



## **FENDALTON/WAIMAIRI COMMUNITY BOARD**

# **WORKS, TRAFFIC AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

## **AGENDA**

**MONDAY 25 JUNE 2007**

**AT 8.00 AM**

**COMMITTEE ROOM 1  
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL FENDALTON  
CNR JEFFREYS AND CLYDE ROADS**

| <b>ITEM<br/>NO</b> | <b>DESCRIPTION</b>  |
|--------------------|---|
| 1.                 | <b>APOLOGIES</b>  |
| 2.                 | <b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>   |
| 3                  | <b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>   |
| 4.                 | <b>TREE REMOVAL 106 WOODBURY STREET</b>   |
| 5.                 | <b>TREE REMOVAL 280 WAIMAIRI ROAD</b>   |
| 6.                 | <b>CIRCUIT STREET – PROPOSED P120 PARKING RESTRICTION</b>                                 |
| 7.                 | <b>DISPOSAL OF REDUNDANT SERVICE LANE – CLYDE ROAD SERVICE LANE</b>                       |
| 8.                 | <b>HOLMWOOD ROAD/ROSSALL STREET – RE-ESTABLISH EXISTING “NO STOPPING”<br/>RESTRICTION</b> |
| 9.                 | <b>GARDEN ROAD PROPOSED KERB AND DISH CHANEL REPLACEMENTS - SEMINAR</b>                   |
| 10.                | <b>WAIRAKEI ROAD SUBSIDENCE OF PROPERTIES</b>   |
| 11.                | <b>HAMILTON AVENUE/COLDSTREAM COURT ROUNDABOUT</b>  |
| 12.                | <b>BRYNDWR ROAD/JEFFREYS ROAD INTERSECTION - SEMINAR</b>                                  |
| 13.                | <b>KNOWLES STREET (PAPANUI ROAD – CRANFORD STREET) - SEMINAR</b>                          |

25.06.2007

- 2 -

**1. APOLOGIES****2. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

Nil.

**3. CORRESPONDENCE**

Nil.

**4. TREE REMOVAL 106 WOODBURY STREET**

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>General Manager responsible:</b> | Jane Parfitt General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656 |
| <b>Officer responsible:</b>         | Michael Aitken, Manager Transport & Greenspace              |
| <b>Author:</b>                      | Shane Moohan, City Arborist, DDI 941- 8030                  |

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. Obtain a decision on the removal or retention of a *Liquidambar styraciflua* (sweet gum) from the roadside on the Woodbury Street frontage of number 106 Woodbury Street.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Ms McQuilken has been in contact with the Council since November 2004 over the trees on the street frontages of Woodbury and Ansonby Streets and also the tree outside 104 Woodbury Street. Requests have included both pruning and removing the trees.
3. The main concern has been over the shading caused to her property at 106 Woodbury Street. The Council has undertaken some pruning and also removed three trees, one tree from the Ansonby Street frontage of 106 Woodbury Street, one tree from outside 104 Woodbury Street and one tree from outside 103 Woodbury Street.
4. On 27 March 2007 the Council received a letter from Ms McQuilken requesting that the tree on her Woodbury Street frontage be removed. A copy of the letter was emailed to Mayor Garry Moore and Councillor Sally Buck.
5. The reasons for the request are –
  - Spends a lot of time clearing leaves from the gutter and sweeping them off the footpath;
  - Unsuitable tree because of its size;
  - Effects that the shading causes i.e. electricity bills and depression.
6. Council staff visited the site on 30 March 2007 and declined the request to remove the tree for reasons of shade.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7. The cost to remove and replace the tree with a pb95 grade tree is \$748.00.
8. The valuation for the tree using STEM is: \$11,300.
9. STEM (A Standard Tree Evaluation Method) is the New Zealand national arboricultural industry standard for evaluating and valuing amenity trees by assessing their condition and contribution to amenity along with other distinguishable attributes such as stature, historic or scientific significance. STEM is used as a valuation tool by other Councils such as Auckland, Tauranga, Lower Hutt and Wellington.

#### 4. Cont'd

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

10. The recommendations align with the current LTCCP budgets as provision for removing and replacing trees no longer considered as appropriate species or in their current position is provided for.

##### **LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

11. The Greenspace Manager has the following delegation with respect to trees:  
  
"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."
12. While the Transport and Greenspace Manager has the delegation to remove the Liquidambar tree 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.
13. Protected street trees can only be removed by a successful application under the Resource Management Act. These trees are not listed as protected under the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan.
14. 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.
15. 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."*
16. An application to prune or remove the tree 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?**

17. Council has the legal right to approve or decline the application to remove the tree.
18. The District Court can order the pruning or removal of the tree under The Property Law Amendment Act 1975.

##### **ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

19. Removing and replacing the tree without obtaining reimbursement from the applicant is inconsistent with the current LTCCP as funding has not been allocated in the Transport & Greenspace Unit tree maintenance budget for the removal of structurally sound and healthy trees.
20. Obtaining reimbursement from the applicant to remove and replace a structurally sound and healthy tree 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 species or no longer appropriate in their current position.
22. Retention of the tree is consistent with the Activity Management Plan provided the tree is structurally sound and healthy.
23. Removal and replacement of the tree is consistent with the Activity Management Plan.
24. Removing and not replacing the tree is not consistent with the Activity Management Plan.

#### 4. Cont'd

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

25. Removing and replacing the tree would support the Street Tree Renewals capital programme.

#### **ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

26. Removing and replacing the tree would be consistent with the Living Streets Strategy and the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy.
27. Removing and replacing the tree would be 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 and replacing the tree would be in keeping with the Garden City Image.
31. Removing and not replacing the tree would not be in keeping with the Garden City image.

