

**LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

**TUESDAY 13 DECEMBER 2011
AT 1.30PM**

**IN THE TOP CLUB,
23 DUBLIN STREET, LYTTELTON**

Community Board: Paula Smith (Chairperson), Jeremy Agar (Deputy Chairperson), Ann Jolliffe, Claudia Reid, Adrian Te Patu and Andrew Turner

Community Board Adviser

Liz Carter

Telephone: 941 5682

Fax: (03) 304-7731

Email: liz.carter@ccc.govt.nz

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

KARAKIA

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES**
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 29 NOVEMBER 2011**
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
 - 3.1 Lyttelton Port Company**
- PART B 4. CORRESPONDENCE**
- PART B 5. PETITIONS**
- PART B 6. NOTICES OF MOTION**
- PART B 7. MINUTES OF LYTTELTON HARBOUR/WHAKARAUPU ISSUES GROUP – 15 NOVEMBER 2011**
- PART C 8. LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD – 2011/12 RECESS COMMITTEE**
- PART C 9. LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD – 2012 MEETING DATES**
- PART C 10. SPARC RURAL TRAVEL FUND FOR BANKS PENINSULA**

13. 12. 2011

- PART C 11. GOVERNORS BAY – SCHOOL PARKING IMPROVEMENTS**
- PART B 12. CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT – LYTTELTON URBAN DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
- PART B 13. BRIEFINGS**
- PART B 14. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER’S UPDATE**
 - 14.1 Board Funding Balances**
 - 14.2 Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority Correspondence**
 - 14.3 November Update on Local Capital Projects and Alliance Report**
- PART B 15. BOARD MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B 16. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 29 NOVEMBER 2011

The minutes of the Board's meeting of 29 November 2011 will be separately circulated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's meeting held on Tuesday 29 November 2011 be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 LYTTTELTON PORT COMPANY

Staff from the Lyttelton Port Company have been invited to brief the Board on the issue of debris washing up on the beaches around Lyttelton Harbour.

4. CORRESPONDENCE

5. PETITIONS

6. NOTICES OF MOTION

7. MINUTES OF LYTTTELTON HARBOUR/WHAKARAUPU ISSUES GROUP – 15 NOVEMBER 2011

The minutes of the Lyttelton Harbour/Whakaraupo Issues Group meeting of 15 November 2011 are **attached**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board receive the minutes of the Lyttelton Harbour/Whakaraupo Issues Group meeting held on 15 November 2011.

8. LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD – 2011/12 RECESS COMMITTEE

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to put in place delegation arrangements for the making of any required decisions (including applications for funding) that would otherwise be dealt with by the Board, covering the period following its final scheduled meeting for the year on 13 December 2011 up until the resumption of its ordinary meetings in late January 2012.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In previous years it has been the Board's practice to resolve to provide delegated authority to a Recess Committee comprising the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson (or their nominees) to make any needed decisions on the Board's behalf, during the Christmas/New Year holiday period.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- (a) That a Recess Committee comprising the Board Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson (or their nominees) be authorised to exercise the delegated powers of the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board for the period following its ordinary meeting on 13 December 2011 up until the Board resumes normal business in late January 2012.
- (b) That the application of any such delegation be reported back to the Board for record purposes.

9. LYTTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD – 2012 MEETING DATES

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To seek the adoption by the Board of its ordinary meeting dates from January to December 2012 inclusive.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. So that the business of the Board can be conducted in an orderly manner, and to allow public notification to be given of those meetings in compliance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, it is necessary that the Board adopt a schedule of ordinary meetings for 2012.
3. The dates proposed assume that meetings of the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board will generally continue to be held on the first and third Tuesdays of each month commencing at 1.30pm. The practice of having a Board Seminar immediately following the first of the Board's monthly meetings is also proposed to continue. The venue for the holding of all ordinary meetings is the Meeting Room in the Lyttelton Recreation Centre, 25 Winchester Street in Lyttelton.
4. The Board will recall that week three of each calendar month is assigned as 'community week' for Councillors where, as far as possible, Council meetings are not generally scheduled during that week so that Councillors have the opportunity to be active in the community in their representation role, including for community board business and activities. By agreeing to the dates for its 2012 meetings, the Board will contribute to week three again being utilised as a 'community week'.
5. At the time of writing this report the Council had not yet adopted its own schedule for 2012 meetings. If there are any developments relating to that schedule that could have an impact on this Board's schedule, the Board will be advised prior to consideration of this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

6. Yes, provision is made in the 2009-19 LTCCP on pages 154 to 159, for elected member representation and governance.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

7. Yes, in respect of Schedule 7, clause 19 of the Local Government Act 2002, community boards may adopt a schedule of ordinary meetings that are also required to be publicly notified in accordance with section 46 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

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?

