

**SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD  
AGENDA**

**WEDNESDAY 18 AUGUST 2010**

**AT 4PM**

**IN THE BOARDROOM  
PAPANUI SERVICE CENTRE  
CORNER LANGDONS ROAD AND RESTELL STREET**

**Community Board:** Yvonne Palmer (Chairperson), Ngaire Button, Kathy Condon, Pauline Cotter, Aaron Keown, Matt Morris, and Norm Withers

**Community Board Adviser:**  
Peter Croucher  
Phone 941 5414 DDI  
Email: [peter.croucher@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:peter.croucher@ccc.govt.nz)

**PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION  
PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION  
PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

**INDEX**

- |               |            |  |
|---------------|------------|--|
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>1.</b>  | <b>APOLOGIES</b>   |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>2.</b>  | <b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – 4 AUGUST 2010</b>   |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>3.</b>  | <b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>  |
|               | 3.1        | Laura Cadigan – Youth Development Report Back  |
|               | 3.2        | Genaya McKenzie – Youth Development Report Back  |
|               | 3.3        | Desiree Jade Stevens – Youth Development Report Back   |
|               | 3.4        | Kathy and Trevor Inwood – Spencer Park   |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>4.</b>  | <b>PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS</b>   |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>5.</b>  | <b>NOTICES OF MOTION</b>   |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>6.</b>  | <b>BRIEFINGS</b>   |
| <b>PART A</b> | <b>7.</b>  | <b>PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES</b>   |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>8.</b>  | <b>PAPANUI DOMAIN LANDSCAPE AND PLAYGROUND RENEWAL</b>   |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>9.</b>  | <b>APPLICATION TO SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD’S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND – AMELIA LINK AND COURTNEY REYNOLDS</b> |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>10.</b> | <b>ELLINGTON RESIDENTS’ ASSOCIATION - BOARD RECOGNITION</b>  |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>11.</b> | <b>NEW ZEALAND COMMUNITY BOARDS’ BEST PRACTICE AWARDS 2011</b>   |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>12.</b> | <b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>  |

- PART B    13.    COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**  
13.1   Current Issues  
13.2   Update on Local Capital Projects  
13.3   Board Funding Update 2010/11  
13.4   CSR Report for July 2010
- PART B    14.    ELECTED MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B    15.    QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES– 4 AUGUST 2010**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Wednesday 4 August 2010 are **attached**.

**CHAIRPERSON'S OR STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 4 August 2010 be confirmed.

**3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**3.1 LAURA CADIGAN – YOUTH DEVELOPMENT REPORT BACK**

Laura Cadigan will provide information on her experience attending the Australian Rhythmic Gymnastics Championships in Perth, 4-13 July 2010.

**3.2 GENAYA MCKENZIE – YOUTH DEVELOPMENT REPORT BACK**

Genaya McKenzie will provide information on her experience representing New Zealand at the Australia National Rhythmic Championships being held in Perth from 5-11 July 2010.

**3.3 DESIREE JADE STEVENS – YOUTH DEVELOPMENT REPORT BACK**

Desiree Jade Stevens will provide information on her experience competing in the National Marching Tournament being held in Rotorua.

**3.4 KATHY AND TREVOR INWOOD – VISION FOR SPENCER PARK**

Kathy and Trevor Inwood will provide information on their vision for Spencer Park.

**4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

**5. NOTICES OF MOTION**

5.1 The following notice of motion has been submitted by Pauline Cotter pursuant to Standing Order 3.10.1:

"That staff be requested to investigate the Adrenalin Forest providing toilet facilities at their Spencer Park location."

**6. BRIEFINGS**

Nil.

## 7. PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941- 8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Manager Transport and Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Shane Moohan, City Arborist

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To present the Proposed Tree Policy for consultation with the Community Boards including proposed amendments to the Council's existing delegations on trees.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Workshops with Councillors were held in June and September 2008 to discuss suggested changes to the current tree delegations.
3. The Combined Community Board Chairs Forum on 13 October 2008 requested that a working party made up of both staff and one nominated member from each Community Board be formed to work through issues relating to a City wide Tree Policy.
4. Since then the Tree Policy Working Party has met five times to prepare the Proposed Tree Policy document (**attachment 1**). Issues that arose during these discussions that were outside of the scope of the Working Party are documented and were presented to Council in a Memorandum on 10 December 2010.
5. An initial draft policy was developed which encompassed suggested changes to the current delegations as well as operational issues for planting, maintaining and removing trees. It did not cover future direction for trees in Christchurch as this would be more appropriately addressed in a strategic document.
6. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs Forum recommended –
  - (a) That this initial draft Proposed Tree Policy be presented to Council for adoption.
  - (b) That the Working Party Memorandum be presented to Council for consideration.
7. The Council workshop on 23 February 2010 requested that an amended Proposed Tree Policy be presented to Council with the recommendation that it be adopted for consultation with Community Boards.

