

RICCARTON WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD

AGENDA

TUESDAY 4 MAY 2010

AT 5PM

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

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

Community Board Adviser

Liz Beaven

Telephone: 941-6501

Email: liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

	CLAUSE	
PART C	1.	APOLOGIES
PART C	2.	CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 13 APRIL 2010
PART B	3.	DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
	3.1	Mr Peter Wakeman, Riccarton Area Parking Study
PART B	4.	PETITIONS
PART B	5.	NOTICES OF MOTION
PART B	6.	CORRESPONDENCE
PART B	7.	BRIEFINGS
PART A	8.	CHILDCARE CENTRE LEASES
PART A	9.	STRUCTURES ON ROADS POLICY
PART A	10.	ROBBIES RICCARTON EXTENSION OF LEASE
PART C	11.	MASHAM SUBDIVISION PROPOSED ROAD NAMING
PART C	12.	RICCARTON AREA PROPOSED PARKING PLAN
PART C	13.	LOCAL GOVERNMENT “KNOW HOW” TRAINING – FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE 101 AND DECISION MAKING WORKSHOPS

- PART C 14. APPROVAL OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD'S SUBMISSIONS ON THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL'S DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2010/11 AND ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY GREATER CHRISTCHURCH METRO STRATEGY REVIEW 2006-2012**
- PART C 15. RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT – 13 APRIL 2010**
- PART C 16. RICCARTON/WIGRAM TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE COMMITTEE REPORT – 19 APRIL 2010**
- PART B 17. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
- PART B 18. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B 19. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
- PART C 20. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 13 APRIL 2010

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Tuesday 13 April 2010 are **attached**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 13 April 2010 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

- 3.1 Mr Peter Wakeman, property owner of Dallas Street Riccarton, will discuss with the Board the Riccarton Area Proposed Parking Plan.

4. PETITIONS

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. BRIEFINGS

8. CHILDCARE CENTRE LEASES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
Author:	Kathy Jarden, Leasing Consultant

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to provide information on the lease renewal process for 11 Council owned independently operated childcare facilities and seek recommendations from the relevant Community Boards to the Council for a resolution providing a delegation to staff to conclude new leases for each of them.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council currently owns 11 childcare facilities independently operated under leases as detailed in the **attached** schedule. (**Attachment 1**). Two of the 11 centres are on land designated as reserve with the balance on fee simple land.
3. The properties are spread across six wards within the city. Therefore, to ensure consistent decision making and processes by Council, the matter is being reported in one generic report submitted to the relevant Community Boards for their recommendations to the Council for a single consideration and decision.
4. The leases for the 11 properties expire on 30 June 2010. Negotiations have commenced with the existing individual lessees for a new lease. The rationale for dealing unilaterally with the existing lessees on expiry is set out in this report.
5. The proposed lease term is six years with one right of renewal for a further six years in the form of the Council's generic lease. This would result in a final expiry date of 30 June 2022, if the right of renewal is exercised.
6. The proposed rents are based on independent current market valuations. The decision to use market based rent was established by the Council in 2002 in response to a report on the setting of rents for childcare facilities.
7. This report recommends proceeding with the grant of new leases to the existing operators on the terms and conditions set out in the report and seeks a delegation to staff to finalise those leases.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. Independent valuation advice has been sought and the valuation for each childcare facility has taken a commercial view of the rental. Simes Limited has assessed each of the centres acknowledging the improvements the centre has funded.
9. Each childcare centre currently receives an operating grant from the Council to cover the annual rent charged under the lease. For the period from 1 July 2010 the centres can apply for funding assistance using the Council's Strengthening Communities Grants process.
10. There have been substantial increases in funding from central government over recent years which has changed the financial circumstances of each centre and may mean they do not have the same reliance on Council support. The Ministry of Education has advised the Council in its submission to the Council's Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) process in 2009 that most preschools now operate with a healthy surplus. This will now more appropriately be taken into account as part of the Council's grant process, rather than being a factor in settling rent.
11. The proposed rents will ensure that the Council properly manages its assets.

8 Cont'd

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

12. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

13. The Community Boards do not have the delegated authority to authorise the granting of the proposed leases on fee simple land; that decision needs to be made by the full Council. The Community Board does have powers to make recommendations to the Council.
14. The Fendalton/Waimairi and Shirley/Papanui Community Boards do have delegated authority to enter into leases for the Bishopdale Community Crèche at 129 Farrington Avenue and Redwood Early Childhood Centre Incorporated at 339 Main North Road, respectively, as these two centres are on reserve land. However, for the purposes of consistent decision making and process, staff are recommending that these two Community Boards attend to those two leases in a similar manner as the other nine leases on fee simple land and do not exercise their delegation; thus leaving all 11 lease renewals for a single decision by the Council.
15. On 13 May 2002 a report to the Strategy and Finance Committee was tabled that recommended *"that the Council confirm its requirement that a system of grants and leases as outlined in the report be put in place."* That report stipulated that the rent for *"each building is assessed at a market rental level in accordance with current Council policy"*. The recommendation was adopted by the Council on 23 May 2002. The method of rent subsidy for the childcare centres in Council-owned buildings was by an internal transfer of funds. This method has subsequently been made more transparent with the childcare centres making application for funding through the Strengthening Communities Fund.

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

16. Council's Legal Services Unit have advised on all aspects of the leases and associated issues.
17. Council's generic lease for early education childcare facilities will form the lease document.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

18. Yes.

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

19. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

20. Council's support for the provision of childcare centres is highlighted in the Early Childhood Education Strategy (2001). The Council provides support to early childhood education through a variety of means. In these instances, assistance is provided through the provision of a Council-owned building and a council funded operating grant. As part of the Council's approved process for entering into formal lease arrangements with early childhood education providers the rent for the Council-owned building is assessed at a market rental. As part of a separate process, early childhood education providers are entitled to apply for financial assistance. Funding requests are assessed against a range of criteria including the location's socio-economic status and whether or not the provider may be able to pay rent. Funding requests are made through the Council's Strengthening Communities fund.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

21. Yes.

8 Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

22. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

23. Staff recommend that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board recommends to the Council that the Council adopts a resolution in the following form:
- (a) That the existing lessees for the childcare centres as listed in the attached schedule be offered a new lease upon expiry of their existing lease terms on 30 June 2010.
 - (b) That the new leases be generally on the Council's generic lease terms and conditions.
 - (c) That the initial term of the leases be six years with one right of renewal for a further six years, which provides for a final expiry date of 30 June 2022, if the right of renewal is exercised.
 - (d) That the market rentals as set out in the attached schedule be adopted from lease commencement, with market related rent reviews at three yearly intervals.
 - (e) That the Corporate Support Unit Manager be granted delegated authority to conclude and administer the leases, as generally set out in the above resolutions.