8. Yes, pages 156 to 159 of the LTCCP refers regarding levels of service for democracy and governance.

9 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

9. Not applicable.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

10. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board consider adopting a schedule of ordinary meeting dates for 2012 to be held at 1.30pm in the Meeting Room in the Lyttelton Recreation Centre, 25 Winchester Street in Lyttelton, as follows:

Tuesday 31 January 2012
Tuesday 14 February 2012
Tuesday 28 February 2012
Tuesday 13 March 2012
Tuesday 3 April 2012
Tuesday 17 April 2012
Tuesday 1 May 2012
Tuesday 15 May 2012
Tuesday 29 May 2012
Tuesday 19 June 2012
Tuesday 3 July 2012
Tuesday 17 July 2012
Tuesday 31 July 2012
Tuesday 14 August 2012
Tuesday 4 September 2012
Tuesday 18 September 2012
Tuesday 2 October 2012
Tuesday 16 October 2012
Tuesday 30 October 2012
Tuesday 13 November 2012
Tuesday 27 November 2012
Tuesday 18 December 2012

10. SPARC RURAL TRAVEL FUND FOR BANKS PENINSULA

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Support , Ph 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Recreation and Sport
Author:	Maggie Button Community Activities Officer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To allocate within the Banks Peninsula area the funds from 2011/12 SPARC Rural Travel Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. SPARC Rural Travel Funds are provided to encourage participation in sport by young people living in rural communities. It is open to rural sports clubs and rural school teams in areas that have less than ten people per square kilometre. The fund is for young people aged between five and 19 years who require subsidies to assist with transport expenses to local sporting competitions. The fund is not available for travelling to regional or national events. A school club team is defined as one participating in regular local sport competitions in weekends, excluding inter-school and intra-school competitions during school time. A sports club is defined as participating in organised, regular sport competition through membership outside school time. 'Local' for Banks Peninsula young people means travelling to other sub-unions such as Ellesmere, Waihora, Lincoln and further afield to participate in regular competitions. **See attachment 1**
3. For the 2011/12 funding round SPARC have allocated \$9,500.00 (excluding GST) for the Banks Peninsula area. Lyttelton and Governors Bay, which have more than ten people per square kilometre, are not included.
4. Last year was to have been the last year that SPARC was going to allocate the grant to Christchurch City Council, but in the light of the earthquakes it has funded the Council for one more year and allowed the Council this year to be more flexible in the allocation of funds. The Council opened the allocation to schools that may have to travel further for sport and recreation due to earthquake damage, but received no applications.
5. In October 2011 two advertisements were placed in the in the Akaroa Mail. The total cost of advertising was \$614.00. All past applicants and schools have been emailed the funding application guidelines and prominent leaders in the community have promoted the opportunity to sporting associations.
6. The closing date of grant applications was 5 November 2011.
7. Last year four organisations applied for and received funds. **See attachment 2.** All the organisations have returned their accountability reports.
8. This year four applications have been received. One each from Diamond Harbour Rugby Football Club, Banks Peninsula Rugby Football Club, Banks Peninsula Cricket Sub-Association and the Tai Tapu Netball Club. The Tai Tapu Netball Club has applied only for the 19 girls who reside in Banks Peninsula.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The total amount available to distribute is \$9,181. This is the balance left from the \$295 carried forward from last year less the advertising costs. The total amount of funds requested this year is \$14,281.