The amendments to the Proposed Tree Policy included changes to –

- (a) 3.1 Tree Management
- (b) 3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces, clauses (i) (k) and (m).
- (c) 6 Definitions, Affected Community and Publicly Owned Land.
- (d) 4 Relevant Delegations, Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to Council for a decision.

A full break down of the amendments is found in paragraph 43.

8. On 25 March 2010 the Council adopted the amended Proposed Tree Policy for consultation with Community Boards.
9. The amended Proposed Tree Policy is now **attached**, together with a comments form template (**attachment 6**), tree removal process map (**attachment 3**), tree maintenance process map (**attachment 4**) and tree planting process map (**attachment 5**) to assist Boards with their discussions.

10. The recommendation is that the amended Proposed Tree Policy be adopted subject to formal consideration of the comments offered by all of the Community Boards.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

11. Adoption of the Proposed Tree Policy is not expected to have significant effects on operational or capital budgets.
12. The Proposed Tree Policy suggests that there is a “user pays” process for some tree planting (3.3.1 Commemorative Trees), some tree pruning (3.7 Pruning Trees in Public Spaces) and some tree removals (3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces, 3.5 Requests to Remove Trees in Public Spaces, 3.6 Cost of Removal of Trees in Public Spaces). This involves the actual cost to complete the work and the cost incurred in gathering sufficient information for Community Boards to make an informed decision where the requested service is not considered ‘business as usual’ and falls outside of approved Activity Management Plan levels of service .
13. The Proposed Tree Policy also suggests that for some tree removals that applicants pay for the value of the tree (3.6 Cost of Removal of Trees in Public Spaces). The value of the tree is based on the Standard Tree Evaluation Method (STEM) which is the nationally recognised system for evaluating and valuing trees (see “Definitions” in Proposed Tree Policy).
14. Should the suggested “user pays” process for tree removal and pruning be adopted, this will have financial implications for some members of the public.
15. Should the suggested user pays system be adopted this will need to be incorporated into the Council’s Fees and Charges Schedule under Section 12 Local Government Act 2002.

#### **Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?**

16. The recommendations align with the current LTCCP budgets.

#### **LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

17. Alignment with Principal legislation –
  - (a) Resource Management Act 1991.
    - (i) Banks Peninsula District Plan.
    - (ii) City of Christchurch City Plan.
  - (b) Reserves Act 1977.
  - (c) Biosecurity Act 1993.
  - (d) Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992 plus amendments and regulations.
  - (e) Electricity Act 1992 plus regulations.
  - (f) Telecommunications Act 2001.
  - (g) Property Law Act 2007.
  - (h) Public Works Act 1981.
  - (i) Local Government Act 1974 and 2002.
  - (j) Christchurch City Council Parks & Reserves Bylaw 2008.
18. The following Council Policies will need to be rescinded –
  - (a) Tree Planting in Streets Policy.

- (b) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404.
- (c) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636.
- (d) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236.
- (e) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178.

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

- 19. The Council has the legal right to adopt the Proposed Tree Policy.
- 20. Irrespective of Council Policies and Strategies the District Court can order the pruning or removal of trees under The Property Law Act 2007.
- 21. Irrespective of Council Policies and Strategies some pruning and removal of protected trees may require a Resource Consent be granted prior to work to being undertaken.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

- 22. Recommendation aligns with current LTCCP and Activity Management Plans.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?**

- 23. Supports the following Levels of Service –
  - (a) 6.0 Neighbourhood Parks.  
6.06 Planted areas and trees.
  - (b) 6.1 Sports Parks.  
6.1.8 Maintain planted areas and trees.
  - (c) 6.2 Garden and Heritage Parks.  
6.2.9 Planted areas and trees.
  - (d) 6.3 Regional Parks  
6.3.2 Protecting biodiversity values
  - (e) 6.4 Cemeteries.  
6.4.8 Maintain planted areas and trees.
  - (f) 6.5 Waterways and Land Drainage  
6.5.3 Cost of maintaining waterways and land drainage system.
  - (g) 10.0 Road Network.  
10.0.11 Road landscaping and street trees.