#### **CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

32. Letters were sent to 20 residents in Woodbury Street, Karnak Crescent and Ansonby Street outlining the request and asking what they thought of the tree and what they thought Council should do with it.

Results are as follows:

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Number of respondents  | 11 |
| Number of respondents who like the tree                      | 10 |
| Number of respondents who dislike the tree                   | 1  |
| Number who think the tree should be removed and not replaced | 2  |
| Number who think the tree should be removed and replaced     | 3  |
| Number who think the tree should be retained                 | 5  |

One respondent suggested the tree either be retained or removed and replaced.

A list of respondents and their comments are attached as Appendix "C".

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) decline the request to remove the Liquidambar tree from the berm outside of 106 Woodbury Street for reasons of shade; and
- (b) place Woodbury Street on the Street Tree Renewal Capital Programme and replace all of the Liquidambars in Woodbury Street that are planted in grass berms of less than 2 metres width;
- (c) that the remainder of Liquidambar trees in Woodbury Street be maintained to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural standards and only be removed and replaced on a case by case basis.

#### **BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

- 33 The first recorded contact with Ms McQuilken over the trees on the berm was 29 November 2004. The request was to prune the tree on the Woodbury Street frontage and the two trees on the Ansonby Street frontage for vehicle clearance and light.

**4. Cont'd**

34. A second request from Ms McQuilken was received the same day to prune the tree in front of 104 Woodbury Street.
35. Both requests were held over for action until general ward maintenance scheduled for March 2005.
36. On 10 May 2005 Ms McQuilken phoned Council asking why only some of the trees in Woodbury and Ansonby Streets had been pruned and not the ones outside her property. The Council's tree maintenance contractor had undertaken what they considered to be urgent health and safety work for low hanging branches and had rescheduled the remainder for October 2005.
37. On 23 May 2005 Ms McQuilken contacted Council requesting that the tree outside 104 Woodbury Street and the tree outside her property on the Woodbury Street frontage be removed. The reason for the request was shade.
38. Council staff visited the site on 26 May 2005 and agreed to remove the trees outside 104 and 103 Woodbury Street. The reason for this was structural integrity – included unions and previous failure of the tree outside 104 Woodbury Street. The removal of the smaller of the two trees on the Ansonby Street frontage was also agreed to due to poor form and overcrowding on the berm. The tree outside 104 Woodbury Street was not replaced as the resident did not want another tree to be planted.
39. This work was completed in January 2006.
40. On 27 March 2007 Council received a letter from Ms McQuilken requesting that the tree on the Woodbury Street frontage be removed. A copy of the letter was emailed to Mayor Garry Moore and Councillor Sally Buck. (Appendix "A" attached)
41. The reasons for the request are –
  - (a) Spends a lot of time clearing leaves from the gutter and sweeping them off the footpath;
  - (a) Unsuitable tree because of its size;
  - (a) Effects that the shading causes i.e. electricity bills and depression.
42. Council staff visited the site on 30 March 2007 and declined the request to remove the tree as the amount of nuisance caused by the shading was not viewed as sufficient to warrant removing the tree. Ms McQuilken was informed that we would review the tree again when the kerb and channel required replacing.
43. On 1 April 2007 Cr Buck contacted Council staff via email and attached several photographs of the tree taken between 8.15am and 3.39pm and the effects of shading on Ms McQuilken's property. (Appendix "B" attached)
44. A site meeting was conducted on 11 April 2007 to view the problem and hear Ms McQuilken's concerns. Present were Ms McQuilken, Cr Buck, Mike Wall, Val Carter and Shane Moohan.
45. It was agreed that Ms McQuilken would present her case to the Works and Traffic Committee at the next available meeting where a report would most likely be asked for from staff.

#### 4. Cont'd

46. At the site visit on 30 March 2007 staff undertook the following steps as part of their assessment of the request –
- (a) Inspect the tree for health and safety concerns. Liquidambar trees are well known within the arboricultural industry for structural failure. This occurs as a result of a genetic problem with the original seed imported into New Zealand. Medium to large Liquidambar trees can have structural failure problems with large branches being shed because of weak branch attachments and also from summer branch drop (Matheny and Clarke, Evaluation of Hazardous Trees in Urban Areas, p81). This can make them a hazard when placed in high or frequently used areas. Studies at the Waikato Institute of Technology show that 52% of Liquidambars surveyed had suffered from structural failure. Because of this Liquidambars are no longer considered a suitable species for streets or some areas in parks. This particular tree does not show sufficient signs of problems with structural integrity to warrant its removal for health and safety reasons.
  - (b) Inspect the damage to the kerb and channel. The kerb and channel has been replaced at least once and has started to crack again. The Council's Pavement Maintenance Team Leader has advised that the crack is not bad enough to repair at this point in time and there are other situations in Christchurch of higher priority, including some in Woodbury Street itself. He does not expect to have to repair this section for another five years. The cost for repairs is approximately \$600.00. In view of this, a decision to remove the tree based on damage to infrastructure was not considered as appropriate. The Council would revisit the decision whether to remove or retain the tree when the kerb and channel required replacing. In the period between, the tree would continue to contribute the environmental and amenity benefits that medium to large trees provide.
  - (c) Assess the amount of nuisance that the tree is causing and attempt to alleviate the concerns. The Council has pruned the tree to the point where it is considered that further thinning or crown lifting may have a detrimental affect on the tree's health. Photographs supplied by Cr Buck show that the tree does not start to cause shade until approximately 2.26pm. The shading from 8.15am until approximately 12.26pm is caused by the position from which the sun rises and sets, the positioning of the dwelling in relation to the sun and the size of the eaves. Liquidambars are a deciduous tree. A benefit of deciduous trees is that they cool through the summer months and let light and warmth through in the winter months when they have lost their leaves. There is a period throughout Autumn, which is normally a cooler time of year, where they still have most of their leaves and can cause some nuisance through shading. The request to remove the tree because of shading was declined as it was considered that the degree of nuisance being caused was not sufficient to warrant removal along with the fact that the tree is deciduous and will lose its leaves thereby letting through winter sun.
47. Council records show that the Liquidambars in Woodbury Street were planted in 1969.
48. This particular problem with trees versus kerb and channel is indicative of many sites throughout Christchurch where large growing trees have been planted seemingly without much thought given to the consequences in future years.
49. The Council may wish to consider a city wide strategy to remove and replace trees which are no longer considered as appropriate for planting in streets (e.g. Liquidambar, claret ash, silver birch) and include in future LTCCP rounds.

