



## Christchurch City Council

# BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA NO 255

WEDNESDAY 16 MAY 2007

5.00 PM

IN THE BOARDROOM,  
CNR BERESFORD AND UNION STREETS  
NEW BRIGHTON

**Community Board:** Glenda Burt (Chairperson), Carole Evans, Carmen Hammond, Caroline Kellaway, Tina Lomax, Don Rowlands, Gail Sheriff

**Community Board Principal Adviser**

Clare Sullivan

Telephone: 941-6601

Fax: 941-6604

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

**Acting Community Secretary**

Leanne Smith

Telephone: 941-6624

Fax: 941-6604

Email: [leanne.smith@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:leanne.smith@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 REPORTS
- PART B 3. PETITIONS
- PART B 4. CORRESPONDENCE  
Hawke Street Car Park
- PART B 5. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
- PART B 6. RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY GROUPS
- PART C 7. BERESFORD STREET - PROPOSED MOBILITY PARKING RESTRICTION
- PART C 8. PROPOSED ROAD AND RIGHT OF WAY NAMING
- PART A 9. FISHING FROM THE NEW BRIGHTON PIER
- PART B 10. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE
- PART B 11. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS 2.16
- PART B 12. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS 4.1
- PART B 13. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
- PART C 14. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

**We're on the Web!**

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



1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF REPORTS**

The reports of the ordinary meetings of the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board held on Wednesday 2 and 7 May 2007 have been circulated to Board members.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the reports of the ordinary meetings held on Wednesday 2 and 7 May 2007 be confirmed.

3. **PETITIONS**

4. **CORRESPONDENCE**

**HAWKE STREET CAR PARK**

The **attached** letter was received from Bill Poysden regarding the poor state of the Hawke Street car park.

5. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

6. **RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY GROUPS**

Time is allocated at Board meetings for Residents' Association/Community Group representatives to address the Board on local matters. Each group is being invited to do this in rotation.

**NEW BRIGHTON RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION**

**Jan Kenny** from the New Brighton Residents' Association will be in attendance to provide an update of the Association's activities and to outline any issues.

**7. BERESFORD STREET - PROPOSED MOBILITY PARKING RESTRICTION**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Malcolm Taylor, Area Engineer (Community)

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval for the installation of a 60 minute mobility parking restriction on the north side of Beresford Street between Union Street and New Brighton Mall (extension of Oram Avenue), New Brighton.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Council has been requested to consider installing a "mobility parking restriction" outside the Work and Income office in Beresford Street, New Brighton.
3. Several people with disabilities visit the Work and Income office in New Brighton and are having difficulty in finding a suitable parking space in this area.
4. Currently, the angled parking spaces in front of the Work and Income office are restricted to 60 minutes parking. It is proposed to replace one of the existing 60 minute parking spaces with a 60 minute mobility parking restriction. As shown on the **attached** plan the western space in front of the Work and Income office would be the most suitable parking space for this change. A cut down for wheelchair access from the road to the footpath will also be provided.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5. An estimated cost for this work is \$600.

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

6. The installation of road markings and signs is within the LTCCP Streets and Transport Operational Budget.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

7. The Land Transport Rule provides for the installation of parking restrictions.

**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 the Council's Community Outcomes.

Safety: By providing a safe transport system.  
Community: By providing easy access to facilities.

**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. Policy 4Q: Parking for Disabled Persons.

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

12. As noted in paragraph 11.

16. 5. 2007

- 4 -

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

13. The management of the Work and Income Office support the installation of the “mobility parking restriction” at this location.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the Board approve:

- (a) That the parking of vehicles restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the north side of Beresford Street commencing at a point 43 metres from its intersection with New Brighton Mall and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 34 metres be revoked.
- (b) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the north side of Beresford Street commencing at a point 43 metres from its intersection with New Brighton Mall and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 28 metres.
- (c) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to “holders of mobility cards only”, for a maximum period of 60 minutes on the north side of Beresford Street commencing at a point 71 metres from its intersection with New Brighton Mall and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 6 metres.

## 8. PROPOSED ROAD AND RIGHT OF WAY NAMING

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8549
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Environment Policy and Approvals Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Bob Pritchard, Subdivisions Officer

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to obtain the Board's approval to one new road name (refer attached).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The approval of proposed new road and right of way names is delegated to Community Boards.
3. The Subdivision Officer has checked the proposed name against the Council's road name database to ensure it will not be confused with names currently in use.

