



## Christchurch City Council

# HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

7 DECEMBER 2006

4.00 PM

IN THE BOARDROOM, LINWOOD SERVICE CENTRE  
180 SMITH STREET

**Community Board:** Bob Todd (Chairperson), David Cox, Anna Crighton, John Freeman, Yani Johanson, Brenda Lowe-Johnson and Brendan Smith

**Community Board Principal Adviser**

Clare Sullivan

Telephone: 941-6601

Fax: 941-6604

Email: [clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz)

**Community Secretary**

Kevin Roche

Telephone: 941-6615

Fax: 941-6604

Email: [kevin.roche@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:kevin.roche@ccc.govt.nz)

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

**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

### INDEX

**PART C 1. APOLOGIES**

**PART B 2. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**PART B 3. BROWNLEE RESERVE LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN**

**We're on the Web!**

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

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

Speaking rights have been granted as follows:

Mr James Eastman  
Dr Michael Olmstead  
Nicky Geddes, Globe Holdings  
Mrs Adrienne Jackson  
Sumner Residents Association  
Mr Mark McKenzie  
Mr Brian Swale  
Mr Richard Cowley  
Representative of the Every family  
Ms Jane Bryden

### 3. BROWNLEE RESERVE LANDSCAPE CONCEPT PLAN

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
<b>Authors:</b>	Joanne Walton, Parks and Waterways Area Advocate Dieter Steinegg, Tree Officer Chris Freeman, Senior Parks and Waterways Planner

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Board approval to the new landscape development concept plan for Brownlee Reserve, amended as a result of public consultation and further technical advice, and including the staged removal of identified trees.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Board has previously considered two landscape development concept plans for Brownlee Reserve following an initial request from a private developer for the removal of a number of trees from the reserve. On 22 March 2006, the Board revoked its earlier decision, following a request from the Council to reconsider this, and directed that a new report on Brownlee Reserve be prepared.
3. Following the Boards' reconsideration of the issues on Brownlee Reserve, a complete review of the condition of all trees on the reserve was undertaken by Transport and Greenspace Unit arborists in May 2006 (**refer to Attachment 1**). The new tree survey identified that 242 or 72.4% of all trees on the reserve showed signs of over-maturity, structural decline, diseases and other stress caused by various biotic and abiotic factors. The removal of these trees for safety reasons, and their replacement where appropriate, was identified as a high priority.
4. A third landscape development concept plan was then prepared taking into account this new survey information. During public consultation on the new plan, a total of 117 submissions were received from the community. A wide range of views were represented in the submissions, but overall a majority of 81 (69.3%) submitters supported the proposal (see table below).

<b>Support for proposed plan</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not sure/Not indicated</b>	<b>Total</b>
Number of responses	81	30	6	117
%	69.3%	25.6%	5.1%	100%

(It should be noted that the outcomes of the two previous consultations undertaken in March and June/August 2005 supported enhancement of the reserve (79% in March 2005 and 80% in June/August 2005)

5. A total of 100 submitters also provided additional comments and identified their individual concerns and priorities for the future of the reserve. While these were wide ranging in content, a number of key issues were identified:
  - General support or opposition to the proposal.
  - The involvement of the private developer.
  - Consultation process.
  - Assessment of the condition of the trees.
  - Existing trees – proposed felling, species of trees, values and hazards.
  - Nature of replacement plantings.
  - Accessibility issues including entranceways and paths.
  - Proposed timeframe.
  - Recreational values.
6. In recognition of community feedback, and further technical advice, the Transport and Greenspace Unit propose to make the following changes (**refer plan Attachment 2**):
  - (a) The timeframe over which the tree removal and replacement programme will be staged will be extended to five years.

## 7. 12. 2006

- 4 -

- (b) The order in which work is to undertaken in the different areas of the reserve as shown on the plan will be amended as follows:

### **Stage 1 - Year 1 - 2006/2007 financial year**

- (i) All trees identified as "Priority Removal" on the development plan will be removed. These trees are the most hazardous and are mostly situated along the inner boundaries of Areas 3 and 4.
- (ii) Replanting of shrubs will be undertaken along the North East boundary of Area 3.

### **Stage 2 – 2007/2008 financial year**

- (iii) Staged removal of identified trees in Area 3 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees.

### **Stage 3 – 2008/2009 financial year**

- (iv) Staged removal of identified trees in southern part of Area 4 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees.

### **Stage 4 – 2009/2010 financial year**

- (v) Staged removal of identified trees in northern part of Area 4 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees.
- (vi) Work undertaken in Area 4 will be staged over a two year period due to the size of this section of the reserve and to enable access from this entrance from Panorama Road to be maintained.

### **Stage 5 – 2010/2011 financial year**

- (vii) Staged removal of identified trees in Areas 1 and 2 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees.
- (viii) Upgrading of paths and entranceways will be undertaken in each area of the reserve once tree felling and replanting operations have been completed in that area.
- (ix) Retaining of the banks on the road frontages of Clifton Terrace and part of Panorama Road will be undertaken as required to control erosion.

7. Due to the availability of additional funding, the Council is now able to, and is committed to progress with a five year restoration process for the reserve. The restoration process also needs to be seen in the context of a longer term replacement and maintenance regime. The proposed design for the reserve retains a framework of existing mature trees, enhancing this with new tree and shrub plantings on a style that is largely informal. A higher level of maintenance and care will be only required for the new plantings during the establishment period to ensure optimum survival and growth.
8. The Transport and Greenspace Unit acknowledges that the issues in the reserve were brought to Council's attention by the initial approach from Globe Holdings Ltd. However, these issues, in particular the health and safety risks posed by the condition of the trees, would remain present regardless of the involvement of Globe Holdings Ltd. There is still a need for an overall plan to guide the long term development and management of the reserve. The current plan is neither developer driven or funded. The most hazardous trees are to be removed first, with subsequent tree removals to be staged so that one area of the reserve is completed at a time. Although this programme may appear to favour the developer, it is incidental that the greatest number of trees posing an immediate risk are situated along the boundary with the Globe Holdings Ltd site.
9. The new proposed landscape development concept plan is not the decision of, or driven by, any one individual Council officer. The plan, including the new tree survey, has been prepared by a team of Council officers and external consultants following the direction of the Board from its

meeting of 22 March 2006. The Council currently employs a team of six arborists involved in the management of Christchurch's urban trees.

10. The landscape plan, and the survey plan upon which it is based, have been prepared by an external consultant to a standard design format. It is not generally the practice to specify planting design to species level in a concept plan but rather to suggest a general proposed concept, for example, native or exotic plantings, and seek community preferences before proceeding to detailed planting plans. The feedback form is consistent with the standard format used city-wide for parks and waterways projects of this scale. The intention of the process was to seek residents views on the future direction of the reserve following a more extensive tree removal programme and to identify any specific concerns or priorities they may have.
11. The survey assessment of the condition of the trees in Brownlee Reserve has been endorsed by other Council arborists. A peer review of the new tree survey is also being undertaken by an independent external consultant. The author of the Council's tree survey has provided clarification and explanation of the survey in relation to comments raised by submitters and this is detailed later in this report. The independent consultants report on the pine trees provided by a submitter group has also been reviewed by a Transport and Greenspace arborist who is in agreement with many of the points raised in relation to the condition of certain trees and the absence of common diseases, and had provided clarification on issues raised in the survey as above.
12. With respect to the potential hazards of tree removal, the Council is aware of the need for soil stability and erosion control in the reserve, and the role that the trees play in this respect. It is proposed to replace a number of trees over a five year period and undertake strategic plantings to reduce soil erosion. During the tree removal process, the tree stumps are ground to ground level so that the roots continue to hold the soil until the new plantings are established.
13. A report was previously commissioned in February 2005 to investigate the possible impacts of tree removal on birdlife in Brownlee Reserve and to assess opportunities for enriching bird species richness and abundance. The author of this report has undertaken a review in the context of the new proposal and has provided recommendations accordingly.
14. The revised report identifies that birds occurring within the reserve use a range of habitats including pine and Eucalyptus trees, shrubs, scrubby habitat and grassy habitats. While use is made of tall trees by many species, none of the birds present are wholly dependant on this type of habitat. Many more trees than previously are now planned to be felled. This can be anticipated to have a negative effect on birdlife unless tree-pruning and tree-felling is staged to ensure sufficient large trees remain until replacement plantings of native and exotic trees and shrubs reach a sufficient size.
15. The review has recommended that tree-pruning and tree-felling should be staged over the next ten years, however, this time period is not considered feasible in terms of tree safety issues and redevelopment work. Instead, the proposed tree felling is to be staged over an intermediate time period of five years with replacement plantings of suitable species being established as soon as possible to minimise impacts on birdlife.
16. The proposed landscape concept plan is able to take into account the views of the community relating to replacement plantings, and accommodate the range of community preferences, by building on a framework of the remaining mature exotic trees, and creating different areas within the reserve that are predominantly native or exotic plantings, or a mixture of both. In accordance with the recommendations of the birdlife report, replacement plantings will begin immediately after the first stage of tree removal in order to support birdlife, and will include high food value native and exotic species such as five-finger, cabbage trees, flax, kowhai, totara, banksias and eucalypts.
17. In the medium to long term, the proposal to plant parts of the reserve in native vegetation is certain to provide a net benefit to birdlife and provide superior feeding and breeding habitat to that currently found within the reserve. With the exception of Eucalyptus trees, the site currently lacks notable food-producing trees and shrubs. Bellbirds and other species are using the pines for roosting and for gleaning insects, but future plantings of other native and exotic trees will eventually provide a much richer habitat.

18. Plant species will also be chosen within each area that are both appropriate for the environmental conditions for optimum survival and growth, and safe for reserve users. In addition, all landscape designs are reviewed according to "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" principles, with the layout designed, and plant species selected and maintained, so as to provide good visibility and sight lines, and improve user safety.
19. In response to the strong community feedback on the issue of accessibility, improving access to the reserve has been made a high priority in the development programme. The upgrading of the entranceways and paths within the reserve will begin in Year 2 of the programme. It will be undertaken following the completion of the tree removal and replacement planting work within each identified area of the reserve in sequence so as not to restrict felling and construction operations. Timber retaining walls will also be constructed along the roadside banks of the Clifton Terrace frontage, and part of the Panorama Road frontage, if required to control erosion.
20. In recognition of the community feedback on the proposed timeframe for the development of the reserve, and additional technical advice, a number of changes to the timeframe for the plan have now been proposed:
  - (a) The time period over which the trees will be removed and replaced has been extended to five years to lessen the impacts on the reserve, reserve users and birdlife,
  - (b) The order in which work will be undertaken in different areas of the reserve has been amended according to the level of identified hazards,
  - (c) The upgrading of the entranceways and paths has been brought forward and will follow the completion of the tree felling and replacement planting in each area.
21. The recreational opportunities provided by the existing reserve, and the desire expressed by the community to retain the wilderness aspect and resulting play opportunities, is acknowledged. The proposed development is based on a framework of existing trees, with new plantings in a relatively informal style that once established should retain the natural feel of the reserve and provide similar play experiences.
22. There is no funding currently available for Council to purchase the Globe Holdings Ltd site as an extension to Brownlee Reserve even if it were available for sale. In addition, the immediate area is considered to already have sufficient reserve land for community use.
23. A number of other issues that were raised by submitters are considered to be outside the scope of this particular project, including traffic safety, undergrounding of services, development of other reserve land, and priority for other projects, and will be referred to other Units of Council as appropriate.

#### FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

24. Funding for the felling of the specified trees, and replacement planting with new trees where appropriate, is available within the major tree replacement capital works budget programmed under the LTCCP. Present costs for this work are estimated at between \$20,000 and \$50,000 per annum over the five year period.
25. Funding for other works, including additional landscape plantings and upgrading of pathways, is to be sourced from the budget for new reserves development programmed under the LTCCP. The costs (GST excluded) of this work are estimated to be:

Stage 1:	\$14,553.00
Stage 2:	\$51,460.50
Stage 3:	\$56,433.83
Stage 4:	\$30,397.50
Stage 5:	\$77,613.90
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$230,458.73</b>

26. An additional cost for timber retaining walls if required is estimated at \$50,000.

27. The Board has granted \$10,000 towards the redevelopment of Brownlee Reserve from its 2006/2007 project funding, and it is proposed that this grant is applied to the upgrading of the reserve entranceways.
28. Council has previously voted against the expenditure of reserve contribution funds from the proposed Globe Holdings Ltd residential development in implementing the reserve development. In addition, the previous offer of an additional contribution from Globe Holdings Ltd towards the enhancement of the reserve is now uncertain.
29. 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 1977 that deal with the preservation of trees and bush are therefore not applicable to this reserve.
30. 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 any adjoining property, including the Globe Holdings Ltd site.
31. Any neighbour 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 applicants 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.
32. 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".
33. The Council has been made aware of the condition of the trees on Brownlee Reserve, and the health and safety risks posed by many of these trees to people and property. As such the Council has a duty of care and legal obligation to undertake the remedial work to address this risk and to ensure the safety of reserve users, and reserve neighbours and their properties.
34. There are no trees on Brownlee Reserve that are listed as notable or protected under the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Board approve the landscape development plan for Brownlee Reserve, amended as a result of public consultation and additional technical advice, and including the staged removal of identified trees, and that the Transport and Greenspace Unit commence the development programme as follows:

##### **Stage 1 - Year 1 - 2006/2007 financial year**

1. All trees identified as "Priority Removal" on the development plan will be removed. These trees are the most hazardous and are mostly situated along the inner boundaries of Area's 3 and 4. Replanting of shrubs will be undertaken along the North East boundary of Area 3.

##### **Stage 2 – 2007/2008 financial year**

2. Staged removal of identified trees in Area 3 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees.

**Stage 3 – 2008/2009 financial year**

3. Staged removal of identified trees in southern part of Area 4 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees.

**Stage 4 – 2009/2010 financial year**

4. Staged removal of identified trees in northern part of Area 4 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees.

**Stage 5 – 2010/2011 financial year**

5. Staged removal of identified trees in Areas 1 and 2 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees.
6. Upgrading of paths and entranceways will be undertaken in each area of the reserve once tree felling and replanting operations have been completed in that area.
7. Retaining of the banks on the road frontages of Clifton Terrace and part of Panorama Road will be undertaken as required to control erosion.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the authors of the report be thanked for their professional opinions and all staff associated with the compilation of the report be commended for the time and energy they committed to the development concept plan.

That all submitters be thanked for their submissions and the many accompanying suggestions.

That the Board adopt the staff recommendation.



## **BACKGROUND ON BROWNLEE RESERVE LANDSCAPE DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

### **HISTORY**

35. A landscape development concept plan for Brownlee Reserve was first prepared following a deputation from Globe Holdings Ltd to the Community Board meeting of 9 February 2005. Globe Holdings Ltd sought the removal of 51 trees in the reserve at their expense primarily on the grounds of safety and shading of their adjoining site. Public consultation of the draft plan, incorporating Globe Holdings proposal, undertaken in March 2005 drew 103 submissions, the majority of which supported the removal of some trees (68%) and the replanting and enhancement of the reserve (80%). The Board considered the results of this consultation on 25 March 2005, and resolved to decline the development plan and the application by Globe Holdings Ltd, but that minimal pruning of the trees be carried out and a management plan for the reserve be prepared in liaison with local residents and Globe Holdings Ltd.
36. A second landscape development concept plan with a reduced number of trees to be felled and a staged development plan for the reserve was prepared. Public consultation on this new plan over June to August 2005 drew a further 78 submissions, the majority of which (80%) again indicated support. The Board considered the results of this second consultation on 26 October 2005, and resolved to approve the amended concept plan minus a number of trees shown as to be removed, that 15-20 identified hazardous trees be removed, that the concept plan be a basis for a management plan and that policy recommendations be adopted. The Board also decided to recommend to the Council that it approve the expenditure of reserve contribution funds from the Globe Holdings Ltd residential development on implementing the reserve development plan.
37. The Council at its meeting on 1 December 2005 voted against this expenditure and requested that the Board reconsider its decision in respect of the amended development concept plan.
38. The Board at its meeting on 22 March 2006 resolved to revoke its decision made at the Board meeting on 26 October 2005, and that the Greenspace Unit prepare a report on Brownlee Reserve for the meeting on 12 April 2006 taking into consideration, amongst other things, the following:
  - (a) The removal of unsafe trees on the boundary of the whole reserve.
  - (b) The prospect of a Globe holdings contribution being accepted for enhancing the reserve.
  - (c) Raising the priority of safety work in the reserve, given the many years of neglect and deferred maintenance of the reserve.
  - (d) Clearly identifying the Development Concept Plan to be approved.
  - (e) The Brownlee Reserve Concept Plan being the basis for a plan in accordance with the Council's current programme for enhancing reserves.
  - (f) And also to consider recommending a commitment of \$10,000 from its project funding towards the reserve enhancement.

The above proceedings have been the subject of previous reports to the Board and to Council.

### **NEW LANDSCAPE CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

39. A third landscape development concept plan was then prepared taking into account this new survey information. The key features of this plan included:
  - (a) Identification of the trees to be removed.
  - (b) Retention of a framework of around 90 existing mature trees to provide amenity for reserve users and to create a microclimate to enable other vegetation to establish more successfully.
  - (c) Planting of replacement trees where appropriate.
  - (d) A proposed concept for the development of the reserve comprising four distinct areas:

- Area 1 - Mediterranean plantings in the north-west entrance area.
- Area 2 - Mixed amenity plantings, including shade trees, in the picnic and playground area.
- Area 3 - A native plant collection to the south-east of the reserve.
- Area 4 - An exotic woodland to the east of the reserve.

(e) A proposed timeframe for staging the tree replacement on an area basis.

#### NEW PUBLIC CONSULTATION

40. A public meeting held on August 7 2006 to present the proposal and new landscape development concept plan proposal to the community was attended by approximately 70 people. A public information leaflet with a revised landscape development plan was then distributed in August-September to all residents on Clifton Hill, all previous submitters and a number of key stakeholder groups, and posted on request to a number of individuals. It was also available at the Linwood Service Centre, local libraries, and on the Council website. A guided tour of Brownlee Reserve was held on 2 September to provide the community with an opportunity to look at the tree issues firsthand with a Council arborist, and was attended by approximately 20 people.
41. During the consultation period a total of 117 submissions were received from the community. Nine submissions were received after the closing date of 15 September but were accepted. As may be expected with the large number of submissions (117) a wide range of views were represented. With over 600 copies of the public information leaflet distributed, it is also presumed that many residents either supported the plan or were not sufficiently concerned about it to make a submissions.
42. Overall a majority of 81 (or 69.3%) of submitters indicated their support for the proposed landscape development concept plan, with 30 (or 25.6%) of submitters indicating they did not support the plan. A further six submitters did not specify their preference, however, from their written comments it appears that one is clearly opposed to the plan, one is clearly in support, and the remaining four have expressed reservations or raised issues.

Support for proposed plan	Yes	No	Not sure/Not indicated	Total
Number of responses	81	30	6	117
%	69.3%	25.6%	5.1%	100%

43. A total of 100 submitters, both for and against the plan, provided additional comments. While some were simple supportive comments, many made specific reference to individual concerns and priorities in the reserve. Many submitters who supported the plan also identified concerns on various issues, whilst some submitters who opposed the plan also identified positive aspects.
44. In particular, 30 of the 81 submitters who supported the plan also made comments about some aspect of the proposed tree removal and replacement. However, for the other 51, this was not identified as a particular issue. In contrast, comments were made about the tree aspects by 23 of the 30 submitters who opposed the plan, and all six who did not specify either way.
45. Additional comments provided by submitters have been categorised according to particular issues, and are summarised in the following sections of the report. Where reference has been made to specific aspects of the proposal, such as the felling of the trees, replacement plantings, and access issues, these have been summarised separately from more general comments.

**Note:** Some submissions have had personal information that may identify the submitter deleted in keeping with the submitters rights under the Privacy Act 1993. This is denoted by [ ].

#### GENERAL COMMENTS FROM SUBMISSIONS IN SUPPORT OF OR AGAINST THE PLAN AS A WHOLE

46. A total of 45 submitters provided additional general comments in support of the plan as a whole. Some submitters who opposed the plan, or indicated reservations, also identified various positive aspects. Submitters were of the overall view that:

- The state of the reserve had deteriorated.
  - The reserve was long overdue for improvement and development to make it more enjoyable for users.
  - The design concept plan was well accepted.
  - The submitters sought to see the plan implemented and the work completed without further delays.
  - Some aspects of the plan are good including new plantings, and path upgrading.
47. General comments against the plan as a whole were made by 21 submitters, and while these were wide ranging in their content, the general overview was:
- The reserve was considered to be acceptable as it was and the need for the redevelopment was questioned.
  - The trees were considered to be healthy and to have a long life span.
  - The approach proposed with the removal of so many trees was considered to be too extreme.
  - There was a desire to retain the existing reserve with its natural, semi-wilderness qualities, rather than create a more formal, manicured, high maintenance park.
  - There was a lack of confidence in the Council's ability to develop and maintain the reserve.
  - The proposal was considered to be too narrow and driven by individual staff opinions.
48. Another common theme raised by nine submitters was the involvement of the private developer, Globe Holdings Ltd, with submitters suggesting that the reserve would have remained as it was without their involvement, that the current proposal still appears to favour the developer, and asking what has happened to the funding that was originally to be provided by the developer.

<b>General Comments in Support of Plan</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Excellent plan bring it on!</li> <li>○ We are very happy with the plan and hope that the timetable is kept.</li> <li>○ Absolutely fantastic!!</li> <li>○ So pleased that the 4-6 old fuddie duddies that have lived on this hill for years and years are not going to get their way and the landscaping will go ahead.</li> <li>○ We are impressed by the level of attention to detail you have provided to residents. Good luck! Well done!</li> <li>○ Well thought out plan – excellent!</li> <li>○ We like the look of the plan v. much and will attend the walk on 2 September 2006.</li> <li>○ I take my one year old son up to the reserve 2-3 times/week and would like to see it improved.</li> <li>○ Concept plan looks good. ☺</li> <li>○ Great plan.</li> <li>○ Congratulations. Go for it. ☺</li> <li>○ We think this looks like an excellent plan.</li> <li>○ "Brilliant! Well thought out. This will be a beautiful and useful recreation reserve. "Feel free to use my comments".</li> <li>○ I have lived on Clifton Hill for 10 years. I have walked through Brownlee Reserve two times only that I can remember. If you're not fit access is only by car – I found it quite spooky, so I love your plan to make it more user friendly. People would want to spend more time visiting there. Best wishes. PS I used to be on the committee for Clifton Terrace – they would argue for argue's sake!!</li> <li>○ Looks good!</li> <li>○ Looks great!</li> <li>○ Great to see a well though out plan come through. Thanks for asking for resident's input.</li> <li>○ I heartily support the proposals of D. Steinegg for the development of the reserve. If you make as good a job as you have done of the opposite corner it will be a pleasure to walk in it! [ ] It was never planted out as a reserve. Most of the scrubby trees were self sown. There were three pine plantations on Clifton Terrace road in the 50's planted for profit.</li> <li>○ Get going and don't procrastinate any longer.</li> <li>○ Good solution!</li> <li>○ Sooner the better!</li> <li>○ Thanks for a great job. Can't wait.</li> <li>○ A great long term development plan for the reserve has to start somewhere.</li> <li>○ I like the look of your plan, the place does need a doing over, good luck and looking forward too.</li> </ul>

