

## 11. BROWNLEE RESERVE CONCEPT PLAN

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Walter Fielding-Cotterell, City Arborist, DDI 941-8630 Chris Freeman, Senior Parks and Waterways Planner, DDI 941-8638 Dennis Preston, Design Leader Landscape, DDI 941-8728

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval of the amended development concept plan for Brownlee Reserve, including the felling of some trees. Council approval is also sought to accept an offer of tree felling and replacement planting from Globe Holdings (at their cost) and also spend reserve contribution funds from their adjacent subdivision on implementing the approved development concept plan for Brownlee Reserve.

### INTRODUCTION

2. At its meeting on 9 February 2005, the Board heard a deputation from Globe Holdings Ltd, regarding their proposed Clifton Heights residential development. Globe Holdings Ltd requested that 51 trees in a portion of the adjoining Brownlee Reserve be removed and replanted. They also offered to pay for the cost of the felling and replanting. They believe the trees represent a potential threat to the proposed development for three main reasons - safety, shading and aesthetics and are prepared to meet the cost of the removal of the trees and the replanting of the area.

No current development concept plan existed for Brownlee Reserve. The Greenspace Unit therefore prepared a concept development plan for the whole reserve so the application could be considered as part of an overall plan. The draft plan was distributed to over 300 local households and stakeholders and feedback invited in March 2005. 108 submissions were received in response to the Brownlee Reserve concept plan. The majority of submissions received supported some pine tree removal and native replanting and further enhancements on Brownlee Reserve.

The Hagley Ferrymead Community Board considered this draft plan, public submissions and Globe Holding's application on 23 March 2005. The Board resolved to decline the application from Globe Holdings Ltd as presented but that a management plan for Brownlee Reserve be prepared for the staging of any future work and/or enhancement and that the plan be developed in liaison with local residents' groups and Globe Holdings Ltd.

Brownlee Reserve is not a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 but administered under the Local Government Act. The Board's resolution to prepare a management plan for the reserve was therefore implemented by continuing the Development Concept Plan process already underway. Given the nature of the issues of planting, tracks, entrances etc a landscape or development concept plan was considered to be the best type of plan to guide future management of the reserve. Management plans are normally used for large complex reserves such as Hagley Park, where a range of recreational uses exist and require policy guidance. Brownlee Reserve was also not a priority area to prepare a management plan.

The 108 submissions already received and the first draft plan were retained as a starting point and further dialogue was initiated with local residents and Globe Holdings Ltd over the plan and possible staging. An onsite meeting was held on the 15 May and the plan was also discussed at the Clifton Neighbourhood Committee (Inc) meeting on 31 May.

After a thorough assessment of the community consultations and the technical assessments gathered a second draft Development Concept Plan was prepared. A revised draft plan with a reduced number of trees to be felled (from the first draft) and a staged development/replanting programme for the reserve was prepared. The second draft Development Concept Plan for Brownlee Reserve was advertised for comments until Friday 8 July, but subsequently extended until the end of August because the revised plan did not clearly show the trees to be felled. The comments made in the submissions have been collated and summarised later in the report.

## SUMMARY

3. The request by Globe Holdings was received in February, extensive consultation has occurred over the last six months. The first round provided 108 submissions the second 59 and the extended submission period with the trees more clearly identified produced one more submission. All rounds of submissions provide a clear majority of support for the development plan for Brownlee Reserve. While submissions range from “does not present proper or adequate due process” to “get on with it,” the vast majority (52/59) are happy with the revision of the plan and see it as a compromise both retaining the majority of trees and planting new trees and shrubs.

The plan’s objectives for amenity value, vegetation, safety, access and recreational facilities are supported however any future landscape work must maintain the rural, untamed, adventurous, natural and sheltered character of the reserve. A conservative approach to changing Brownlee Reserve’s character is called for.

Trees around the reserve’s boundaries are now and have been an issue for many neighbours to the reserve in the past (not just the current developers). Sunlight, views and nuisance are common issues where residences exist already and any development on the neighbouring site will eventually involve the same issues of nuisance.

Support exists for better paths (currently slippery), safer entrances and better road access for pedestrians. The Clifton/Panorama intersection is not considered safe and could be improved by the Council and maybe also Globe. The Transport and City Streets Unit have been asked to investigate both traffic speed and intersection safety on Clifton Terrace.

The offer from Globe Investments to pay for some replanting is viewed as “self serving” by some and a “win win” by others. The majority opt for a balanced approach providing both a “good neighbour” approach to tree issues for the whole park but ensuring the essential character of the pine plantation with its natural “untamed” state is conserved now and by proposed planting. Some loss of views and sun by neighbours is however reasonable given the reserve’s existing character. Many are concerned by the recent loss of large mature trees on the old Richmond Hill Golf Course.

Native planting is supported by many for the benefits to native ecology particularly native birds such as the bellbird. Overall a wide range of preferences exist for replanting with both exotic and native promoted. Given the reserves suburban setting a mixture of both (similar to Nicholson Park) is considered appropriate, lower growing natives and exotics around the boundaries but larger trees inside to ensure the plantation/large tree canopy is maintained in the future.

The current opportunity to replant a small area of the reserve now will reduce the scale and cost of a large scale felling and replanting programme in the future, when the whole stand of similar aged pine trees in Brownlee Reserve begin to die (over say 10 years). This situation is unusual in that the planting is an even aged monoculture and the opportunity to establish some more sustainable planting is therefore supported.

If the subdivision proceeds, the developer will fund the tree removal and replanting proposed in the plan on their boundary from their own funds.

In addition reserve contribution funds which will be owed by Globe Holding’s neighbouring residential development could (if approved by the Council) also be used to fund some of the other reserve enhancements identified on the concept plan.

If the residential development does not proceed the plan will be implemented as funds become available with tree felling and replacement planting funded as funds allow.

## FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

4. No funding has been allocated currently in the LTCCP for development works on Brownlee Reserve. The Brownlee Reserve Development Concept Plan's funding (beyond any Globe Holdings contribution), will have to be considered as a bid for funding under the 2006/16 LTCCP.