BACKGROUND

Burwood/Pegasus Ward

24. The Canterbury Westland Free Kindergarten Association Inc is a not-for-profit society operating the Kidsfirst Early Learning Centre at 284 Breezes Road, Aranui. The land is described in Certificate of Title 11K/595 as being Lot 1 DP 27621 and was vested in the Christchurch City Council for the purpose of a crèche. The property is a 1940's bungalow that was converted by the Council. The childcare facility is currently licenced for 33 children.
25. The New Brighton Community Preschool & Nursery Incorporated is a not-for-profit society operating the New Brighton Community Preschool at 109 Beresford Street, New Brighton. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB26B/643 as Lot 25 DP 100 and held as fee simple for crèche purposes. The property is a traditional pre-war bungalow that has been extensively extended and converted by the tenant. The childcare facility is currently licenced for 39 children.
26. North Beach Community Childcare Centre Incorporated is a not-for-profit society operating the North Beach Community Childcare Centre at 102 Marriotts Road, North Beach. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB375/138 as Lot 3 DP 6151 and held as fee simple for crèche purposes. The building is a former church hall which has been converted to a childcare centre by the Council. The tenant has been responsible for the establishment of the outdoor play area. The childcare facility is currently licenced for 34 children.

Fendalton/Waimairi Ward

27. Bishopdale Community Preschool Association Incorporated is a not-for-profit society operating the Bishopdale Community Crèche at 129 Farrington Avenue (13 Bishopdale Courts), Bishopdale. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB20F/1396 as Lot 10 DP 42896 and held as local purpose (community centre) reserve. The building is a 1970's concrete block building originally used as library storage. The tenant converted the building into a pre-school and it is licenced for 50 children.

8 Cont'd

Hagley/Ferrymead Ward

28. New Beginnings Preschool Incorporated is a not-for-profit society operating the New Beginnings Preschool at 136 Aldwins Road, Linwood. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB245/193 as being Part Rural Section 347. The building is a modern, purpose-built pre-school constructed by the Council. The centre is currently licenced for 36 children.
29. Woolston Preschool Incorporated is a not-for-profit society operating the Woolston Community Child Care Centre at 52 Glenroy Street, Woolston. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB37B/959 as being Lot 1 DP 63343. The building is a purpose built preschool constructed by the Council. The centre is currently licenced for 39 children.

Riccarton/Wigram Ward

30. Springs Community Early Learning Centre Incorporated (SCELC) became registered as a not-for-profit society in November 2009.
31. The land is described in Certificate of Title 18A/1036 as being Lot 1 DP 25336 and Part Lot 1 1DP 23275 and is the site of a childcare centre and social housing complex.
32. The current lease is with Affinity Child and Family Services who operate the Springs Community Preschool at 10 Weaver Place, Sockburn through Springs Community Preschool. The preschool operations were handed over to SCELC as a "going concern" in December 2009.
33. Springs Community Pre-School has operated for 21 years under the management of voluntary trusts, committees and church groups. The centre is currently licenced for 35 children.
34. SCELC has not been able to provide financial information for the previous three years as that was filed by Affinity Child and Family Services. They have however, provided a five-year cash flow projection and projected registrations. As this group, in various forms, has operated the childcare centre, it is believed they have the practical experience to carry forward but it would be recommended that their financial position and business plan are reviewed on a regular basis to ensure they can continue to operate.

Shirley/Papanui Ward

35. Redwood Early Childhood Centre Incorporated is a not-for-profit society operating the childcare centre at 339 Main North Road, Redwood. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB244/204 as Rural Section 41271, Rural Section 41272 and Rural Section 42037 and held as recreation reserve. Rural Section 41271 is classified by way of Gazette Notice as a local purpose (community centre) reserve. The property is a 1970's building originally constructed as a hall and converted by the Council into a childcare centre. The centre is currently licenced for 40 children.
36. St. Albans Edu-Care Centre Incorporated is a not-for-profit society operating the childcare centre at 3 Thames Place, St Albans. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB293/37 as Part Lot 63-64 DP 3115 and held for crèche purposes. The property is a 1940's bungalow that was converted and extended by the Council in 1985. The childcare centre is currently licenced for 35 children.

Spreydon/Heathcote Ward

37. Hoon Hay Community Crèche Incorporated Society is a not-for-profit society operating the Hoon Hay Community Preschool at 113 Mathers Road, Hoon Hay. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB17K/1312 as being Lot 2 DP 20805. The property is a 1970's community hall that was converted by the current tenant into a childcare centre. The centre is licenced for 36 children.

8 Cont'd

38. The Sydenham Community Pre-school Incorporated is a not-for-profit society operating the 8 Sydenham Community Preschool at 113 Huxley Street, Sydenham. The land is described in Certificate of Title CB42A/668 as being Lot 1 DP 72739 for the purpose of a crèche. The property is a 1960's house that was converted into a childcare centre by the Council. The centre is licenced for 30 children.

THE OPTIONS

39. To enter into a new lease with the existing tenants as detailed in **Attachment 1**.
40. Not enter into a new lease with the existing tenants and call for expressions of interest for the future use of these facilities.

THE PREFERRED OPTION

41. To enter into a new lease with each of the existing tenants who have maintained the building and land and are fulfilling an important community service.
42. The Council's normal practice is to deal in an open and transparent public manner, with the opportunity to lease the property made available to the general market through tender on expiry of any lease. The Council made a commitment in the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) to continue the provision of the early childhood facilities. To achieve this, the preferred option, for the reasons set out below, is to deal unilaterally with the childcare centres to negotiate a new lease and set a fair market rental for the property.
43. The Council has purpose-built some of the facilities and contributed to the upgrade of other facilities in conjunction with significant financial contributions made by the incumbent tenant and the Ministry of Education.
44. The current tenants are meeting the requirements of the Ministry of Education to maintain their childcare licence. The childcare centres own the business as the licences are specific to those organisations.
45. The Council is satisfied with the current operators and recent experience has shown that there is a limited market available if the Council were to seek expressions of interest for the 11 facilities.

9. STRUCTURES ON ROADS POLICY 2010

General Manager responsible	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible	Asset and Network Planning Manager
Authors	Tina von Pein, Project Manager – Public Places Policies Review

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek comments from Community Boards on the draft Structures on Roads Policy 2010 (**Attachment 1**).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At the 5 March 2010 meeting of the Regulatory and Planning Committee the Committee resolved: *“That this issue lie on the table until staff have briefed Community Boards, and that it return to the Committee in April in light of these discussions”*.
3. With the 2006 amalgamation of Banks Peninsula District Council (BPDC) and Christchurch City Council (CCC) some operational policies specific to each area remained in existence for the respective areas.
4. With the adoption of the Public Places Bylaw 2008 (the bylaw) the policies related to structures on roads were identified as needing review to ensure they appropriately give effect to the bylaw. The Council appointed Public Places Policies Working Party has worked with staff on the review of this and the other operational policies that relate to matters covered by the bylaw.
5. The proposed Structures on Roads Policy 2010 provides a single policy for the whole of the city and incorporates and replaces the following:

(a) Current CCC policies:

- (i) Airspace over Public Roads - Granting Rights.
- (ii) Structures on Roads (Ramp, Retaining Walls, Garage, Parking Platform etc).