#### THE OBJECTIVES

50. The objectives of this report are to -
- (a) Place Ms McQuilken's case before the Community Board for a decision on the future of the tree.
  - (b) Provide the Community Board with sufficient information to enable Board Members to make a decision on the future of the tree.

#### 4. Cont'd

##### THE OPTIONS

##### Option 1: Maintain the status quo

51. Do not remove the tree immediately but reconsider removal when the kerb and channel requires replacing. Continue to maintain the tree to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural standards. Continue to monitor the tree for ongoing health and structural integrity.

##### Option 2

52. Remove the tree and do not replace it.
- (a) Do not charge the applicant for removal.
  - (b) Charge the applicant the cost of removal only. Cost of removal only is \$300.00.

##### Option 3

53. Remove the tree and replace it with another species.
- (a) Do not charge the applicant cost of removal or replacement.
  - (b) Charge the applicant the cost for removal and replacement. Cost for removal and replacement is \$748.00.
  - (c) Charge the applicant the STEM value of the tree. Use the funds received from the removal of this tree to remove and replace other trees in Woodbury Street and/or Ansonby Street (17 trees).

##### Option 4

54. Decline the request to remove the tree because of shading but place Woodbury Street on the Street Tree Renewal Capital Programme and replace all of the Liquidambar trees in Woodbury Street that are planted in grass berms of less than 2 metres width. The remainder of Liquidambar trees will be maintained to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural standards and only removed and replaced on a case by case basis.

##### THE PREFERRED OPTION

55. Decline the request to remove the tree because of shading but place Woodbury Street on the Street Tree Renewal Capital Programme and replace all of the Liquidambar trees in Woodbury Street that are planted in grass berms of less than 2 metres width. The remainder of Liquidambar trees will be maintained to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural standards and only removed and replaced on a case by case basis.

##### ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

##### The Preferred Option

56. Decline the request to remove the tree because of shading but place Woodbury Street on the Street Tree Renewal Capital Programme and replace all of the Liquidambar trees in Woodbury Street that are planted in grass berms of less than 2 metres width. The remainder of Liquidambar trees will be maintained to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural standards and only removed and replaced on a case by case basis.



## 4. Cont'd

|   | <b>Benefits (current and future)</b>   | <b>Costs (current and future)</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Social</b>   | Ms McQuilken's concerns over shading and debris are initially addressed.<br>Local area character and amenity is improved.<br>Street amenity improves over time.  | Initial impact on street amenity as larger trees are removed and replaced with smaller trees.<br>New trees may over time create shade and debris problems. |
| <b>Cultural</b>   | Garden City image is enhanced.<br>Council may be viewed as not removing trees based on shade alone.  |  |
| <b>Environmental</b>  | Council replaces a species of tree which has known health and safety issues.<br>As the new trees grow the environmental benefits they produce will increase.   | Initial loss of environmental benefits that large trees produce.   |
| <b>Economic</b>   | Funding for removal and establishment of plantings is within current LTCCP.<br>Real estate values may increase.<br>Need for kerb and channel repair may be alleviated by proactively replacing trees in small berms. | Future maintenance costs of trees.   |
| <p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>Environment<br/>"A City of people who value and protect the natural environment".<br/>Council will be seen as protecting, enhancing and restoring the street environment.</p> <p>City Development<br/>"An attractive and well designed City"<br/>Council will be seen as providing attractive neighbourhoods with lifestyles enhanced by the urban environment</p> <p>Governance<br/>"A Well-Governed City".<br/>Council will be seen as utilising LTCCP funds responsibly, responding to current needs and planning for future needs for the street environment.</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>Assists with delivering the LTCCP.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Consistent with Corporate Environmental Policy, Public Transport Policy, Traffic Calming Policy, Urban Renewal Policy.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>See Consultation Fulfilment.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters: None identified</b></p> |  |  |

## 4. Cont'd

**Maintain the Status Quo**

57. Do not remove the tree immediately but reconsider removal when the kerb and channel requires replacing. Continue to maintain the tree to internationally accepted arboricultural standards. Continue to monitor the tree for ongoing health and structural integrity.

|                      | <b>Benefits (current and future)</b>  | <b>Costs (current and future)</b>   |
|----------------------|---|---|
| <b>Social</b>        | Visual amenity that the tree provides will remain.  | Ms McQuilken's problem with shade and debris will continue. Council may be seen as unreasonable by not removing the tree. |
| <b>Cultural</b>      | Garden City image will be retained. Council may be viewed as not removing trees based on shade alone. |   |
| <b>Environmental</b> | Tree will continue to provide environmental benefits.   | Chance to immediately replace with a more appropriate species is not taken.   |
| <b>Economic</b>      | Future maintenance costs for new plantings are not needed.  | Tree will require ongoing monitoring and future maintenance<br>Kerb and channel will require repairing in 5 years.        |

**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.

## City Development

"An attractive and well designed City".  
Council may be seen as continuing to provide an attractive neighbourhood however may be viewed as not providing well designed plantings.