Globe Holdings Ltd have offered to fund the majority of the pine tree removal and replanting proposed in the Brownlee Reserve concept plan, if the proposed residential development at 116-118 Clifton Terrace proceeds. The estimated cost of the proposed works to Globe Holdings, as supplied by their landscape architects, is \$98,000. This is offered as a gift and is not proposed to be part of the cash in lieu of reserve contribution.

In addition the development is required to pay a reserve contribution (yet to be calculated) relating to the subdivision of the site under the LTCCP Development Contributions Policy 2004. Additional works (outside of the Globe boundary area) proposed in the Brownlee Reserve plan could be funded from this source, if approved by the Council. Normal subdivision practice is for land and works required as reserve contribution on a site to be funded by the Development Contribution (reserve contribution). While some land and works may be vested as part of the subdivision, the presence of the large Brownlee Reserve on two sides suggests any reserve contribution should be best invested on the existing reserve or taken in cash for wider application in the general locality. Given the nature of reserve contribution mitigating the effects of an increased recreation demand resulting from subdivision investing at least some funds in the immediate locality is considered appropriate.

Brownlee Reserve is held as Recreation Grounds pursuant to section 20 of the Public Works Act 1991 and was gazetted as being vested in the Council as a reserve on 1 October 1987. The provisions in the Reserves Act 1997 Act that deal with the preservation of trees and bush are therefore not applicable to this reserve.

Under the common law of Nuisance the Council would be legally obliged to cut back all parts of the Council trees that encroach or trespass over the park boundary into Globe Holdings site.

Globe Holdings would have the legal right to apply to a District Court for an order under section 129c of the Property Law Act for the removal or trimming trees they consider to be injuriously affecting their land in the following ways stated in the Act:

- (a) Any actual or potential danger to the applicant's life or health or property, or to the life or health of any person residing with the applicant.
- (b) Any undue obstruction of a view that an occupier would otherwise be able to enjoy from the applicant's land or from any building used for residential purposes erected on that land.
- (c) Any other undue interference with the reasonable enjoyment of the applicant's land for residential purposes.

However, it also has to be noted that in dealing with such an application a Court must also consider matters such as "the interests of the general public in the maintenance of an aesthetically pleasing environment" and "the desirability of protecting public reserves containing trees".

## STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board:

- (a) Approve the readvertised and amended Development Concept Plan as requested by the Board and policy recommendations in this report for Brownlee Reserve.
- (b)
  - (i) Note that if the proposed subdivision by Globe Holdings Ltd of land adjoining Brownlee Reserve goes ahead Globe Holdings Ltd has undertaken to pay to the Council upon resource consent being granted the sum of \$98,000 to cover the cost of removing 36 trees generally from the boundary between 116-118 Panorama Road and the Reserve and the replanting of this area as shown in the Development Concept Plan.
  - (ii) Approve the carrying out of the work referred to above.
  - (iii) Note that the payment of \$98,000 by Globe Holdings Ltd is in addition to any reserve contributions required to be paid under the Council's Development Contributions Policy.

- (c) If the funding from Globe Holdings Ltd and Reserve Contribution is not available, approve the Brownlee Reserve Concept Plan for implementation in accordance with the Council's current programme for enhancing reserves.
- (d) Adopt the policy recommendations following the public consultation process.

It is recommended that the Council:

- (e) Approve the expenditure of the reserve contribution funds payable from any subdivision of neighbouring property at 116-118 Clifton Terrace on implementing the Brownlee Reserve Development Concept Plan, excluding (b) above and subject to all work and estimates being approved by the Greenspace Manager.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

## BACKGROUND ON BROWNLEE RESERVE CONCEPT PLAN

5. Globe Holdings Ltd having reviewed their initial request for Board approval to remove 51 trees on Brownlee Reserve, are now seeking Board approval for the removal of just 36 trees. This is a reduction of 15 trees compared with their previous application. Globe Holdings have cited four main reasons for their application:

- Safety - they believe the trees constitute a potential danger to the property;
- Shading - the trees prevent sunlight from a northerly direction from reaching the property and actually overhang the boundary in places;
- Views - to the sea are significantly obstructed by the trees; and
- Aesthetics - there is an overall feeling of the site being oppressed by the close proximity of the trees.

To alleviate the problems, Globe Holdings are prepared to meet the costs of removing the trees and replanting the area.

In response to submissions received from residents living on adjacent properties, it is proposed to remove an additional four pine trees on the western side of the reserve for reasons of safety, shading and suppression of a large gum of superior landscape quality.

There is no previous Council plan for Brownlee Reserve. It is zoned Open Space 1 in the City Plan and is mainly used by walkers and dog walkers with some informal and play opportunities.

The Christchurch City Council Parks Code of Practice 1993 comments on tree nuisances that "All proposals for tree planting on reserves shall take into account the provisions available to adjoining property owners under the common law of nuisance (trees actually encroaching/trespassing over neighbouring land) and Section 129C of the Property Law Amendment Act 1977." That section states that "a Court shall not make an order under this section unless it is satisfied (a) that the tree or structure is causing or is likely to cause loss of or injury or damage to the applicant's life or health or property, or the life or health of any other person residing with the applicant or (b) that the tree or structure is obstructing any view that an occupier of the applicant's land would otherwise be able to enjoy, or is otherwise causing injury or loss to the applicant by diminishing the value of the property or reducing the enjoyment of it for residential purposes-". Section 129c also requires the Court "to have regard to the following matters:

- (a) The interests of the public in the maintenance of an aesthetically pleasing environment;
- (b) The desirability of protecting public reserves containing trees;
- (c) The value of the tree as a public amenity;
- (d) The historical, cultural, or scientific significance (if any) of the tree; and
- (e) The likely effect (if any) of the removal or trimming of the tree on ground stability, the water table, or run-off."

Although the Christchurch City Council Parks Code of Practice 1993 does not comment on the removal of existing trees directly, it does state that when assessing proposals for tree planting on reserves "*Account shall also be taken of possible impacts on adjoining properties arising from shading, loss of views, damage from wind blow debris, and damage to underground and/or overhead services.*"

## TREE CONSIDERATIONS

6. The trees on the reserve and those affected by the Globe Holdings' proposal consist mainly of Monterey Pine (*Pinus radiata*) and several gum species mainly Tasmanian Blue Gum (*Eucalyptus globulus*) Mountain Ash (*E. regnans*) and *Eucalyptus leucoxylon*.