Note: “Use of Legal Road as Licensed Premises policy”: The ability of the Council to revoke a permit to occupy legal road as licensed premises as currently contained in this policy now forms part of each individual permit issued by the Council and is therefore not retained.

(b) Current BPDC policies (all part of the Banks Peninsula Roading Policy):

- (i) Structures on Legal Roads in Urban Areas - License to Occupy Policy.
- (ii) Retaining Walls - Responsibility Policy.
- (iii) Fencing Policy.

The proposed policy therefore provides clarity and consistency in the management of applications for structures on roads throughout the Council area.

6. For most of its content the proposed policy incorporates the current CCC policies with updated wording and minor changes. The provisions in the existing ‘city’ and ‘peninsula’ policies are overall similar in nature. There are also some additions e.g. the provisions relating to verandas and fences, and inclusion of the Banks Peninsula fences policy into the new policy for the whole city. Current provisions in both CCC and BPDC policies which addresses council operational procedures (and do not belong in policy statements) were not retained.

9 Cont'd

7. This policy addresses only structures of permanent nature on roads and therefore does not deal with temporary structures on roads such as those associated with restaurants and cafes occupying sidewalks, which is planned for consideration and consultation during 2011, nor with '*paper roads*' which is planned for consideration at a later stage.
8. In summary, the proposed policy achieves an overdue streamlining and consolidation of policies and introduces:
 - (a) Provisions relating only to verandas previously in the Public Places Bylaw 1992;
 - (b) Changed provisions relating to fences;
 - (c) New provisions on the use of airspace over roads for architectural features; and
 - (d) New provisions for infrastructural and other structures.

Key stakeholder groups were contacted in writing about the proposed review and no concerns were raised.

9. It is not proposed to have a Special Consultative Procedure for the Structures on Roads Policy. The policy will become operative once adopted by the Council, and relevant stakeholders will be notified in writing.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. Current policy enforcement is undertaken on a 'response to a complaint' basis. It is anticipated that this will remain the same with the adoption of a reviewed policy, with no anticipated additional expenses.

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

11. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. The Public Places Bylaw 2008 came into force on 1 July 2008. Clause 8 of that bylaw provides for operational policies to be formulated, relating to matters regulated by the bylaw. Such policies must be adopted by Council resolution, and may include information on application procedures, administrative arrangements, terms and conditions related to activities in public places, definition of terms and other guidance information.

The consideration and adoption of such policies must be done in accordance with the Council's usual decision-making processes under the Local Government Act 2002.

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

13. Initial analysis of this policy and the potential review requirements have been considered in relation to the CCC Policy on Determining Significance, and the level of formal consultation that may be required has also been considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

14. The following Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) chapters are relevant: 5.3 City Promotions – 5.3.2 Promoting the City as an attractive place to live, learn and work.– 9.0 Enforcement and Inspections – Protect public health & safety; enforce compliance.

9 Cont'd

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

15. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES OR OTHER BYLAWS

16. The Structures on Roads Policy is aligned to the following Christchurch City Council strategies, plans and policies:
- (a) Central City Revitalisation Strategy.
 - (b) Safer Christchurch Strategy.
 - (c) Pedestrian Strategy.
 - (d) Parking Strategy.
 - (e) Equity and Access for People with Disabilities Policy.
 - (f) Long Term Council Community Plan.
17. This policy gives effect to the Public Places Bylaw 2008 and should be read in conjunction with the Council's General Bylaw 2008, Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008, Parks and Reserves Bylaw 2008 and the relevant rules, policies and objectives in the District Plan/City Plan.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

18. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

19. During the drafting of this policy some initial discussion has been undertaken with key stakeholders including Community Boards. Potentially affected external parties and associations were invited to provide feedback on any concerns and no concerns were raised.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board consider, and comment on, the draft Structures on Roads Policy 2010.

9 Cont'd

BACKGROUND

20. On 1 July 2008 the Christchurch City Council Public Places Bylaw 2008 became operative.
21. The bylaw enables the management of public places in order to balance the various different, and sometimes competing, lawful uses for which public places may be used. It seeks to provide for reasonable controls to protect health and safety, to protect the public from nuisance and to provide for the regulation of trading in public places.
22. Following the adoption of the bylaw a new operational policy was proposed to be developed from a review of the 12 relevant existing policies and associated matters. The policies all relate to the clauses in the bylaw that regulate commercial activities and obstructions in public places (clauses 6 and 7). This report only deals with the specific policies of the 12 that deal with structures on roads. The remaining policies have either already been considered by the Council (*Trading and Events in Public Places* in February 2010) or will be considered later in 2010/2011.
23. The current policies were developed before the amalgamation of Banks Peninsula District Council and the Christchurch City Council, and all were developed before the adoption of the new bylaw. The policies need to be reviewed to ensure that they are still necessary, that they are appropriate and that they are fit for purpose. The review of the policies addresses the following criteria:
 - (a) Rationalise the current policies where needed;
 - (b) Establish whether current practice and needs align with the policies;
 - (c) Assess whether any new matters need to be included;
 - (d) Establish whether the policies align with the bylaw;
 - (e) Take account of internal (Council) needs and external (stakeholder) needs; and,
 - (f) Result in redrafted policies that are coherent, stand-alone documents.
24. In addition to these 12 policies, related operational issues have been identified that would benefit from being included in or adopted into the new operational policy, resulting in some new areas of consideration.
25. On 2 February 2009, the Regulatory and Planning Committee agreed to appoint a working party to work with staff to discuss the review of operational policies that relate to matters covered by the Public Places Bylaw 2008. The members of the Public Places Policies Working Party are Crs Wells, Wall, Shearing, Reid and Johanson. The Working Party concluded its deliberations during 2009 with a meeting on 4 December 2009. Due to the considerable workload of reviewing all 12 policies, the Council on 24 September 2009 approved a timetable to split consideration of the 12 policies into a first group to be finalised by June 2010 (including those considered in this report), with the remainder to be considered in 2011 after the 2010 local government elections.

Proposed Structures on Roads Policy:

26. The proposed Christchurch City Council Structure on Roads Policy 2010 provides a single policy for the whole of the city and incorporates and replaces the following:
 - (a) Current CCC policies:
 - (i) Airspace over Public Roads - Granting Rights.

9 Cont'd

- (ii) Structures on Roads (Ramp, Retaining Walls, Garage, Parking Platform etc).

Note: "Use of Legal Road as Licensed Premises policy": The ability of the Council to revoke a permit to occupy legal road as licenced premises as currently contained in this policy now forms part of each individual permit issued by the Council and is therefore not retained.

- (b) Current BPDC policies (all part of the Banks Peninsula Roading Policy):

- (i) Structures on legal Roads in Urban Areas - License to Occupy Policy.
- (ii) Retaining Walls - Responsibility Policy.
- (iii) Fencing Policy.

The proposed policy therefore provides clarity and consistency in the management of applications for structures on roads throughout the Christchurch City Council area.

