 28 applications	\$33,039.00 (ave \$1,271.00)	17	\$19,844.00 (ave \$1,167.00)
<b>2008/09</b> Fund available \$100,000	27 of 36 applications	\$43,573.00 (ave \$1,614.00)	17	\$25,893.00 (ave \$1,523.00)
<b>2009/10</b> Fund available \$47,500	25 of 26 applications	\$35,192.00 (ave \$1,408)	TBC	TBC

10 Cont'd

34. Decisions on grant applications are currently made by the Character Housing Grants Panel (comprising one member from each Community Board), following consideration and a recommendation by the relevant Community Board. The means that for each grant there is a two step process. This has resulted in a lengthy time from application to decision-making, and for the size of the fund and scale of the grants, increased the associated administration. The intention of this grants scheme was for this to remain focused at the local level. The preferred option reinforces this intention, recommending responsibility for decision making lies with each Community Board based upon an annual allocation of grant funds.
35. Operation of the grant system over the past four years has highlighted a number of weaknesses and disincentives associated with the current policy that provide areas for consideration in this review, including the following:
36. **Financial incentive**
- (a) The grant fund has not been fully allocated.
  - (b) Uptake of grants approved has been low, on average this is less than 25 per cent of total grant fund.
  - (c) The maximum of 10% of the total cost of the project excl GST (max \$5,000) is too little to act as an effective incentive to promote retention of character houses. Average grants are \$1,243.
37. **Grant conditions and criteria**
- (a) If ownership changes within five years the applicant is required to pay back the grant, although the property will continue to make a contribution to the character of the area and street scene.
  - (b) The Policy requires a non-demolition or relocation clause for 10 years.
  - (c) The Policy only allows for one grant per property, there is no time limit after which further applications may be considered.
  - (d) The criteria requires that the proposed works must be visible from a public place which excludes character houses on rear sections and essential maintenance works such a piling which are important to the retention of the building.
  - (e) The policy excludes non-residential buildings which can make a significant contribution to the streetscape, character and history of the local area.
38. **Administrative process**
- (a) The grant process from opening the fund and receipt of applications through to completion of works spans just one financial year. The process results in only one window of opportunity for applicants to apply for a grant each year.
  - (b) The decision making process can take up to four months and restricts time for completion of works to a maximum of seven months in order to claim the grant before the end of the financial year.
  - (c) If works are not complete by the end of the financial year the grant offer lapses and the applicant either foregoes the grant or has to reapply to another funding year.
  - (d) There are no opportunities to consider grants for urgent repair works or retrospective applications where works have been completed between the cut off in one financial year and the opening date in the next.
  - (e) The Policy does not allow for funding to be carried forward to the next financial year even for those grants offered but where work is unable to be completed within the timeframe, even if the work has commenced.
39. These issues have been considered in light of the original intent of the policy and operational guidelines and that the Community Board involvement be retained as an important part of the decision making process.
40. Following recognition of the these weaknesses and a review process a number of solutions were considered that would improve grant effectiveness including; making the grants more of an incentive by offering a greater quantum of funding; amending conditions; allowing access to the grants throughout the year and improving the process to allow for greater uplift of the grants.

10 Cont'd

41. Giving the Community Boards the discretion to award grants for between 10%-20% would enable the opportunity to provide more of an incentive for those applications considered to make more of a contribution to the street scene and identity of the local area and will be more in line with the quantum of grant funding offered by the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy and should provide for a full allocation of the fund. This will also give the Community Boards the opportunity to make the decisions for properties within their wards and promote the grants within their ward.
42. Removing the condition to repay the grant should the property be sold within five years of the issuing of the grant, allows owners to sell a property. The grant funding is provided to retain the character house, irrespective of who owns the property and is consistent with the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy. The non demolition and relocation clause will be retained with a payback requirement.
43. Providing the opportunity for applicants to apply for subsequent grants after the first grant is uplifted, and dependent upon available funds, allows applicants to stage their maintenance works and manage their budgets for such works.
44. The criteria restricts the funding to properties that make a contribution to the street scene or public space therefore excluding character houses on rear sections and buildings in commercial use. Due to the reduction in the overall fund it is considered these conditions are appropriate.
45. Currently there is one opportunity for grant applications to be submitted each year. Allowing applications for grants to be submitted throughout the year will provide greater accessibility to the fund and enable applicants needing to undertake urgent repair works to access the grants within an appropriate timeframe. These changes to the process will allow for greater accessibility to the grants and will improve speed in decision making.
46. Changing the requirement for works to be completed within the same financial year that the grant was offered and allowing applicants 11 months for the uplift of their grant will provide greater accessibility to the fund and facilitate uptake and allocation of the fund. There are numerous examples whereby applicants have been unable to complete the works within the current prescribed timeframe. This makes the fund more inline with the Heritage Incentive Grants that are allowed 18 months for uplift their grant.
47. An amended policy has been formulated to address these issues to enable a more effective and efficient use of the grant funding. A revised policy is set out in **Appendix A**.