- Was at meeting at Gethsemane Gardens. Very impressed with Dieter's speech. [ ] and a few others don't have enough to do, just stirring and most people on the hill just want Brownlee reserve to be developed with Dieter's help.
- "Just hurry up and do it"!! ☺
- Your plan is great, the reserve certainly needs a revamp.
- Shame about the small minded who can't see the long term benefits for all!!
- I grew up beside Brownlee Reserve. It's about time it had a makeover, the pine trees have always been untidy. It will make more people want to walk etc through the reserve and will look better over all. I think your plan looks really good.
- The Council's track record for designing suitable landscapes is positive (referring to the "recent" re-design of a small section of reserve on the Panorama/Clifton intersection). It is a HUGE improvement on the pines.
- An attractive redevelopment. Hopefully it will be funded through to its conclusion.
- I am impressed with the comprehensive survey of the trees and with the enthusiasm to rejuvenate the reserve.
- I strongly support the plan to upgrade the tree collection and the facilities in the park.
- The plan to fell a significant number, but not all, of the existing large trees and to replant in a tiered fashion is good.
- We thoroughly approve of the new concept plan. [ ] Nothing has been done since then – when we used to picnic and play. Now the trees have taken over, shaded and obliterated the view. Pines are out of date – would love to see a variety as you have planned. [ ]
- I totally approve of the new Brownlee Reserve plan. [ ] But now that land gets no sun.
- It will be good to see the trees have some work done on them. The smaller trees sound really good and should look great. Long overdue to get some of the trees down.
- Looking forward to it starting!
- We very much like the more complete approach to the reserve plan. We like the defined and landscaped spaces proposed. Please address the safety concerns first – trees, fallen trees, holes in ground etc. The number of trees proposed for felling is unfortunate but we support the proposal because it is necessary for new growth and the trees there have never been taken care of anyway.
- Globe Holding has been involved in the proposed plans for Brownlee Reserve since the beginning of the Consultation process. Our views on the re-development have been well documented by the CCC and the Community Board during this process. Suffice to say, we are in agreement with the latest Plan proposed by Deiter Steinegg of the CCC Greenspace Unit – with some minor adjustments which we will propose to Deiter as the plan is implemented (ie: the urgent removal of the trees on the boundaries of our site at 118 Clifton Terrace, and the replanting of these boundaries being consistent with our rights to views, light, safety etc.).
- Wonderful – I have total faith in the arborist's findings. Not meaning to be rude but please get on with it! Well done.
- We support the concept plan. Very well thought out. [ ] It was an important play area for our children.
- I like the proposal with varied and interesting plantings.
- Aspects of the plan that are positive:  
I think it is good to look at options for the park, provide not too much money is spent on the exercise.  
There are a number of aspects of the plan that are good:  
The trees should be reviewed for individual pruning and stand thinning to maintain the health and safety of the stand.  
Some new trees and shrubs could be introduced to improve the landscape and interest of the reserve and as eventual replacements for the current trees. But I think the essential tall stand forest character with open spaces should be retained and I think sticking with the pines and eucalypts as the tall canopy is fine.  
The children's playground could do with some upgrading.  
A basic downhill bike course could be built for teenagers. An exercise course is mentioned in the plan which could be okay, provide it doesn't intrude too much on the visual wilderness of the area.  
In places the paths could be improved but not over "sanitised" and definitely no lights.  
The boundaries with the neighbours should be encouraged to be open to provide surveillance.
- Stabilising exterior banks.  
This is a good idea, but will probably need an engineering solution, as the banks are too dry for most plants.

### General Comments Against the Plan

- You people must hate trees. Why take out so many large trees. This arborist you have won't live as long as some of those trees. What are you going to replace them with, decent NZ native, or the usual hebes and scrubby NZ bushes you seem to put in most of your other redevelopments. Given you don't have the money to do it all at once, why start and do a half hearted job. Looking at the main areas that you intend to remove trees it appears to me you are giving the developer of the corner section what he wants. Given your attitude I don't think your dept is competent to do this job properly.
- I am in my late 60's and walk through the park approx 300 per year and have no problems with the tracks or trees.
- Gradual replacement is fine but the suggestion that 73% of trees be removed in the immediate future seems completely over the top. The Council must respect what seems to be a majority local view that the community – who are certainly the bulk of its users, want to retain pine trees, want to retain the shelter of the large trees. Native shrub replacements will do nothing to provide a sheltered get away from the nasty prevailing easterlies. Remove dangerous trees/overcrowded areas ONLY. Remove and replace over a much grater period of time than proposed.
- If Globe Holdings had not wanted the trees removed the reserve would have remained the same for many years to come. The natural nature, beauty and ambience of this reserve will be lost. Your plan will cost the ratepayers unnecessary money to install and maintain something that doesn't require changing.
- You say this is not developer driven – then why are you removing the trees from the area surrounding the development plot first? What about the pathways and landscaping – waiting for funding in 2011 is far too far away. You will leave us with a bare sparse reserve. There is no guarantee that there will be funding for the pathways so what will happen then? What will hold the soil together when the trees roots are gone? There will be a danger of landslip. This does not have the residents interests at heart. Why have you let the trees get into such a state? Lack of care from the Council.
- Most of the trees are healthy and have a long life span – they must be retained for aesthetic reasons and for the shelter they provide. This is a reserve not a park to be “prettified”, constrained by formal plantings and constituted as an ongoing high maintenance burden for the Council and ratepayers. What is needed is removal of dead or dying trees and provision of safe/all weather paths and steps.
- We don't think this is a matter of yes or no. We do agree that the reserve is in need of a good clean up (ie the dead trees removed and some thinning out). This reserve has been sadly neglected in the past and we don't see that it will be any better cared for if the proposed plans go ahead, for example, look at the corner of Clifton Terrace, Panorama Road, where the trees were removed (they needed to be) and replaced with native shrubbery and later neglected.
- Such a makeover is not required. The reserve is a much loved, informal and used area. The stand of pine trees while not perfectly shaped individual specimens are healthy, free of disease and windfirm. They frame the views to the sea and Scarborough while blocking out housing development on Richmond Hill. In short, a tranquil oasis in suburbia! We do not want the Botanical Gardens on Clifton Hill. The Council should undertake its routine maintenance – pruning hazardous branches, weeding out noxious plants, making the paths safer – not create a high maintenance park which will require a much larger budget for its upkeep.
- We take our grandchildren to Brownlee – we all pretend we are in Winnie-the-Pooh's “Hundred Acre Wood”! Please do not destroy this really special place. It is a safe park as you can see through the pine trees – no places for undesirables to lurk. I will not be alive when the new trees grow up but I hope our grandchildren will remember their days of fun.
- This plan is obviously being driven by people with selfish, ulterior motives and is being handled by bureaucrats who know nothing about trees. And I question the competence of the arborist involved, he just seems to like felling trees! Or he has a thing against exotics. The trees should be maintained for their health and any possible safety issues but they don't pose a threat as a collective group. Next someone with a heap of cash will want to develop Victoria Park! And this arborist will want to cull! Cull! Cull! Since its his thing. Leave the trees alone. They have taken 50 years to grow. We all like the reserve as it is. If its not BROKEN don't FIX IT!
- It ain't broke, don't fix it!
- Prefer No. Cannot give a straight yes/no answer – some of the plan excellent; especially a good tree mix. Native and exotic and conifer. Notice renewal of areas closest to development! Leave them out of it and attend to routine maintenance and take out only a

fraction of trees that are really necessary. It's a lovely natural space especially tranquil under tall canopy of pines – copses/clearings. Do not want an overly manicured space. It has survived untouched until now. Enhance and care for what exists – maintain what is essential. Do not accommodate developers. The community pays your rates.

- We do not want a “manicured” reserve. “As is” has its special charm.
- The reserve is fine as it is. Don't spend rates on this.
- The Sumner Residents Association does not support the proposed Brownlee Reserve landscape development plan. The reserve is an important and treasured asset for our community. We support routine maintenance such as pruning hazardous branches and getting rid of [?] and upgrading the paths and entry points. The bulk of the trees particularly those identified on the concept plan as “Area 4” are healthy, wind firm, and disease-free and shelter the reserve from the prevailing winds. The dark pines on the crown of the hill are one of Sumner's iconic views. This is a reserve. It is not a park, a specimen garden of individual trees or an arboretum. Our community values it and wants to retain it in its current form.
- Prefer a more friendly approach. This seems too extreme.
- Why also has it all of a sudden been a decision to wholesale remove so many trees. It is not a model reserve that hill residents are asking for but an environment that is looked at without the prompting of a property developer.
- The report from the CCC seems, as usual, very biased, always supporting their views, not mine or any of my friends, even though through rates, I pay for it.
- This park would need a full time keeper.
- For the Christchurch City Council to undertake the restructuring of the entire tree population of the city based on one Arborist opinion is a blatant misappropriation of authority and millions of dollars as well as forever changing the face of our beautiful city. An independently chosen “not by CCC or Arborist” panel of Arborists should be formed and consulted as a prerequisite prior to such action city wide. The end result will be a loss of beauty, city funds and visitor revenues. I urge caution with this idea. Once it is implemented, the damage will be irreversible and devastating.
- **Current proposals – their introduction to the community**
- At the presentation of the current management proposals (the Ark, Gethsemane Gardens, Revelation Drive at 7 pm, Monday 7 August 2006) Mr Steinegg informed the assembly that he had not read any of the papers recording the previous consultations and deliberations on Reserve management. He also seems to have been influenced by the un-informed off-the-cuff comments by an arborist from another city to whom he showed the Reserve and elicited comment, and which he told us about.
- Mr Steinegg spent quite some time telling the meeting that he was an utter perfectionist and that he intended to apply this attitude to Brownlee Reserve in respect of tree form, tree structure, tree placement, choice of tree species, emphasis on youth, and safety.
- There has been considerable work by arborists on management proposals, and consultation with the community since early 2005. It is unacceptable for this previous work to be ignored, since it was prepared by experienced arborists, and particularly because it was then supposed to be in the context of on-going interactive discussion with the community.
- While safety must be taken into consideration, the extreme values of required tree perfection and exaggerated hazard presentation which form the basis of this “Concept Plan” are out of place and need moderation.
- Many residents have observed, and I concur, that the “new” direction of plan represents the extreme values of just one person, and that this is an unwise development.
- Mr Steinegg said at the Gethsemane meeting that he wanted to make Brownlee Reserve a prize park for the residents, that they could be proud of. Many residents consider that this is exactly what they have now, and have no wish to have the usual bland style of City Park imposed on them and Brownlee Reserve.
- Mr Steinegg also made it clear that he has no liking for trees unless they are absolutely perfect, and if they are in close groups. He stated that there was only ONE tree in the reserve that he deemed to be acceptable by his standards – the silver birch in the rock pile near the old quarry. That's a pity, really, since close examination of that small tree shows it has significant scarring at the base which may hide incipient rot, and the root system is very unbalanced. As a result of that, the tree already has a pronounced lean to the SE, is already wobbly, and will probably topple over within the next five years.

#### **Comment**

- People who have worked with the author of the Draft Concept plan have explained to me how he is consumed with a desire for perfection, has an unduly enhanced concern for hazard, and can not tolerate the idea of trees growing in groups. It seems to me that these

preconceptions have resulted in a concept plan that in its turn is extreme in its proposals and unbalanced.

- o Community aspirations and the Plan. Plan does not maintain or respect community wishes for the copse/clearing structure of the stand to be maintained and perpetuated.
- o There are few specific names of intended tree species provided. It is essential that this be done. Without this, the Parks people are being handed a blank cheque for the future.
- o There is a consistent community call for retaining the natural nature and scale of this part of the Reserve. The specific features – clumps, glades, closed “forest” canopy, irregular growth, that set this Reserve **apart from and above** the normal city “Park” are what they value. Several people (including visitors) have said to me that they love the wild and semi-natural style of the Reserve, and hope that the Council do not do to it what has been done to South Brighton Park and Nicholson Park, which in their eyes have suffered disastrous fates.
- o Many of the people who favour wholesale removal of the mature trees on the Reserve own adjoining property without living on site, and hope to improve the dollar value of their property by the removal of these trees.