- 24. Supports the Capital tree replacement programmes for street and park trees.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

- 25. There is currently no overarching city wide policy for vegetation management. In the Memorandum from the Tree Policy Working Party (**attachment 2**) it is suggested that funding for the commencement of a City wide policy be included for consideration in the next LTCCP.
- 26. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with the following Strategies–
  - (a) New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy.

(b) Christchurch City Council Biodiversity Strategy 2008-2035.

27. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with Council Policies –

- (a) Traffic Calming Policy.
- (b) Sponsorship of Trees and Other Plantings on Reserves.
- (c) Proposed Central City Street Tree Plan.
- (d) Central City Streetscape Plan.
- (e) Consultation Policy.

28. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with the following sections of the Christchurch City Plan -

Volume 2: Section 4 City Identity.

#### 4.2.1 Policy: Tree Cover.

To promote amenity values in the urban area by maintaining and enhancing the tree cover present in the City.

Tree cover and vegetation make an important contribution to amenity values in the City. Through the redevelopment of sites, existing vegetation is often lost and not replaced. The City Plan protects those trees identified as “heritage” or “notable” and the subdivision process protects other trees which are considered to be “significant”. The highest degree of protection applies to heritage trees.

Because Christchurch is largely built on a flat plain, trees and shrubs play an important role in creating relief, contributing to visual amenity and attracting native birds.

The amount of private open space available for new planting and to retain existing trees is influenced by rules concerning building density and setback from boundaries. The rules do not require new planting for residential development but landscaping is required in business zones.

#### 4.2.2 Policy: Garden City

To recognise and promote the “Garden City” identity, heritage and character of Christchurch.

A key aspect of achieving this policy will be maintaining and extending environments and vegetation types which compliment this image. A broad range of matters influence and contribute to this image, including the following:

- (a) Tree-lined streets and avenues.
- (b) Parks and developed areas of open space.

#### 14.3.2 Policy: “Garden City” image identity.

To acknowledge and promote the “Garden City” identity of the City by protecting, maintaining and extending planting which compliments this image.

Volume 3: Part 8 Special Purpose Zone

#### 14.3.5 Street Trees

Nearly half the length of streets within the city contains street trees, but the presence of very high quality street trees which add considerable presence to streets and neighbourhoods is confined to a relatively small proportion of the road network. These streets add particular character and amenity of the city, either in the form of avenues which form points into the city, or an important part of the local character of particular streets.

## CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

29. All eight Community Boards appointed representatives to the Tree Policy Working Party to ensure their Ward's views and concerns were represented.
30. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs Forum recommended that the Proposed Tree Policy be presented to Council for adoption.
31. No public consultation has been undertaken as this document is intended for internal use.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

- (a) That the Board review and provide comment on the attached Proposed Tree Policy and the proposed changes to delegations.
- (b) That the Board recommends to the Council that the Proposed Tree Policy be adopted subject to formal consideration of the comments offered by all of the Community Boards.
- (c) That the Board recommends to the Council that the following policies be rescinded:
  - (i) Tree Planting in Streets Policy.
  - (ii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404.
  - (iii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636.
  - (iv) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236.
  - (v) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178.
- (d) That the Board recommends to the Council that the following delegations be rescinded:

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. (CR 23.10.96)”

Community Boards:

“To plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council. (CR 13.12.07)”
- (f) That the Board recommends to the Council that the following changes to delegations be made-

That the following delegations for the policy be made:

  - (i) The Transport and Greenspace Manager on the recommendation of the City Arborist and relevant infrastructure Manager where appropriate has delegated authority for the planting of trees under Section 3.3 and the removal of trees under Section 3.4 and the pruning of trees under Section 3.7 of this policy.
  - (ii) The relevant Community Board has delegated authority in consultation with the Transport and Greenspace Manager and relevant infrastructure Manager to decide on any tree matter that either falls outside of the Transport and Greenspace Manager’s delegation or, after consultation with affected parties, has remained contentious and is unable to be resolved by the Transport and Greenspace Manager.
  - (iii) In emergency situations, the Transport and Greenspace Manager or the City Arborist have full delegated powers to negate immediate danger.