- 27. For most of its content the proposed policy incorporates the current CCC policies with updated wording and minor changes. The provisions in the existing 'city' and 'peninsula' policies are materially the same. There are also some additions e.g. the provisions relating to verandas and fences, as set out in the Background section below. Current provisions in both CCC and BPDC policies which addresses council operational procedures (and do not belong in policy statements) were not retained.
- 28. In summary the proposed policy achieves an overdue streamlining and consolidation of polices and introduces (1) provisions relating only to verandas previously in the 1992 Public Places Bylaw; (2) changed provisions relating to fences which are taken from the Banks Peninsula policy and is now proposed for the whole city, (3) new provisions on the use of airspace over roads for architectural features; and (4) new provisions for infrastructural and other structures. Key stakeholder groups were contacted in writing about the proposed review and no concerns were raised.

THE OBJECTIVES

- 29. The key objectives of the public places policy review are to:
 - (a) Review and update, as appropriate, the policy clauses and to enable a working policy that is supported by the Council and the community.
 - (b) Bring together the current policies and practices for both the former BPDC and CCC.
 - (c) Align the policy with current CCC plans and strategies.
- 30. The key objective of this policy is to manage structures on street and to develop a single policy to assist the public in identifying what can happen where and under what conditions.

THE OPTIONS

- 31. Two options have been identified in relation to managing structures on roads.
 - (a) The adoption of a new Council policy.
 - (b) Maintain the status quo with some editing to factually update of current policies.

THE PREFERRED OPTION

- 32. The preferred option is the adoption of the proposed Council policy. The proposed policy is attached to this report. (**Attachment 1**).

9 Cont'd

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Preferred Option

33. The preferred option is the adoption of a new Council wide policy (as tabled with this report). In addition to updating the wording and minor changes to the text this policy brings together the key elements of current policies and practices and incorporates new policy clauses which will assist with developing clarity and consistency in policy understanding and application.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Clarity to the community as to the policy, how to apply and how it applies. Alignment of policies between the former BPDC policies and the CCC policies will assist clarity and ease of use and application.	Communication of policies is part of the Council's core business.
Cultural	None specific.	None specific.
Environmental	Policy will enable more robust and transparent management of structures on roads	None specific.
Economic	Consolidated policy.	None specific.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

This policy option aligns with the following Community Outcomes:

- A Safe City** – we live free from crime, violence, abuse and injury. We are safe at home and in the community. Risks from hazards are managed and mitigated.
- An Attractive and well designed City** – Christchurch has a vibrant centre, attractive neighbourhoods and well-designed transport networks. Our life styles and heritage are enhanced by our urban environment.
- A City for recreation, fun and creativity** – We value leisure time and recognise that the arts, sports and other recreational activities contribute to our economy, identity, health and wellbeing.
- **A Prosperous City** – We have a strong economy that is based on a range of successful and innovative businesses. We value sustainable wealth creation, invest in ourselves and in our future.

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

The development of a consolidated policy will enable Council to better manage structures on roads through more transparent and consistent processes and procedures.

Effects on Maori:

No specific effects noted.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

The policy pulls together the key elements of the current policies and practices of the Council into a consolidated policy document and incorporates some new provisions consistent with existing Council policies.

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

No comments were received from relevant stakeholders invited to comment. As only minor changes are proposed from the existing policies and as there have been no issues with the operation of those policies it is not likely to have any significant effects.

9 Cont'd

Maintain the Status Quo with some editing (not preferred option)

34. The option of maintaining the status quo with some editing would mean maintaining the series of policies and current practices that apply to the post-amalgamation CCC area, and some specific policies that only apply to pre-amalgamation areas. Within this option it would be logical to update the policies (desk top activity) to ensure that historical and no longer relevant clauses are not included.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Communities should be aware of the current policies / practices as most have been operational since the early 1990's.	Continued segregation of the City's District Council areas as per pre-amalgamation.
Cultural	None specific.	None specific.
Environmental	Current status will continue to promote the areas of CCC and the former BPDC as two separate regions.	None specific.
Economic	None specific.	None specific.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

This policy option aligns with the following Community Outcomes:

- **A Safe City** – we live free from crime, violence, abuse and injury. We are safe at home and in the community. Risks from hazards are managed and mitigated.
- **An Attractive and well designed City** – Christchurch has a vibrant centre, attractive neighbourhoods and well-designed transport networks. Our life styles and heritage are enhanced by our urban environment.
- **A City for recreation, fun and creativity** – We value leisure time and recognise that the arts, sports and other recreational activities contribute to our economy, identity, health and wellbeing.
- **A Prosperous City** – We have a strong economy that is based on a range of successful and innovative businesses. We value sustainable wealth creation, invest in ourselves and in our future.

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

Maintaining the status quo will mean business as usual for council enforcement and policy development.

Effects on Maori:

No specific effects noted.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

The current policies broadly align with existing council strategies and plans, however the factual update is recommended, should this option be chosen, as many of the clauses are either out of date or no longer relevant.

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

No comments were received from relevant stakeholders invited to comment.

At Least one Other Option (or an explanation of why another option has not been considered)

35. No other option has been considered as the Council has previously adopted (24 September 2008) the recommendations to review the policies.

10. ROBBIES RICCARTON EXTENSION OF LEASE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Corporate Services DDI 941 8528
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Corporate Support
Author:	Jeff Woodham, Leasing Consultant

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's recommendation to the Council to approve the extension of the existing lease for the building at 199 Clarence Street, LOT 1 DP 50551, to Jacquesy Holdings Limited (trading as Robbies Riccarton) by two years, with 12 months notice, and to obtain a delegated authority for the Unit Manager Corporate Support to negotiate the terms of the lease extension and to accept a rental provided the rental is within 10 per cent of market assessment. (See **Attachment 1**).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The current lease of the facility will expire on 7 October 2010. The Property Asset Management Team have undertaken to assess the longer term strategic use of the building and formulate a strategy over the next 24 months for inclusion in a future Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP).
3. The Council's normal practice is to determine a new lease by way of a tender process. However, given the preference to limit the lease term to two years to facilitate the future strategic planning process, it is proposed to negotiate unilaterally with the incumbent tenant to extend their lease for this short period. Market experience suggests that a lease for only 24 months would only be viable for the incumbent tenant.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. All of the costs associated with the proposed extension of the lease of the facility will be borne by the Lessee.

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

5. Yes. There is no specific line item in respect of this property or the associated lease. This activity is part of the Council's normal property ownership and management functions.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. The Community Board does not have delegated authority to pass the resolutions contained in this report. However the Community Board does however have recommendatory powers to Council.

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

7. Yes. The Council's Legal Services Unit will prepare the Deed of Renewal and Variation documentation.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

8. Yes. There is no specific line item in respect of this property or the associated lease. This activity is part of the Council's normal property ownership and management functions.

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

9. Not applicable.

10 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

10. Not applicable.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. There are no Council strategies relevant to this report.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board recommend to the Council that:

- (a) The Council approve an extension of the existing lease for the building at 199 Clarence Street, LOT 1 DP 50551, to Jacquesy Holdings Limited (trading as Robbies Riccarton) by two years with provision to extend the lease further (subject to 12 month's notice) thereafter if further time is required to complete the strategic planning process.
- (b) Delegated authority be given to the Unit Manager Corporate Support to negotiate and conclude the terms of the lease extension and accept a rental provided the rental is within 10 per cent of market assessment.