**THE OBJECTIVES**

48. To efficiently and effectively administer the Character Housing Maintenance Grants to provide a real incentive to property owners to maintain and enhance character houses that display character elements and contribute to the street scene and the character and identity of the area.

**THE OPTIONS**

- (a) Maintain the Status Quo with the addition of a new review clause.  
To continue the Character Housing Maintenance Grants as per the current policy.
  - A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to Council
- (b) Continue the Character Housing Maintenance Grants with minor changes to the existing policy and process to:-
  - Allow applications to be submitted twice a year dependent upon available funds.
  - Require the Grants Panel to sit twice a year.
  - Increase potential grant funding for each application to 10%-20% (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Grants Panel.
  - Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.

10 Cont'd

- Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once first grant completed dependent upon available funds and limited to a maximum of \$5,000 per property.
  - Remove the payback clause if the property is sold as the property still retains a relationship with the street scene or public open space.
  - Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with an added payback requirement .
  - A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to Council.
- (c) Fund allocation to be determined by the Community Boards with the fund allocated between the eight Community Boards who can determine applications throughout the year by altering the policy and process to:-
- Allow decisions on grants to be taken at Community Board level.
  - Allow applications to be submitted throughout the year.
  - Allocation of fund to Community Boards is based on the number of pre-1945's houses in each ward.
  - Increasing potential grant funding for each application to 10%-20% (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Community Board.
  - Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.
  - Remove the payback clause if property sold as property still retains relationship with street scene or public open space.
  - Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with an added payback requirement.
  - A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to Council

**ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**

**The Preferred Option - Option C**

49. Each Community Board will be given a share of the overall Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund to allocate to applicants of properties located within their ward. The share of the fund will be based on the number of residential properties within their ward built before 1945 (source: *Christchurch City Council Valuation Hub Database*,

The Community Boards will take responsibility for decision making for Character Housing Maintenance Grants in their ward based on the policy guidelines.

- (a) Applications can be submitted throughout the year and taken before the relevant Community Board for a decision on the quantum of grant funding dependent upon available funds.
- (b) Increasing potential grant funding for each application to 10%-20% (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the individual Community Board on the merits of each application.
- (c) Applicants be permitted 11 months from approval of the grant to complete works and uplift the grant.
- (d) Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once first grant completed dependent upon available funds and limited to a maximum of \$5,000 per property.
- (e) Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with a payback requirement.
- (f) Remove the payback clause if the property is sold as the property still retains a relationship with the street scene or public open space.
- (g) A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to Council.

## 10 Cont'd

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Community Board take responsibility for allocation of grants within their ward and support promotion of this grant scheme.	Potential for inconsistent application of the guidelines and grant approvals.
<b>Cultural</b>	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing.	
<b>Environmental</b>	Community Boards can promote improved amenity and character for streetscapes within each of their wards.	
<b>Economic</b>	Equitable distribution of funds across the city. Sustainable maintenance of a broader city housing stock. Expected to result in improved allocation and uplift of grants.	Reduces administrative complexity with simplified process. Will involve an accrual of funds for grants not uplifted within financial year.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>Aligns with Liveable City outcomes Contributes to a Cultural City</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>Improves the Council's contribution to the community and neighbourhood identity in a consistent process for improvements to local residential streetscapes.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>NA.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Improved consistency with Heritage Incentive Grant Fund Process.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>The process allows more direct input by the Community Boards into applications within their own ward area. This report seeks feedback from the Community Boards on the revised process. Addresses feedback from applicants and the Grants Panel on the current process. No extra administrative work for Community Boards but retains administrative tasks currently undertaken by the Strategy and Planning Group.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p> <p>This brings the Character Housing Maintenance Grants process more in line with Community Board initiatives to promote positive outcomes for their ward. The focus remains on the retention of older character houses which make a contribution to the local streetscape and identity of the residential area through their street presence as perceived by the local community.</p>		