## Governance

"A Well-Governed City".  
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:**

None identified.

**Effects on Maori:**

None identified.

**Consistency with existing Council policies:**

Consistent 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:**

See Consultation Fulfilment.

**Other relevant matters:**

None identified.

## 4. Cont'd

58. Remove the tree and do not replace it.

|  | <b>Benefits (current and future)</b>                                 | <b>Costs (current and future)</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Social</b>  | Ms McQuilken's concerns over shading and debris are fully addressed. | Loss of visual amenity that this tree gives. 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 Council as unable/unwilling to provide protection for public trees.  |
| <b>Cultural</b>  |  | 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.                               |
| <b>Environmental</b>   |  | Loss of environmental benefits that large trees produce. Chance to replace with a more appropriate species is not taken. 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. |
| <b>Economic</b>  | Future maintenance costs for this tree is 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><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b><br/>Not achieved.</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b><br/>Council is not enhancing the Garden City image.<br/>Council can still deliver the LTCCP in other areas of the City.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b><br/>None identified.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b><br/>Inconsistent with Corporate Environmental Policy and Urban Renewal Policy, Public Transport Policy and Traffic Calming Policy.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b><br/>See Consultation Fulfilment.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b><br/>None identified.</p> |  |  |

## 5. TREE REMOVAL 280 WAIMAIRI ROAD

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>General Manager responsible:</b> | Jane Parfitt General Manager City Environment, DDI 941- 8656  |
| <b>Officer responsible:</b>         | Michael Aitken, Manager Transport & Greenspace, DDI 941- 8096 |
| <b>Author:</b>                      | Shane Moohan, City Arborist, DDI 941- 8030                    |

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. Obtain a decision on the removal or retention of two Eucalyptus trees from the roadside outside number 280 Waimairi Road.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Since May 2003 (and possibly prior to that) Mrs Scott has had concerns over two of the Eucalyptus trees situated on the Waimairi Stream bank adjacent to her property at 280 Waimairi Road. The concerns include debris, falling branches and the possibility of the trees falling over.
3. Council has pruned back some branches in an attempt to alleviate the falling debris (July 2004) and has inspected the trees at various times to assess their structural integrity and health.
4. Both trees have been considered as structurally sound and healthy as recently as March 2007 by Council's main tree contractor City Care Ltd.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. An estimate of \$5,000 to remove both trees has been obtained.
6. The valuation for the two Eucalyptus trees combined using STEM is : \$22,600:

*STEM (A Standard Tree Evaluation Method) is the New Zealand national arboricultural industry standard for evaluating and valuing amenity trees by assessing their condition and contribution to amenity along with other distinguishable attributes such as stature, historic or scientific significance. STEM is used as a valuation tool by other Councils such as Auckland, Tauranga, Lower Hutt and Wellington.*

7. The estimate cost to remove all of the exotic vegetation and replant with native trees, shrubs and groundcovers is \$36,800 and is broken down as follows –

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Estimated cost of vegetation removal  | \$15,000 |
| Estimated cost for traffic management (2 days)  | \$ 2,400 |
| Estimated cost to supply and plant 1860 pb2 grade Revegetation plants and 20 pb95 grade trees | \$12,700 |
| Estimated cost to maintain plantings for 3 years  | \$ 6,700 |

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

8. The recommendations align with the current LTCCP budgets as provision for removing and replacing trees no longer considered as appropriate in their position is provided for in the Park Tree Capital Renewals Programme.

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. The Greenspace Manager has the following delegation with respect to trees:

“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.”

10. While the Transport and Greenspace Manager has the delegation to remove the two Eucalyptus trees 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.
11. Protected street trees can only be removed by a successful application under the Resource Management Act. These trees are not listed as protected under the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan.

## 5. Cont'd

12. 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.
13. 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".*
14. 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?**

15. Council has the legal right to approve or decline the application to remove these trees.
16. 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**

17. Removing and replacing the trees without obtaining reimbursement from the applicant is inconsistent with the current LTCCP as funding has not been allocated in the Transport & Greenspace Unit tree maintenance budget for the removal of structurally sound and healthy trees.
18. Obtaining reimbursement from the applicant to remove and replace structurally sound and healthy trees is consistent with the current LTCCP.
19. 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.
20. Retention of the trees is consistent with the Activity Management Plan provided the trees are structurally sound and healthy.
21. Removal and replacement of the trees is consistent with the Activity Management Plan.
22. Removing and not replacing the trees is not consistent with the Activity Management Plan.

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

23. Removing and replacing the trees would support the Park Tree Renewals capital programme.

### **ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

24. Removing and replacing the trees would be consistent with the Living Streets Strategy and the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy.
25. Removing and replacing the trees would be consistent with the Christchurch Urban Design Vision.
26. There is currently no overarching city wide strategy for vegetation management.
27. There is currently no policy for the pruning or removing of trees in public spaces. A Draft Tree Policy is being worked on.
28. Removing and replacing the trees would be in keeping with the Garden City image.
29. Removing the trees and not replacing them would not be in keeping with the Garden City image.