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

10. Yes, the funding has been provided to Christchurch City Council from SPARC and is aligned to The Council's community grants scheme on page 187: "*community grants made on behalf of other organisations.*"

10 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. The Lyttelton/Mt Herbert and Akaroa/Wairewa Community Boards have joint authority to allocate the annual SPARC Rural Travel fund for Banks Peninsula.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. This funding assists the Council to meet the community outcomes under Recreation on page 56 of the 2009-2019 LTCCP: - *"More people participate in physical and sporting activities."*

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

13. Yes, as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. The applications align with the Physical Recreation & Sport Strategy 2002, objective 4.1: *"Sports clubs and associations are meeting the needs of the public"*.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. Not applicable

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board approves the staff recommendations contained in the Application Matrix 2011/12. **See attachment 3.**

11. GOVERNORS BAY - SCHOOL PARKING IMPROVEMENTS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Transport & Greenspace
Author:	Mark Millar, Senior Traffic Engineer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board to consider a staff recommendation regarding parking improvements at Governors Bay School, following a deputation from the Governors Bay Community Association to the Community Board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Concerns had been raised regarding safety around the Governors Bay School following a crash involving a vehicle reversing out of the angled parking and striking a school child. The concerns included a lack of footpath on the northern side of Jetty Road/Cresswell Ave, visibility of children, children walking on the road behind vehicles parked in the angled parking, and the locations children were crossing the road.
3. Following a number of meetings and discussions with the Governors Bay Community Association, in conjunction with Governors Bay School and various community representatives, three staged options were developed to address safety issues surrounding the school and the immediate area for school students and the general community. These options all had components for the Community Association, Governors Bay School and the Council to address collectively.
4. The Community Association adopted the three staged options approach to resolving the issues of concern and option one, the first stage, was completed in 2010. This also involved buy-in from the community and school in relation to education of road users, parents and students using the area.
5. Funding is now available within the Minor Safety Budget to complete option two, the second stage to resolving the concerns. This involves the installation of new kerb and channel, footpath and parking layout as shown in **Attachment 1**. These proposed works will:
 - help to formalise access points to and from the school,
 - provide a footpath on the north side of Cresswell Avenue and part of Jetty Road to link the Reserve to the school,
 - provide a safer crossing point on the corner of Jetty Road,
 - establish a new layout of parking by changing angled parking to parallel parking opposite the school and providing parking spaces further west along Jetty Road up to the intersection with Main Road.
6. It is intended to carry out construction of these proposed works without first carrying out a full field survey and design process, as essentially the kerb and channel will be constructed to tie into the existing carriageway seal levels. The parallel parking layout can be better defined and appropriately placed once the kerb and channel is constructed, as can any parking restrictions (no stopping) as shown on **Attachment 1**. Once established in conjunction with the final parking layout, the actual measurements can be included in resolutions within a further report to confirm these.
7. Due to the nature of the intersection of Jetty Road with Main Road, vertical and horizontal alignments and the wide open area without pavement markings, it is proposed to install a "Give Way" intersection control as part of the proposed works.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The estimated cost for this proposal is \$65,000. This will be funded from Minor Safety funding.

11 Cont'd

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

9. The installation of kerb and channel, footpaths, road marking and signs is within the LTCCP Streets and Transport Operational Budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

13. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

14. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community Outcomes-Safety and Community.

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

15. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

16. The recommendations align with Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, Pedestrian Strategy 2001, Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

17. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. As all the proposed works are safety related, it is not proposed to carry out consultation within the community. However, it is noted that these works were generated and proposed following extensive input from the Governors Bay Community Association, Governors Bay School and the Council's Senior Traffic Engineer – Community for this area via publicly invited and attended meetings. Further discussions will be held with property owners, with frontages where the proposed works are to occur, to cover construction detail.
19. The Officer in Charge - Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board:

- (a) Approve construction of the proposed works this financial year using Minor Safety Budget.

11 Cont'd

- (b) Approve the parking layout and parking restrictions on the basis of those shown on **Attachment 1** with the condition that a further report be completed to confirm the final layout and parking resolution with accurate and actual measurements for Board approval.
- (c) Approve the installation of a "Give Way" intersection control at the intersection of Jetty Road with Main Road in Governors Bay.

12. CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT – LYTTTELTON URBAN DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The purpose of this report is to provide background information to enable the Board to decide how and when to proceed with the Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee

In April 2011, the Board's consultation with the Lyttelton community about earthquake recovery highlighted a high level of community interest and concern about urban design matters. *"A plan for the renewal of Lyttelton Town Centre developed with genuine community participation, and incorporating many of the suggestions made"* was a key recommendation in the Lyttelton Community Recovery Plan, and *"Establishment of a Lyttelton Design and Advisory Committee to review resource consent applications"* was also recommended to support heritage and town character and associated economic recovery (Pages 13 and 19, Lyttelton Community Recovery Plan)

The idea for a Lyttelton Design and Advisory Committee was based on the long-standing Akaroa Design and Appearance Advisory Committee which is a formally established committee of the Akaroa-Wairewa Community Board. It is made up of community members, Board members and professional advisers (consultants). The Committee meets monthly, and the meetings are advertised and open to the public. The Committee is supported by the Community Board Adviser, the Secretarial Services Officer and a Council planner. The consultants who provide advice to the committee can claim for the time spent attending the meeting at a rate of \$150 per meeting plus mileage expenses.

Resource consent applications for new buildings (and significant alterations to existing buildings) are referred to the committee which considers the design and appearance aspects of the proposal in terms of the Akaroa Design Guidelines. It also considers such matters as effects on the streetscape and how well the proposal fits with the town's character. Amendments are often suggested to the applicant(s). While there is no compulsion for the applicant to follow the committee's recommendations and amend the proposed design, planning staff do take account of the Committee's comments when considering the resource consent application. Consent applications with Design and Appearance Advisory Committee approval generally move through the consent process more smoothly, are more likely to be approved, and with fewer conditions. There are benefits for the applicant.

Earlier in 2011 Board members were briefed by staff planner Kent Wilson with information about both the Akaroa committee and the Christchurch Urban Design Panel which considers resource consent applications in the central city. The Board considered the pros and cons of each model and reached a consensus that the Akaroa model was best suited to Lyttelton because of:

- Its greater level of community involvement,
- Its ability to blend detailed local knowledge with design expertise,
- Its transparent processes and
- A greater degree of community ownership and autonomy.

The Board concluded that over time greater local involvement is likely to result in a town character which is a closer expression of local cultural values and the finer details of the underlying environment.

Draft Lyttelton Master Plan

The Lyttelton Community Recovery Plan has been widely circulated and was apparently well received by Council's elected members. It was used by consultants and staff as a starting point for the Lyttelton Master Plan process. Early internal drafts of the master plan picked up on the Board's recommendation, incorporating as action:

B3 Lyttelton Design and Advisory Panel to *"Consider the establishment of a local design advisory panel or other pre-application assessment/advice mechanisms to give input on town centre development. Within the community there is a body of local independent built environment professionals who can help ensure high quality development that is appropriate for the context and is aligned with the objectives of this vision"* (Draft 29/7/2011 Page 23).

12 Cont'd

However in the draft which went to Christchurch City Council for approval on 27 October, and which has been released for public comment action B3 was changed to:

B3 Inclusion of local involvement in the existing Urban Design Panel with the comment *“Provide for the inclusion of appropriately qualified local design professionals in the already established Christchurch Urban Design Panel to provide local input into town centre redevelopment and rebuilding, preferably at the pre-application assessment and advice stage. This does not preclude a design advisory panel being established by the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board.”*

While the amended action B3 may “not preclude” the Board establishing a committee having both would probably create a pointless replication, and yet another step in the process for consent applicants.

Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee

Establishment of the Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee is considered to be a recovery matter by the Board which sees it as important the committee is up and running before the rebuild starts in earnest, especially in the commercial area. While there have been a number of applications for temporary activities, no resource consent applications for new commercial buildings in Lyttelton have been lodged (elected members intranet resource consent lists as at 13 November 2011) This may be because of insurance issues or could be because owners of commercial properties are waiting for rules in the district plan to change before submitting applications. Once these hurdles are overcome it is expected applications will be lodged with increasing frequency.

At its meeting on 18 October 2011 the Board agreed *“to establish a Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee comprised of three consultants, two community representatives, one Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board member and the chairperson of the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board as ex officio member.”*

It was also agreed the Board would seek registrations of interest from suitably qualified people who may wish to be members of the committee.

Resourcing the Committees

The Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee needs to be resourced in three ways:

- (a) Staff support for meeting administration and advice,
- (b) Planning staff to prepare reports and attend meetings,
- (c) Funding for the remuneration of independent professional advisers.