10 Cont'd

**Maintain the Status Quo (if not preferred option) – Option A**

50. The Community Boards recommend applications to the Character Housing Grants Panel who consider and determine grant approvals. A new review clause is added to allow for a three year review of the grant scheme.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Community Boards retain their input into the decision making process via the Grants Panel.	
<b>Cultural</b>	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing.	Limited success of current policy and process to date.
<b>Environmental</b>	Shared responsibility between Community Boards for improved amenity and character for streetscapes across the whole city.	Limited success of system to date with poor awareness of the grant scheme.
<b>Economic</b>	Sustainable maintenance of a broader city housing stock.	Administrative complexity and high costs when compared to limited success of policy and process so far. Limited allocation of fund and uplift of grants.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>Alignment with community outcomes for a Liveable City. Contributes to a Cultural City</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>Maintains the Council's contribution to the community and neighbourhood identity in a consistent process for improvements to local residential streetscapes.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>NA.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Some conditions of the grants are more onerous than the Heritage Incentive Grants Fund and process more complex.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>Community Boards to retain a limited influence over grants within their ward. Applicants feedback on current process will not be addressed.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p> <p>The focus remains on the retention of older character houses which make a contribution to the local streetscape and identity of the residential area through their street presence as perceived by the local community.</p>		



10 Cont'd

**Continue with the Character Housing Maintenance Grants with minor amendments to Policy and Process. – Option B**

51. To make minor changes to the existing policy and process by:
- (a) Increasing potential grant funding for each application to between 10%-20% (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Grants Panel.
  - (b) Allow applications to be submitted twice a year dependent upon available funds.
  - (c) Require the Grants Panel to sit twice a year.
  - (d) Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.
  - (e) Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once the first grant has been uplifted and dependent upon available funds.
  - (f) Remove the payback clause if the property is sold as the property still retains a relationship with the street scene or public open space.
  - (g) Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with a payback requirement.
  - (h) A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to Council.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Community Boards retain their input into the decision making process in a similar way to previous process but now biannually.	
<b>Cultural</b>	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing	
<b>Environmental</b>	Shared responsibility between Community Boards for improved amenity and character for streetscapes across the whole city.	
<b>Economic</b>	Will enable a more flexible process for applicants to apply for and to uplift grants. Will improve allocation and uplift to a limited degree.	Will double the administrative process and the time involvement for the Community Boards and Grants Panel. Will involve an accrual of funds for grants not uplifted within the financial year.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b> Alignment with community outcomes for a Liveable City. Also contributes to a Cultural City.</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b> Greater commitment to scheme with biannual process shows a greater commitment to enhancing residential identity and amenity.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b> NA.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b> Emphasis on local and Community Board participation.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b> Greater input from Community Boards and Grants Panel as process will need to be undertaken twice a year and will address some of the feedback from applicants and Grants Panel.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b> The focus remains on the retention of older character houses which make a contribution to the local streetscape and identity of the residential area through their street presence as perceived by the local community.</p>		

## 11. APPLICATION TO SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – MANNING INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services group DDI 941-8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
<b>Author:</b>	Community Development Adviser Jay Sepie DDI 941 5102