There are a total of 277 live trees on Brownlee Reserve consisting of 193 pines, 80 gums and 4 other species (wattles etc). The current Globe Holdings proposal to remove a total of 36 live trees represents a figure of 13% of all the trees on the reserve.

Most of the pines throughout the reserve are estimated to be about 45 years old and have achieved quite good growth in the exposed conditions, many being about 30 metres in height. At an age of 45 years the pines have reached maturity as can be seen by the reduced growth of the leading shoots and the broadening of their crowns. From a public amenity tree viewpoint however, the pines are not in the over-mature category where the frequency of branch failure and wind-throw dictates that they have reached the stage where they all need to be removed in the interests of public safety or because they no longer make an attractive contribution to the landscape values of the reserve. There are however some pines that do need to be removed because they are suppressed by larger adjacent trees, growing too close together, suffering from die-back or have structural defects. There are a few dead trees (mainly small) throughout the reserve that will have to be removed irrespective of Globe Holdings' application.

With regard to safety, irrespective of their condition, in extreme climatic events pines and other conifers on the hill reserves (and elsewhere in the city) have proved vulnerable to storm damage and wind throw. For this reason, over the past decade the Council has budgeted for and progressively removed pines and other trees growing along boundaries that were considered at risk of falling on to neighbouring land. The felled areas have been replanted with more suitable trees from a safety and sustainable environmental point of view. The pines removed in the triangle of land across the road from the park some years ago, which was followed by replanting, is an example of the work the Council has previously carried out in this respect. Other safety strips have been created along the boundaries of the conifer plantation reserve areas of North and South New Brighton.

In the case of Brownlee Reserve and the proposed development site in question, there are 112 reserve trees (including the 36 that are proposed to be removed with the current plan) that are situated within a distance of 30 metres of the northern and south western boundaries. At heights of up to 30 metres many of these trees would land well within and up to 30 metres inside the boundaries of the development site should they fall in that direction. The possible coverage of the site with up to 10 family dwellings will be of such a high density that should a tree fall towards the site there is an extremely high likelihood of injury to persons and property. In terms of arboricultural hazard evaluation, such a site, because of its constant human occupancy/use would be classified as a high "hazard target" area. Given the sheer number of trees that have the potential to fall onto the property it is reasonable to assume that over a period of time, irrespective of individual tree condition, climatic conditions will prevail that will cause some reserve trees to fall. The removal of the selected trees proposed, while not eliminating the risk entirely, is considered to be a reasonable balance between preserving the existing tree'd character of the reserve and minimising the risk to the future occupiers of the development site.

The problem of the reserve trees shading the development was another of the reasons cited by Globe Holdings for wanting the trees removed. The trees involved are mostly situated on the northern aspect of the site and being evergreen will have a high shading effect on the property. In mid winter when the sun only rises to an angle of 24 degrees at noon, shading of the site will start from about mid morning and remain for the rest of the day.

The removal of the amount of trees requested by the applicant will reduce the wind sheltering effect for the reserve user and the existing properties adjacent to the reserve to some degree. Remaining trees will also receive increased wind forces, particularly from the south west, making them slightly more vulnerable to breakage or wind-throw until they have time to adapt to the changed conditions. Trees near Panorama Road properties adjacent to the north boundary of the reserve need to be considered in this respect. However, as the amount of trees originally proposed to be removed have been reduced and some of the number to be removed are small or have sparse foliage any effect on the remaining trees is likely to be minimal.

The gums are generally smaller trees than the pines and from the extent of die-back and branch breakage, the site conditions have obviously not been favourable for their growth or health. They have not thrived on this site and it is reasonable to assume that their condition is unlikely to improve. There are a few gums that were not identified but given that the plantings on the reserve were not intended to be a botanical collection, they were probably obtained as bulk grown nursery stock and are therefore not of any particular rarity value.

Although retaining the trees close to the proposed development site would screen the development to some degree, with the foliage on the trees generally being above park users' angle of vision, the proposed development would still be quite visible from anywhere in its vicinity.

Some residents have raised questions as to fire risk on the reserve particularly with regard to the gums. In the particular conditions that exist on the reserve, the risk of crown fires occurring in the larger trees is extremely small. For crown fires to take hold requires a good deal of combustible material to be present on the ground. Grass fires occurring naturally pass through quite quickly with relatively little heat radiated, leaving taller trees like gums growing in natural situations, mostly unscathed. Frequent fires in grass or shallow forest litter keep the combustible material at a low level and it is often in areas where there has been human intervention in preventing such fires, that the material on the ground has built up and provided sufficient fuel and heat to cause and sustain major crown fires. Therefore although grass and minor tree litter fires could occur, the conditions on Brownlee Reserve are not such that highly dangerous, uncontrollable crown fires are likely to take place.

Replacement planting is proposed to consist mainly of a mixture of native and exotic plants.

Planting a wider range of species in the park would also ensure that infection by serious, host specific diseases known to affect pines and gums, that have entered the country from time to time, would never result in large scale tree losses and amenity values on the reserve.

In addition to the obvious benefits for the future occupiers of the land to be developed, the proposal before the Board would enable a start to be made in renewing the plantings and redesigning the landscape of the reserve, work that can be continued progressively over the years. This will ensure that the reserve will not be devastated by massed felling or an extreme climatic events at any one future point in time. There would always be well established multi-aged trees and other vegetation present on the reserve as replacements for any trees that need to be removed for any reason.

## **LANDSCAPE CONSIDERATIONS**

7. Brownlee Reserve is an important open space on the Clifton Hill ridgeline it is a prominent feature of the lower Port Hills and for the immediate area particularly from Sumner.

The existing pine trees contribute to the reserves prominence through their size and dark foliage. The pine trees also define some interesting spaces and character within the reserve.

Removal of some of the pines along the south eastern boundary would have an impact, however, most of these trees are below the ridgeline on lower slopes except for a small cluster at the top of the reserve.

The views from the reserve are impressive especially towards the Kaikoura's and Sumner head, unfortunately most of these are no longer visible from the Reserve or walking tracks. Removing some of the trees at the top of the reserve and on the northern face would significantly improve views from the reserve towards the north and east. New seating and some track realignment would then take full advantage of the new vistas.