BACKGROUND

13. The current lease with Jacquesy Holdings Limited (trading as Robbies Riccarton) expires on 7 October 2010. It is customary practice of the Council, where practically possible, to make premises publicly available for lease upon the final expiry of any lease. In this case there are extenuating circumstances to suggest that the Council should depart from this practice.
14. Jacquesy Holdings Ltd were assigned the lease in August 2004. Since that time they have proved to be a model tenant, paying rent and other outgoings in a timely fashion, maintaining the premises to an acceptable standard and driving improvements to the outward visual aspect of the building and surrounds. They have expressed an interest in a long term tenancy and also wish to be considered if the building was to be disposed of by the Council.
15. The Property Asset Management Team (PAMT) have indicated they are to undertake an assessment of the building shortly with a view to formulating a strategy regarding its future use. It is anticipated that this will be completed within the next 18-24 months with the outcome being incorporated in a future LTCCP. Flexibility is therefore required to ensure that the property is unencumbered by any lease or other interest(s) in 24 months time to enable all future use options/strategies to be considered.

To this end, and given the preference to limit the lease term to facilitate the future strategic planning process, the intention is to enter into discussions with the incumbent tenant to extend their existing lease by two years with provision to extend the lease further (subject to 12 months notice) thereafter if further time is required to complete the planning process.

Market experience suggests that a short lease term of 24 months would only be commercially viable for the incumbent tenant.

10 Cont'd

LEASE EXPIRY - OPTIONS

16 The following lease expiry options have been considered:

1. *Negotiate unilaterally with the incumbent tenant*

It is customary practice, where practically possible, to make premises publicly available for re-lease upon final expiry of the lease. There are extenuating circumstances in this case which suggest that we should depart from this practice and deal unilaterally with the incumbent tenant.

2. *Leave the property vacant on expiry*

This option would not be contemplated given, among other things, there would be ongoing maintenance and other expenses incurred which would not be offset by the receipt of rental income. There is no funding in the current LTCCP to cover this shortfall.

3. *Tender on an existing 'as is' use basis:*

This approach preserves the existing use and public services offered by the facility and also provides the opportunity for the incumbent tenant to participate in a tender process. However, there is legitimate concern that a 24 month lease term would not present a commercially viable proposition.

17. Given the context identified above Option 1 is the recommended option.

11. PROPOSED ROAD NAMING – MASHAM PARK SUBDIVISION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation & Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Environmental Policy & Approvals Manager
Author:	Bob Pritchard, Subdivisions Officer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval for four new road names within the Masham Park Subdivision.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The approval of proposed new road names is delegated to Community Boards.
3. The Subdivisions Officer has checked the proposed names against the Council's road name database to ensure it will not be confused with names currently in use.

RMA 92005616 Enterprise Homes Limited "Masham Park" 471 Yaldhurst Road

This application is Stage Two of the Masham Park subdivision (see **Attachment 1**). The Board will recall approving names for Stage One of the subdivision in March 2009. Stage Two will create 47 new residential allotments to be served by four new roads. The development company also developed the adjoining subdivisions, and chose Scottish names centred around the Kintyre Peninsula in the southwest of Scotland as the road name theme. The company wishes to continue this latest subdivision with a Scottish theme. The names proposed are Rannoch Drive for the larger road. Loch Rannoch is one of the larger Lochs in Scotland. The other through road is proposed as Carradale Avenue. Carradale is a picturesque village on the east side of the Kintyre Peninsula. A cul-de-sac off Rannoch Drive is proposed as Kilkivan Close after an old church on Kintyre. The second cul-de-sac is proposed as Dunaverty Place, Dunaverty is a golf course on the Peninsula. Alternatives have also been provided, Torrisdale, Dunmarra or Glen Kerran Avenue or Drive, and Bowmore Place or Close. (**Attachment 1**).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. There is no financial cost to the Council. The administration fee for road naming is included as part of the subdivision consent application fee, and the cost of name plate manufacture is charged direct to the developer.

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

5. Not applicable.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. Council has a statutory obligation to approve road names.

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

7. Yes. There are no legal implications.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

8. Not applicable.

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

9. Not applicable.

11 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

10. Not applicable.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Where proposed road names have a possibility of being confused with names in use already, consultation is held with Land Information New Zealand and NZ Post.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board consider and approve the proposed road names, Rannoch Drive, Carradale Avenue and Kilkivan Close as submitted for Stage Two of the Masham Park Subdivision.

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

13. There are no issues.

THE OBJECTIVES

14. Approval by the Community Board of the road names proposed in this report.

THE OPTIONS

15. Decline the proposed names and require alternative names to be supplied.

THE PREFERRED OPTION

16. Approve the names as submitted by the applicant.

12. RICCARTON AREA PARKING PLAN: PROPOSED CHANGES

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board's approval that parking restrictions be installed on Peverel Street, Burdale Street, Clarence Street, Division Street, Broadbent Street, Matipo Street, George Street and Wainui Street Area, in general accordance with the Riccarton Area Parking Plan. (See **Attachment 1**).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. After a deputation from the Central Riccarton Residents' Association on the 21 November 2008 the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board passed a resolution requesting that staff report on the restriction options suggested by the Central Riccarton Residents' Association within the vicinity of the Westfield Mall in Riccarton.
3. During the investigation of existing parking issues within the vicinity of the Westfield Mall, staff identified that there were problems with the demand for kerb side parking exceeding supply in residential streets on the southern side of Riccarton Road. However, on the northern side of Riccarton Road staff identified that an over restriction on parking within residential streets forced the majority of all day commuter parking to the southern side of Westfield Mall, compounding the problem.
4. Staff further identified that the restrictions as requested by the Central Riccarton Residents' Association were not a viable option. This option has the potential to split and shift the existing all day commuter parking problem on the southern side of Riccarton Road into adjoining residential streets thus transferring the problem without addressing the issue.
5. It is not a requirement for staff to seek formal approval from the Board prior to initiating consultation, but staff believed that a workshop presenting the findings of the investigation would help and inform the Board of the issue. A workshop was held on 29 September 2009. The Board further requested a seminar which was held on 6 October 2009. Following this seminar the Board requested another seminar presenting consultation options which was held on 3 November 2009. Following the second seminar the Board requested that staff prepare a report to the Board presenting the same four consultation options to assist the Board to vote formally on a preferred option (see **Attachment 2**).
6. The Riccarton Area Parking Plan: Proposed Consultation Options Report was presented to the Board at its meeting of the 15 December 2009. The Board resolved to:
 - (a) *Not adopt the staff recommendation.*
 - (b) *Approve Option 4 for consultation which includes the status quo for the north side and the "Balanced Approach" as it applies to parking options on the south side of Riccarton Road.*
 - (c) *Request staff to report back on a preferred plan for parking in central Riccarton taking into account the consultation feedback.*
7. Staff prepared the Option 4 plan, as directed by the Board, for consultation and delivered it, along with consultation feedback documents within the approved consultation area on the week beginning 8 February 2010, naming it the "Riccarton Area Proposed Parking Plan".
8. The "Riccarton Area Proposed Parking Plan" will not change:
 - (a) Any existing parking restriction north of Riccarton Road.
 - (b) Any existing time restricted parking restriction south of Riccarton Road.