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request from the Manning Intermediate School to the Spreydon Heathcote Community Board for funding of \$6,500 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.
2. The request is for \$6,500 towards the costs of the Manning Intermediate School Pou Whenua project.
3. There is currently a balance of \$22,641 remaining in the Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4. The Manning Intermediate School is located at 50 Hoon Hay Road in Spreydon. The present school role is approximately 200 pupils, and is representative of both the ethnic diversity and comparatively low socio-economic conditions of the surrounding area. The school early last year identified 32 nationalities on the role, and while the majority of pupils identify as European, Maori and Pacific pupils are more highly represented compared to Christchurch as a whole, and there is a small growing Asian group. The school sees itself as a "community school" and has as its number one strategic goal: "Strengthen our participation in and contribution to the community".
5. In June 2009 the school's administration and block and hall were destroyed by fire. The rebuilding programme is underway. The project for which funds are sought is to install a "Pou Whenua" sculptural pole near the school entrance and new buildings as part of signalling to the staff, pupils, and local community the fresh start or renewal of the school and its local role. The loss of an existing "waimokihī" carving in the fire was a concern for many students. The Pou is intended to be a guardian and living symbol of local commitment to the school as "territory for our community", and will be partnered with another steel sculptural piece taken from the fire, that will symbolise "resilience". The project is important to the people of the local community that rallied forces when the fire occurred and assisted the school to restart within three days. A community opening event is planned for December for the new buildings and will include the sculpture or, if unfinished this will be subject to a later community event.
6. A key community focus for the project is evident in the working relationship with revivalist Ngai Tahu carver Cain Tauwhare of the Whakaraupo Carving Centre. The school has consulted with Ngai Tahu representatives, and will also be working with the carver to consult with the local community committee who will have input into the design of the sculpture so that it reflects the diversity of the families connected and potentially attracted to the school and all its facilities. It is evident that community groups such as three churches, a gymnastics club, and dance club are planning to return to using the new hall; previous to the fire there were at least five users per week. It is hoped that the renewal programme including this sculpture will add positively to the reputation of the Rowley/Hillmorton area as well as strengthening school and community links.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The school has a quote for the carving work and associated costs totalling \$16,222.22 and estimates an additional installation cost of some \$1,200. The amount of \$6,500 is sought towards the cost of the carving, and if the total required is not met, the size of the Pou (3.5 to four metres) and detail of carving would be reduced. Over fifty percent of the target budget has been met by the Board of Trustees, and by Konica Minolta sponsorship. Further fund raising with a target of \$2,000 is planned. The project income and expenditure budgets are outlined below:

## 11 Cont'd

<b>Income</b>	<b>\$</b>
Funds on hand (Board of Trustees)	\$9,000
Sponsorship (Konica Minolta)	\$1,000
Other fund raising	\$2,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$12,000</b>

<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Requested</b>
Design cost	\$650	
Materials	\$2,300	
Carving	\$12,000	\$6,500
Transport	\$300	
Engineer installation	(est.) \$1,200	
GST	\$2,056.25	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$18,506.25</b>	<b>\$6,500</b>

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

8. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

9. Nil.

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

10. Not applicable.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

11. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans – Community Support.

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

12. Yes Strengthening Communities page 172 (2009 – 19 LTCCP).

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

13. This application meets the following Council Community Grants funding Outcomes:
- 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, programme and local events
  - Enhance community and neighbourhood safety
  - Reduce or overcome barriers to participation
  - Foster collaborative responses to area of identified need.
14. The application also meets the following Community Board objectives:
- A culturally inclusive Spreydon Heathcote community
  - The development and maintenance of safe and strong local communities
  - Local urban renewal and developments complement the heritage and identity of the Spreydon Heathcote community

**11 Cont'd**

- Formation of a "Spreydon Heathcote identity" for past, present and future
- Improve social well being in Spreydon Heathcote

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

15. Strengthening Communities Strategy  
Children's Policy

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

16. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Spreydon Heathcote Community Board agree to grant \$5,000 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to the Manning Intermediate School toward its Pou Whenua project.

**CHAIRPERSONS RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**12. APPLICATION TO SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – ROWLEY AVENUE SCHOOL SAMOAN LANGUAGE TRIP**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services Group DDI 941 8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
<b>Author:</b>	Community Development Adviser, Jay Sepie DDI 941 5102

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to present a funding request from Rowley Avenue School to the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.
2. The request is for \$7,500 towards the costs of the Rowley Avenue School Samoan Language Trip project.
3. There is currently a balance of \$22,641 remaining in the Board's Discretionary Response Fund.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