## 5. Cont'd

### CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

30. Letters were sent to 56 residents either bordering this section of the Waimairi Stream or from the Grahams Road intersection to the Greers Road intersection explaining the request and asking what they thought of the trees and what they thought Council should do with them.

Results are

|   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| Number of respondents   | - | 36 |
| Number of respondents who like the trees                      | - | 20 |
| Number of respondents who dislike the trees                   | - | 11 |
| Number of respondents with no particular view                 | - | 5  |
| Number who think the trees should be removed and not replaced | - | 7  |
| Number who think the trees should be removed and replaced     | - | 10 |
| Number who think the trees should be retained                 | - | 16 |

Two respondents suggested either Council should either remove and replace or retain the trees. One respondent gave no option to remove or retain.

31. A list of respondents and their comments are attached as Appendix "B".

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Remove both Eucalyptus trees. (See Appendix A attached)
- (b) Restore the Waimairi Stream banks from Grahams Road through to 280 Waimairi Road by removing all exotic vegetation and planting with native trees, shrubs and groundcover.

### BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

32. Mrs Scott has said that she lives in constant fear of the trees falling on her house when the wind is strong.
33. Eucalyptus trees are well known for shedding large limbs in high wind and sometimes when there is no wind. Pruning of the branches to reduce their weight can go some way to alleviating this but is not guaranteed to stop branches falling from these trees. For these reasons Eucalyptus trees are not considered appropriate trees for urban areas outside of large parks.
34. Eucalyptus trees shed a high degree of debris. This includes fine hairs from the seed pods, the seed pods themselves, leaves, twigs, branches and bark. The Council's storm water engineers have advised that although the storm water grate requires regular cleaning both before and after heavy rain the removal of these two trees would have little effect on the frequency that this is done.
35. Mrs Scott is concerned about the fine hairs from the seed pods which can form a dense fibrous mat. The forming of this mat in her gutters has recently caused her down pipes to block up and flood the back room in her house. The hairs are fine enough to slip through most gutter protection systems. Pruning the trees will not alleviate this problem.
36. On 26 March 2007 Mrs Scott's solicitor wrote to the Council requesting the trees be removed and advising that if the trees were not removed then Mrs Scott "will be forced to resort to Court action to have this situation resolved".
37. The Council's main tree contractor City Care Ltd inspected the trees on 29 March 2007. They found that there was no arboricultural reason to remove them as, apart from a small amount of dead branches, they were in good health and of sound structure and that there was no evidence indicating they were likely to fall over. Mrs Scott's solicitor was advised of this and also that Council would continue to monitor the trees as and when required.

## 5. Cont'd

38. Tree one is approximately 34 metres high, DBH of 1.1 metres and a canopy spread of 18 metres. Tree two approximately 29 metres high, DBH of 1.25 metres and a canopy spread of 15 metres.
39. Removing one tree and leaving the other tree in place may cause future hazard risks as the remaining tree will be opened up to new wind forces which could cause it to lose large branches or fall over.

### THE OBJECTIVES

40. The objective of this report is to place Mrs Scott's case before the Community Board for a decision on the future of the trees.

### THE OPTIONS

#### Option 1

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

#### Option 2

42. Remove both trees and do not replace them.

#### Option 3

43. Remove both Eucalyptus trees. Restore the Waimairi Stream banks from Grahams Road through to 280 Waimairi Road by removing all exotic vegetation and planting with native trees, shrubs and groundcover.

### THE PREFERRED OPTION

#### Option 3

44. Remove both Eucalyptus trees. Restore the Waimairi Stream banks from Grahams Road through to 280 Waimairi Road by removing all exotic vegetation and planting with native trees, shrubs and groundcover.

### ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

#### The Preferred Option

45. Remove both Eucalyptus trees. Restore the Waimairi Stream banks from Grahams Road through to 280 Waimairi Road by removing all exotic vegetation and planting with native trees, shrubs and groundcover. (See diagram on next page).

## 5. Cont'd

|   | <b>Benefits (current and future)</b>   | <b>Costs (current and future)</b>   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Social</b>   | Mrs Scott's concerns over safety and debris are fully addressed.<br>Local area character and amenity is improved.<br>Street amenity improves over time.  | Initial impact on street amenity as larger trees are removed and replaced with smaller trees, shrubs and groundcover.<br>Some sections of the community may take exception to Council replacing exotics with natives. |
| <b>Cultural</b>   | Garden City image is enhanced.   |   |
| <b>Environmental</b>  | Chance to increase the native biodiversity within the City is taken.<br>Native plantings will restore this section of the Waimairi stream into a natural healthy habitat; preserve the stream banks through erosion prevention by vegetative methods.<br>Control of plant pests. | Loss of environmental benefits that large trees produce.  |
| <b>Economic</b>   | Funding for removal and establishment of plantings is within current LTCCP.<br>Real estate values may increase.  | Maintenance of new plantings is not within current LTCCP.   |
| <p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>Environment<br/>"A City of people who value and protect the natural environment".<br/>Council will be seen as protecting, enhancing and restoring the street environment.</p> <p>City Development<br/>"An attractive and well designed City".<br/>Council will be seen as providing attractive neighbourhoods with lifestyles enhanced by the urban environment.</p> <p>Governance<br/>"A Well-Governed City".<br/>Council will be seen as utilising LTCCP funds responsibly, responding to current needs and planning for future needs for the street environment.</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>Assists with delivering the LTCCP.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>Will have apposite effect as Council will be restoring the riparian margins to this section of the Waimairi Stream.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Consistent with Corporate Environmental Policy, Public Transport Policy, Traffic Calming Policy, Urban Renewal Policy.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>See Consultation Fulfilment.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p> <p>72% of respondents say that trees should be present at this site in some shape or form. 44% of respondents think the two Eucalyptus trees should be retained. 19% of respondents say no trees should be present on this site.</p> |  |   |