12 Cont'd

9. As part of the Riccarton Area Proposed Parking Plan, No Stopping restrictions are recommended around the corners at intersections where they currently do not exist. For some other intersections it is proposed to lengthen existing no stopping Restrictions to provide increased sight lines with the aim of improving safety.
10. P120 parking (maximum two hour parking) restrictions are proposed for one side of all eight streets named in paragraph 1. On the longer of the streets, the P120 restriction will alternate from side to side. By leaving portions of each street unrestricted, the all day commuter parking issue will be dispersed throughout the identified parking plan area south of Riccarton Road, rather than being transferred completely into other residential streets. Some commuters may take this opportunity to switch to public transport as an alternate to using their private motor vehicles to travel to work.
11. Some outlying streets within the area covered by the Riccarton Area Parking Plan, such as George and Burdale Streets may not be currently affected by all day commuter parking. However, George and Burdale Streets will be affected by the controlled dispersal of the all day commuter parking from streets closer to the retail area which is experiencing all day commuter parking issues when P120 restrictions are installed in these streets.
12. The Proposed Riccarton Area Parking Plan provides some day time kerb side parking for residents living in central Riccarton in streets, which are currently completely parked out every day by people working at the Westfield Mall and adjoining retail areas. The availability of day time kerbside parking, on any given day will be provided to residents, visitors or tradespersons returning to, or visiting an address within the Riccarton Area Parking Plan area. These people will be able to park at least across the road from the property they intend to visit and in half of every street they will be able to park directly outside the property.
13. Because Westfield Mall Riccarton operates seven days a week, the proposed time limited parking restrictions will operate Monday through Sunday from 8.00am to 6.00pm. A resident returning home at 4.00pm will be able to park their vehicle on the P120 restriction and will not have to move it until 10.00am the next day.
14. P10 parking (maximum 10 minute parking) restrictions are proposed for the two dairies at the intersections of Matipo/Elizabeth Streets and Division/Elizabeth Streets. This will provide short term/turn over parking discouraging customers from parking on no stopping lines.
15. Consultation was undertaken with all residents, property and business owners within the identified distribution area. Approximately 1,976 consultation documents were hand delivered or posted out to property owners/residents with 230 response forms being returned. The property owners/residents north of Riccarton Road overwhelmingly supported the proposal which will maintain the status quo for all streets within the consultation area north of Riccarton Road. The majority of residents from Broadbent, Clarence, Division, Matipo, Peverel and Wainui Streets being south of Riccarton Road also supported the proposal which will install P120 restrictions in their street (See **Attachment 3** for greater detail on consultation).
16. There was neither a clear majority of support nor opposition from the owners/occupiers of George and Burdale Streets. George Street had one more vote opposed than it did in support of the proposed P120 restriction for the street. Burdale Street had two more votes in support of the proposed P120 restriction for its street than it did in opposition. On reading some of the opposition responses from these two streets it was clear that several owners/occupiers may not have understood the affect the proposed Riccarton Area Parking Plan would have on their streets (see paragraph 11).
17. For the above mentioned reason this report proposes the installation of P120 parking restrictions in both George and Burdale Streets, so that these two streets do not have to be revisited once the proposed Riccarton Area Parking Plan is implemented.

12 Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

18. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$10,500.

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

20. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
21. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
22. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

23. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

24. 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?

25. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

26. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003 and Road Safety Strategy 2004.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

27. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

28. Consultation was undertaken with all residents, property and business owners within the identified distribution area. Approximately 1,976 consultation documents were hand delivered or posted out to property owners/residents. There were 230 response forms returned, 160 responses from property owners, 51 responses from tenants and 19 from business owners/employees.
29. The residents north of Riccarton Road overwhelmingly supported the proposal which will maintain the status quo in all streets within the consultation area north of Riccarton Road. The majority of residents from Broadbent, Clarence, Division, Matipo, Peverel and Wainui Streets being south of Riccarton Road also supported the proposal which will install P120 restrictions in their street (see **Attachment 3** for greater detail on consultation).

12 Cont'd

30. There was neither a clear majority of support nor opposition from the owners/tenants of George and Burdale Streets. George Street had one more vote opposed than it did in support of the proposed P120 restriction for the street. Burdale Street had two more votes in support of the proposed P120 restriction for its street than it did in opposition. On reading some of the opposition responses from the two streets it was clear that several owners/residents may not have understood the affect the proposed Riccarton Area Parking Plan would have on their streets (see paragraph 11).
31. After the close of the consultation period it was discovered that the Westfield Riccarton Mall management had not electronically delivered the Riccarton Area Parking consultation documents to the individual business owners within the Westfield Mall. Therefore, it was decided that a further delivery of the Riccarton Area Parking consultation documents, to all 200 shops within Westfield Riccarton Mall be undertaken. These were delivered on 5 March 2010, giving mall staff until the 15 March 2010 to respond. However, even with this additional delivery, response from mall business was low. (See **Attachment 4**).
32. The Officer in Charge of parking supports the proposal.
33. The two residents associations located within the consultation area support the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board:

Approve the Riccarton Area Parking Plan as outlined below in the following 143 resolutions.

Burdale Street

- (a) Approve the following on Burdale Street:
 - (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Burdale Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of nine metres.
 - (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Burdale Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of six metres.
 - (iii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the north side of Burdale Street commencing at a point six metres east of its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 175 metres.

Clarence Street

- (a) Revoke the following on Clarence Street:
 - (i) That all existing parking restrictions on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction to its intersection with Peverel Street be revoked.
 - (ii) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 14 metres be revoked.
 - (iii) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the west side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 14 metres be revoked.

12 Cont'd

- (iv) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the west side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 15 metres be revoked.
- (b) Approve the following on Clarence Street:
 - (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
 - (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
 - (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
 - (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 12 metres.
 - (v) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at a point 12 metres north of its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 87 metres.
 - (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Burdale Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 10 metres.
 - (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Burdale Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 11 metres.
 - (viii) That a bus stop be installed on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at a point 47 metres north of its intersection with Burdale Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 12 metres.
 - (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
 - (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 13 metres.
 - (xi) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the east side of Clarence Street commencing at a point 13 metres north of its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 65 metres.
 - (xii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 12 metres.
 - (xiii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Clarence Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 13 metres.

12 Cont'd

- (xiv) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the west side of Clarence Street commencing at a point 13 metres south of its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 101 metres.