- (iv) Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to the Council for a decision.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted with the exception of clause (f)(iv).

That the Board provides the following comments to the Council:

1. The Board does not support clause (f)(iv) whereby the Council can make a decision if the Board and Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree.
2. Tree maintenance: -when pruning is user pays it needs to be clarified that the cost includes removal and replacement.
3. Evaluation – in addition to the three categories (condition, amenity, notability) liveability needs to be added. This covers nuisance value (debris, leaves, shading etc) and health and well-being. Also, under notability there are three criteria: stature, historic and scientific. The Board wishes “species” to be included as a criterion.

## BACKGROUND

32. On 12 June 2008 a workshop was held to discuss potential changes to the tree delegations.

Currently delegations are:

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. (CR 23.10.96)"*

Community Boards -

*"To plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council. (CR 13.12.07)"*

33. Changes were suggested to enable:

- (a) Clear parameters over what decisions staff can make.
- (b) Greater clarity over when decisions are to be made by Community Boards.
- (c) Timely and pragmatic decisions for residents requesting tree removals.

34. As a result of this meeting a Memo was issued to the Mayor, Councillors and Community Board Members on 1 August 2008 outlining the current tree delegations for the Community Boards and the Greenspace Manager, suggesting changes to the delegations, the reasons why the changes were being suggested and safe guards.

35. On 29 September 2008 a further workshop was held providing an outline of issues faced by the arborists. These included -

- (a) Removal, replacement, removing otherwise healthy trees.
- (b) Pruning trees under power lines causing disfigurement to the tree.
- (c) Removing trees which are overcrowded.
- (d) Removing trees of poor shape.
- (e) Removing trees which pose a health and safety risk.

36. Proposals to clarify staff delegations were mainly around tree removal and tree planting. Some guidelines around staff decisions on tree removal and planting were suggested. These included the significance of the tree to be removed and the agreement of affected parties. Guidelines around tree planting included aligning to strategies or plans or direction, maintaining design integrity (e.g. Living Streets), maintaining existing levels of service for provision of street and park trees, and agreement of affected parties.

37. On 13 October 2008 the Combined Community Board Chairs forum requested that a working party made up of both staff and one nominated member from each Community Board be formed to work through issues relating to a tree policy.

38. The Working Party was made up of the following Community Board Members –

Paula Smith	Lyttleton/Mt Herbert (Chairperson)
Matt Morris	Shirley/Papanui (Deputy Chairperson)
Tim Carter	Hagley/Ferrymead
Mike Mora	Riccarton/Wigram
Val Carter	Fendalton/Waimairi
Stewart Miller	Akaroa/Wairewa
Linda Stewart	Burwood/Pegasus

Karolyn Potter      Spreydon/Heathcote  
Tim Scandrett      Spreydon/Heathcote (proxy)

39. The following Terms of Reference were drawn up to guide the Working Party in its discussions -
  - (a) Clarify understanding around proposed changes to the tree delegations.
  - (b) Clarify staff and Community Board roles in tree maintenance i.e. business as usual vs pruning for views or shade or light and cost recovery with pruning for views or shade or light.
  - (c) Clarify staff and Community Board roles in tree planting and removals and cost recovery with tree removal and replacement planting.
  - (d) Consider the application of STEM (Standard Tree Evaluation Method) in its application to tree maintenance and removal decision making.
  - (e) Recommend any changes to existing delegations or the implementation of a Tree Policy following on from discussions over the above.
40. During Working Party discussions matters that were outside of the scope were raised. These were detailed in a Memorandum from the Working Party and presented to Council.
41. On 16 October 2009 the Combined Community Board Chairs recommended that the Proposed Tree Policy be forwarded to the Council for adoption.
42. On 10 December 2009 the Proposed Tree Policy went to the Council for adoption with the following recommendations –
  - a) Rescind the following Policies –
    - (i) Tree Planting in Streets Policy.
    - (ii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree and Vegetation Policy Resolutions 98/178 and 97/404.
    - (iii) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Trimmings (Private Plantings) Policy Resolution 94/636.
    - (iv) Banks Peninsula District Council Tree Planting on Reserves Policy Resolution 99/236.
    - (v) Banks Peninsula District Council Wildling Trees – Removal from Road Reserve Resolution 98/178.
  - b) Adopt the Proposed Tree Policy including the following delegations:
    - (i) The Transport and Greenspace Manager on the recommendation of the City Arborist and relevant infrastructure Manager where appropriate has delegated authority for the planting of trees under Section 3.3 (Planting and Planting of Trees in Public Spaces) and the removal of trees under Section 3.4 (Removal of Trees in Public Spaces) and the pruning of trees under Section 3.7 (Pruning Trees in Public Spaces) of this policy.
    - (ii) The relevant Community Board has delegated authority in consultation with the Transport and Greenspace Manager and relevant infrastructure Manager to decide on any tree matter that either falls outside of the Transport and Greenspace Manager's delegation or, after consultation with affected parties, has remained contentious and is unable to be resolved by the Transport and Greenspace Manager.