## 5. Cont'd

**Maintain the Status Quo**

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

|                      | <b>Benefits (current and future)</b>                           | <b>Costs (current and future)</b>  |
|----------------------|--|--|
| <b>Social</b>        | Visual amenity that these trees provide will remain.           | Mrs Scott's problem with the fine hairs getting in to the down pipes will continue. Mrs Scott will continue to not feel safe in her own home. Overall street amenity does not improve. |
| <b>Cultural</b>      |  | Garden City image may be affected as the chance to improve this section of the Waimairi Stream is not taken.   |
| <b>Environmental</b> | Trees will continue to provide environmental benefits.         | Chance to increase the native biodiversity is not taken. Chance to restore a riparian strip is not taken.  |
| <b>Economic</b>      | Future maintenance costs for the new plantings are not needed. | Trees will require ongoing monitoring and future maintenance.  |

**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. Council may be seen as not enhancing and restoring the street environment.

## City Development

"An attractive and well designed City."

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

## Governance

"A Well-Governed City."

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:**

Council may be seen as not supplying Mrs Scott with a healthy and safe environment.

**Effects on Maori:**

May have negative effect as Council will not be restoring the riparian margins to this section of the Waimairi Stream.

**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:**

See Consultation Fulfilment.

**Other relevant matters:**

+72% of respondents say that trees should be present at this site in some shape or form. 44% of respondents think the two Eucalyptus trees should be retained. 19% of respondents say no trees should be present on this site.

## 5. Cont'd

47. Remove both trees and do not replace them.

|                      | <b>Benefits (current and future)</b>                             | <b>Costs (current and future)</b>   |
|----------------------|--|---|
| <b>Social</b>        | Mrs Scott's concerns over safety and debris are fully addressed. | Loss of visual amenity that these trees give.<br>Council may be seen as removing trees unnecessarily.<br>Residents with similar problems may reasonably expect to receive favourable consideration for tree removal requests.<br>Residents may view Council as unable/unwilling to provide protection for public trees.   |
| <b>Cultural</b>      |  | Garden City image may be affected.<br>Contribution to local area character that the tree provides is lost.<br>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.  |
| <b>Environmental</b> |  | Chance to increase the native biodiversity is not taken.<br>Chance to restore a riparian strip is not taken.<br>Loss of environmental benefits that large trees produce.<br>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. |
| <b>Economic</b>      | Future maintenance costs for the 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.  |

## 5. Cont'd

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>Not achieved.</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>Council will be seen as supplying Mrs Scott with a healthy and safe environment.</p> <p>Council is not enhancing the Garden City image.</p> <p>Council can still deliver the LTCCP in other areas of the City.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>None.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Inconsistent with Corporate Environmental Policy and Urban Renewal Policy, Public Transport Policy and Traffic Calming Policy.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>See Consultation Fulfilment.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p> <p>19% of respondents think the trees should be removed and not replaced.</p> |
|--|

## 6. CIRCUIT STREET – PROPOSED P120 PARKING RESTRICTION

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>General Manager responsible:</b> | Jane Parfitt, General Manager City Environment, DDI 941- 8656 |
| <b>Officer responsible:</b>         | Michael Aitken, Transport and Greenspace Manager              |
| <b>Author:</b>                      | Jeff Owen/Barry Cook  |

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Boards approval to install a 120 minute parking restriction on the north side of Circuit Street.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Council has received numerous complaints from local residents regarding the levels of traffic congestion and on-street parking in Circuit Street. The congestion is predominantly attributed to the presence of the Heaton Intermediate School and St Andrews College. This particularly happens at peak "drop-off" and "pick-up" times namely 8am to 9.30am and 2.30pm to 4pm. On street parking concerns relate to all day commuter parking from nearby businesses. Vehicle access to properties is regularly blocked due to vehicles parking closer than they should to driveways. The high level of on-street parking contributes to the congestion and raises safety and visibility issues for both residents and road users of the street.
3. A public meeting has been held with the residents and two rounds of consultation have been carried out involving all affected stakeholders. The first round of consultation sought to identify the issues and problems currently being experienced in the street and suggested a solution by installing a P120, 8:00am – 4:00pm, Monday - Friday parking restriction on one side of the street. The parking restriction was identified at the residents meeting. A total of 15 consultation documents were delivered and 13 were returned. The consultation documents suggested the problems currently being experienced could be alleviated with the installation of a parking restriction on the one side of the street.