4. The Rowley Avenue School is located at 48 Rowley Avenue Hoon Hay. The present school role stands at over 100 primary age pupils. The school is located in an area of Hoon Hay that is recognised for low socio-economic conditions combined with an ethnically diverse population. A large proportion of children belong to families with origin and continuing links to Samoa.
5. A key strategy for the school over the past three years has been to support the development of Samoan pupils through language and cultural learning. Most of the Samoan pupils are New Zealand born and with their families encounter the conflict of values and expectations that living here presents to those brought up in a different tradition. This project creates a significant opportunity for pupils to connect with and better understand the Samoan culture and language that influences their community.
6. In September 2009 the tsunami that hit Samoa affected two villages of familial significant to the school community. This included the loss of two family members and friends for a Rowley Avenue School teacher. The school funded and filled a container with school and household items, that arrived the day before Christmas. Junior pupils had paid for and wrapped small Christmas gifts for the children of the two affected villages. The school Board of Trustees funded the affected staff member to travel with the goods and perform the hand over to the two villages. The school response to the tsunami was the precursor to this project, and demonstrates the importance of the connection and relationship with Samoa.
7. This project involves 25 children from the Rowley Avenue Samoan language programme travelling to Samoa, in the September school holidays, for 12 days. The group will be accompanied by two Matai in the parents group, and has made arrangements to visit the northern side of Upolo as well as the two affected villages on the southern coast of the island. The group will experience living in three villages as well as attending school during their trip: "living the life their parents did."
8. The school believes that its language programme has already contributed to learning improvements, an absence of stand downs or suspensions for three years, provision of music and cultural community performances, regular Hoon Hay Park cleanups, and graffiti removals. This project aims to provide a strengthened connection between the pupils and their heritage in order to better contribute to their own learning and place in the local and wider New Zealand community.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

9. The total cost of the project is \$42,000.

**12 Cont'd**

10. Children and parents have raised \$15,000 in funds and the school Board of Trustees has contributed another \$10,000. Air tickets for travel have been paid for, however there is a shortfall of an estimated \$17,000 still needing to be raised in order to meet the costs of local transport, school attendances, and accommodation in the villages.
11. Voluntary input to the project is estimated at 1,000 hours. Risks to the project from falling short of the target will be addressed by reducing costs as much as possible and an underwrite of funds by the school paid for by further fund raising after the trip.
12. Social Work in Schools has contributed \$2,000 of funds raised to date, and other potential sources include Canterbury Community Trust, the Blogg Trust and Mike Pero as a total of \$9,500 has been requested across these funders, with decisions pending.
13. The school is requesting \$2,000 for school resources plus \$5,500 for accommodation costs from the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board, a total request of \$7,500.

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

14. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

15. Nil.

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

16. Not applicable.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

17. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans – Community Support.

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

18. Yes Strengthening Communities page 172 (2009 – 19 LTCCP).

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

19. This application meets the following Council Community Grants Funding Outcomes:
  - 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.
  - Reduce or overcome barriers to participation.
  - Enhance community and neighbourhood safety.
  - Provide community based programmes which enhance basic life skills.
20. This application also meets the following Spreydon Heathcote Community Board objectives;
  - A culturally inclusive Spreydon Heathcote community.
  - The development and maintenance of safe and strong local communities.
  - Formation of a "Spreydon Heathcote identity" for past, present, and future.
  - Improve social well being in Spreydon/Heathcote area.

**12 Cont'd**

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

21. Strengthening Communities Strategy  
Children's Policy  
Safer Christchurch Strategy

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

22. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommend that the Spreydon Heathcote Community Board decline the request from Rowley Avenue School towards cost of its Samoan Language Trip project as other sources of funding are considered more appropriate.

**CHAIRPERSONS RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board support the funding to meet the Koha for the children's accommodation and local transport costs.

**13. APPLICATION TO SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD DISCRETIONARY 2009/10 RESPONSE FUND – SINGLE MUMS SUPPORT**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services Group DDI 941 8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
<b>Author:</b>	Community Development Adviser, Jay Sepie DDI 941 5102

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding from the Project Esther Charitable Trust to the Spreydon Heathcote Community Board from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.
2. The request is for \$15,000 towards the costs of establishing and implementing a new One On One Support project in the Trust's Single Mum's Support programme.
3. There is currently a balance of \$22,641 remaining in the Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