Elizabeth Street

- (a) Revoke the following on Elizabeth Street:
 - (i) That all existing parking restrictions on both sides of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in a westerly direction to its intersection with Wainui Street be revoked.
- (b) Approve the following on Elizabeth Street:
 - (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
 - (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
 - (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Division Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of six metres.
 - (iv) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 10 minutes on the north side of Elizabeth Street commencing at a point six metres east of its intersection with Division Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 12 metres.
 - (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Division Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of nine metres.
 - (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Division Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 12 metres.
 - (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Division Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 12 metres.
 - (viii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
 - (ix) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 10 minutes on the north side of Elizabeth Street commencing at a point 14 metres east of its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of five metres.
 - (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 16 metres.

12 Cont'd

- (xi) That a "loading zone" restricted to a maximum period of five minutes" be installed on the south side of Elizabeth Street commencing at a point 41 metres east of its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 19 metres.
- (xii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
- (xiii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Elizabeth Street commencing at its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.

Division Street

(a) Revoke the following on Division Street:

- (i) That all existing parking restrictions on the east and west sides of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction to its intersection with Peverel Street be revoked.
- (ii) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the east side of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 15 metres be revoked.
- (iii) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the west side of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of nine metres be revoked.

(b) Approve the following on Division Street:

- (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of nine metres.
- (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 13 metres.
- (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 11 metres.
- (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of eight metres.
- (v) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the east side of Division Street commencing at a point eight metres north of its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 110 metres.
- (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of eight metres.
- (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 21 metres.

12 Cont'd

- (viii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of nine metres.
- (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Division Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 11 metres.
- (x) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the west side of Division Street commencing at a point 11 metres south of its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 94 metres.

Broadbent Street

- (a) Approve the following on Broadbent Street:
 - (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Broadbent Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 10 metres.
 - (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Broadbent Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of eight metres.
 - (iii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the west side of Broadbent Street and the hammer head turning area at the southern end of the street, commencing at a point eight metres south of its intersection with Peverel Street and extending initially in an southerly direction then turning around the hammer head to the west, south, east and back to the north for a total distance of 229 metres.

Matipo Street

- (a) Revoke the following on Matipo Street:
 - (i) That all existing parking restrictions on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction to its intersection with Maxwell Street be revoked.
 - (ii) That all existing parking restrictions on the west side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction to its intersection with Peverel Street be revoked.
 - (iii) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 18 metres be revoked.
 - (iv) That the bus stop currently located on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at a point 18 metres south of its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 15 metres be revoked.
 - (v) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the west side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 13 metres be revoked.
 - (vi) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the west side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 20 metres be revoked.

12 Cont'd

- (b) Approve the following on Matipo Street:
- (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 18 metres.
 - (ii) That a bus stop be installed on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at a point 18 metres south of its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
 - (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at a point 32 metres south of its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of four metres.
 - (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 13 metres.
 - (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 11 metres.
 - (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
 - (vii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 10 minutes on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at a point 15 metres north of its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 18 metres.
 - (viii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at a point 41 metres north of its intersection with Elizabeth Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 77 metres.
 - (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 20 metres.
 - (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 10 metres.
 - (xi) That a bus stop be installed on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at a point 10 metres north of its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 21 metres.
 - (xii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at a point 31 metres north of its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 56 metres.
 - (xiii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Maxwell Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
 - (xiv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 25 metres.

12 Cont'd

- (xv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
- (xvi) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the west side of Matipo Street commencing at a point 14 metres south of its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 89 metres.
- (xvii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with George Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of nine metres.
- (xviii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Matipo Street commencing at its intersection with George Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 11 metres.

Wainui Street

- (a) Revoke the following on Wainui Street:
 - (i) That all existing parking restrictions on east and west sides of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with George Street and extending in a northerly direction to its intersection with Riccarton road be revoked.
- (b) Approve the following on Wainui Street:
 - (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with George Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 10 metres.
 - (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with George Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of seven metres.
 - (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 19 metres.
 - (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction to its intersection with Maxwell Street.
 - (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with Maxwell Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
 - (vi) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 16 metres north of its intersection with Maxwell Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 44 metres.
 - (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 60 metres north of its intersection with Maxwell Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 18 metres.
 - (viii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 78 metres north of its intersection with Maxwell Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 13 metres.

12 Cont'd

- (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with Dallas Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 24 metres.
- (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with Dallas Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 20 metres.
- (xi) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 20 metres north of its intersection with Dallas Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 10 metres.
- (xii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 30 metres north of its intersection with Dallas Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 30 metres.
- (xiii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 60 metres north of its intersection with Dallas Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 37 metres.
- (xiv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 12 metres.
- (xv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 32 metres.
- (xvi) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the west side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 32 metres south of its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 63 metres.
- (xvii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 95 metres south of its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in an southerly direction for a distance of 32 metres.
- (xviii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the west side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 127 metres south of its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 11 metres.
- (xix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 138 metres south of its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 17 metres.
- (xx) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the west side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 155 metres south of its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 11 metres.
- (xxi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 166 metres south of its intersection with Riccarton Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 91 metres.
- (xxii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 24 metres.
- (xxiii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Wainui Street commencing at its intersection with Peverel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 17 metres.

12 Cont'd

- (xxiv) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the west side of Wainui Street commencing at a point 17 metres south of its intersection with Peverel and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 94 metres.

George Street

- (a) Revoke the following on George Street:
 - (i) That all existing parking restrictions on both sides of George Street commencing at its intersection with Wainui Street and extending in an easterly direction to its intersection with Matipo Street be revoked.
- (b) Approve the following on George Street:
 - (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of George Street commencing at its intersection with Wainui Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of nine metres.
 - (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of George Street commencing at its intersection with Wainui Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of seven metres.
 - (iii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the south side of George Street commencing at a point seven metres east of its intersection with Wainui Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 162 metres.
 - (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of George Street commencing at its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
 - (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of George Street commencing at its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.

Peverel Street

- (a) Revoke the following on Peverel Street:
 - (i) That all existing parking restrictions on the north and south sides of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Wainui Street and extending in an easterly direction to its intersection with Picton Avenue be revoked.
- (b) Approve the following on Peverel Street:
 - (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Wainui Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 18 metres.
 - (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Wainui Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 18 metres.
 - (iii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at a point 18 metres east of its intersection with Wainui Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 160 metres.

12 Cont'd

- (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 13 metres.
- (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 20 metres.
- (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
- (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 21 metres.
- (viii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at a point 21 metres east of its intersection with Matipo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 100 metres.
- (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Broadbent Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of eight metres.
- (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Broadbent Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of seven metres.
- (xi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Division Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 24 metres.
- (xii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Division Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 23 metres.
- (xiii) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at a point 23 metres west of its intersection with Division Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 90 metres.
- (xiv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Division Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 27 metres.
- (xv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Division Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
- (xvi) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at a point 15 metres east of its intersection with Division Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 116 metres.
- (xvii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Rotherham Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of six metres.
- (xviii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Rotherham Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of six metres.

12 Cont'd

- (xix) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at a point six metres east of its intersection with Rotherham Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 84 metres.
- (xx) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 24 metres.
- (xxi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 10 metres.
- (xxii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 25 metres.
- (xxiii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 11 metres.
- (xxiv) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the north side of Peverel Street commencing at a point 11 metres east of its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 71 metres.
- (xxv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at a point 88 metres east of its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 32 metres.
- (xxvi) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the south side of Peverel Street commencing at a point 120 metres east of its intersection with Clarence Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 56 metres.