Any replacement trees should be positioned to help reinforce open spaces between the tree groupings and to maintain the spatial qualities of the reserve. A wider variety of tree species used would also add interest.

Over the years native plantings have become more dominant in the area for both private and public plantings. The Council recently removed pines from a reserve on the corner of Panorama Road and Clifton Terrace and replaced them with native plants. They are now growing well and having an impact.

Proposed native plantings on the lower steeper northern and eastern edges of the reserve would extend the native plantings up from the valley to the reserve. The plantings would also screen rough, difficult to maintain banks and provide a more pleasant margin to the reserve. It is recommended that the new plantings be supplied with an irrigation system that would see the plants through the establishment stages.

The native planting theme could then be expanded further into the reserve as large clumps of plants on the western and southern boundaries, these plantings could be established over time as either under plantings to existing trees or replacement plants as some of the larger pines need to be removed.

The open space at the top of the reserve is well contained by large pine trees. This space should be retained and over time additional tree species introduced to preserve the open space and provide some protection from the prevailing winds.

An existing small quarry has been put to good use as a play area however a lot more could be made of the natural rock outcrops and quarry faces to make it more interesting and unique feature of the reserve.

There are three entrances to the park all in different stages of repair and contribute little to its



A total of 78 (individual or combined) new submissions were received on the second consultation. The majority 62 (80%) again supported the plan with 16 (20%) submissions concerned about aspects or opposing the whole plan. A clearer plan was also sent out and submission date extended until 28 August following concerns being raised by some submitters (one existing submitter provided additional information).

### **General Analysis of Submissions**

As can be expected with the large number of submissions (181) a wide range of views were represented in submissions. With over 700 copies of the plan distributed over the three notification periods it is presumed that many residents either supported the plan or were not sufficiently concerned about it to make a submission.

Overall 80% of submissions on both notifications supported enhancing Brownlee Reserve.

The plan is the first prepared for the Brownlee Reserve to include consideration of a private request. This was reflected in some submitters concerns in relation to the need for any change. While acknowledging this, the Greenspace Unit still considers that regardless of the proposed arrangement to fell trees there exists a need for a plan to guide long term management of Brownlee Reserve.

The existing tree structure relates to its historic private, rural landscape rather than a professional landscape design for a reserve. At 2.4ha the reserve's capital value at residential values would be over \$8 million. A plan to guide its management is considered to be essential.

A number of submitters felt that the plan was only produced to assist the developer. This is not the case. The Greenspace Unit would not have supported or even considered the proposed arrangement with Globe Holdings Ltd if there were not both health and safety and planting sustainability issues with the reserve. It is considered that while not urgent the situation is worthy of attention and the current planning approach is better than a legal debate with an adjoining landowner and a possible court order under 129c of the Property Law Act.

In terms of the second round of submissions 62/81 (70%) supported the plan. While many gave a simple supportive response, some submitters made specific references to their individual priorities.

The nature of the existing planting and its associated nuisance and safety issues was specifically identified by 51% of submitters supporting the felling and planting proposed. The choice and style of proposed replacement planting varied widely in submissions but the majority agreed with the plan's objective to replace a small percentage (13%) of the pine/gum plantation. Strong support exists for utilising native plants in replanting but not exclusively or at the expense of shelter and the reserve's existing woodland character as strong support exists also for exotic trees.

The plan proposes to retain the core of large pine trees and concentrates on replacing trees on the residential and road boundaries, as the best design response to the issues. The new boundary plantings will be mature by the time significant losses occur to the 274 mature pine and gum trees over the next 10-30 years.

Walking is the biggest form of recreation on the reserve and specific support for track work (37%) reflected this. Current paths are steep and slippery in places which are of a particular concern to the elderly and mothers with prams. Again health and safety is of prime concern and the revised plan proposes more gentle grades.

Specific support for improving amenity values was received from 32% of submissions. 33% specifically supported improved recreational facilities with the majority supporting better entrances and walkways with children and youth facilities also promoted.

19 individuals 30% opposed the plan. Two people made multiple submissions raising issues such as "adequate legal due process", "a document with no justifiable basis", "why would the City pay to improve the sunlight of private landowners?" why are the trees to be removed not blatantly visible on the map?. "This round of submissions is based on faulty information on the faulty map and faulty key and therefore void." "I strongly urge all the CCC and Community Board Members to begin this process a new..."

Two other submitters and six additional signatories raised the opposing views that the trees “could be expected to grow for another 70-80 years”, and “if the Council were to take land around the boundary of the development, creating a “safe zone” without removing existing trees”. “The Sumner Redcliffs area is seriously under resourced in terms of gazetted parks and reserves.”

The nine other opposing submissions raised issues of shelter, the “zealous promotion of the developers interest ahead of those of the community” to support for some reserve enhancements but not for “removing trees for park neighbours”.

Traffic safety and concerns over the type of building development on 116-118 Panorama Road are outside the scope of the plan but may be able to be addressed by City Streets and/or Environmental Services Unit when the land use consent is considered for this site.

The following is a summary of issues raised by submissions and some policy recommendations for inclusion in the Brownlee Development Concept Plan.