## 6. Cont'd

4. The majority of submissions received expressed dissatisfaction with the current situation. The main concerns that emerged from the consultation process were:
  - (a) Adverse effects of all day staff parking in particular from St Georges Hospital;
  - (b) Traffic congestion in the street at peak school times;
  - (c) Double parking of vehicles down the centre of the roadway at these times;
  - (d) The lack of available on-street parking for residents and their visitors;
  - (e) Frustration with St Georges Hospital for not providing adequate off-street parking for staff;
  - (f) Inconsiderate parking on both sides of the street (encroaching over driveways);
  - (g) Poor visibility when exiting driveways due to poorly parked vehicles;
  - (h) Parking on fire hydrants;
  - (i) Angle parking at the St Andrews frontage;
5. The feedback from the first round of consultation (see attachment 1) showed that:
  - (a) Eleven were in favour of the installation of a parking restriction on one side of the street and 2 were opposed. Three were in favour of 'Residents Only' parking as well as the proposal;
  - (b) Six were in favour of the north side of the street, 1 either side, 3 the south side and 3 both sides;
  - (c) Six favoured P120, 1 P60, 1 any time limit, and 3 no preference;
  - (d) There was a general feeling St Georges should provide more staff parking;
  - (e) Some residents want the street parking for residents only;
6. Feedback from those opposed to the suggested parking restriction was happy with the current situation. Elizabeth House also opposes any form of restriction stating that they will go out of business. Currently they do not have any off street parking for their customers. The original residents meeting discussed this issue and the proposal took into account the requirement of on street parking for Elizabeth House customers.
7. The second round of consultation (see attachment 2) offered the following option for comment:

That a "P120, 8:30am–4:00pm, Monday - Friday" parking restriction be installed on the north side of Circuit Street.
8. A total of 15 consultation documents were delivered and 13 submissions were received. All 13 submissions were in favour of the proposal. General comments were:
  - Landscape the street;
  - Mark parking limit lines at driveways;
  - Change parking restriction alternate years from north to south and vice versa;
  - Both sides of the street;
  - Enforcement of the restriction;

## 6. Cont'd

9. The proposed P120 parking restriction will help alleviate the issues of congestion in the street by limiting all day parking to the south side only. It will also significantly improve visibility for residents exiting their properties and increase the general safety of the street by reducing the need for double parking. To stop illegal angle parking at the St Andrews frontage no stopping lines will be installed. Parking limit lines will be installed in association with the parking restriction as will as on the other (north) side of the street. By limiting the restriction to "8:30am – 4:00pm Monday - Friday residents will benefit both from the increased turn over of car parking spaces when the restriction is operative and from unrestricted parking outside week days. This will also help alleviate concerns expressed by Elizabeth House. The P120 parking restriction as in the proposal is considered the most cost effective and practical solution to the problems currently being experienced in Circuit Street.
10. St Andrews College has been advised of the residents request and fully supports the proposal.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

11. The estimated cost of this work is \$1500.

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

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

### **LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

13. The Land Transport Rules provide for the installation of parking restrictions.

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

14. As above.

### **ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

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

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

16. As above.

### **ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

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

### **DO THE RECOMMENDATIONS ALIGN WITH THE COUNCIL'S STRATEGIES?**

18. As above.

### **CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

19. Consultation has been carried out with the residents and businesses and general support has been forthcoming. St Andrews College supports the proposal.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board approve:

- (a) The parking of vehicles is limited to a maximum of 120 minutes (8:00am to 4:00pm, Monday to Friday) on the north side of Circuit Street from a point 11 metres west of the Heaton Street intersection and extending 178 metres in a westerly direction. (see attachment 3)

**6. Cont'd**

- (b) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time at the end of Circuit Street across the frontage at St Andrews College, commencing at the boundary of number 31 Circuit Street and extending across Circuit Street to the boundary of number 34 Circuit Street for a distance of 20 metres.

**7. DISPOSAL OF REDUNDANT SERVICE LANE – CLYDE ROAD SERVICE LANE**

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>General Manager responsible:</b> | Jane Parfitt General Manager City Environment, DDI 9418656 |
| <b>Officer responsible:</b>         | Michael Aitken Transport & Greenspace Manager              |
| <b>Author:</b>                      | Weng-Kei Chen  |

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's recommendation to Council to declare the existing service land an area of 158m<sup>2</sup> surplus to roading requirements and to proceed by way of consent to stop a portion of service lane as shown in Attachment 1 pursuant to the provisions of section 6, 117 (1) and 120 (3) of the Public Works Act 1981.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The redevelopment carried out to Fendalton Village Shopping Centre in 1995 has rendered the service lane redundant for access to the site.
3. The only access onto the site from Clyde Road permitted for the development was approximately 20m south of the service lane and the area designated as service lane was included in the carpark layout. The development site is shown on Attachment 2.
4. The design of the parking layout and access onto Clyde Road has worked satisfactorily and there is no requirement for the Council to continue allowing public space to be used for the development.
5. The Council as owner of the land has not formally resolved to declare this area of the service lane as surplus to roading requirements and commence road stopping procedure.
6. Staff have concluded the negotiation with Rock Kwon Ltd (owner of the shopping centre), for the sale of the redundant service lane subject to the Council's decision to commence the road stopping procedure.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7. The Council will incur costs associated with the road stopping procedure. This cost is estimated to be \$5,000 and is budgeted for in the Capital Programme Subdivision Code 542/137.

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

8. Yes see above.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

9. Staff have recommended the use of Public Works Act 1981 for the road stopping procedure.
10. Section 116 Public Works Act 1981 – stopping roads states:  
*“Subject to the written consent of the territorial authority and the owner(s) of the land adjoining the road, then the road can be declared formally stopped by notice in the gazette.”*
11. There will be no loss of public access to this section of service lane.
12. Section 117 (1) Public Works Act 1981 – dealing with stopped roads states:  
*“The Council may deal with road stopped under the Act in the same manner as if the road has been stopped pursuant to the Local Government Act 1974.”*

**7. Cont'd**

13. The parcel of "stopped road" in this case "service lane" will be transferred to Rock Kwon Ltd (owner of Fendalton Village Shopping Centre).