13. LOCAL GOVERNMENT “KNOW HOW” TRAINING – FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE 101 AND DECISION MAKING WORKSHOPS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
Officer responsible:	Democracy Services Manager
Author:	Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board's approval for interested members to attend Local Government New Zealand “Know How” Training Workshops – Financial Governance 101, to be held in Christchurch on Friday 2 July 2010 and Decision Making Workshop, to be held in Christchurch on Friday 9 July 2010.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Financial Governance 101 course is designed to enhance fiscal knowledge in a way that will enable better financial decisions to be made. The Course consists of a series of workshops and group exercises, during which participants will gain a deeper understanding of:

- council finances;
- how depreciation, capital expenditure and debt servicing work together;
- the relevance of financial information to the planning and Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) process;
- important financial, accounting and asset management concepts and
- balance sheet and financing choices.

Further information is available in **Attachment 1**.

3. The Decision Making Workshop will provide an overview of the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, including the purposes of local government and the role of local authorities. The workshop will incorporate decision-making information that has been developed by the Office of the Auditor General, case law on decision-making requirements, and a range of practical application ideas. The course consists of a series of workshops and group exercises, during which participants will gain a deeper understanding of:

- decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act, and the Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act;
- the Auditor General's principles for good decision-making;
- balancing the political and technical aspects of decision-making;
- decisions which balance short-term and long-term objectives; and
- techniques and processes for making good decisions.

Further information is available in **Attachment 2**,

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The cost of these Local Government workshop is \$350 plus GST per person per course for elected members from member Councils. The Board's 2009/10 training and travel budgets currently have an unallocated budget of \$2,479.

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

5. Yes, provision for elected member training is made in the LTCCP, specifically under the Elected Member Representation activity.

13 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

6. Yes, there are no legal implications.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

7. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

8. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

9. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board give consideration to approving the attendance by interested members at the Local Government New Zealand "Know How" Training Workshops – Financial Governance 101, to be held in Christchurch on Friday 2 July 2010 and Decision Making Workshop, to be held in Christchurch on Friday 9 July 2010.

14. APPROVAL OF THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY BOARD'S SUBMISSIONS ON THE CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL'S DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2010/11 AND ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY GREATER CHRISTCHURCH METRO STRATEGY REVIEW 2006-2012.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The Board decided to develop a submission to the Council's Draft Annual Plan 2010-11 and a submission to the Environment Canterbury Greater Christchurch Metro Strategy Review 2006-2012.

The **attached** submissions were submitted and ratification of that action is requested.

Attachment 1 – Submission to The Council's Draft Annual Plan 2010-11

Attachment 2 – Submission to Environment Canterbury Greater Christchurch Metro Strategy Review 2006-2012.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approve the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board's submissions on the Christchurch City Council's Draft Annual Plan 2010/11 and the Environment Canterbury Greater Christchurch Metro Strategy Review 2006 – 2012 and the action of the Board in forwarding the submissions be confirmed.

15. RICCARTON/WIGRAM COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT – 13 APRIL 2010

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser
Author:	Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the Community Services Committee meeting held on Tuesday 13 April 2010.

The meeting was attended by Beth Dunn (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen and Pete Laloli.

Apologies for absence was received and accepted from Judy Kirk, Mike Mora and Bob Shearing.

1. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

Nil.

2. PETITIONS

Nil.

3. BRIEFINGS

Nil.

4. APPLICATION TO THE RICCARTON/WIGRAM 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – ASHLEIGH LAVINIA O'NEILL

The Committee considered a report seeking funding from the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Youth Development scheme for Ashleigh Lavinia O'Neill to attend the Pacific Rim Rhythmic Gymnastics Championships in Melbourne.

The Committee's decision on this matter is recorded under clause 5 of this report.

5. COMMITTEE DECISION

5.1 Application to the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme – Ashleigh Lavinia O'Neill

The Committee **resolved** to support the funding application of Ashleigh Lavinia O'Neill and allocate \$500 as a contribution towards the costs of competing at the Pacific Rim Rhythmic Gymnastics Championships in Melbourne from the Riccarton/Wigram 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme.

6. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

The Committee **resolved** that the resolution set out on page 8 of the agenda be adopted.

The meeting concluded at 5.10pm.

16. **RICCARTON/WIGRAM TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE COMMITTEE REPORT –
19 APRIL 2010**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Regulation and Democracy Services
Officer responsible:	Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser
Author:	Liz Beaven, Community Board Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to submit the outcomes of the Transport and Greenspace Committee meeting held on Monday 19 April 2010.

The meeting was attended by Mike Mora (Chairperson), Helen Broughton, Jimmy Chen, Peter Laloli and Bob Shearing.

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Beth Dunn and Judy Kirk.

1. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

Nil.

2. CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence was **received** from:

- 2.1 **Riccarton Park Residents' Association** - A copy of a letter from the Association, dated 5 April 2010, to the Transport and Greenspace Unit questioning the Council's stance on not relocating a bus stop in Buchanans Road. The Committee requested staff to organise an on-site visit with the Riccarton Park Residents' Association to discuss the Association's concerns about the bus stop in Buchanans Road.
- 2.2 **Wigram Residents' Association** - A letter outlining the Association's concerns on the volume and speed of traffic on Springs Road and the request to the Council to consider erecting a larger 50km per hour speed sign on Springs Road.

The Committee requested a report on the issues raised by the Wigram Park Residents' Association in their letter dated 15 March 2010.

3. BRIEFINGS

- 3.1 Will Doughty, Manager Project Management Unit updated the Committee on the Southern Motorway Project.
- 3.2 Tara Smith, Consultation Leader – Greenspace, discussed with the Committee a project regarding the proposal for a mural within Mandeville Reserve.

The Committee **agreed** that a meeting between the Deans Avenue, Riccarton Bush/Kilmarnock, and Central Riccarton Residents' Associations with the Committee be held to discuss the format of the planned mural for Mandeville Reserve.

16 Cont'd

4. **MONA VALE AVENUE AND MATAI STREET EAST – PROPOSED NIGHT TIME NO STOPPING RESTRICTIONS**

The Committee considered a report requesting the approval of Night Time No Stopping restrictions on the western side of Mona Vale Avenue and on Matai Street East to operate from 11pm to 5am each day.

The Committee's recommendation on this matter is recorded under clause 6 of this report.

5. **ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

5.1 **Council Vehicle Entrances Policy Review** - The Committee **requested** staff advice on the progress of the review of the Council's Vehicle Entrance Policy. The Committee **agreed** that the matter of the review of the Policy be noted in the Board's submission on the Council's Draft Annual Plan 2010/11.

6. **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1 **Mona Vale Avenue and Matai Street East – Proposed Night Time No Stopping Restrictions**

The Committee **recommended** that the report lie on the table until the Committee's questions on the proposed parking restrictions have been answered.

The Committee recommended that the current parking restriction during the daytime remain unchanged in principle.

The meeting concluded at 10.50am.

17. **COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
18. **ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
19. **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
20. **RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**
(See attachment 1).