#### **Park design criteria**

- o The questions must be asked in relation to Parks and Reserves in Christchurch.
- o Why must ALL of them conform to the seeming standard model of solitary specimen trees?
- o Why is there an unwritten policy of felling all stands, whatever size, of pine trees, and replacing them with some other species instead of the same species in a similar pattern.
- o These two approaches, allowing no other concept to apply, are blinkered in the extreme.
- o Brownlee Reserve is NOT the usual sort of Reserve which is allocated primarily for sports-fields. The topography does not permit this. It is suited to walking, and quiet reflective pursuits, as well as children having rough wilderness experiences quite close to home. Just as they have done for the past 60+ years.
- o The City Parks people should allow some flexibility in these matters, and Brownlee Reserve is an excellent place to start.
- o Low-maintenance versus complex and expensive. Brownlee Reserve is not expensive now, and little money has been spent there for decades.
- o The credibility of other submitters is equally suspect as they stand to gain in their property value by endorsing this proposal, if trees are cut thus improving their ocean view. I seriously doubt they would show any concern in this process if this were not the case.

#### **Comments about the involvement of the developer**

- o Just a pity we're not going to have the developer bearing some of the cost that he offered to pay originally.
- o It is not a model reserve that hill residents are asking for but an environment that is looked at without the prompting of a property developer.
- o Make any damaged trees safe, not just for Globe Holdings benefit.
- o If Globe Holdings had not wanted the trees removed the reserve would have remained the same for many years to come.
- o What happened to the \$100K offered by the developer? If this contribution has been lost who is accountable for that?
- o You say this is not developer driven – then why are you removing the trees from the area surrounding the development plot first?
- o Notice renewal of areas closest to development! Leave them out of it and attend to routine maintenance and take out only a fraction of trees that are really necessary. Do not accommodate developers. The community pays your rates.
- o It was mentioned in the community meeting held by the Council that the property developer, Globe Holdings, would consider giving the city a portion of their land as some motivating factor to hasten the acceptance of the proposal. The land that was shown is useless to either party and so small as to be an insult to Rate Payers.
- o Lastly, the order of the stages is very favourable to the developer. It considers cutting trees immediately adjacent to their property and ignores the main public use area until 2008/09. This is obviously self serving.

**GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE CONSULTATION PROCESS**

49. A total of eight submitters indicated their appreciation of the consultation process undertaken by Council including the effort made to inform the community of the new situation, the public meeting and reserve tour, and the opportunity to comment on the proposal.
50. A number of concerns about the consultation process were raised by one submitter, including inaccuracies in the information provided and in the way it was presented in the plan, and the inadequacy of the comment form in effectively canvassing the views of the residents.

**Comments in support of the consultation process**

- o Thank you to the Council staff that attended the meeting. It was most interesting and informative. It seems that there is a small vocal minority that want not trees removed under any circumstances.
- o From my understanding of the results of the original residents survey, the prop plan should be well accepted. I'm very concerned about the minority representing "residents assoc" having too much clout with their very negative views. Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the prop plan.
- o I would like to thank Dieter and Joanne for their time (and patience) at the Brownlee Reserve last Saturday afternoon.
- o Thank you for the efforts with meetings and mailings you have arranged to keep us informed. It is appreciated.
- o Many thanks for asking.
- o We appreciate the time and effort the Council has put into the redevelopment programme in terms of listening to residents thoughts and opinions.
- o Keep up the good work. Appreciate the process you have undertaken and the opportunity to comment.
- o Thanks to CCC for a community wide consultation on the status and use of this Reserve. May the democratic process continue to deliver the wishes of the community.

**Comments against the consultation process****Degree of detail made available for residents to evaluate**

- o Community involvement, apart from surveys such as this rather flawed example, seems to be about as far as the Parks people can face doing.
- o Local interest is such that I suggest closer involvement, such as the joint consultations proposed in a resolution placed before the Board by Councillor Anna Crighton, and passed.

**Specific concerns about the new Concept Plan****Presentation and representation**

**Firstly**, there are significant errors (once again) in the map supplied for residents to assess and comment on, as part of the proposals.

There are great distortions within the map; existing trees are often not shown, or if shown may be at a distance up to 300% different from firm ground features as shown (such as surveyed boundary corners), as revealed by actual measurement on the ground and comparison with the map.

Thus, regarding trees not shown, the reader can therefore not tell if they are to be felled or kept. Because of these errors, the locations of proposed replacement seedlings can not be interpreted with any assurance of accuracy, or in relation to existing trees and features and those trees to be retained.

If this map is based on a GPS survey, then somebody got it very wrong. In any case, it was money badly spent.

**Again**, as in the previous consultation, the trees proposed to be felled are represented on the map in a colour that does not stand out, thus appearing to minimise the extent of felling. It is difficult to see what trees are to be felled. Red figures in thick lines, rather than pale blue in very thin lines, would have been a more suitable colour and illustrative proportion. It is noted that the "positive" arborist proposals use thick lines which are more obvious. Could the illustrative strategy employed possibly be termed "devious"?

**Secondly**, with regard to the questionnaire; these days there is a good science of, and lots of available experience in opinion gathering, so that the degree and concerns of people whose opinions are being canvassed can be analysed and evaluated. The simplistic "Yes/No" response provision of the current "Comment Form" is inadequate and unworthy of the Christchurch City Council. Council can and should do much better.



**COMMENTS ON THE ASSESSMENT OF THE CONDITION OF THE TREES**

51. There were 21 additional comments made by submitters who were opposed to the plan either questioning the findings of the tree survey and the condition of the trees (9), or suggesting that routine maintenance and pruning only would be sufficient (12).
52. The eight submitters who questioned the findings of the tree survey and the condition of the trees identified several key ideas:
- The majority of trees in the reserve are healthy, have a long life expectancy and do not pose a hazard.
  - There are no indications that the trees are in an unhealthy or hazardous condition.
  - The imperfect or mis-shapen nature of some of the trees does not mean they should be removed.
  - The number of trees to be removed is excessive.
  - The assessment of the trees in the reserves, including the criteria used, and the sequence of interventions, is considered to be inaccurate.
53. An independent report on the pine trees from Mark Bloomberg (see **Attachment 3 tabled**), Lecturer in Forestry at Lincoln University, was commissioned by the Sumner Residents Association and a copy was also provided to the Council. This report supports some of the submitters views that the majority of pine trees in the reserve are healthy, free of disease and wind-firm.
54. Another 12 submitters made further comments about the condition of the trees suggesting that a routine maintenance programme is all that is required. The key views identified in these comments were:
- The current situation has arisen through a lack of previous care by Council.
  - Only damaged or dangerous trees should be removed or made safe for everyone's benefit.
  - A routine maintenance programme for the trees is all that is required.
55. The author of the Council's tree survey has provided clarification and explanation of the survey in relation to comments raised by submitters as follows:
- (a) Brownlee Reserve has reached a point where it could be classed as a liability, therefore a restoration process needs to be put in place now to prevent accidents and assure long term viability of the asset. All plant collections in the urban environment depend on management strategies, and Council is committed to long term maintenance and restoration processes.
  - (b) The proposal is to replace approximately 40-50 specimens per annum over a five year period. It needs to be appreciated that the survey included a large number of young and semi-mature specimens of poor quality (including the shrubby and declining Ngaios along the western boundary) thereby increasing the total number of trees considerably.
  - (c) It is the Council's intention to remove dangerous and overcrowded trees and to make any damaged trees safe for all reserve users. Replacing the dead, dying, diseased and hazardous trees only will leave a number of trees inside the plantation classed as in "fair" condition suddenly exposed to the elements. These previously protected trees then become "edge trees" with potential to fail. It is recommended to leave a framework of the most predictable trees and still provide necessary maintenance to the remainder. As some of the "edge trees" need to be replaced due to lack of structural integrity, any remaining trees need to be re-evaluated for their suitability under these new conditions. It also needs to be appreciated that new buildings built on the Globe Holdings property have the potential to create new wind forces and wind directions that need to be considered before the development goes ahead.
  - (d) The senescence and decline referred to in the survey relates mainly to eucalypt, Ngaio and young totara trees, not pine trees. Over-maturity relates to many of the eucalypts.

- (e) Criteria used in evaluating the tree hazards included the proximity of trees to boundaries, the presence of a target, overhanging branches, weak branch attachments, trees on a lean, and sudden exposure. For example, a number of mis-shapen specimens are classed as hazardous due to weak branch attachments caused by internal decay in the main trunk.
- (f) The foliage of most pines appears healthy. The problem however, lies with co-dominant stem attachments displayed by a number of trees. The foliage of most eucalypts appears unhealthy due to insect damage and other environmental circumstances.
- (g) The Board considered a 30 metre safety boundary in the reserve as was specified previously in relation to the Globe Holdings Ltd development. The author requests in the new tree survey that the Board reconsider this boundary as some of the trees within are tall enough to reach private property and paths (should they ever fail), but appear sound enough at the time of inspection to be part of the retained framework until circumstances change.

#### **Comments questioning the findings of the tree survey and the condition of the trees**

- o Gradual replacement is fine but the suggestion that 73% of trees be removed in the immediate future seems completely over the top.
- o The stand of pine trees while not perfectly shaped individual specimens are healthy, free of disease and wind-firm.
- o The trees should be maintained for their health and any possible safety issues but they don't pose a threat as a collective group.
- o The bulk of the trees particularly those identified on the concept plan as "Area 4" are healthy, wind firm, and disease-free and shelter the reserve from the prevailing winds.
- o We are not happy with 242 trees being removed and in a relatively short time frame. An earlier assessment of the trees found far fewer to be at risk or hazardous.

#### **Health of trees and tree life expectancy:**

- o My opinion is that the majority of trees in the reserve are relatively healthy and, given normal maintenance, don't pose a serious health risk to the public. The current stands of pine and eucalypts with some re-planting are likely to have decades of life in them. I've worked with pines and eucalypts as a forester for most of my working life [ ]. I've noticed that many trees live and remain intact a lot longer than one would think. The trees in the reserve I estimate are about 40 years old. While some of the radiata pines in Hagley Park and the Botanic Gardens are over 120 years. During recent strong winds, storms and very wet winter there was only minimal breakage and uprooting. The hillside maritime location is ideal for both the pines and the eucalypts, with some re-planting and normal maintenance these stands could be maintained indefinitely.
- o Why remove trees in the prime of their life to avoid trouble in 20-30-40 years' time? As someone wrote in one of the local papers; it is like pulling out all of someone's teeth because they might cause trouble at some stage.  
For safety reasons, no tree over 2.5-3 metres high should be allowed on City Council land. Anything higher can cause injury?

All trees must be perfect!! Perfection in nature is very much in the eye of the beholder: it is very personal. In the case of Brownlee Reserve it seems that one man's idea of perfection will be forced on everybody. Many artists are greatly inspired by trees in a shape abhorred by foresters, for instance. The permanent resident bellbirds love the imperfect trees.

- o In the 2½ years that I have lived next to the reserve, I have walked thru the reserve during and after some of the most severe wind and rain storms that have been recorded in Christchurch. The winds have been "Northwest" as well as "Southerly". I have never seen a limb, branch or tree damaged by these storms. It makes sense that if a tree develops and grows as it is being exposed to a certain environmental stress, it adapts. This is elementary biology. There are a very small number of trees that are close enough to homes that they would create a hazard if they fell. This warped logic could be perpetrated on any stand of mature trees justifying their unnecessary removal. Do we put a fence around every cliff overlooking the ocean in Godley Reserve to protect against legal redress. Passing this proposal off from the angle of legal justification is deceptive.
- o The health of the existing trees has been substantiated by other experts over the course of

the last 2 years. Certainly some very small and crowded specimens could be removed; however, the wholesale removal of nearly 75% of the trees in the reserve is based on misinformation and thus unjustified.

o **Evaluation and proposed treatment of safety**

*Boundaries*

The Board imposed a 30m safety buffer strip. Takes no account of wind direction, tree height, soils, previous history etc. One wonders about the rationale behind this.