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>
<b><i>Comments in Support of Plan</i></b>
<p><b>Comments about the developer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent opportunity to gain a win situation for both the developer and the community. We hope the developer is as sympathetic with the architecture as he is with the planting plan.</li> <li>• I would like to acknowledge the positive initiative the developer has made. Although the main reason for the development is to improve the environment close to their private land, I would like to thank the developer for the consultative and constructive approach.</li> <li>• Will the developer be required to select plantings that are suitable to the land form or be responsible for the on going maintenance for those plantings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Communication with public</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An attached copy of the reserves management plan would have been useful in assessing the long term impacts and implications.</li> <li>• Pleased that the neighbourhood is being consulted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Holistic Approach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal just looks at the section adjacent to the residential development. Consistency is needed throughout the reserve and hence any proposal should deal with the reserve in its entirety. This applies to both upgrading of facilities and plantings.</li> <li>• The development of a long term plan for the reserve would ensure a more holistic approach is taken to the immediate development.</li> <li>• Any redevelopment of the reserve should be for the benefit of everyone.</li> </ul> <p><b>Miscellaneous Comments regarding the Proposal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing the reserve is a good idea <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It is in need of an upgrade</li> <li>○ Upgrading it would increase usage</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Great to see that the CCC are prepared to look ahead and consider something outside their proposed plans for the park and trees. Hopefully the Council will contribute to this great idea and assist the developer in enhancing not only the Brownlee Reserve but the whole neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Congratulations on a well thought out plan.</li> <li>• The current proposal is clearly trying to balance new development with the needs of the users of the reserve. This approach is good.</li> </ul> <p><b>Miscellaneous</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it possible to get Council workers to do tree work on properties backing on to the reserve at the same time as the park work is being done. This would be at the expense of those residents who wanted the work done.</li> <li>• Can Council help resolve issues with trees that on neighbouring properties that pose safety issues and have the capacity to block views.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Comments against the Plan</i></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The document has no justifiable basis, public notice was inadequate, motivated on self-serving and unnecessary ends.</li> <li>• The area should not be changed just to fit in with a developers plan.</li> <li>• The developer should manage the property they own, not the public area.</li> <li>• Reservations are held over the number of units planned for the site.</li> <li>• Is the proposal in sympathy or complimentary to the proposed development or does it clash?</li> <li>• The proposal is developer driven and maximises the developer's profit at the expense of the</li> </ul>

Clifton Hill community. A few tens of thousands of dollars will be invested to replace lovely tall trees with deciduous exotics and low height natives so as to provide unobstructed views for the residential development thereby adding hundreds of thousands of dollars to the value of the development.

- The park should not be developed in such a way that makes it costly to maintain.
- The upgrade is commendable but it needs to be easy to keep tidy.
- This or any development concept for Brownlee Reserve should be subject to or conditional upon the granting of the resource consent for the residential development.
- Council should buy land around the park and extend it, rather than changing the park to suit a developer.
- There is no need for a viewing platform, the park is not used by tourists and locals get views from their own properties.
- It is likely that it would be blocked by fences or planting used by the owners of adjacent properties to gain privacy from the reserve.
- The proposals should not be paid for by the ratepayer.
- Funding of the proposal should be at the Council's expense, not from a subsidy from a developer whose main goal in doing so is to sell properties.

#### **COMMENTS AGAINST THE PLAN**

The comments against the Plan have been considered. Whilst it might be an attractive option to purchase the adjoining land and extend Brownlee Reserve, the Council has no funds budgeted to enable it to do this, assuming that the land was available for sale.

The interest of Globe Holdings Ltd in land adjoining Brownlee Reserve may have the effect of ensuring that the enhancement of the reserve is undertaken sooner than would otherwise be the case. It has to be noted, however, that this has also prompted the preparation of the Development Concept Plan and its inclusion in the Council's programme for enhancing reserves. Council staff see that this result is one that can be beneficial to both the developer and the community, irrespective of whether or not Globe Holdings Ltd proceeds with its development.

#### **POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS: 1**

1. A decision be made on the information and submissions received on the Brownlee Reserve Development Plan to date.
2. Globe Holdings Ltd be requested as part of the subdivision consent process to vest the 'public viewing area' as shown on the concept plan as part of their reserve contribution.
3. Any approved felling and replacement planting on the Globe Holding's boundary be at the applicant's expense.
4. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board recommend to the Council that any reserve contribution from Globe Holding's proposed subdivision may be used on implementing the approved Development Concept Plan for Brownlee Reserve.

#### **Planting**

##### **Comments supporting the felling trees**

- A much reduced felling proposal would be supported
  - Thinning of trees rather than full scale removal.
  - The only pines that should be removed are those on the area marked as "Public Viewing Area.
  - Limit felling to dangerous trees.
- Healthy trees could be topped rather than felled to create more light and reduce danger in storms.
- Existing residents also have problems with shading and blockade of views from trees
  - Selective tree removal or pruning/topping the pines and gums would be appreciated.
- Remove all the existing pine trees
  - Are ugly and make the NE side of the reserve uninviting.
- Remove all the gum trees.
- Remove all non-native trees.
- Remove all the identified pine and gum trees
  - Residents were asked in the past to remove gum trees from their properties due to the fire hazard from them and Council should now remove those in the park.
  - Have concerns about safety during high winds.
- The eucalypts and gums are of poor quality, restrict views, are dangerous in high winds and don't provide a utilitarian open recreational area.

- Large pines around the play area should be trimmed or removed to improve safety and reduce shade in this area.

### **Comments Regarding Replacement Vegetation**

#### **Exotic Trees**

- The new exotic tree planting is supported
  - But shouldn't be too eclectic.
  - Should consist of deciduous exotics eg chestnut, oak, ash, maple, beech, walnut.
  - Should be large canopy trees that provide shade and colour and are great for kids.
- Native trees should be planted rather than new exotic trees
  - Totara, rimu or kauri.
- Exotics are best kept out of the reserve; natives are more in sympathy with what was originally here.
- Exotics are not sufficient to support birdlife.

#### **Native re-planting**

- Native re-vegetation is supported
  - The new planting on the corner of Panorama Road and Clifton Terrace has encouraged new bird life to the area and helps to form a corridor for the birds on the Port Hills and is a visual success.
  - Selected trees should be replaced with native vegetation but the replacement programme should include native trees, shrubs and grasses and not just low lying shrubs and grasses similar to those occupying the Panorama/Clifton Terrace corner.
  - Plant natives (including native trees) that will encourage native birds to return.
  - Native trees cause fewer problems with shading and blocking views.
  - Native trees to be planted shouldn't be too high and should provide colour - eg kowhai, pohutukawa, rata, pittosporum crassifolia, ngaio, corokia.
- Native re-vegetation shouldn't just include drab looking plants such as on the Panorama/Clifton corner.
- Proposed native replanting is supported but not with plants/shrubs that only grow 1-2 metres high. Shelter trees need to be replaced with similar shelter bearing trees.
- Preference is for native planting
  - Natives preferred to exotic trees.
  - Reserve could become a stand of native bush eventually.
- Don't get carried away with natives just for the sake of having them.
- It is not clear what natives are to be planted.
- Additional natives to help stop erosion or to attract and retain birds are acceptable.
- Do not replant like the replanted native area on the corner of Panorama and Clifton Terrace
  - It offers no shade, no privacy and has no special feel
  - Replanting more areas like this will destroy the very things that make Brownlee Reserve special.