43. At a February 2010 workshop Council requested that an amended Proposed Tree Policy be brought to Council with the recommendation that it be adopted for consultation with Community Boards.

The suggested amendments were –

3.1 Tree Management

Delete - “ecology - by”

Insert - “Enhancing and protecting the surrounding environment and safeguarding biodiversity”

3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces

(i) Delete - “significant” and insert “have only a minor detrimental effect”.

(k) Insert - “Control of roadside pests that are listed in the Canterbury Regional Pest Management Strategy 2005-2015 in Banks Peninsula remain the responsibility of the adjacent land owner”.

(m) Insert - “that is not listed as a threatened or endangered species either locally or nationally or internationally”.

Section 4 - Relevant Delegations

Insert - paragraph 3

“Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to Council for a decision”.

6. Definitions

Affected Community table – delete - “<” and insert - “approximate maximum”

Affected Community table Local Park – delete - “key stakeholders e.g. sports groups, lessees”

Affected Community (a) – delete - “significant” and insert - “important”

Publicly owned land - delete “regional parks, sports parks, cemeteries” after “road reserve either formed or unformed” insert “excluding arterial roads”

44. On 25 March 2010 the Council adopted the amended Proposed Tree Policy for consultation with Community Boards.

## 8. PAPANUI DOMAIN LANDSCAPE AND PLAYGROUND RENEWAL

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, City Environment Group DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Mary Hay, Consultation Leader

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the Papanui Domain Landscape and Playground Renewal plan, (LP334102) as shown in **attachment**.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Papanui Domain is a sports park located on Sawyers Arms Road, beside the railway line. Papanui High School is on the domain's southern boundary. The park is home to a number of sports clubs. The Papanui Leagues Club has a carpark and clubrooms adjacent to the park which is home to the Papanui Rugby League Club, Papanui Softball Club and Papanui Tigers Netball Club. Two league fields, a softball diamond and practice net are located in the domain, adjacent to an area of native bush that is referred to as Papanui Bush - an acknowledgment of the original bush that was in this part of the city.
3. There are two buildings on Papanui Domain. One building houses the Papanui Boxing Club and a public toilet, which was painted with a mural during the Whakaoho community event. The other building is run down and used to house the Papanui Scout Group. This group has disbanded and Scouts New Zealand have advised that they no longer have a use for the original hall. The log cabin at the rear of the building will be relocated off site and the hall, which is located at the front of the building, is in poor condition and will be demolished.
4. The play facilities in the park include swings and a slide which are old and of limited use. It is proposed to retain the junior swing near the leagues club and replace the other swing and slide with a merry-go-round and a slide. It is also proposed to provide a 'Fitness Wheel' near Sawyers Arms Road. This location will be more visible to passers-by and provides better connection to residential properties. It also provides another fitness opportunity for sporting groups and other users of the park. A walk/cycleway runs along the park boundary adjacent to railway line and this will be realigned as part of this proposal. A number of landscape and tree issues have been considered as part of this project to ensure a long term management approach is taken with this reserve.
5. The public consultation indicated support for the proposed concept and the proposal has been amended in response to feedback received from the community. Minor amendments have been made to the location of the new playground and to a number of tree management issues. The amended plan is included (refer **attachment**) and recommended for approval by the Community Board.
6. If approved, the installation of the playground and planned tree removals will be completed by Christmas this year. The proposed removal of the scout building, realignment of the path, tree replacements and work on the railway boundary would follow, in the first half of 2011.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The proposed works in Papanui Domain are programmed in the LTCCP for implementation in the 2010/11 financial year.
8. Based on current estimates, staff believe there is sufficient funding in the budget to implement the proposed plan.

### Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

9. Yes. Funding is provided from within the Sports Parks Programme in the 2009-19 LTCCP (refer page 239).

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. The Shirley/Papanui Community Board has delegated authority to approve the attached concept plan.