**RMA 92005247**

This subdivision is a further stage in the development of Mrs Dixon's land at Corserland Street adjacent to the intersection of New Brighton Road and ANZAC Drive. Thirty-seven sections are to be created, to be served by one new cul-de-sac and Corserland Street. Three names have been proposed by the developer in order of preference: **Nordon Place**, **Longview Place**, and **Wideview Place**. "Nordon" is a combination of Mrs Dixon's Christian name *Norma* and her maiden name *Donnell*. Mrs Dixon and her family have had a long association with this land.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. There is no financial cost to the Council. The administration fee for road naming is included as part of the subdivision consent application fee, and the cost of name plate manufacture is charged direct to the developer.

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

5. N/A

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6. Council has a statutory obligation to approve road names.

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

7. Yes. There are no legal implications.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

8. N/A

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

9. N/A

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

10. N/A

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

11. N/A

**16. 5. 2007**

- 6 -

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

12. Where proposed road names have a possibility of being confused with names in use already, consultation is held with Land Information New Zealand and New Zealand Post. Where a Maori name is proposed Ngai Tahu are consulted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board approve the proposed road name "Nordon Place" for use.

## 9. FISHING FROM THE NEW BRIGHTON PIER

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8656
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Kay Holder, Regional Parks Team Manager and Rodney Chambers, Coastal Parks Head Ranger

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To report back to the Council on a former decision to consult the community on the potential impact of banning fishing from the New Brighton Pier and investigate the placing of a purpose built fishing gantry under the Pier.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Since the rebuilt New Brighton Pier opened in 1997, some aspects of fisher behaviour have been in conflict with the expectations of other pier users and supporters. A growing number of complaints from members of the community and pier visitors have focused on the mess that irresponsible fishers leave behind them, the disregard for the 'no fishing' area at the end of the pier and unsafe fishing practises, such as overhead casting.
3. The Council decided in November 2006 to consult with the community on the preferred option to manage fishing from the pier for the future.
4. The options identified for how the Council could manage fishing off the pier were:
  - (a) No change - current unrestricted access and fishing rules apply, with limited enforcement.
  - (b) Increased enforcement and communication - on-site supervision, supported by a public education programme.
  - (c) Restricted fishing - allow fishing only at specified times or days.
  - (d) Total ban on fishing - with on-site enforcement.
  - (e) Structural addition to the pier - an additional platform to separate sightseers and fishers.
5. Public consultation took place from 4 November to 8 December 2006 with the above options details with explanations for and against.
6. The preferred option identified from public consultation and staff is for:
  - (b) Increased enforcement and communication - on-site supervision, supported by a public education programme.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. Increased enforcement is not currently budgeted for. Funding of \$25,000 would enable part-time staff to be employed at the appropriate times, especially weekends and peak use times. The cost of developing a communication plan will be covered within existing staff resources.

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

8. Not specifically mentioned.

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Whoever is employed to enforce the rules on the pier will need to have delegation to issue Trespass Notices.

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

10. Yes see above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

11. Aligns with objective "To provide a network of parks, open-space, waterways and wetlands that meet community and environmental needs" and "providing a variety of recreation opportunities and facilities in parks".

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

12. N/A

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

13. Recreation and Sports Strategy, Parks Access Policy.

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

14. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

15. Consultation took place over a 4½ week period, with 280 responses received. The existing pier users and members of the general community were consulted (**Attachment 1**). A breakdown of the number of submitters preferring each option is shown in the diagram (**Attachment 2**).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Board recommend to Council to:

- (a) Budget to enable increased enforcement on the Pier.
- (b) Develop an communication/education plan, including signage to increase awareness of the rules of using the pier. This would enable the pier to continue to be used for what it was built for in the most cost-effective way. Fishing can continue but it will be better managed. A staff presence would minimise the conflict between groups such as fishers and sightseers.



## BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)

16. The pier is used by residents throughout Christchurch and was constructed partly by community raised funds, thus consultation was extensive. Consultation took place from Saturday 4 November until Friday 8 December 2006.
17. The following activities were included in the consultation programme:
  - Approximately 3,500 (including a submission form) were distributed via Council Service Centres and Libraries, New Brighton shops, events and direct mail.
  - Some members of the public were interviewed, to obtain the same information as the brochure submission form. This was particularly focused on obtaining the views of people fishing off the pier including non-English speaking people.
  - The Council website featured the pier consultation on its homepage during most of the consultation period, and further web pages included the information in the brochure, plus an on-line submission form.
  - Two displays in the New Brighton Library - including brochures.
  - Meetings were held with the Pier and Foreshore Society, and staff at the New Brighton Library, to inform them and listen to their suggestions relating to the consultation. One public meeting was held on 22 November to discuss the consultation and the issues.
  - Council staff attended some events in New Brighton, with an information stall, to talk to members of the public and distribute brochures. Events included two New Brighton market days, Take a Kid Fishing (Owles Terrace), and an Asian church market.
  - Article in the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board's December newsletter.
  - Direct mail to approximately 200 stakeholders, including all residents' groups and schools in Burwood/Pegasus ward, names provided from Pier and Foreshore Society, list of important stakeholders, all fishing shops in Christchurch and other potentially interested parties/organisations.
  - Use the Council's "Our Christchurch" page in The Star.
  - Advertisements placed in local community papers to supplement coverage in Our Christchurch (Eastern Mail, Pegasus Post).
  - Advertisements on Plains FM in Korean and Chinese programmes, in their own language.
  - Media releases were distributed at key points in the consultation process.
  - A special briefing was held with programme makers of the Chinese programme on Plains FM.
  - Key messages were formatted into FAQs for Customer Services staff.

## Consultation Results

18. An analysis of the 280 submission forms received indicates that most submitters (70%) support the continuation of fishing off the pier, however 65% of all respondents say they want better management of it. The option most favoured by submitters was Option 2, increased enforcement and communication, which was chosen by 89 submitters (representing nearly a third of submissions received).
19. The option least favoured (7% of submissions) was Option 1, continuation of the status quo, whereby fishing is largely unrestricted and there is limited enforcement of the rules. Banning fishing off the pier (Option 4) was chosen by 84 submitters or 30%. The breakdown of the number of submitters preferring each option is as follows:
  - (a) Option 1 (No changes) - 19 submissions, or 7%
  - (b) Option 2 (Increased enforcement and communication) - 89 submissions, or 32%
  - (c) Option 3 (Restricted fishing) - 42 submissions, or 15%
  - (d) Option 4 (Total ban on fishing) - 84 submissions, or 30%
  - (e) Option 5 (Structural addition to the pier) - 50 submissions, or 17%

20. A high percentage of pier visitors experienced inconsiderate behaviour by fisherman - the follow table explains the nature of complaints.

**Nature of the inconsiderate behaviour:**

Overhead Casting/ inconsiderate casting	Fishing in the no-fishing zone	Fishing crowding out other pier visitors	Fishing mess/ smell	General inconsiderate behaviour	Creating dangerous/ hazardous situation	Use of drugs/ alcohol
19.16%	16.54%	9.71%	22.83%	7.09%	2.89%	1.84%

Use of bad language/ abuse directed at others	Littering	Cutting on handrails/ seats	Breaking fishing rules	Cruel/inhumane treatment of fish	Too many rods per angler
8.66%	1.05%	4.20%	2.10%	2.10%	1.84%

**THE OBJECTIVES**

21. The objective is to manage the New Brighton Pier in the most effective way for the enjoyment of all visitors.

**THE OPTIONS**

**Option 1**

22. No change - continue to allow fishing - current unrestricted access and fishing rules apply, with limited enforcement.

**Option 2**

23. Increased enforcement and communication. This would necessitate the employment of a part-time person who would be present only at the high use times to oversee the behaviour of pier visitors - provide general information - issue trespass notices if need be, report any maintenance issues, ensure the general area is at an acceptable standard. It is timely to also review the signage and other information about the pier. A communication plan would be developed to assist with education of pier users. This plan would cover signage, publications, web information and other publicly accessible information. The additional enforcement could be achieved through contracting a security firm, or preferably by employing a part-time staff member who would be supervised by the Coastal Park Ranger Team.