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

14. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

15. LTCCP page 152 "Streets and Transport Objectives" – to provide a sustainable network of streets connecting the main traffic routes with properties while contributing to the liveable environment.

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

16. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

17. This action is consistent with the Traffic Objectives stated in the City Plan.

**Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

18. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

19. Not required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board recommends that the Council:

- (a) Declare the existing service lane as shown in Attachment 1 surplus to the Council's requirements.
- (b) Pursuant to Sections 116 (1), 117 (3) (b) and 120 (3) of the Public Works Act 1981 resolves to stop that parcel of service lane as described in the schedule (Attachment 2) and to amalgamate that parcel with the adjoining property.

Schedule:

| Being     | Adjoining      | Title Reference | Area              |
|-----------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Section 1 | Lot 2 DP 23933 | CB 9B/1407      | 158m <sup>2</sup> |

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

20. Prior to 1995, this service lane served a neighbourhood shopping strip along Clyde Road. This was typical in many of the city neighbourhood shopping strips developed prior to 1970.
21. In October 1995 a resource consent was granted for the redevelopment of the entire Business 2 zone at the southeast corner of the intersection of Ilam and Clyde Roads. This Resource Consent approved the access from Clyde Road 20m south of the service lane and hence rendered the service lane redundant. The developed site is as shown on Attachment 2.
22. The redundant service lane was incorporated into the design of the carpark layout. This service lane has no impact on the roading network. The carpark has served the development well and no legal issue of the right of access from the service lane to Clyde Road has been raised. There was also no requirement for the Council to provide carparking for this development.
23. The Council land ownership for this parcel of service lane was raised with owners of the shopping centre but due to the ownership changes over the years, this matter did not progress.

**7. Cont'd**

24. Negotiation with the current owner of the shopping centre has been completed and based on the assessment by the Council's appointed valuer; the land is valued at \$71,000 + GST.

**8. HOLMWOOD ROAD/ROSSALL STREET – RE-ESTABLISH EXISTING “NO STOPPING” RESTRICTION**

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>General Manager responsible:</b> | Jane Parfitt, General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656 |
| <b>Officer responsible:</b>         | Michael Aitken, Transport and Greenspace Manager             |
| <b>Author:</b>                      | Jeff Owen/Barry Cook   |

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to re-establish the existing broken yellow “no stopping” lines at the Holmwood Road/Rossall Street intersection.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The intersection of Holmwood Road/Rossall has been reconstructed in recent years when Rossall Street was upgraded. Various lengths of “No Stopping” restrictions were installed with the reconstruction along with various other road markings including cycle lanes for traffic management purposes.
3. Recently concern has been expressed to the legality of “No Stopping” restrictions. Council records failed to return any legal resolutions establishing the existing no stopping restrictions.
4. Extensive consultation was conducted before the reconstruction project was undertaken. Residents, businesses and stakeholders agreed to the Council's final proposal at the time, this included the existing No Stopping restrictions that are in place today.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5. The “no stopping” restrictions are existing therefore there are no additional costs.

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

6. There is no budget required.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

7. 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?**

8. As noted in paragraph 7.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

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

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

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

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

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



## 8. Cont'd

### Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

12. Noted in paragraph 11.

### CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

13. Extensive consultation was conducted before the reconstruction project was undertaken. Residents, businesses and stakeholders agreed to the Councils final proposal at the time, this included the existing No Stopping restrictions that are in place today.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended as shown in the attachment that the Community Board approve:

- (a) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Holmwood Road commencing at the Rossall Street intersection and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 8.5 metre.
- (b) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Rossall Street commencing at the Holmwood Road intersection and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 20 metres.
- (c) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Rossall Street commencing at a point 39.8 metres south of the Holmwood Road intersection and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 10.2 metres.
- (d) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Rossall Street commencing at a point 82 metres south of the Holmwood Road intersection and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 13 metres.
- (e) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Rossall Street commencing at a point 138 metres south of the Merivale Lane intersection and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 24 metres.
- (f) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Rossall Street commencing at the Merivale Lane intersection and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 127 metres.
- (g) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Merivale Lane commencing at the Rossall Street intersection and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 21.5 metres.
- (h) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Merivale Lane commencing at the Rossall Street intersection and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
- (i) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Rossall Street commencing at the Merivale Lane intersection and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 50 metres.
- (j) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Rossall Street commencing at the Holmwood Road intersection and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 113 metres.
- (k) The stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Holmwood Road commencing at the Rossall Street intersection and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 9.5 metres.

**9. GARDEN ROAD PROPOSED KERB AND DISH CHANNEL REPLACEMENTS - SEMINAR.**

Brian Boddy will be in attendance to present the proposed survey on Garden Road Proposed Kerb and Dish Channel Replacement (See attachments 1, 2 and 3).

**10. WAIRAKEI ROAD SUBSIDENCE OF PROPERTIES**

See attached letter and memorandum.

**11. HAMILTON AVENUE/COLDSTREAM COURT ROUNDABOUT**

See attached concept plan for information.

**12. BRYNDWR ROAD/JEFFREYS ROAD INTERSECTION - SEMINAR.**

Andrew Hensley will be in attendance to present the proposed Neighbourhood Improvement Project.

**13. KNOWLES STREET (PAPANUI ROAD – CRANFORD STREET) - SEMINAR**

Andrew Hensley will be in attendance to present the proposed Street Renewal Project.