*Hazard trees*

To quote from the "New Development Concept Plan",

A new survey to assess the condition of all trees on Brownlee Reserve on an individual basis ... has identified that 242 or 72.4% of all trees on the reserve show signs of over-maturity, structural decline, diseases, and other stress caused by various factors. Measures must now be taken to ensure that all trees that are potentially a serious risk to neighbouring residents and other reserve users' safety are removed and the hazard eliminated.

Albers et al (1) point out that a tree is not a hazard tree until a target is identified. For perhaps most of the 242 trees, there is no target.

Very few of these trees can be accurately described as over-mature. On-site assessment reveals that the age of the naturally regenerated trees is probably in the range 26 - 36 years. Radiata pine has a natural lifespan in such dry conditions of well over 100 years, as many trees in Christchurch reveal. Look, for example, at the large specimens in the Park near the Linwood Service Centre, and in North Hagley Park. Burstall and Sale (3) record ages (extrapolated) of 140 years.

*Clumps and groups of trees*

Many of the trees are growing in clumps. This fact is also one clue to their natural origin. When pine trees grow in clumps, the degree of competition can be severe; but frequently there is considerable root-grafting, so that despite the competition for light, they share the soil moisture and nutrients and the competition that humans might envisage, is actually not present to the degree expected.

These irregular clumps of trees are part of the charm of this arm of the Reserve. Because they are growing in clumps it does not follow that they are structurally unsound or about to fall over. In practice, such trees, even if they die alone, usually do not fall for some years and park maintenance staff would be able to deal with this matter as a routine procedure.

Occurrence of such trees is NOT a phenomenon that requires urgent felling. These comments in part apply also to ...(see paragraph below)

Many of the trees are mis-shapen. This does not necessarily mean that they present a danger. With pines, usually not. Pine trees with a pronounced lean, especially solitary trees, however, do deserve careful evaluation, and it is surprising, in view of the fuss that is being made about safety, that some have not already removed. For example, the tree leaning over power-lines on Clifton Terrace. The most recent concept plan would have (east arm) such a heavy felling in the pine trees that it would equate to a heavy thinning (in forestry terms). On such an exposed site, to fell such a high proportion of stems would be akin to signing a death warrant for the little stand. There would be an extremely high probability (about 80% in my experience) of all or most of the remaining stems, now without the joint protection of neighbours, to all be windthrown within 2 or 3 years. There is plenty of experience of this happening during the last 85 years with this species, in New Zealand, and over a longer time period world-wide.

The **only** reasonable way to avoid this catastrophe is to use the careful, gradual and considered thinning process detailed by Mr W. Fielding-Cottrell during the previous consultation round.

It would be very enlightening to learn just what criteria were applied to the individual pine trees that caused each one to be placed on the "condemned list".

Crowding, dead lateral branches, long lateral branches, are not hazard indicators in this species.

There are no fungal or bacterial pathogens evident in these trees. (also see Bloomberg).

*Comment.*

People who have worked with the author of the Draft Concept plan have explained to me how he is consumed with a desire for perfection, has an unduly enhanced concern for hazard, and can not tolerate the idea of trees growing in groups. It seems to me that these

preconceptions have resulted in a concept plan that in its turn is extreme in its proposals and unbalanced.

*Sequence, degree, and timing of interventions.*

For one of the area of the Reserve (north), these are not of great significance, but for the remainder they are. It again emphasised that the minimal, careful, considered and progressive management proposed by Mr Fielding-Cottrell in the last version he presented was very sound, and should be followed.

The “one-hit” approach proposed in this current “Concept Plan” is a recipe for certain disaster as far as the trees and the Reserve are concerned. The gales to which this Reserve is exposed, and which the trees have quite well withstood, will certainly quickly find the newly exposed and rather solitary trees, and pick them off with the mercy of a killer-whale eating seals. There is a history spanning at least 80 years, of such sad and misguided events already, in New Zealand. This approach will almost certainly cause the destruction of the most valued parts of the Reserve. [Finish]

*Hazard indicators in this Reserve.*

I disagree with narrow branch angle and included bark being a strong hazard indicator for pine in a closed stand. Such trees rarely give problems.

While I mention this topic, I note with wonder at the values and instructions to the people who have been doing tree maintenance recently in the Reserve, including during this week. Obvious hazards have been ignored, even though they have worked right alongside these hazards.

**Comments suggesting that maintenance of the trees is all that is required**

- Make any damaged trees safe, not just for Globe Holdings benefit.
- Remove dangerous trees/overcrowded areas ONLY.
- All that is required is just routine maintenance and pruning of any hazardous trees.
- Why have you let the trees get into such a state? Lack of care from the Council.
- What is needed is removal of dead or dying trees and provision of safe/all weather paths and steps.
- The Council should undertake its routine maintenance – pruning hazardous branches, weeding out noxious plants, making the paths safer – not create a high maintenance park which will require a much larger budget for its upkeep.
- Notice renewal of areas closest to development! Leave them out of it and attend to routine maintenance and take out only a fraction of trees that are really necessary. It’s a lovely natural space especially tranquil under tall canopy of pines – copses/clearings. Do not want an overly manicured space. It has survived untouched until now. Enhance and care for what exists – maintain what is essential. Do not accommodate developers. The community pays your rates.
- We support routine maintenance such as pruning hazardous branches and getting rid of [?] and upgrading the paths and entry points.
- Routine maintenance is all that is needed. Trees are important on the skyline. They don’t need replacing.
- Over mature trees are only an issue for safety (and most can be safely lopped) or for plantations. In great parks and gardens worldwide mature trees are seen as assets rather than as liabilities.
- It has been suggested by the Council Arborist that we could satisfactorily maintain the existing trees by trimming them yearly. The cost of this would be miniscule when compared to the many hundreds of thousands of dollars of ratepayers money required for the current proposal.
- At long last some of the more obvious loose branches and distorted branches on eucalypts in the south area have been trimmed, and this has been very welcome.
- “Corrective prune” remaining trees.
- This must be **very** important to the authors, as it is printed in two separate entries in the objectives !! In my opinion, such pruning applied to the radiata pine trees willy-nilly, would seriously undermine and compromise the essential character of the east area (4) that exists and which people like. I could be applied to a very few trees, but not to many, and certainly not to trees like these (below), adjoining nice sheltered glades.

**COMMENTS ABOUT THE EXISTING TREES – FELLING, SPECIES AND VALUES**

56. There were an equal number of submitters making general comments in support of (8), or against (8), the proposed felling of the existing trees. Those supporting the felling indicated that:
- Removal was long overdue.
  - The trees were out of scale and caused shading.
  - They had doubts about the need to change, or preferred the wild feel of the reserve, but subsequently acknowledged the need to fell the trees due to their condition.
57. However there was a higher number of comments specifically against the existing pine and eucalypt trees that currently comprise the majority of the larger trees in the reserve. These 12 submitters identified a range of issues with the pine trees:
- particular, pines were not a suitable species for a reserve setting.
  - The pines were causing shading effects.
58. Support for the pines and/or eucalypts was shown by five submitters including those who just like these particular species of trees.
59. A greater number of comments (10) were made in relation to the nuisance values of the existing trees:
- The shading of adjoining properties and parts of the reserve being of key significance (9).
  - The growth of the trees to block the views from the reserve and neighbouring properties (3)
60. A number of hazards were identified by five submitters:
- Safety of reserve users and adjoining property due to unsafe trees.
  - Threats to electricity supply.
61. In contrast, the beneficial values of the existing trees in the reserve were identified by seven submitters:
- Providing shelter from winds.
  - Soil stability.
  - Landscape character and aesthetics.
62. Similarly, the potential hazards of removing the identified trees have been identified in ten submissions:
- Exposure to winds (1).
  - Soil erosion and threat of landslips (3).
  - Potential impacts on the birdlife in the reserve (6).

<b>General comments supporting tree felling</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Thrilled about the trees.</li> <li>○ At first we were sceptical about the need to change the park but we realise now that cutting down dangerous trees and replanting is necessary.</li> <li>○ [ ] it doesn't get any sun because of those very tall pine trees. They should come down and natives planted instead.</li> <li>○ I very much support the removal of many (if not all) of the large trees. They are out of scale in a residential area, and must cause much shading to nearby residents (No I am not one of them!).</li> <li>○ Would also like pine trees removed around the playground as is very cold and dark, not really inviting for young children.</li> <li>○ Long overdue to get some of the trees down.</li> <li>○ Probably prefer the wild untamed pine feel of the reserve but if the trees are past their "best by" date, then it sounds a good plan to replace them.</li> <li>○ Looking forward to a view from the top.</li> </ul>

**Against pines and gums**

- We will be delighted to see the ragged looking pine trees along Panorama Road be culled out. They represent probably a greater threat to electricity supply than personal safety – some trees there though are needed for soil stability.
- Pine trees belong in a pine forest. The trees have served the purpose. It is now time to convert the reserve to an attractive living space for both plants and people. The design and planting of what is proposed has much to offer.
- [ ] it doesn't get any sun because of those very tall pine trees. They should come down and natives planted instead.
- I am personally pleased that the tall pines along Panorama Road are going to be thinned out as we are being increasingly shaded out from the afternoon sun.
- The existing trees have few remaining features – other than being there now.
- The pines are basically self seeded by the look of them, should be in a plantation not a park!! They're always breaking or falling over. When we first lived [ ] the reserve beside us was horse paddock!! I personally trimmed all the pines above head height, put in the walking track (from our side across to Panorama), took down fences etc, so people could get through.
- It's about time it had a makeover, the pine trees have always been untidy.
- It is a HUGE improvement on the pines.
- Would also like pine trees removed around the playground as is very cold and dark, not really inviting for young children.
- Would prefer to see all pine trees particularly pinus radiata eventually removed – they are an attractive commercial species which prevent anything growing beneath them.
- Pines are out of date – would love to see a variety as you have planned.
- I do not think Pinus radiata is a suitable tree for the reserve. Would prefer natives.

**Hazards from the existing trees**

- We will be delighted to see the ragged looking pine trees along Panorama Road be culled out. They represent probably a greater threat to electricity supply than personal safety – some trees there though are needed for soil stability.
- Please address the safety concerns first – trees, fallen trees, holes in ground etc.
- Can be a bit frightening on a windy day.
- Because we walk our grandchildren through this park it needs to be safe.
- We understand the concerns some residents who live next to the reserve have about the dangers of falling trees and quite rightly so.

**Nuisance values of the existing trees**

- [ ] There was plenty of sunshine on that area then. [ ] it doesn't get any sun because of those very tall pine trees. They should come down and natives planted instead.
- I am personally pleased that the tall pines along Panorama Road are going to be thinned out as we are being increasingly shaded out from the afternoon sun.
- I would like to see area three done asap as the houses there have so much shading. Warmth and light would be fantastic.
- I very much support the removal of many (if not all) of the large trees. They are out of scale in a residential area, and must cause much shading to nearby residents (No I am not one of them!).
- Would also like pine trees removed around the playground as is very cold and dark, not really inviting for young children.
- Now the trees have taken over, shaded and obliterated the view. Pines are out of date – would love to see a variety as you have planned. Our family also own property beside the park. It is now completely shaded, cannot grow anything.
- [ ] But now that land gets no sun.
- Trees remaining on the Clifton Terrace side (area 3) will still cause us considerable shade – can these be topped?
- The trees on the adjacent Brownlee Reserve have grown so much they shade the land and there is no longer a view down to Sumner Bay.
- We lived in [ ]. Both with views down to Sumner Bay now blocked out by the tall on Area 3.

### General comments against tree felling

- Why also has it all of a sudden been a decision to wholesale remove so many trees. It is not a model reserve that hill residents are asking for but an environment that is looked at without the prompting of a property developer.
- We would like to see as many trees as possible stay or pruned, however we understand if they are dead or dying it is better to replace sooner.
- Most of the trees are healthy and have a long life span – they must be retained for aesthetic reasons and for the shelter they provide.
- The stand of pine trees while not perfectly shaped individual specimens are healthy, free of disease and wind-firm.
- The trees should be maintained for their health and any possible safety issues but they don't pose a threat as a collective group.
- They don't need replacing.
- We would like to see a revision in the no. of trees removed near our boundary – at the moment the plan is a clear-fell which would remove all wind protection and significantly alter our forest-like environment.
- How are you going to dispose or remove the trees, we are already being exposed to concrete trucks and transporters defying the notice at the bottom of the hill causing many hold ups on road while trying to negotiate bends.

### For pines and gums

- The Council must respect what seems to be a majority local view that the community – who are certainly the bulk of its users, want to retain pine trees, want to retain the shelter of the large trees.
- Strongly support retaining eucalypts on eastern Clifton Terrace side. As retired people we love watching their lovely swaying movements in winds from all directions from our home.
- We do not support removal of pine and eucalypt plantation.
- Probably prefer the wild untamed pine feel of the reserve but if the trees are past their "best by" date, then it sounds a good plan to replace them.
- While very common I like the pine and eucalypts.

### Benefits/values of the existing trees

- We will be delighted to see the ragged looking pine trees along Panorama Road be culled out. They represent probably a greater threat to electricity supply than personal safety – some trees there though are needed for soil stability.
- The trees provide shelter from prevailing easterly and southerly winds.
- Most of the trees are healthy and have a long life span – they must be retained for aesthetic reasons and for the shelter they provide.
- The dark pines on the crown of the hill are one of Sumner's iconic views.
- Trees are important on the skyline.
- We enjoy the wilderness aspect of Brownlee Reserve and as in the wilderness trees are not all perfect.
- What we like about Brownlee Reserve:  
 We have lived [ ] for the past 12 years; Brownlee reserve is an important attraction for us living on Clifton Hill. We frequent it often and from our house look through the trees to the sea beyond.  
 One of the main things we like about the reserve is its tall forest character and its undeveloped wild nature. While very common I like the pine and eucalypts. Hilliers manual on trees and shrubs a bible to many gardeners has this to say about Radiata Pine: "A large tree with deeply fissured, dark brown bark and a dense head of branches shoots bright green and densely crowded on the branchlets.  
 An attractive, rapidly growing tree for mild coastal areas. Excellent for withstanding sea winds," and on the Eucalypts: "their lush foliage, unusual multi-stamened flowers and attractive stems provide an impressive subtropical effect". The tall trees provide a nice contrast to normal suburbia. The rushing sound of the wind through the tall pines and views through the layered gum canopy to a silvery moonlit sea beyond are enchanting. The wild nature and forest effect would be ruined with over development, signs and lighting.

### Potential hazards of tree removal

- We will be delighted to see the ragged looking pine trees along Panorama Road be culled out. They represent probably a greater threat to electricity supply than personal safety – some trees there though are needed for soil stability.
- Removal of so many trees will cause erosion and slips as we are experiencing but on a larger scale.
- What will hold the soil together when the trees roots are gone? There will be a danger of landslip. This does not have the residents interests at heart.
- We will be exposed to the southerly with little wind protection
- Bird life will be affected with your open plan.
- You will DESTROY the beautiful bird song of many bellbirds that fill the reserve and surrounding area from daybreak until dusk.
- The proposal removes far too much of bellbird habitat too quickly. The old trees need to be removed gradually over the next 20 years.
- The permanent resident bellbirds love the imperfect trees.
- Please ensure enough old tall trees are retained to keep our native birds who live in the tree tops, ie: bellbird. Even hopefully add a few more large trees.
- My only reservations are: Enough large trees must remain over the replacement periods to retain the native birdlife who roost and live in the taller tree tops – ie bellbirds, fantail, grey warbler etc.

### REPLACEMENT PLANTINGS IN THE RESERVE

63. General comments about the proposed replacement plantings in the reserve were made by eight submitters, including:
- A need for trees to be planted especially for wind protection.
  - Species selection appropriate to the environmental conditions.
  - Toxicity of some proposed plant species around the playground area.
  - Potential risks to personal safety from criminal behaviour encouraged by dense plantings.
64. There were again approximately even numbers of submitters indicating a preference for either exotic (6) or native (7) plantings, with some support also for a mixture of both (3). A further 6 submitters identified a specific need for replacement plantings that will provide habitat and food for birdlife in the reserve.

### Comments about replacement plantings

#### General comments

- Make sure we get trees planted not just bushes. We like trees!!
- The design and planting of what is proposed has much to offer.
- I'm happy to help with planting – I can also supply dozens of cabbage trees, ake ake and renga renga seedlings.
- Native shrub replacements will do nothing to provide a sheltered get away from the nasty prevailing easterlies.
- More trees please or it will get very windy (NE and E seabreeze).
- The three entrances to the Reserve reflect the very different climates in terms of prevailing winds and sunshine / shade. The planting suggestions of the Council's Tree Officer do reflect these differences well, but it is important that all proposed species will thrive without needing long-term expensive labour-intensive care.
  - Are rain-forest species such as beech and totara suited for the indicated dry, windy, salty position proposed? The proven "coastal" species of Pohutakawa, Ngaio and AkeAke as proposed seem better suited.

There is still a place for the "pioneer" species of pine and gums, especially in a coastal setting. The former manage to extract moisture from cold damp air (in abundance), the latter to conserve moisture in arid circumstances (also prevalent).

**Note:** A search of the internet revealed that several of the proposed species (including plants designated for the play area), range in toxicity from mild when contacted to fatal if ingested. Please do not place these in the children's space.

- Some new trees and shrubs could be introduced to improve the landscape and interest of the



reserve and as eventual replacements for the current trees. But I think the essential tall stand forest character with open spaces should be retained and I think sticking with the pines and eucalypts as the tall canopy is fine.

o **Many low plantings proposed, especially around the boundary.**

At present the Reserve is safe for more vulnerable people to walk in as it is relatively open and outsiders, including neighbours, can, if they wish look in (solid fences excluded!). The many long, low and dense plantings proposed will nullify this safety aspect, and several of the women I have spoken to in regard to this plan have expressed concern that such plantings might screen from view, untoward goings-on and attackers.

**For native plantings**

- o Clifton, now a part of "Christchurch City", is geographically and historically a part of Banks Peninsula. It is a hill area, adjacent to a tidal estuary and seaside area, where humans have lived for over 1000 years. (source: Rik Tau, of Ngai Tahu). This history seems too easily dismissed in the still evident "first four ships" mentality of "flat-earth" Christchurch. I grew up on Clifton, and have always been aware of pre-European Aotearoa. From Brownlee Reserve we look out into the vast Pacific Ocean. For these reasons I would like to see, in appropriate areas, a programme of the gradual replacement of exotic species, with well chosen, indigenous Genus/species/varieties (which have withstood this local climate, and a lack of ready water over the many thousands of years before Pakeha arrived here) Just imagine how it could look one day! Footnote: (In my property [ ] such trees are growing (from seed specially grown by DOC), without special watering, and with success.
- o I do not support the exotic, which obviously includes the Mediterranean, plantings which proposal seems to make a botanical garden of the area. The planting should be limited to native species with particular selections to provide habitat for native birds. Exotic trees ie pines, gums etc already dominate the hill "treescape" in the area. Its time to restore the native flora with integrity and passion!!
- o [ ] it doesn't get any sun because of those very tall pine trees. They should come down and natives planted instead.
- o I would like to see lots of pohutukawa trees planted.
- o My only preference for a change in the proposal would be for the planting to be entirely of native trees and shrubs – complementing the planting on the corner of Panorama Road and Clifton Tce and providing good habitat for indigenous birds.
- o Hope trees will suit few remaining fantails and bellbirds. More native trees/bush?
- o I do not think Pinus radiata is a suitable tree for the reserve. Would prefer natives.

**For exotic plantings**

- o I think that deciduous trees should be considered for the South-West border of the park to reduce winter shade on the adjoining properties.
- o Like the idea of growing some exotic and frost tender trees and shrubs up there.
- o It would be lovely if there are some cherry trees around the fringe of the reserve.
- o Strongly support including deciduous trees to bring seasonal colour to the reserve as well as more sun into it during winter.
- o **Tree species to be used.**  
The "Proposed Concept" has for area 4:  
*Area 4 - Exotic Woodland.*  
*Comprised of exotic deciduous and coniferous tree species including Pinus, Cedrus and Abies; and deciduous trees species may consists of **Betula jaquemondii** and Larix to provide seasonal contrast. Shrub species to be used could include viburnum and arbutus.*  
When I asked Mr Steinegg, at the presentation in "The Ark", what species were proposed to be used in the replanting of this area, I first of all outlined the current nature of this miniature "forest walk" which is so valued, then asked if it would be maintained, and what species would be used.  
He hesitated for a moment as if in disbelief, then replied emphatically "*If you want a plantation, then you can have a plantation !*".  
This was not the answer I expected, but it told the meeting what they should hear.  
I suggest that two other species be chosen instead to perpetuate the current theme; these are, Pinus nigra (Corsican pine) and Pinus sylvestris (Scots pine). Each grows to a lower maximum height than radiata pine, and have a similar character. they should be used as a matter of preference on the northern and southern flanks of area 4. I do not favour the range of species suggest in the draft plan. To use them to more than minimal extent will undermine the essential character.

In passing, I observe that radiata pine has become something of an iconic landscape tree in New Zealand. And who has not had a young radiata pine as a Christmas tree? Only a few

<p>New Zealanders.</p> <p>Radiata pine has become a typical and valued part of our national landscape, but most city dwellers do not have the opportunity to walk in a small stand of these trees and experience the specific sensations and quiet such an environment provides. This area is a miniature forest-walk, such as provided at Hanmer Forest Park, but it is local, and tiny. And valued as it is.</p> <p><b>Additional species</b></p> <p>(Repeat) I propose the use of Corsican pine and Scots pine on the north and south margins of the east wing, as their lower maximum height would give longer term safety than radiata pine, and still retain the semi-forest values of that part of the Reserve.</p> <p><b>Structure of the tree component of the Reserve.</b></p> <p>For the north area, city park criteria could be used without detracting from the present values. Similarly for some of the central area, and some of the south area. I have reservations about the indigenous zone planned for as it would destroy the open grassy and easily maintained character of this part.</p> <p>One other aspect of the new plantings; some emphasis is given in the Draft for new viewpoints so people can see out of the reserve. Locals see no need at all for these since nearly all have marvellous views every day from their homes, and they go to the Reserve for other values. Also, good views can be had from the streets and margins of the Reserve.</p> <p>New plantings proposed, especially those of low height, will strongly obscure views (currently possible under and past mature trees), just like the little garden at the junction of Clifton Terrace and Panorama Road is increasingly obscuring views from Panorama Road, as the ngaios grow in height.</p>
<p><b>For mixed plantings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Pines are out of date – would love to see a variety as you have planned.</li> <li>o Cannot give a straight yes/no answer – some of the plan excellent; especially a good tree mix. Native and exotic and conifer.</li> <li>o I like the proposal with varied and interesting plantings.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Either one or the other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o We appreciate the time and effort the Council has put into the redevelopment programme in terms of listening to residents thoughts and opinions. However, we believe the reserve should retain its exotic pines or become a 100% native reserve (preferably the former as the reserve is too dry for most natives except shrubs which would do little to provide the shelter and shade the pines currently provide).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Specific to birdlife</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please consider the growing bellbird population when selecting trees – maybe some rata's, kowhai, pohutukawa, and Banksia would encourage more birds.</li> <li>o I would like to see some tree/shrubs that would produce suitable berries for the recovery of the local bird population.</li> <li>o My only preference for a change in the proposal would be for the planting to be entirely of native trees and shrubs – complementing the planting on the corner of Panorama Road and Clifton Tce and providing good habitat for indigenous birds.</li> <li>o Please ensure that there are some flowering exotics available for the resident bellbirds.</li> <li>o Hope trees will suit few remaining fantails and bellbirds. More native trees/bush?</li> <li>o The planting should be limited to native species with particular selections to provide habitat for native birds.</li> </ul>

#### ACCESSIBILITY ISSUES

65. With 29 individual comments being made on various aspects of accessibility, there is a very clear indication from the community that the improvement of access to the reserve with upgrading of the entranceways and paths should be a priority. Two of the three existing entrances to the reserve comprise steps cut into relatively steep banks which may limit accessibility for many reserve users. The banks are also subject to undercutting and erosion which has been particularly evident during the wet conditions of the last winter. The steep topography of much of Brownlee Reserve makes the gradient of the walking paths difficult to negotiate for many users. This is made worse by loose gravel and slippery mud underfoot.

### Accessibility issues with paths and entranceways

- o Please make stroller access easier, ideally at more than one of the entrances.
- o If you're not fit access is only by car – I found it quite spooky, so I love your plan to make it more user friendly. People would want to spend more time visiting there.
- o However as a daily user of this area (walking dogs) the current wet winter has brought to light some access issues.
- o It would be disappointing to not have a safe access point in winter for 5 years. Maybe some urgent work on slippery mud should be considered maintenance and done soon?
- o The time plan is wrong, why should the reserve only be available to those who can negotiate loose and steep unkept gravel tracks?
- o It was mentioned at the recent meeting that some elderly residents were having difficulty accessing the reserve. Someone suggested that there could be a car drop-off point in the reserve. I would urge that vehicles are not allowed in the reserve.
- o Speed restrictions 30 kmph on Clifton and upper Panorama entrance would make access much safer. Parked cars and a narrow road make access/egress dangerous for children at the moment.
- o However I believe that priority should be given to improving the reserve entrances and stabilising the Clifton Terrace frontage which is eroding regularly and collapsing into the gutter.
- o What is needed is removal of dead or dying trees and provision of safe/all weather paths and steps.
- o Path renewal work should be given a higher priority. The current access is poor and basic work should begin before the planned landscaping in 2010.
- o Notice pathways and entranceways which need urgent attention, especially for access, to be done last! This is the most urgent need from local/public viewpoint. Access at entrances very difficult for elderly and prams.
- o We approve of the upgraded entranceways and paths but note this work will not happen until 2011 which we consider an unacceptable delay.

### Improvements

- o Perhaps there is some walkway enhancement and play area development that could be considered. This would include improving accessibility from the roads bordering the reserve.
- o The upgrading of the entrance from Clifton Terrace needs to be undertaken immediately due to repeated slips of clay. Dealing with these as they occur will be costly and ongoing – it is obvious a retaining wall of some sort is urgently required due to increased usage with [?] building projects at 2 properties.
- o Access from Panorama Road to playground is treacherous especially for small children and impassable with a pram (I have both a toddler and a baby).
- o Entrances could be tidied.
- o With recent rains several slips have occurred on Clifton Tce side of reserve and surface runners have appeared – retaining and planting is very much needed.
- o Only thing I would like to see done first is making the main pathway Clifton Tce to Panorama Road safe and easy to use.
- o Pathways do need to be upgraded as well.
- o Need to put new pathways through Clifton Terrace to Panorama Road urgently not safe for elderly.
- o It was a good idea to zig-zag those paths too as a lot of us here are getting on in age! Thank you.
- o We feel that the pathways should have priority over all other work.
- o What about the pathways and landscaping – waiting for funding in 2011 is far too far away. You will leave us with a bare sparse reserve. There is no guarantee that there will be funding for the pathways so what will happen then?
- o Suggest long zig-zag lengths at North and especially South East sides would be better for old folks to get into the park. Currently very steep for them.
- o The pathway upgrades would be a good idea.
- o Why not invest a little in tree safety, leaving the rest of the money for pathways.
- o We understand that there is permission to use the recently re-formed driveway access off Clifton Tce (area 3) and we trust that the path will be realigned or extended to intersect with this sealed, sloping surface which is well suited to prams etc. Signs to warn of the possible presence of children need to be placed on the driveway to remind residents to take due care.
- o In places the paths could be improved but not over "sanitised" and definitely no lights.
- o Tracks. It is proposed to improve the tracks in the year 2010-11, after the tree felling is done. Yes, in 4 - 5 years' time. Certainly some of the tracks would benefit by being made longer for

the benefit of less able walkers. One has to wonder about the rationale of at least one proposed re-route however; on the north area the proposed new track is almost the same length as the existing one, so no difference in overall gradient will result.

- o Several times in the last two years Council has been told about the folly of laying this small gravel on the sloping paths in Brownlee Reserve. Seemingly, no notice has been taken of the need to incorporate the gravel in the top layer of the soil. The result is that the loose gravel quickly is washed away in rivulets that develop in rainstorms on the sloping paths, as shown here. Even worse, it reacts like loose marbles when walked on so that people are likely to fall due to this hazard.

#### PROPOSED TIMEFRAME

66. Nine submitters made comments about the proposed timeframe for the redevelopment of the reserve, with three major issues identified:

- That the removal of the trees is to be undertaken over too short a time period.
- The sequence in which the different areas of the reserve are to be developed should be changed.
- Priority should be given to other works in the reserve in particular upgrading of the entranceways and paths.

#### Comments about the timeframe

- o Would love to see it started soon.
- o Does it really have to take five years to complete?
- o The proposal removes far too much of bellbird habitat too quickly. The old trees need to be removed gradually over the next 20 years.
- o I would like to see Area 3 done asap as the houses there have so much shading. Warmth and light would be fantastic.
- o The time plan is wrong, why should the reserve only be available to those who can negotiate loose and steep unkept gravel tracks?
- o Remove and replace over a much greater period of time than proposed.
- o We enjoy the wilderness aspect of Brownlee Reserve and as in the wilderness trees are not all perfect. We are not happy with 242 trees being removed and in a relatively short time frame. An earlier assessment of the trees found far fewer to be at risk or hazardous. We approve of the upgraded entranceways and paths but note this work will not happen until 2011 which we consider an unacceptable delay. We would rather see any felling of trees staged over a longer period of time.
- o We feel that Area 4 should be left to last (except for dealing with the most unsafe and diseased trees). We feel that the pine plantation should be retained as long as possible to continue protection of the Reserve from the driving, prevailing easterly wind.
- o We (perhaps cynically), have doubts over the long-term prospects of the entire proposal receiving the required on-going funding – over a minimum term of 5 years. Therefore we urge the CCC to embark immediately on the most relevant work **in the following order**:
  1. To improve access to all entrances, (particularly areas 1 and 3).
  2. To upgrade pathways (as proposed).
  3. To upgrade area 2 (especially the children's play equipment).
  4. To remove **only** the most unsafe or diseased trees. (We note that this work has already begun).
  5. To improve the picnic table and seating in area 2. (If the initial funding is insufficient, these items may be able to be funded by the community e.g. service group / neighbourhood committee project).

If there is still money available (or as money becomes available in future years), then, and only then, begin the process of tree replacement as outlined in the plan.

**We do not wish to begin the larger scale replacement of trees until funding is secured (perhaps for each area in turn).**

**RECREATION**

67. A total of 18 submitters made reference to the recreational values of Brownlee Reserve, with nine of these relating to the play opportunities available for children, and a further two requesting additional seating. A key theme was the variety and nature of the recreational and play experiences provided by the unique environment and character of the reserve.

<b>Comments about recreation</b>
<b>Recreation opportunities</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o I'm also happy that dogs can walk there on a lead.</li> <li>o The reserve was a great place to grow up. I did heaps of stuff there, learnt to mountain bike, made jumps, skate boarded (took wheels off!), made huts etc. Our dogs loved it too Can't wait to Mum and Dad build our new house back up there. Dad always tidied it up, watered new plants and chopped up fallen trees for firewood (before OSH!).</li> <li>o I have grown up with the trees in Brownlee Park and they are great for children to play in and provide nice shade when you are having a picnic or just need a place to rest on your walk.</li> <li>o Need for family picnic and [?].</li> <li>o Area 4 is well suited to the exercising of dogs without disturbing children at play. Perhaps a fenced area might allow for the free exercise of local dogs.</li> <li>o The children's playground has been well used by our children as they grew up and they often use the park for adventure and bike riding.</li> <li>o We enjoy the steep paths for a strenuous walk or a more sedate wander.</li> </ul>
<b>Play opportunities</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Please ensure enough old tall trees are retained to allow the children to climb, swing from, build huts etc. This is sadly lacking in Christchurch parks nowadays. They seem to be "ascetic and safe" rather than fun!!</li> <li>o My only reservations are: 2. Enough large trees remain to allow children to climb, make rope swings etc. Christchurch parks have lost the tall trees that used to be there for children to play in – "safety" issues have eradicated the areas children used to be able to climb, run, build tree huts, swing from branches etc. This is all part of mobility play!</li> <li>o Prefer modern interesting playground equipment. <u>Not</u>: old machinery (if this was the intention)</li> <li>o The park is used by children on bikes who at various times build tracks and small jumps/obstacles. It would be great for children to have a permanent circular cycle path built into the plan. At the moment Council staff spend time deconstructing ramps etc and it would be better to recognise this use and accommodate it.</li> <li>o We take our grandchildren to Brownlee – we all pretend we are in Winnie-the-Pooh's "Hundred Acre Wood"! Please do not destroy this really special place. It is a safe park as you can see through the pine trees – no places for undesirables to lurk. I will not be alive when the new trees grow up but I hope our grandchildren will remember their days of fun.</li> <li>o It was an important play area for our children.</li> <li>o The children's playground could do with some upgrading.</li> <li>o A basic downhill bike course could be built for teenagers. An exercise course is mentioned in the plan which could be okay, provide it doesn't intrude too much on the visual wilderness of the area.</li> <li>o Christchurch's parks and reserves are becoming more and more sterile; one of the reasons is to make them "Safer for Children". Two points:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. None of these places leaves anything to the imagination. Local parks being almost the only place they can go, with home having no garden, and indoors there being TV, video, computer, DVD etc.</li> <li>2. With all these measures, New Zealand has a much higher accident rate for children in playgrounds than countries where children are allowed to climb higher, have less "safe" surfaces to fall on, etc. Could it be that NZ children never learn to cope with "unsafe" situations? But life really is all about learning that from an early age.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o I did ask if there could be some benches put on the steep paths.</li> <li>o Yes, some additional seating would be good.</li> </ul>

**COMMENTS ON OTHER ISSUES RELATING TO BROWNLEE RESERVE**

68. A total of 6 submitters made additional comments on various other matters:
- Prospective purchase of the Globe Holdings Ltd site.
  - Traffic hazards in the transporting of felled trees.

- Undergrounding the services in the area.
- Traffic management.
- Historical and background information on the reserve.

#### **Other comment relating to Brownlee Reserve**

We understand the concerns some residents who live next to the reserve have about the dangers of falling trees and quite rightly so. One possible way of overcoming this problem would be for the Council to buy the land Globe Holdings are considering developing on, and adding that to the reserve. That way, if the 30m trim zone was implemented, there would still be a considerable amount of tree-cover in the reserve, and all sides, including Globe Holdings, would benefit.

We urge the CCC to buy the section on the corner of Panorama Rd and Clifton Tce as a natural and complementary extension of the Reserve. Many observers (both local and otherwise), quite naturally (and without prompting), see this as a commonsense solution to the problem of a "developer driven" proposal for high-density town-housing requiring a Specified Departure, due to over-development and corresponding issues of shade and safety. As the only Reserve of any significant size on Clifton, Brownlee Reserve would benefit the community greatly if the larger area was to be landscaped and planted appropriately, along with a network of meandering tracks through a range of flora.

How are you going to dispose or remove the trees, we are already being exposed to concrete trucks and transporters defying the notice at the bottom of the hill causing many hold ups on road while trying to negotiate bends.

Improving the general quality of the park and surrounding residences would be to run the services ie power and phone underground. Safety issue with many of the power lines and telephone lines running through or are in contact with trees that are on residential sections especially Panorama Road.

Speed restrictions 30kmph on Clifton and upper Panorama entrance would make access much safer. Parked cars and a narrow road make access/egress dangerous for children at the moment.

#### **Background information**

##### **Brownlee Reserve – history**

From the perspective of the current debate, the history of Brownlee Reserve starts somewhere about 1930, when radiata pine shelterbelts were planted around much of the perimeter and on internal fences in what is now the Reserve. It is usual for shelterbelt trees to be planted in rows, and it is not known how many rows were used in these shelterbelts. Three rows is a common number in many parts of New Zealand. Many sections on Clifton Hill, including my own, were soon after this time surrounded by planted shelterbelts, usually of macrocarpa cypress, to keep out the easterly, southerly, and north-westerly winds. The practice was common on such bare hillsides.

By 5 October 1956, when the photograph (attached) was taken, the Brownlee Reserve trees were very obvious from a distance. At this stage they had been planted about 26 years. The source of the photograph is the book "Gateway to the Ice" Christchurch International Airport - Antarctic Air Links from 1955, by Tony Phillips.

The Reserve also had other trees including the current eucalypts planted in it, but it had a lot of grassland, so was used for depasturing usually about four horses, and many rabbits besides.

Mr John Handiside, now of Ngaio, lived alongside the Reserve within a couple of houses of the Brownlee house, and through his school years from about 1947 to 1958 played several times a week in the Reserve, then known universally on Clifton Hill as "The Horse paddock", as well as the many other local open spaces. He has attested to the layout and nature of this area.

Some time around the year 1967 give or take a year or two, somebody, probably in Council, saw fit to fell one (outside) row of radiata pine trees on the northern side of the shelterbelt from the eastern corner of the Brownlee home section, to Panorama Road near the property of the Pumpa family (Montrose) at number 23. A consequence of that action was that in a strong storm one of the remaining (now exposed) trees fell on the Pumpa family house, damaging it. There

was an insurance claim which was opposed by the contractor, who denied any felling. The Judge was not convinced, and took the jury to the site where he soon uncovered fresh-cut stumps. The case was rapidly concluded. This evidence comes from [ ].

Some time later, many or most of the pine trees were felled, especially on the northern margin.

Radiata pine has serotinous cones (in common with several other species); that is, they retain live seed for about seven years, and release them when heated sufficiently by the sun or fire. This is an ideal characteristic for such a colonising and pioneer species.

One of the consequences of that is that seedlings in Brownlee Reserve have self-established (regenerated) from the abundant seed, in two kinds of place;

- (a) the (sometimes hot) bare and disturbed earth at and near the felled shelterbelt, and
- (b) at rock outcrops where there would be accumulated heat as well as occasional moisture.

These seedlings have grown to become most of the pine trees we see there now.

These kinds of place are favoured by radiata pine for natural regeneration all over New Zealand, and it still happens around Sumner as the young trees on the Scarborough side of the Sumner Valley prove. Luckily, natural regeneration is usually more wind-firm than planted seedlings are; their roots have not been messed with.

That this version of the history is correct is corroborated by the random clustered distribution of most of the radiata pines in the Reserve, and by whorl counts of the largest trees.

Radiata pine has the characteristic of usually producing one whorl of major branches every year and some minor whorls. Thus, by counting major whorls, one can often derive a reasonable estimate of age of the tree. Factors making this method approximate include (a) if it is not possible to read the number of youngest whorls at the base of the tree, (b) if drought years slow growth and reduce branch size, and (c) if the tree is old enough to have significantly slowed growth at the apex. All these factors apply to the trees in question.

A quick count this week gives the age of some trees here as about 26 years, so 10 years have to be accounted for.

Some time, after an inspection by Mr Warwick Scadden and Mr Gilpin (City Parks manager) in possibly the 1970's, it was decided to maintain this Reserve in a natural style, and as preferred by residents. City Council records should contain a file with this decision.

#### **Brownlee Reserve in summary, September 2006.**

Brownlee Reserve is a T-shaped section of land straddling the end of a high ridge. All three arms slope downwards from the central section.

The North and South areas are slopes that are mostly grass maintained by mowing, and which have mainly sparse eucalyptus and radiata pine trees with lots of open space.

The Central area is the convex crown of the ridge, with shallow soil, much open space, a remnant small rock quarry, an open picnic area, and a infants / pre-teen play area with swings, slides etc. It used to have a large eucalypt tree that was a focus of teen play with a swing-rope, but that has been done away with and teen-age children seldom come here now.

The East area is without doubt the section that sets Brownlee Reserve apart from most other parks and reserves in eastern Christchurch, as it is one of a dwindling number which can boast of being a very enjoyable small area of natural forest-like copses and grassy clearings. The tree species are radiata pine and some eucalypts. It has a unique character of naturalness that sets it apart from most other city places. As such it is a prize jewel for the local suburbs and is one which locals wish to retain with this character.

**COMMENTS ON ISSUES OUTSIDE OF BROWNLEE RESERVE**

69. A total of five submitters made comments on issues that were considered outside the scope of this project:
- Other issues that should be given priority over this reserve.
  - Development work on other reserve land.

<b>Comments relating to other areas or issues</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brownlee Reserve is not as urgent as Ferrymead Bridge widening and strengthening, or the two kilometre sea outlet from the sewage treatment facility discharge at Bromley.</li> <li>○ Other projects requiring work – Scarborough Road lower section, Richmond Hill Road - widening .</li> <li>○ Perhaps there are more pressing issues in Christchurch eg the pools/libraries.</li> <li>○ I like the proposal with varied and interesting plantings. However I wish we could have some of the Clifton Hill planting effort expended on the Richmond Hill Road track – since 2000 I have seen work on the Zig Zag, the corner of Panorama/Clifton, now Brownlee. Richmond Hill Track had improvements made to shore up earth and then not 1 single plant was put in by the CCC (I have planted ¼ of it myself).</li> <li>○ Re: wee park cnrs Starwood Lane and Panorama Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would like to see some more facilities at this park – especially given the relatively long time line for upgrade to Brownlee and possibility that it might be out of commission for a period.</li> <li>• Maybe a climbing frame/slide addition.</li> <li>• A lot of people with young children (under 5) use this playground.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**OPTIONS**

70. There are two options:

- (A) Do nothing/maintain the status quo.

This is not considered a viable option due to the condition of the trees and the reserve overall, and the health and safety risks to people and property posed by hazardous trees.

- (B) The landscape development plan for Brownlee Reserve, amended as a result of public consultation and additional technical advice, and including the staged removal of identified trees, is approved and the Transport and Greenspace Unit commence the development programme as follows:

**Stage 1 - Year 1 - 2006/2007 financial year**

1. All trees identified as "Priority Removal" on the development plan will be removed. These trees are the most hazardous and are mostly situated along the inner boundaries of Area's 3 and 4. Replanting of shrubs will be undertaken along the NE boundary of Area 3.

**Stage 2 – 2007/2008 financial year**

2. Staged removal of identified trees in Area 3 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees.

**Stage 3 – 2008/2009 financial year**

3. Staged removal of identified trees in southern part of Area 4 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees

**Stage 4 – 2009/2010 financial year**

4. Staged removal of identified trees in northern part of Area 4 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees

**Stage 5 – 2010/2011 financial year**

5. Staged removal of identified trees in Areas 1 and 2 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees



6. Upgrading of paths and entranceways will be undertaken in each area of the reserve once tree felling and replanting operations have been completed in that area.
7. Retaining of the banks on the road frontages of Clifton Terrace and part of Panorama Road will be undertaken as required to control erosion.

#### PREFERRED OPTION

71. The preferred option is (B).

#### ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

##### The Preferred Option

72. The landscape development plan for Brownlee Reserve, amended as a result of public consultation and additional technical advice, and including the staged removal of identified trees, is approved and the Transport and Greenspace Unit commence the development programme as follows:

##### Stage 1 - Year 1 - 2006/2007 financial year

- (a) All trees identified as "Priority Removal" on the development plan will be removed. These trees are the most hazardous and are mostly situated along the inner boundaries of Area's 3 and 4.  
Replanting of shrubs will be undertaken along the NE boundary of Area 3.

##### Stage 2 – 2007/2008 financial year

- (b) Staged removal of identified trees in Area 3 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees.

##### Stage 3 – 2008/2009 financial year

- (c) Staged removal of identified trees in southern part of Area 4 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees

##### Stage 4 – 2009/2010 financial year

- (d) Staged removal of identified trees in northern part of Area 4 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees

##### Stage 5 – 2010/2011 financial year

- (e) Staged removal of identified trees in Areas 1 and 2 on the plan followed by replanting of replacement trees
- (f) Upgrading of paths and entranceways will be undertaken in each area of the reserve once tree felling and replanting operations have been completed in that area.
- (g) Retaining of the banks on the road frontages of Clifton Terrace and part of Panorama Road will be undertaken as required to control erosion.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Reduction of health and safety risk posed to people and property by trees in hazardous or declining condition. Improved amenity for reserve users. Reclaims views from reserve.	Potential short term loss of amenity value and wind protection provided by mature trees until new plantings establish.
<b>Cultural</b>	No benefits identified.	No costs identified.
<b>Environmental</b>	Enhancement of vegetation including native species. Enhancement of bird life by planting species for habitat and food production.	Loss of some large trees that provide habitat value for bird life.

<b>Economic</b>	Reduced costs of future maintenance of declining tree population.	Estimated costs over a 5 year period – Tree removal \$20,000 to \$50,000 per annum. Other works \$230,458.73
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b> Primary alignment with community outcome “A City of People who Value and Protect the Natural Environment”. Also contributes to “A City for Recreation, Fun and Creativity”</p> <p><b>Impact on Council’s capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b> No effects on Maori were identified.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b> Consistent with the Environmental Policy 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 general policy on nuisance trees in the Christchurch City Council Parks Code Of Practice.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b> The original proposal was supported by approximately 69% of submitters but not local residents groups.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p>		

#### Maintain The Status Quo (If Not Preferred Option)

73. Do nothing/maintain the status quo.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	The trees will continue to provide amenity value until declining state forces their removal.	Trees will pose a serious health and safety risk to people and property. No improvement in amenity for users.
<b>Cultural</b>	No benefits identified.	No costs identified.
<b>Environmental</b>	Large trees remain as habitat for birdlife.	Poor quality vegetation and bird habitat with little ability for second generation trees to establish successfully.
<b>Economic</b>	Capital expenditure not required in the short-term.	Higher maintenance costs on declining tree population. Will eventually require Council to fund large scale replanting programme at a future date when stands of trees begin to senesce and die.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b> Primary alignment with community outcome “A City of People who Value and Protect the Natural Environment”.</p> <p><b>Impact on Council’s capacity and responsibilities:</b> Will eventually require Council to fund large scale replanting programme at a future date when stands of trees in the reserve begin to senesce and die.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b> No effects on Maori were identified.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p>		

N/A

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

Approximately 26% of submitters including local residents groups opposed the proposed plan with many indicating a less extreme approach, or maintaining the reserve as is, as the preferred option.

**Other relevant matters:**

Possibility of Council facing legal action as a result of nuisance trees, or harm to people and property.