Other Community Boards have committees which are supported by Democracy Services staff. These include Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board which has two committees (Community Finance and Planning Committee and Works Traffic and Environment Committee), Riccarton/Wigram Community Board which has three (Community Services Committee, Transport and Greenspace Committee and Regulatory and Planning Committee) as well as the Akaroa/Wairewa Community Board's Akaroa Design and Advisory Committee and Akaroa Museum Advisory Committee. All of these Community Board committees are also provided with technical staff reports and advice.

We might expect these two aspects of the resourcing required for the Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee would be met by the Council, though this is not yet clear. However there is still the question of remuneration for the independent consultants on the committee.

The Board's initial plan was to advertise for registrations of interest making it clear that professional involvement would need to be on a pro bono basis, at least to begin with. During informal discussions with the Mayor, Chief Executive and Councillors on 10 November when the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board's 18 October minutes were considered by Council, it was made clear there is unlikely to be funding to pay design professionals on the Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee.

The Board now needs to consider whether there is a risk the lack of payment would limit the pool of people from which it can select committee members (and a possible consequential effect on the quality of the professional advice provided to the committee), and if so, whether it may need to consider using its Discretionary Response Fund to pay the consultants or look outside the council to other funding sources.

12 Cont'd

At its meeting on 24 November, Christchurch City Council considered a report on the Urban Design Panel which signalled a review of *“the number, composition, or scope of panels that may arise as a result of the Central City Plan and Suburban Masterplanning exercises.”* A more comprehensive report is in preparation. *“It is considered more appropriate that this more holistic report be considered in the New Year once the Minister's decision on the Central City Plan is known and once consultation has been completed on at least the first four Suburban Masterplans.”* (Item 25, p293, CCC agenda 24 November 2011, clause 1).

Staff recommended an expansion of the available pool of panellists from 18 to 24, and an increase in the rate paid to consultants serving on the Urban Design Panel from \$150/hour to \$180/hour.” It was *“expected these costs can be met within existing operational budgets”* (clause 10).

At this new rate the full cost of independent professional advice to the Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee is likely to be of the order of \$12,000 per year:

$$3 \text{ consultants} \times 2 \text{ hours each per month} \times 11 \text{ months} \times \$180 = \$11,880$$

How to proceed?

The Board now needs to consider if, when and how it wishes to proceed. Options include:

- (a) Do nothing.
- (b) Wait until the submissions on the draft Lyttelton Master Plan have closed and see what submissions say on the matter, then decide whether to proceed with the Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee early in the new year.
- (c) Wait until the more comprehensive Council staff report on the Urban Design Panel and other panels which may arise as a result of the four suburban master plans is available about June next year and then decide whether to proceed with the Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee.
- (d) Proceed with getting the Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee up and running as soon as practicable, then review its value and operations at the time of the Council review report expected about June next year.

If the Board favours option (d) members may wish to consider the draft terms of reference as **attached**.

13. BRIEFINGS

14. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISERS UPDATE

14.1 BOARD FUNDING BALANCES – 2011/12 FINANCIAL YEAR

A copy of the Board's funding balances as at 30 November 2011 is **attached** for members' information.

The Council resolved at its 10 November meeting to distribute the remaining Metropolitan Small Grants Fund 2011/12 (\$98,621), on a pro rata basis, amongst the eight Community Boards to distribute via their Discretionary Funds. The Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Board received \$3,793.06 as its share of this, which has been added to the monies available for allocation in its Discretionary Response Fund.

14.2 CANTERBURY EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY AUTHORITY CORRESPONDENCE

Attached for members information is a letter from the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority acknowledging comments made by the Board on the Draft Recovery Strategy for Greater Christchurch.

14.3 NOVEMBER UPDATE ON LOCAL CAPITAL PROJECTS AND STRONGER CHRISTCHURCH INFRASTRUCTURE REBUILD TEAM UPDATE

The November Update on Local Capital Projects is attached (**Attachment 1**) for members information, along with an update from the Stronger Christchurch Infrastructure Rebuild Team (SCIRT), which is attached separately (**Attachment 2**).

13. 12. 2011

15. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

16. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS