



Christchurch City Council

HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 25 JULY 2007

3.00 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

Acting Community Secretary
Tony McKendry
Telephone: 941-6615
Fax: 941-6604
Email: tony.mckendry@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 C 2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORT
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
 - 3.1 Mr Geoff Watts
 - 3.2 Mr Ross Edgar
- PART B 4. PETITIONS
- PART B 5. NOTICES OF MOTION
- PART B 6. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE
- PART B 7. CORRESPONDENCE
- PART B 8. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS 4.1
- PARTS A & C 9. STRUCTURE ON STREET APPLICATION FOR 40 KINSEY TERRACE
- PART B 10. TREE REMOVAL BANGOR STREET
- PART C 11. APPLICATION TO HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – SARAH ELIZABETH GILMOUR

We're on the Web!

www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/

25. 7. 2007

- 2 -

- PART C 12. APPLICATION TO HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – SOPHIE KILKENNY-BROWN
- PART C 13. MOA RESERVE – PROPOSED “NO STOPPING”
- PART A 14. ASSIGNMENT OF DEED OF LEASE OF AIRSPACE

1. APOLOGIES

Anna Crighton.

2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORT

The report of the Board's ordinary meeting of 11 July 2007 has been separately circulated to members.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the report of the Board's ordinary meeting be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 MR GEOFF WATTS

Mr Watts will speak regarding clause 9 of the agenda – Structure on Street Application for 40 Kinsey Terrace.

3.2 MR ROSS EDGAR

Mr Edgar will speak regarding clause 10 of the agenda – Tree Removal – Bangor Street.

4. PETITIONS

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

6. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE

CSR REPORT (JUNE 2006 AND JUNE 2007)

Attached.

7. CORRESPONDENCE

The **attached** items of correspondence have been received.

7.1 Linwood Community House – Thanks for funding

8. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS 4.1

9. STRUCTURE ON STREET APPLICATION FOR 40 KINSEY TERRACE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8656
Officer responsible:	Transport & Greenspace Manager
Author:	Neera Vishnubhatla, Engineer (Information)

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the:
 - (a) Board's approval to erect a timber ramp partially on legal road. The timber ramp is to serve the double garage proposed on the property at 40 Kinsey Terrace. The proposed structure is as shown on **Attachment 1**.
 - (b) Board's recommendation to the Council to declare the area of road where the structure will occupy, surplus to road requirements, and approve in principle the commencement of road stopping procedures.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. A Structure on Street application for a new double garage which is sited within the property boundary with a drive on access partially sited on legal road has been made by the owners of 40 Kinsey Terrace. Currently the owners have a deed of licence with the Council for a dedicated single garage located entirely on legal road.
3. Previous to this application the Board has declined the application to build a double garage entirely on legal road.
4. A contract has been let for the street renewal project on Kinsey Terrace.
5. There is no impact of the proposed structure on the design of Kinsey Terrace upgrading project. The design was carried out to accommodate the existing garage on legal road. This proposal is for its removal and using the road space for access onto the site.
6. Staff have assessed that the public walkway is not affected and that the proposed structure will not compromise any existing parking.
7. The owners of 44 Kinsey Terrace and 38 Kinsey Terrace, who are the most affected parties, are supportive of the proposed structure.
8. Approval of the structure on street will render road space the structure occupies surplus to road requirement, hence the recommendation for road stopping procedures to commence.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. There will be revenue to the Council for surplus road disposal.

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

10. N/A.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. Community Boards have delegated authority to approve Structure on Street applications for garages and parking platforms.

12. This application is for road access onto the site and Local Government Act 1974 Sec 335(i) states "Where vehicles are being taken or, in the opinion of the council, are likely to be taken, on to or from any land across any footpath on any road or any water channel on or adjoining any road otherwise than by means of a crossing properly constructed under the provisions of any bylaw made by the council, the principal administrative officer or other officer authorised by the council may, by notice in writing, require the occupier or, in any case where there is no occupier, the owner of the land to pay to the council such sum of money as the council from time to time fixes as payment for the cost of the construction of a crossing by the council.
13. "CCC Public Places and Signs Bylaw 2003" requires the owner to apply to the Council for vehicle access to road as stated in Clause 52 Vehicle Crossings:
- "1. No person shall construct any crossing across the footpath or water channel without obtaining a crossing permit form the Council.
2. (a) The owner or occupier of any land who may require vehicular access across any footpath and water channel adjoining that land shall apply in writing to the Council to construct at the owner's or occupier's cost.
- (b) Together with every application there shall be submitted a plan showing the location and design of the crossing and description of the construction materials."
14. And Clause 54 Access On Hillside Sites:
- "1. Where a new vehicular access is to be created and where there is a difference in level between the edge of the kerb or road seal on a formed road and the property boundary the cost of forming a suitable access way for the vehicles shall be the responsibility of the owner requiring the access and the standard of any works carried out on the road shall be the standard that would be appropriate for a right-of- way to a new subdivision.
2. Where the access way is a structure a formal licence agreement between the owner and the Council will be required. Surfacing of the access way and the installation of any culvert required will be carried out in accordance with vehicle crossing procedures set out in clause 52 of this Bylaw."

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

15. Yes as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

16. Yes, LTCCP page 152 "To provide public street frontages to properties.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

17. Yes.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

18. This recommendation is in alignment with the parking strategies of City Plan.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

19. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

20. Affected neighbours have been consulted and are supportive of the proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the:

1. Board approves this application subject to:
 - (a) A deed of licence being entered into with the Council.
 - (b) Resource and building consents being obtained.
 - (c) The engineering plan for construction being approved by the Asset Planning & Network Unit prior to the application for a building consent.
 - (d) The owner being responsible for the stability, safety and future maintenance of the bank, driveway and formation work associated with the structure.
 - (e) The site being kept in safe and tidy condition at all times during the course of construction.
 - (f) Clear access to neighbouring properties and pedestrians being maintained at all times.
2. Board recommends that the Council declare the area of road to be occupied by the ramp surplus to the Council's requirements and that it commence road stopping procedures accordingly.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

21. Initially, the owners of 40 Kinsey Terrace approached the Council earlier with plans for the construction of a double garage sited partly on legal road(3m over the boundary). A report was submitted to the Board in April 2006 and the Board resolved to decline the application.
22. However, the owners have now made another application for a new double garage to be incorporated within the property with a drive on access partially on legal road. The existing single garage is proposed to be removed. Plans for the proposal are shown on **Attachment 1**.
23. When considering the application for approval the following assessments have been considered by staff:
 - (a) Safety of all road users is not compromised.
 - (b) Legal right of access is maintained for individual property owners.
 - (c) The applicant is unable to construct the structure on his or her land because of the nature of terrain.
 - (d) The proposal is consistent with the City Plan objectives on the property access and parking requirements.
 - (e) The road environment is not unduly compromised with the presence of the structure.
 - (f) The visual intrusion to the streetscape will have minimal effect to road users.
 - (g) Road users include pedestrians, cyclists, and other commuters.
24. The owners of 44 Kinsey Terrace and 38 Kinsey Terrace have been consulted and are supportive of the application.
25. The Kinsey Terrace renewal project has commenced. This proposal will not have any impact on the number of on street parking spaces available to the road upgrade project. See **Attachment 2**.
26. The owners have an existing deed of licence for the existing garage and this will be revoked by Transport and Greenspace Manager.
27. This proposed structure is below the road level and impact on road environment will be minimal.
28. The proposed structure will have a minimum life of 50 years and approving the road space for this structure renders the land surplus to road requirement.
29. The declaration of the road space as being surplus to the Council's requirements and disposal of the road land occupied by the structure is recommended. This action is the preferred option for managing redundant road space and will have financial benefit to the Council.

THE OBJECTIVES

30. The approval of the structure will enable a motor vehicle to be garaged instead of occupying road space. The approval will lead to compliance to City Plan's rules for property access and car parking on the Living Hills Zone.

10. TREE REMOVAL BANGOR STREET

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941- 8656
Officer responsible:	Manager Transport & Greenspace
Author:	Graham Clark, Arborist, Street Tree Asset

PURPOSE OF REPORT

- The purpose of the report is to consult the Board regarding the removal of 19 trees in Bangor Street prior to the Transport and Greenspace Manager making a decision. The trees comprise:
 - Nine Pin Oaks, *Quercus palustris*,
 - Three Cherries, *Prunus spp*,
 - Five Cabbage trees, *Cordyline australis*,
 - One Alder, *Alnus spp* located on private land but appears to be in street garden area
 - One Elm, *Ulmus spp*
- The removal of these trees from the roadside landscape planting and immediately adjacent to Walnut Tree Park, will allow the remaining trees to achieve their full potential. This thinning out operation is required to reduce competition for light, nutrients and canopy space allowing retained trees to grow to their correct form and stature. The removal will also allow greater light penetration to the street. However, as the trees retained continue to grow and develop full canopies this will over time, be reduced to a degree.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Shading issues from the trees in Bangor Street were brought to the Council's attention by Mr Ross Edgar, of 410 Oxford Terrace in a letter sent to Mayor's office on 2 November 2006 (CSR90605431). The issue that Mr Edgar has is that the adjacent Pin Oaks are shading his property making it cold and damp. He is particularly concerned with the trees located nearest his property.
- Staff responded to Mr Edgar's request by visiting the street to assess the trees for shading of his property. Photographs were taken (attached) and the following recommendations are the result of the completed tree assessment.
- In respect to the density of planted trees in Bangor Street, staff are recommending the removal of a total of 19 trees in Bangor Street to alleviate the over crowding issue. We are of the opinion that it is essential to remove these trees to ensure that the remaining trees can reach their full stature and form. If all the trees are retained then the tree form of the majority of the larger trees in the street will be compromised over time. In particular, the canopy structure of many of the trees in Bangor Street will become misshapen, due to competition for light from adjacent closely planted trees.
- In respect to the shading of Mr Edgar's property at 410 Oxford Terrace by adjacent Council street tree planting, we are recommending that only the trees of poor form at the northern end of Bangor Street be removed. It is our opinion that the removal of further trees at this location will not resolve the shading issue due to shading from other privately owned trees at this location, including a Rimu tree on Mr Edgar's property.
- The five northern most Pin Oaks located at the Oxford Terrace end of Bangor Street are located in the Oxford Terrace Special Purpose Road Zone. The removal any of these trees will require consent under the Resource Management Act (RMA) as they are protected under the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan. Also there are the five trees with which Mr Edgar has an issue of shading.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- It is our estimate that the removal costs will be approximately \$10,000.

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

9. The recommendations align with the current LTCCP budgets, as provision for removing and replacing trees no longer considered as appropriate in their position are provided for in the Street Tree Maintenance Programme.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. The Council has granted delegated authority to the Greenspace Manager:

"In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control."
11. While the Transport and Greenspace Manager has the delegation to remove the trees identified current practice is that in most cases, requests to remove healthy and structurally sound trees are placed before the appropriate Community Board for a decision.
12. Protected street trees can only be removed by a successful application under the Resource Management Act (RMA). The five northern most Pin Oaks located at the Oxford Terrace end of Bangor Street are located in the Oxford Terrace Special Purpose Road Zone. The removal any of these trees will require consent under the RMA as it they are protected under the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan. Consent will be sought to remove one of these tree as identified in the tree assessment.
13. The Council has a responsibility under the Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992 to provide a healthy and safe environment. This extends to public spaces under its administration and ownership.
14. City Plan Volume 2 Section 14.3.2 Policy: "Garden City" Image Identity states –

"To acknowledge and promote the "Garden City" identity of the City by protecting, maintaining and extending planting which compliments this image
15. An application to prune or remove the trees may be made to the District Court under The Property Law Amendment Act 1975.

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

16. The Council has the legal right to approve or decline the application to remove these trees.
17. Protected street trees can only be removed by a successful application under the Resource Management Act (RMA). The five northern most Pin Oaks located at the Oxford Terrace end of Bangor Street are located in the Oxford Terrace, Special Purpose Road Zone. Removal of any of these trees will require consent under the RMA.
18. The District Court can order the pruning or removal of these trees under The Property Law Amendment Act 1975.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

19. Removing and replacing any trees which are in addition to those which the Council is recommending for removal as part of the City Street Tree Maintenance without obtaining reimbursement from the applicant is inconsistent with the current LTCCP, as funding has not been allocated in the Transport and Greenspace Unit tree maintenance budget for the removal of structurally sound and healthy trees unless for health and safety reasons.
20. Obtaining reimbursement from the applicant to remove and replace structurally sound and healthy trees is consistent with the current LTCCP.
21. Funding is available in the Transport & Greenspace Unit Street Tree Capital Renewals budget for the removal and replacement of trees which are no longer appropriate in their current position.

22. Retention of trees which are appropriate in their current position is consistent with the Activity Management Plan provided the trees are structurally sound and healthy.
23. Removal of trees which are no longer appropriate due to competition with the preferred climax street trees in their current position, is consistent with the Activity Management Plan.
24. The thinning out of poor quality trees to ensure that the remaining desired tree asset can achieve its natural form and stature is consistent with the Activity Management Plan.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

25. Removing and replacing the trees would support the Street Tree maintenance programme.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

26. Removing and not replacing poor quality trees to ensure that the remaining desired tree asset can achieve its natural form and stature is consistent with the Living Streets Strategy and the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy.
27. Removing and not replacing poor quality trees to ensure that the remaining desired tree asset can achieve its natural form and stature is consistent with the Christchurch Urban Design Vision.
28. There is currently no overarching city wide strategy for vegetation management.
29. There is currently no policy for the pruning or removing of trees in public spaces. A Draft Tree Policy is being worked on.
30. Removing the trees identified to allow the remaining trees to achieve their natural form and stature would be in keeping with the Garden City image.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

31. No consultation has been carried out in respect to this proposal at this stage.
32. Staff will send a letter out to all residents in Bangor Street at least two weeks prior to commencement of operations informing them of the proposed tree works and explaining why the removals are required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board note that the Greenspace Manager has the delegated authority to:

- (a) Authorise the removal of 19 trees in Bangor Street to alleviate the issues of over crowding and inappropriate planting locations.
- (b) Lodge an application for a Resource Management Consent to remove one Pin Oak at the end of Bangor Street.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

33. Bangor Street was redesigned around 1985 when then current streetscape was planted. The predominant species being Pin Oaks and Cherries with some supplemental planting occurring around 1990. The initial planting densities being much higher than is now required to maintain the desired streetscape.
34. In 1989 several of the Pin Oaks were transplanted to Victoria Park as even at this stage it was recognised that the planting density in the street was to great.
35. Mr Edgar has stated that he discussed the issue approximately five years ago with Walter Fielding Cotterill, City Arborist at that time. The City Arborist informed Mr Edgar that there was little he could do to resolve the issue.
36. Staff are of the opinion that even with the removal of all of the adjacent Council planted street trees the issue of shading on Mr Edgars property will not be resolved. This is due to two facts, the first being that there are two large Ash tree planted on the private property at 406 Oxford Terrace which are of a similar size to the Council street trees (Pin Oaks) located between them and Mr Edgar's property and even after the removal of the Oaks the ash will continue to shade the property to a similar extent to that occurring at present. The second issue being the medium sized Rimu tree located in Mr Edgar's front garden contributes significantly to the amount of shading his property receives. Staff do not recommend the removal of any of the specimen Pin Oaks located adjacent to Mr Edgar's property as the removal of these trees would not be in keeping with the original planting scheme for Bangor Street. The Pin Oaks are providing exactly the type and quality of landscape they were planted to achieve and their removal would significantly reduce the aesthetic appeal of Bangor Street.

THE OBJECTIVES

37. The objective of this report is ;
 - (a) To place Mr Edgar's case before the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board for a decision on the future of the trees.
 - (b) To authorise the removal of a total of 19 trees in Bangor Street, to alleviate the over crowding issue and inappropriate plantings and allow the Bangor Street tree asset to develop as the streetscape design intended.

THE OPTIONS

Option 1

38. Maintain the status quo. Do not remove any of the trees. Continue to maintain all trees to internationally accepted arboricultural standards. Continue to monitor the trees for their ongoing health and structural integrity.

Option 2

39. Remove only the 19 trees as recommended and allow the streetscape to develop as the street design intended.

Option 3

40. Remove any Pin Oaks which in the opinion of Mr Edgar are shading his property.

THE PREFERRED OPTION

Option 2

41. Remove only the 19 trees as recommended and allow the streetscape to develop as the street design intended.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option Option 2**

42. Remove only the 19 trees as recommended by Council and allow the streetscape to develop as the street design intended.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Local area character and amenity is improved . Street amenity improves over time.	Initial impact on street amenity as larger trees are removed. Some sections of the community may take exception to the removal of large trees and not replacing them. Mr Edgars shading issue is not addressed and he remains aggrieved at the outcome. Mr Edgar could take the Council to court in an attempt to have the tree shading issue resolved
Cultural	Garden City image is enhanced.	
Environmental	The remaining large trees have through reduced competition the ability to fully mature in both form and stature.	Short term loss of environmental benefits that large trees produce until remaining trees fill the space provide through thinning out.
Economic	Funding for removal of street tree plantings is within current LTCCP. Real estate values may increase. Reduced future maintenance costs	The Council may be perceived as wasting funds on removing healthy trees.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Environment "A City of people who value and protect the natural environment" The Council will be seen as protecting, enhancing and restoring the street environment</p> <p>City Development "An attractive and well designed City" The Council will be seen as providing attractive neighbourhoods with lifestyles enhanced by the urban environment</p> <p>Governance "A Well-Governed City" The Council will be seen as utilising LTCCP funds responsibly, responding to current needs and planning for future needs for the street environment.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Assists with delivering the LTCCP Effects on Maori: None identified.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Consistent with Corporate Environmental Policy, Public Transport Policy, Traffic Calming Policy, Urban Renewal Policy</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>No consultation has been carried out in respect to this proposal at this stage.</p> <p>The Board to recommend that a letter be sent out to all residents in Bangor Street at least two weeks prior to commencement of operations informing them of the proposed tree works and explaining why the removals are required.</p> <p>Other relevant matters: None</p>		

Maintain the Status Quo – Option 1

43. Do not remove any of the trees. Continue to maintain all trees to internationally accepted arboricultural standards. Continue to monitor both trees for their ongoing health and structural integrity.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Visual amenity that these trees provide will remain.	Mr Edgar's problem with shading will continue. Overall street amenity does not improve.
Cultural		Garden City image may be affected as the chance to improve this section of the Waimairi Stream is not taken.
Environmental	Trees will continue to provide environmental benefits	Chance to enhance the streetscape through the removal of poor quality trees and inappropriate trees not taken. Quality of the form and stature of the street tree planting will reduce over time as competition for light causes growth deformities
Economic	Short term maintenance costs are reduced.	Trees will require increased ongoing monitoring and future maintenance due to potential for growth deformities as trees compete for available light and canopy space.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Environment

"A City of people who value and protect the natural environment"

Council may be seen as protecting trees not worthy of protection. The Council may be seen as not enhancing and maintaining the street environment

City Development

"An attractive and well designed City"

The Council may be seen as not providing attractive neighbourhoods with lifestyles enhanced by the urban environment

Governance

"A Well-Governed City"

The Council may not be seen as utilising LTCCP funds responsibly, responding to current needs and planning for future needs for the street or riparian environment.

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

The Council may be seen as not supplying Mr Edgar with a healthy environment.

Effects on Maori:

None identified.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Inconsistent with Corporate Environmental Policy and Urban Renewal Policy.

Consistent with Public Transport Policy, Traffic Calming Policy.

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

No consultation has been carried out in respect to this proposal at this stage.

Other relevant matters: None.

Option 3

44. Remove any Pin Oaks which in the opinion of Mr Edgar are shading his property.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Mr Edgars concerns over shading are fully addressed.	Loss of visual amenity that these trees give. The Council may be seen as removing trees unnecessarily. Residents with similar problems may reasonably expect to receive favourable consideration for tree removal requests Residents may view the Council as unable/unwilling to provide protection for public trees.
Cultural		Garden City image may be affected. Contribution to local area character that the tree provides is lost. Residents with similar problems may reasonably expect to receive favourable consideration for tree removal requests. This would result in a reduction in the public tree canopy for Christchurch City which may negatively affect the Garden City image.
Environmental		Chance to maintain and enhance the streetscape is not taken. Loss of environmental benefits that large trees produce. Residents with similar problems may reasonably expect to receive favourable consideration for tree removal requests. This would result in a reduction in the public tree canopy for Christchurch City and could have a negative impact on Christchurch's environment.
Economic	Future maintenance costs for the larger trees are not needed	Residents with similar problems may reasonably expect to receive favourable consideration for tree removal requests. This would result in a reduction in the public tree canopy for Christchurch City and may negatively affect property values, increase costs for regulating temperatures in winter and summer for private residences.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Not achieved.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Council will be seen as supplying Mr Edgar with a healthy environment. ▪ The Council is not enhancing the Garden City image. ▪ The Council can still deliver the LTCCP in other areas of the City. <p>Effects on Maori: None.</p>		

25. 7. 2007

- 15 -

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Inconsistent with Corporate Environmental Policy and Urban Renewal Policy, Public Transport Policy and Traffic Calming Policy.

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

No consultation has been carried out in respect to this proposal at this stage.

If this option is chosen then recommend that all residents and property owners in Bangor Street and the residents and property owners of all properties located in Oxford Terrace for 200m either side of the Bangor Street and Oxford Terrace intersection also be consulted.

Other relevant matters: None.

11. APPLICATION TO HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – SARAH ELIZABETH GILMOUR

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services Group, DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	Recreation and Sports Manager
Author:	Diana Saxton, Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Board approval for an application for funding from the 2007/08 Hagley/Ferrymead Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Funding is being sought by the applicant, Sarah Gilmour, a 14 year old of Major Hornbrook Road, Mt Pleasant who is a Year 10 student at Avonside Girls High School. Sarah is seeking funding to support her represent New Zealand at World Sports Climbing Competition to be held in Ecuador, August 2007.
3. Sarah's application for funding aligns with two of the five Youth Development Scheme categories that are eligible for consideration. These are: representation at events and recreation development. This is the first time the applicant has approached the Board for funding support.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The following table details event expenses and funding requested:

EXPENSES FOR SARAH GILMOUR	Cost (NZ \$)
Return airfare	2,698
Taxes and visa	400
Accommodation	700
Insurance	131
Uniform	183
Entry and license	200
Food/Misc(\$45 per day)	450
Coach and Management Costs	600
Internal Travel	125
Total Cost	5,487
Amount raised by applicant	\$4,900
Amount requested from Community Board	\$500

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

5. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. There are no legal issues to be considered.

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

7. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

8. Yes, relates to 2007 – 08 Community Board Funding Allocations.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

9. Yes, as mentioned above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

10. Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board allocate \$500 from the 2007/08 Youth Development Scheme to assist Sarah Gilmour represent New Zealand at World Sports Climbing Competition to be held in Ecuador, August 2007.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

BACKGROUND OF APPLICANT

13. Sarah's application is supported by her parents, her coach at Clip 'n Climb, the Roxx and Avonside Girls High School as follows:

- Sarah is a dedicated, talented young climber who trains four times a week and in the weekends. She climbs for the Geckos Club at the Roxx Climbing Centre and is a positive role model to other young climbers; displaying focus, determination and promoting a healthy lifestyle. She is very supportive of other climbers and willingly assists others in the sport.
- Sarah has been climbing for three years and started competing for the first time last year where she won both national titles in under 14 females and was 2nd in Oceania. This year Sarah has competed in Open Women's competitions and has been placed 2nd and gained one national title. Sarah is one of seven young adults selected to represent New Zealand in the Worlds which is a real honour for such a young climber.
- Sarah works hard to support herself financially and has saved a considerable amount to put towards the trip through working part time after school and in the weekends. She has also been involved in several fundraising events including a sausage sizzle and an auction. Clip n Climb, the Roxx is also providing some sponsorship towards the trip.
- Sarah is looking forward to going to Ecuador for the competition and the incredibly diverse cultural experience it offers. She is aiming to represent New Zealand again at the 2008 Worlds to be held in Australia and this competition will be valuable preparation. Sarah's other interests include rollerblading, athletics and reading.

12. APPLICATION TO HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – SOPHIE KILKENNY-BROWN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services Group, DDI 941-8534
Officer responsible:	Recreation and Sports Manager
Author:	Diana Saxton, Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Board approval for an application for funding from the 2007/08 Hagley/Ferrymead Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Funding is being sought by the applicant, Sophie Kilkenny-Brown, a 17 year old of Head Street, Sumner who is a Year 12 student at Marian College. Sophie is one of four members, from the Marian College Aerobic Squad, who has qualified to compete in the Australian Aerobic Competition in Melbourne on 15 and 16 September 2007 as part of the New Zealand team.
3. Sophie's application for funding aligns with two of the five Youth Development Scheme categories that are eligible for consideration. These are: representation at events and recreation development. This is the first time the applicant has approached the Board for Funding support.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The following table details event expenses and funding requested:

EXPENSES FOR SOPHIE KILKENNY-BROWN	Cost (\$NZ)
Accommodation	206.65
Airfares	460.00
Internal transport (hire bus share)	43.73
Transfers	22.30
Meals	<u>167.00</u>
Total	899.68
Less Contribution from the school	50.00
Total Cost	849.68
Amount raised by applicant to date – this is proving difficult as money raised through part time jobs and fundraising is required for training, costume and national competition costs. Extenuating financial circumstances also apply given Sophie's family situation.	
Amount requested from Board	\$600-\$840

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

5. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. There are no legal issues to be considered.

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

7. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

8. Yes, relates to 2007 – 08 Community Board Funding Allocations.

25. 7. 2007

- 20 -

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

9. Yes, as mentioned above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

10. Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board allocate \$600 from the 2007/08 Youth Development Scheme to assist Sophie Kilkenny-Brown participate in the Australian Aerobic Competition.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

BACKGROUND OF APPLICANT

13. In support of this application, the following background information has been supplied by the applicant, Sophie Kilkenny-Brown; her coach, Kaylee Cowan; Kathy Seaward, Marian College, and Nicky Harrall, Marian College Aerobic Squad Manager.
 - Sophie has been involved in this sport for four years with repeated success at both regional and national levels. She is squad captain and will compete as an individual in Australia. Competition at this level is tough and extremely competitive and Sophie is committed to training up to four days a week.
 - Over the past four years Sophie has funded almost all her aerobic training. For this trip she has limited hours available to raise funds additional to what is required for training gear, shoes, outfits, travel to national competitions and coaching. As a single parent with four children, Sophie's mother is unable to provide as much as she would like to enable Sophie to compete, and the growing costs associated with the trip are proving difficult.
 - As a Captain of the school team and coach to junior students at Marian College, Sophie is committed to giving back to her school community. She (and the team) would be very happy to perform at the LYFE festival or any other event/s the Board considers appropriate, in return for financial assistance to attend the competition.
14. Sophie's application is supported by both school and coach. This is considered a valuable sporting opportunity and Sophie aims to use this experience for inclusion in the New Zealand team to compete at World level in 2008 and 2009. Special mention has been made that financial support is needed, given the extenuating

13. MOA RESERVE – PROPOSED “NO STOPPING”

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Jeff Owen, Consultant

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s approval to install ‘No Stopping’ lines at the entrances to MOA Reserve in Ely Street, Melrose Street and Moa Place.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Board members will recall that the final landscape concept plan for Moa Reserve was presented to the Board meeting on Wednesday 27 September 2006 for approval.
3. Within that report to help further alleviate the parking and access issues, it was proposed that yellow “No Stopping” lines be placed either side of the Ely Street entrance, across the service vehicle entrance on Moa Place and outside the new entrance on Melrose Street. It is also proposed to install a cut down in the kerb at the Melrose Street entrance to allow cyclists to enter and exit. The Transport and Greenspace Unit had consulted with Officers from the Capital Programme (Transport) and the Network Operations teams who have advised that they would be in support of this proposal.
4. At that meeting the Board **resolved** to approve:
 1. *The landscape concept plan for the development of MOA Reserve (as shown in Attachment 1 of the report), to proceed to final design, tender and construction.*
 2. *Provision of a cut down in the kerb at the Melrose Street entrance to MOA Reserve. A separate report will be provided to the Board seeking its formal approval to no stopping restrictions at the Melrose Street, Ely Street and Moa Place entrances to the reserve.*
5. The proposed ‘No Stopping’ is consistent with Transport and Greenspace guidelines for no stopping at pedestrian and cycleway cutdowns.
6. Consultation with the stakeholders including the MOA Neighbourhood Committee has taken place within the consultation process for the landscape concept plan
7. To improve road safety and visibility for pedestrians and cyclists it is proposed to install broken yellow “no stopping” lines at each entrance to the reserve as shown on the attached plan. This is considered to be the most cost effective and practical solution to the problem.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. An estimated cost for this work is \$100.

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

9. The installation of road markings is within LTCCP Street and Transport operational budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. The Land Transport Rules provide for the installation of parking restrictions including broken yellow (no stopping) lines.

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

11. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community outcomes – Safety.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?

13. This contributes to improve the level of service for safety.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. The recommendations align with the Council's Parking Strategy 2003.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

15. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. Consultation has been carried out with the stakeholders and the Moa Neighbourhood Committee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board approve:

- (a) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Ely Street commencing at the western boundary of number 38 Ely Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 6 metres.
- (b) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Ely Street commencing at a point 16 metres west the western boundary of number 38 Ely Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 5 metres.
- (c) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Melrose Street commencing at a point 4.5 metres west of the western boundary of number 24 Ely Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 10 metres.
- (d) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time at the cul-de-sac head of Moa Place commencing 16.5 metres east of the western boundary of number 17 Moa Place and extending around the cul-de-sac for a distance of 10 metres.

CHAIRMAN'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

14. ASSIGNMENT OF DEED OF LEASE OF AIRSPACE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager of City Environment, DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Jeff Woodham, Property and Leasing Advisor

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's recommendation to the Council to consent, as landlord, to the assignment of a Deed of Lease of Air Space for an Overbridge over Woolsack Lane from Hyman Marks Trust to Professional Fitness Limited (refer attached).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council is obliged to consent to the assignment of the lease subject to the fulfilment of the conditions under the assignment clause.
3. An agreement for the sale and purchase of the property has been entered into between the parties. Clause 8 of the lease provides that the Council be satisfied that the land should reasonably be owned by the company entitled to the benefits of the lease. A Deed of Assignment to the satisfaction of the Council is to be signed between the parties.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. Nil.

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

5. N/A

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

6. The Board does not have delegated authority to give the consent as such a decision needs to be made by the Council. The Board does, however, have recommendatory powers to the Council.
7. The overbridge spans legal road between LOT 9 DP 796 and LOT 2 DP 5977 in Woolsack Lane.
8. The term of the lease is for 40 years from 3 September 1992 with a right of renewal for a further 40 years. The final expiry on 2 September 2072.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board recommend to the Council that it consent to the assignment of the Deed of Lease of Airspace for the overbridge spanning Woolsack Lane from Hyman Marks Trust to Professional Fitness Limited, subject to:

- (a) A deed of assignment in customary form being signed by the parties.
- (b) That the vendor and purchaser meet all costs of the assignment of the lease as agreed between the parties.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.