#### **Other comments regarding replacement planting**

- Planting should be a mix of exotics and natives.
- If poor eucalyptus trees are to be replaced with deciduous trees then a high priority should be to include some fruit trees (eg pear or plum).
- A bit more colour and variation in trees and shrubbery would be nice. A good comparison would be the variation of trees (colour and type) and the open aspect of the reserve at Diamond Harbour.
- Am sceptical that the 'proposed re-vegetation areas' will ever be re-vegetated. What is the time line/guarantee for this?
- Planting of deciduous trees is supported
  - Would improve views in winter and enhance the open nature of the reserve and make it more appealing in summer.
- Need to leave some open spaces between the new plantings.
- Plant more trees.
- Local residents happy to help with re-development work.

#### **Maintenance for Plantings**

- The proposed ongoing maintenance to assess and maintain the existing pines is supported and should be extended to all vegetation within the reserve, not just pines.
- New plantings need to be maintained better than previous plantings have been
  - No maintenance was provided after natives were planted in the Panorama/Clifton corner. A resident had to take it upon themselves to weed and water the plantings for the first 12 months to enable the plantings to survive.

- An irrigation system would help as hill is very dry.

#### **Miscellaneous Comments**

- Thin pines keep best.
- Safety must be a consideration with plantings: at present the park is reasonably open which allows for easy supervision of children from Panorama Road.
- Enhancement of our native bird habitat should be the foremost priority with regard to management of vegetation.
- Plantings along the boundary should screen the fence line to maintain a rural reserve feel rather than a suburban park feel.
- A large number of the Clifton residents are very happy with the present vegetation, partly because they recognise that it is the kind of semi-open forest that they can have in a built neighbourhood that is not a fire-threat but most of all because the semi-open forest of Brownlee Reserve is evocative of what has been their own valued earlier-life experience of the hill. There is a strong cultural heritage element in Brownlee Reserve, which is not amenable to the strictures of arboreal hygiene and the like.

#### **Comments against the felling of trees**

- Positive aspects of the mature pines and gums
  - It is a great place to safely experience what a stand of pines is like in strong winds.
  - Trees are home to a number of species of bird.
- Provide a food source in terms of the insects they harbour and the flowers on the gum trees
  - It is good to walk under trees.
- Sound of the wind in trees is good.
- Feels like walking in a large forest.
- Pine needles provide a soft surface to walk on
  - Trees provide an area where urban children can experience nature.
  - Trees are not a fire hazard.
  - Due to their relatively small size and the hard nature of the soil, the pines are relatively wind firm.
  - Trees provide shelter for the available seats.
  - Trees give Clifton Hill its special visual character.
  - Trees provide very effective shelter against the wind.
  - Trees are a big part of the community.
  - Pines are healthy and relatively young.
  - Trees enhance the view rather than blocking it.
  - Trees are low maintenance.
  - Trees provide pine cones for children and dogs to play with.
  - Gums are very picturesque and add character to the reserve.
  - Trees screen the increasing housing developments on Richmond Hill.
- Removal of the marked pines and planting grasses and other vegetation as proposed would:
  - Take out about 50% of the best pine trees.
  - Destroy the forest atmosphere of the stand.
  - Open up the stand up to NW gales with the potential for the remaining trees to be blown over.
  - Increase the fire danger in the remaining stand by providing a bridge for fire to jump from the ground to the forest canopy.
  - Create no-go areas for pedestrians.
  - Significantly reduce some views to the sea that are currently possible through the tree trunks.
  - Remove vital shelter for the existing picnic area at the south edge of the main nearly flat area.
  - Not address the neglected look of the reserve.
- Remove as few pines as possible
  - Trim branches rather than removing trees to provide open park views and improve personal safety.
- Trees that are healthy should not be cut down whether at the request of residents or developers.
- Whether the trees marked for removal are actually in a poor condition is questioned.
- The old gum trees are not dangerous.
- Two spectacular gum trees adjacent to the section at 148 Clifton Terrace should be included as notable trees in the city plan.
- A site visit to discuss which trees are to be felled is recommended.
- Pines should not be felled to
  - Make way for other plantings.

- To improve the views - similar views are in abundance elsewhere.
- It is possible that the owners of the new apartments to be built would want the trees to remain, in order to have some privacy from the reserve.
- Christchurch already looks denuded due to too many trees being felled.

**Other Comments Regarding Existing Vegetation**

- The current eucalyptus trees should remain.
- The eucalyptus trees grow well in the poor soil, they result in an open look that is positive and it feels safe walking there.
- There has been mention previously that the Eucalyptus species here are some of the rarest species outside Australia. This should be looked into before any felling takes place.
- The eucalyptus trees should be felled replaced
  - Fire risk - trees are extremely flammable.
  - Danger from trees toppling and branches falling - of particular concern where the trees are very close to power lines.
  - Trees cause significant shading during winter.
  - Trees are non-native and should be replaced with suitable native shrubs and/or trees.
- The current vegetation in the reserve is fire-safe. This is true for both the area of pine trees and the grassed areas.
- The existing trees and vegetation enhance the views and should not be removed for the financial benefit of a developer.
- Sufficient trees should be left to screen the new residential development from the park.

**POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS: 2**

5. Local residents are informed by a start work notice prior to any major physical works being undertaken on the reserve in any year. All development to be specified contracts approved by the Greenspace Unit's Capital Projects Team, to ensure appropriate standards are met and planting success.
6. A planting day is provided to allow local residents to participate in physical works and any after care required.
7. Replacement planting to include both native and exotic species to provide better boundary planting, native bird habitat but also create a new large exotic tree canopy for shelter, shade when the majority of the trees need replacement in the future.