**Option 3**

24. Restricted fishing - allow fishing only at specified times or days. This option would be administratively onerous. It could be confusing for visitors to know when they could or could not fish, it may necessitate the addition of signage and could be open for ongoing debate about when fishing is allowed and not. Increased enforcement would also be necessary to ensure fishers were following the set times.

**Option 4**

25. Total ban on fishing. This option would no doubt solve a number of problems associated with the existing misuse of the pier and conflict between recreationists. However, it would necessitate enforcement as people would not continue to fish until forced not to. It would also remove one of the benefits of the pier - to be able to easily fish over the water. Christchurch City has limited facilities for this activity.

**Option 5**

26. Structural addition to the pier. The Board requested the option for a gantry under the pier be investigated to provide a separate fishing area where fishing can continue without disturbing people using the pier for other recreational purposes. An engineering feasibility report showed that this could cost up to \$1 million. Consultation showed this that was not the most preferred option. It is the option that would cost the most and may still require some additional enforcement to ensure fishers kept to their allocated space. A central platform above the end of the pier may also be constructed at a lesser cost.

**THE PREFERRED OPTION**

27. Option 2, increased enforcement and communication.

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

28. Option 2 - increased enforcement and communication - on-site supervision, supported by a public education programme.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Fishing can continue. Information provided by a person and through signage and publications about the pier, fishing and the general area will increase enjoyment to visitors.	
<b>Cultural</b>		
<b>Environmental</b>	A staff presence would increase the compliance of fishing regulations.	
<b>Economic</b>	There may be a reduction in maintenance costs as staff presence may reduce vandalism.	Increased employment cost.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>The option contributes to "A Safe City and A City for Recreation, Fun and Creativity".</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>This will increase the Council's efficacy managing conflict on the pier.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Yes.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>This is the most preferred option of those who took part in consultation.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p> <p>N/A</p>		

**Maintain the Status Quo (if not preferred option)**

29. No change. Continue to allow fishing - current unrestricted access and fishing rules apply, with limited enforcement.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Fishing will continue.	Conflict and complaints will continue.
<b>Cultural</b>		
<b>Environmental</b>		
<b>Economic</b>	No extra cost for enforcement.	On going maintenance costs for cleaning and vandalism.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>The option contributes to "A City of Recreation Fun and Creativity".</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>The Council would be seen to be doing nothing about an issue the community has raised.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>This is not the preferred option of those consulted.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p> <p>N/A</p>		

**At Least one Other Option (or an explanation of why another option has not been considered)**

## 30. Option 4. Total Ban on Fishing

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>		Loss of a popular recreation activity.
<b>Cultural</b>		
<b>Environmental</b>	Less fish taken.	
<b>Economic</b>	There will be less maintenance costs as there will be less fish mess to clean.	There will be costs to enforce a fishing ban.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>This option is aligned to "A Safe City , but not a City for Recreation, Fun and Creativity".</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>This option does not encourage recreation and outdoor use.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Goes against encouraging physical activity.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>This is not the preferred option of those consulted.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p> <p>N/A</p>		

## 31. Option 5. Structural Addition to the pier.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Provides a better opportunity to separate fishing and non-fishing visitors to the pier.	Construction may impact on the current use of the pier.
<b>Cultural</b>		
<b>Environmental</b>		Construction could have an impact on the environment.
<b>Economic</b>	May increase visitor attraction and overall visitor numbers.	This option is the most expensive. Maintenance costs would also be increased.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>This aligns to "A Safe City and A City for Recreation, Fun and Creativity".</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>The Council has not budgeted or planned for a structural addition.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Not specified.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>This is not the most preferred option.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p> <p>N/A</p>		

16. 5. 2007

- 15 -

**10. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE**

**10.1 OUTSTANDING REPORTS**

**10.2 ARTWORKS IN BURWOOD/PEGASUS WORKING PARTY**

**Attached** are minutes from the Working Party's meeting held on 30 April 2007.

**10.3 CSR UPDATE (APRIL 2007)**

**Attached.**

**11. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS 2.16**

**12. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS 4.1**

Members may at any ordinary meeting put a question to the Chairperson concerning any matter relevant to the role or function of the Community Board concerning any matter that does not appear on the order paper. All questions are subject to Standing Orders 4.1.1 to 4.1.5.

**13. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

Board members will have an opportunity to provide updates on community activities and/or Council issues.

**14. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

**Attached.**