4. The Project Esther Charitable Trust is located in Lyttelton Street, Spreydon and delivers a range of services to women and their families, particularly those at risk of negative social outcomes. The Trust acts as the umbrella legal entity to the Single Mums Support (SMS) group. Both the Trust and the SMS group have an accountable funding history with the Board, and are long standing, reputable community based support organisations.
5. The Single Mums Support mission is to promote and encourage single mothers and their children towards healthy relationships, positive parenting, and personal growth. A range of activities is provided to achieve this mission:
  - Coffee groups and soup lunch - four groups meeting weekly, each averaging 15-20 women and 10 children.
  - Social and family events – up to 60 women projected to benefit in the next 12 months from various events that often also target other family members.
  - Provision of resources such as books, pamphlets, magazines, donated clothing, DVDs, vegetables, and other service information and referrals.
  - Advocacy and support with service appointments and court appearances; two monthly newsletters; and home visits/one on one support for up to 20 women annually.
6. Over recent years the group has identified an increasing need for the more in depth one on one support compared to the more general support that is offered in the group sessions. A number of women present with depression, related mental health issues, and/or insufficient confidence to take part in group based activities.
7. The current Family Worker deploys a portion of time to some three instances per week of one to one support which is proving inadequate to demand. The group seeks to extend this type of work to a volume level comparable to the established group work by establishing a new 15 hour per week position equivalent. This will enable the group to resource an estimated 432 one on one contacts per year with some 60 women, compared to 144 contacts with 20 women at present. The result is likely to be better quality as well as more one to one support to meet the needs presenting to the SMS group.



**13 Cont'd**

8. While there are some other groups with similar services in Christchurch and the Spreydon/Heathcote Ward, Single Mums Support note it is the only service working solely with single mothers in the Spreydon and greater South Christchurch area. The group networks and reciprocates referral with relevant local and government agencies including but not restricted to: Kingdom Resources; Plunket; midwifery local services; Arahura Medical and Counselling Services; Building Blocks Trust Community Early Learning Centre; Work and Income; and Comcare. The group considers that working relationships developed over the past nine years, and attendant credibility with these agencies is contributing to the increased demand through increasing referrals, along with ongoing impacts of the recession such as unemployment.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

9. The group has received approval of two grants to a total of \$2,300 from Lotteries and the Tindall Foundation that it intends to apply for the overhead and support costs of the project. The grant sought in this application is intended for salary costs. The project is at risk of not proceeding without Community Board funding, but may be able to proceed with a reduced amount by securing subsequent other sources of funding.
10. Ongoing funding for the project will be sought through the group making applications to future Strengthening Communities funding rounds in addition to other funding sources. Currently, the group has no funds of its own on hand available to support this new project. The total project cost is \$17,300, detailed as below:

<b>Budget item</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Requested</b>
Phone, stationery, power, rent	\$1,642	\$0
Supervision and training	\$658	\$0
Salary	\$15,000	\$15,000
<b>total</b>	<b>\$17,300</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>

**Council and Community Board Funding History of Project Esther Trust**

2009/10 - \$20,000	Single Mums Support salaries (Strengthening Communities Fund)
2009/10 - \$2,000	Music and Movement (Strengthening Communities Fund)
2009/10 - \$2,205	Strategic Dev and Newsletter (Small Grants Fund)
2009/10 - \$3,097	Single Mums Support (Small Grants Fund)
2008/09 - \$15,000	Single Mums Support salaries (Strengthening Communities Fund)
2008/09 - \$1,500	Instruments (Small Grants Fund)
2008/09 - \$2,000	Volunteer recognition (Strengthening Communities Fund)
2008/09 - \$1,500	Single Mums Support resources (Small Grants Fund)
2007/08 - \$10,000	Single Mums Support salaries (Project Fund)
2007/08 - \$2,000	Single Mums Support resources (Community Development Fund)
2007/08 - \$1,000	Music and movement (Community Development Fund)

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

11. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

12. Nil.

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

13. Not applicable.

**13 Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

14. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity management Plans – Community Support.

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

15. Yes. Strengthening Communities, page 172 (2009 -19) LTCCP.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

16. This application meets the following Council Community Grants Funding Outcomes:
- Provide community based programmes which enhance basic life skills
  - Reduce or overcome barriers to participation
  - Foster collaborative responses to areas of identified need
  - Enhance community and neighbourhood safety
17. The application also meets the following Spreydon Heathcote Community Board Objectives:
- Improve social wellbeing in Spreydon/Heathcote.
  - Empower communities and community groups to deliver services that contribute towards achievement of the Community Outcomes.
  - The development and maintenance of safe and strong local communities.

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

18. Strengthening Communities Strategy  
Children's Policy

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

19. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Spreydon Heathcote Community Board agrees to grant \$12,000 from its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund to the Project Esther Trust Single Mums Support group towards costs of its One on One Support project.

**CHAIRPERSONS RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

29. 6. 2010

- 35 -

14. **COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISERS UPDATE**
15. **ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
16. **MEMBERS QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**