Comments on the proposed upgrade of entrances and comments on accessibility issues.
<p><b>Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The proposal to upgrade the entrances is supported.</li> <li>● The use of large volcanic stones set in vegetation to mark entrances is supported and should be done at the Clifton Terrace and Panorama Road entrances.</li> <li>● The use of large volcanic stones set in vegetation to mark entrances is not supported           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A decent earthquake would easily dislodge poorly fixed rocks which would then start rolling down the hill with disastrous consequences.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Need safe pedestrian crossing points over Clifton Terrace and Panorama Road to make it safer to access the reserve           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A speed bump or mid-road island would make crossing safer.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● The tarmac footpath bordering the reserve which goes along Clifton Terrace and up Panorama Road could be uncovered and developed to make access to the park safer.</li> <li>● A small rail/barrier at the smaller entrance on Panorama Road would enhance safety here as access to the road is rather abrupt at present.</li> <li>● The reserve needs to be made more accessible for young families, especially with prams           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Entrances need to be improved, preferably with no steps.</li> <li>○ Paths to the playground from Clifton Terrace needs to be re-graded.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● All entrance paths should be upgraded.</li> <li>● Need better signage on the roads to prevent children being run over.</li> <li>● Steps would improve the entrances.</li> <li>● New signs are not needed to mark the entrances as residents know where the reserve is. Upgrading the entrance and signage could attract hoons or other groups who would gather in the reserve to drink. This could result in residents facing increased rubbish and noise.</li> </ul>

### POLICY RECOMMENDATION: 3

8. New pathways will be created in accordance with the plan with easier grades for pedestrians, push chairs etc.

Recreation
<b>Comments</b>
<b>Picnic areas</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Picnic facilities should be upgraded.</li><li>• Additional picnic tables would be good.</li><li>• The existing picnic table should remain at its present site with the accompanying barbecue pad.</li></ul>
<b>Seating</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Upgrade seating.</li><li>• New seats would be a nice addition, including some that captured views to the plains.</li><li>• Consider the use of local stone for seating to give a sense of permanence.</li></ul>
<b>Play Opportunities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposed rock pile area (playground) would be a real plus.</li><li>• The existing rock pile is not a play area and should not be developed as such.</li><li>• A water feature for kids would be good.</li><li>• Existing playground facilities should be upgraded.</li><li>• Playground is liked just as it is.</li><li>• Existing playground is only suitable for young children - those facilities are valued for young children.</li><li>• Park has been sanitised with regard to play opportunities<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Removal of gum tree with rope swing.</li><li>○ Removal of BMX cycle obstacles constructed by children.</li><li>○ Removal of fallen trees which children used to play on.</li><li>○ Removal of trees that children climbed.</li></ul></li><li>• Need areas where 5-15 year olds can amuse themselves as well as areas for young children.</li><li>• There is a danger potential with the old diggers.</li><li>• The large flat area of land near the playground would be ideal for a multi-purpose sports facility.</li><li>• A safe, flat zone where children and adults could cycle would be appreciated.</li><li>• A fun obstacle course would increase park usage.</li><li>• The proposed upgrade to the playground is fine as long as it doesn't result in large groups congregating at night creating noise and rubbish.</li></ul>
<b>Paths</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The opportunity the reserve provides to walk on grass rather than tar seal is good.</li><li>• Additional and varied walking tracks and mountain bike tracks could be developed.</li><li>• The pathway through the Clifton/Panorama corner is in urgent need of repair.</li><li>• The main problem with the paths at present is that the fine crushed grit surface gets washed away during heavy rain. To be effective the grit needs to be bound into the top layer of soil.</li><li>• The footpath going downhill in the middle of the reserve is very steep and slippery for buggy use; graduated steps could be introduced to aid this.</li><li>• There is some lack of definition of walkways which is inviting now that difficulty of access from Clifton Terrace seems to have been solved.</li></ul>
<b>Miscellaneous Comments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The open easy care nature of the park is good for walkers, dog-walking and for informal play by children.</li><li>• The reserve is an enticing deviation on hill walks, a recreation that is important for maturing citizens.</li><li>• A water tap could be introduced for walkers.</li><li>• An information point with some history and a contour legend could be introduced for walkers in the reserve.</li><li>• A small enclosed dog exercise area would be good.</li></ul>

#### **POLICY RECOMMENDATION: 4**

9. New pathways will be created in accordance with the plan with easier grades for pedestrians, push chairs etc.

Traffic Issues
<b>Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The speed of traffic on Clifton Terrace is a real worry for parents wanting to cross the road to access the reserve and playground - the introduction of judder bars may address this.</li><li>• More residential development will tax Clifton Terrace and the roads through Redcliffs and Ferrymead. There is already an excessive volume of traffic using these roads.</li><li>• How about cutting into the bank for car parking.</li><li>• The park should not be used for access during the construction of any residential units - last year earth moving equipment used the park to access the developer's section of land.</li><li>• There should be no vehicular use of the reserve for public or private traffic other than Council or their nominated companies for maintenance and upgrading work.</li><li>• The Clifton /Panorama Corner is dangerous and should be re-aligned<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ There is concern about how access to the new subdivision can be made without creating a greater hazard.</li><li>○ Is there an opportunity for any car parking.</li><li>○ Where will cars park if non-residents are being attracted to the reserve.</li><li>○ With regard to any development work, it should be noted that Clifton Terrace is only suitable for smallish trucks - too many unsuitable vehicles use this road.</li></ul></li></ul>

#### **POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS: 5**

10. Detailed designs are needed to be produced in consultation with Transport and City Streets Unit for all the reserves entrances. These designs should enhance pedestrian safety and provide better access.
11. Transport and City Streets have been asked to investigate both traffic speed and intersection safety on Clifton Terrace.

#### **OPTIONS**

10. From the information gathered through the technical assessments and community consultations three options relating to the proposed tree removal, replanting and general development of Brownlee Reserve were identified and are assessed. These are as follows:
  - (a) Minimum pruning and replanting for safety of users and adjoining residents to Brownlee Reserve as required and upgrade the reserve when capital funds are available.
  - (b) Limit tree removal proposed in the plan to say a maximum of 15 per year, use reserve contributions to fund some development of the park.
  - (c) Allow removal of trees as shown on the Brownlee Reserve concept plan and replant with both exotic and native plants. Secure funds from Globe Holdings for felling/planting work and use reserve contributions for wider reserve development. (the preferred option).
  - (d) If funding from Globe Holdings Ltd and Reserve Contributions is not available, implement the Brownlee Reserve Concept Plan in accordance with the Council's current programme for enhancing reserves.

#### **PREFERRED OPTION**

11. Having assessed all the options it is recommended that option (c) be approved assuming that funding from Globe Holdings Ltd and Reserves Contributions are available. Allow removal of trees as shown on the Brownlee Reserve concept plan and replant with more sustainable native plants (the preferred option).

This would reduce the scale and cost to Council of a large scale replanting programme in the future when the stand of similar aged pine trees in Brownlee Reserve begin to die and need to be felled. The developer would fund the identified tree removal and replanting. The majority of submissions received supported some pine tree removal and native replanting and further enhancements on Brownlee Reserve.



## ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

### The Preferred Option (C)

Allow removal of trees as shown on the Brownlee Reserve concept plan, incorporating immediate and potential health and safety risks of reserve users and adjoining residents and replanting with more sustainable native plants.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Will reduce a health and safety risk posed by trees when they enter the rapid decline stage. Reclaims views from Brownlee Reserve.	Reduced amenity value and wind protection afforded by mature trees.
<b>Cultural</b>	No benefits identified.	No costs identified.
<b>Environmental</b>	Allows room and funding for native plants to be planted and enhancing opportunities for bird life by planting food producing species.	Loss of some large trees which provide habitat value for bird life (exotic). Removes wind protection provided by pine trees.
<b>Economic</b>	Removal of trees, including those that will pose a health and safety risk in the future, and replanting at no cost to Council.	Costs to Globe Holdings of \$98,000.

#### **Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:**

Primary alignment with community outcome: *“Our City’s natural resources, biodiversity, landscapes, and ecosystem integrity are protected and enhanced.”*

Also contributes to *“Our City’s infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability”*.

#### **Impact on Council’s capacity and responsibilities:**

Would reduce the scale and cost to Council of a large scale replanting programme in the future when the stand of similar aged pine trees in Brownlee Reserve begin to die and need to be felled and replaced, as the developer would fund the identified tree removal and replanting.

#### **Effects on Maori:**

No local Maori were identified as being affected by this proposal.

#### **Consistency with existing Council policies:**

Consistent with the Environmental Policy and specifically: *“Open Spaces and Planting - The Council will manage and maintain the open spaces of the City in ways that enhance amenity, avoid adverse effects and minimise maintenance requirements”*.

Consistent with the general policy on nuisance trees in the Christchurch City Council Parks Code of Practice.

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

Not supported by the Clifton Neighbourhood Committee. However this option was supported by approximately 70% of those households who returned submissions.

#### **Other relevant matters:**

## Maintain The Status Quo

- (a) Minimum pruning and replanting for safety of users and adjoining residents to Brownlee Reserve as required and upgrade the reserve when capital funds are available.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Trees continue to provide amenity value and wind protection to reserve users and viewers.	Trees will pose a health and safety risk in the future when they enter the rapid decline stage. No views regained from Brownlee Reserve.
<b>Cultural</b>	No benefits identified.	No costs identified.
<b>Environmental</b>	Some trees continue to provide habitat value to bird life.	No space or funding for mixed tree renewal plantings.
<b>Economic</b>	No benefits identified.	Will result in Council needed to budget for a large scale replanting programme in the future when the stand of similar aged pine trees in Brownlee Reserve begin to die and need to be felled and replaced.

### **Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:**

Primary alignment with community outcome *“Our people enjoy and value our natural environment and take responsibility for protecting and restoring it.”*

### **Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:**

Will result in Council needed to budget for a large scale replanting programme in the future when the stand of similar aged pine trees in Brownlee Reserve begin to die and need to be felled and replaced.

### **Effects on Maori:**

No local Maori were identified as being affected by this proposal.

### **Consistency with existing Council policies:**

Consistent with the Environmental Policy and specifically: *“Open Spaces and Planting - The Council will manage and maintain the open spaces of the City in ways that enhance amenity, avoid adverse effects and minimise maintenance requirements”.*

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

Was supported by the Clifton Neighbourhood Committee and approximately 25% of those households who returned submissions.

### **Other relevant matters:**

Possibility of the Council facing legal action that may result in the removal of more trees from the reserve than stated in the current Globe Holdings application.

**Option (b)**

Limit tree removal proposed in the plan to say a maximum of 15 per year, use reserve contributions to fund some development of the park.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Trees that will pose a health and safety risk in the future could be removed will remaining trees continue to provide amenity value to reserve users and viewers.	No views regained from Brownlee Reserve. Removes wind protection provided by pine trees and puts remaining pine trees more at risk of wind throw. May only occur over time as Council
<b>Cultural</b>	No benefits identified.	No costs identified.
<b>Environmental</b>	Provides some space for native replant <sup>4 85</sup> via a staged replacement programme.	Loss of some trees which provide habitat value for bird life.
<b>Economic</b>	Interim adjoining residential development proceeds will allow for the removal of those trees that will pose a health and safety risk in the future and replant <sup>4 85</sup> at	Developer may not proceed with residential developer or seek to not fund removal if less trees than requested are approved for removal, or staged, thereby generating <sup>4 85</sup> less or no external funding <sup>4 85</sup> for the tree removal or replant <sup>4 8</sup> .

**Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:**

Primary alignment with community outcome: *“Our City’s natural resources, biodiversity, landscapes, and ecosystem integrity are protected and enhanced.”*

Also contributes to *“Our City’s infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability”.*

**Impact on Council’s capacity and responsibilities:**

May have to be part of wholly funded by Council in stages through the LTCCP if agreement could not be reached with developer.

**Effects on Maori:**

No local Maori were identified as being affected by this proposal.

**Consistency with existing Council policies:**

Consistent with the Environmental Policy and specifically: *“Open Spaces and Plant - The Council will manage and maintain the open spaces of the City in ways that enhance amenity, avoid adverse effects and minimise maintenance requirements”.*

Consistent with the general policy on nuisance trees in the Christchurch City Council Parks Code of Practice.

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

May be a basis for further consultation with stakeholders and local residents. Was not presented as an option on the feedback form, but many people made reference to support limited tree removal, pruning etc.

**Other relevant matters:**