11. All necessary Resource Consents and Building Consents will be obtained before any construction is undertaken.
12. All work will be carried out by a Council approved contractor with the appropriate health and safety and work site management controls in place.
13. Scouts New Zealand will surrender their lease on the domain in due course. Council staff will prepare the appropriate paperwork to formalise this.

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

14. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

**15. LTCCP 2009-2019**

**Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Page 116**

- (a) Safety – by ensuring our parks, open spaces and waterways are healthy and safe places;
- (b) Community – by providing welcoming areas for communities to gather and interact;
- (c) Governance – by involving people in decision-making about parks, open spaces and waterways;
- (d) Health – By providing areas for people to engage in healthy activities;
- (e) Recreation – by offering a range of recreational opportunities in parks, open spaces and waterways;
- (f) City Development – by providing an inviting, pleasant and well cared-for environment.

**16. Parks and Open Spaces Activity Management Plan**

- (a) Council's objective with urban parks is to provide and manage Community Parks, Garden and Heritage Parks, Sports Parks and Riverbanks and Conservation Areas throughout the city that provide amenity values, areas for recreation and organised sport, garden environments and green corridors, that contribute to the city's natural form, character, heritage and Garden City image.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

**17. Safer Christchurch Strategy**

This strategy aligns injury prevention, road safety and crime prevention under the overarching aim of Christchurch becoming the safest city in New Zealand. One of the goals of this strategy is to enhance safety from crime through preventative and supportive actions, such as:

- (a) Ensure the phased adoption of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Principles (CPTED) into city-wide planning and policy;
- (b) To promote CPTED principles for application by owners and occupiers of existing buildings and spaces;
- (c) Provide active support to locally led initiatives that make significant contributions to reducing the incidence and effect of crime.

**18. Parks and Waterways Access Policy**

- (a) Improved access to parks and open space will increase equity as promoted by the City Council Policy on Equity and Access for People with Disabilities. Additionally, improved access has the potential to increase park use by enhancing comfort and convenience for all users and providing significant safety benefits.

## CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

### Consultation Process

19. Prior to the development of a concept for the park, the project team had discussions with a number of key stakeholders. The Consultation Leader contacted the sports and recreation groups associated with the park and met onsite with representatives from the Papanui Leagues Club (parent body of Papanui Rugby League, Papanui Softball Club and Papanui Netball) and the (now defunct) Papanui Scout Group. The feedback provided in these discussions was taken into consideration with the development of a concept plan for the park.
20. Once the concept plan was drafted, the project team held a seminar with the Community Board on 19 May 2010 to advise them that the plan was ready to go out to full public consultation. This seminar discussed the proposed concept, consultation stakeholders, project timeline and provided an opportunity for Board members to comment on the consultation programme.
21. The consultation on the concept plan was open from 21 June to 5 July 2010. A public information leaflet was delivered to adjoining residents and a number of other interest groups and key stakeholders. This leaflet included a summary of the concept, an initial concept plan and a feedback form. The project team sought feedback from the community to see whether the proposal was supported and asked for any comments. Also included was an offer to meet onsite, if requested. The proposal was posted on the CCC Have Your Say website.
22. The project team were also asked to meet on site with the Papanui Softball Club and some residents that look onto the park.
23. Each submitter that provided their contact details received an interim reply letter. This acknowledged that the submission had been received and that it would be considered, once the consultation period had closed. Submitters were also advised that they would receive further correspondence prior to a decision being made.
24. Once the project team finalised the concept, submitters that provided their contact details were advised of the outcome of consultation, the project team's preferred concept plan and the expected timeline for the project. They were also advised of the decision making process and how they could observe or be involved in this.
25. Submitters that provided their contact details will also be advised of the Community Board's decision about this proposal, after the Board meeting.

### CONSULTATION OUTCOME

26. The consultation on the concept plan received 34 responses (9 per cent response rate), which is a fairly low response to this proposed concept. The feedback received was largely positive, as indicated by the following:

Number of respondents		Feedback option selected
20 respondents	(59 % of submissions)	<i>"YES – I fully support the proposal"</i>
8 respondents	(23 % of submissions)	<i>"MIXED VIEWS – I have some concerns that I would like to be considered"</i>
0 respondents	(0 % of submissions)	<i>"NO – I completely oppose the proposal"</i>
6 respondents	(18 % of submissions)	Preference not indicated

27. The quantitative responses above indicate support for the proposal, with 59 per cent of submitters indicating that they fully support the proposal and no one completely opposed to it.
28. Submitters also provided written comments about this proposal. There were numerous comments of support for the proposal and also a number of issues raised, for the project team's consideration. The qualitative community feedback and project team responses will be circulated to submitters and elected members, prior to the meeting.
29. The key issues raised in the public consultation, and project team responses, were as follows:

- (a) **Concern about location of the new playground.** Concern was raised about the new playground's proximity to the softball diamond and the possibility that foul balls might hit playground users. In response to this the proposed location of the playground has been amended. This new location is supported by the softball club.
  - (b) **Requests for non-deciduous trees on the road boundary, due to leaf fall in gutters.** Evergreen trees cannot be used on the northern boundary of the sports park due to shading issues. However Council staff are aware that leaf fall is an issue in Sawyers Arms Road in autumn. Between April and June the street is checked twice a week to see whether the leaves are up to the level of the kerb. If they are then the contractor is sent in to clear them.
  - (c) **Some opposition to the removal of the two oaks near the railway boundary.** In response to this feedback, the plan will be amended to include the retention of the two oak trees near the railway boundary. However it is noted the southern most oak tree does have trunk decay and its structural integrity will be monitored.
  - (d) **Some support for the removal of the oak trees.** In response to feedback received in support of these trees it is proposed to retain them. However it is noted the southern most oak tree does have trunk decay and its structural integrity will be monitored
  - (e) **Support for the removal of the scout hall.** The removal of the scout hall will remain on the plan
  - (f) **Concern about the dense undergrowth, rubbish and antisocial behaviour in Papanui Bush.** The project team agrees that the undergrowth in the Papanui Bush should be thinned out. This will be actioned over summer.
30. The project team considered this consultation feedback and also reassessed a number of trees in the park. In response to this, the plan has been amended in the following way:
- (a) Amended location for the new playground to in front of Papanui Bush (this may require some small adjustments to the bush, to ensure there are open sightlines to the playground).
  - (b) Inclusion of a basket swing in this proposal.
  - (c) Amend the proposed oak trees on the Sawyers Arms Road frontage near the scout den to lime trees.
  - (d) Retention of the two oak trees near the railway boundary.
  - (e) Removal of a birch tree in the north east corner of the park – in response to a reassessment from the Arborist.
  - (f) A note that the oak tree near the existing playground will be monitored for future removal (depending on its condition) – in response to a reassessment from the Arborist.
  - (g) Addition of low shrubs between the softball diamond and the batting cage.
  - (h) Widening of the cycleway to a standard width of 2.5 metres.
  - (i) Noting connection between the on road cycleway between Papanui Domain and the cycle way to the north that runs beside the railway line (this will be formally resolved as part of this report).
31. The project team will also refer the following issues to the relevant Council staff, for consideration:
- (a) Request for upgrade to lighting of cycleway.
  - (b) Issue of magpies in the park.
  - (c) Issue of flooding on Sawyers Arms Road.



- (d) Request for a kerb cut down on the south side of Sawyers Arms Road, adjacent to the park.

32. The final concept plan, which includes the above amendments, is included as **attachment**.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approve:

- (a) The Papanui Domain Landscape and Playground Renewal Plan as shown in **attachment** (LP334102).
- (b) The following resolutions for the installation of a new shared pedestrian/cycle path:
  - (i) That the footpath area on the northern side of Sawyers Arms Road located 204 metres to the north west of the intersection of Sawyers Arms Road and Nyoli Street and extending for a length of 12 metres in the north-west direction be designated as a shared cycle/footpath.
  - (ii) That the footpath area on the southern side of Sawyers Arms Road located 651 metres to the north west of the intersection of Sawyers Arms Road and Main North Road and extending for a length of 14.5 metres in the north-west direction be designated as a shared cycle/footpath.

#### **CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

## 9. APPLICATION TO SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND – AMELIA LINK AND COURTNEY REYNOLDS

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
<b>Author:</b>	Bruce Meder, Community Development Adviser

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present two applications to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board's 2010/11 Youth Development Fund, one from Amelia Link to visit Korea as part of a student exchange with Jamsin School in Christchurch's sister city (Songpa-gu) in October 2010 and the other from Courtney Reynolds to visit the Cook Islands as part of a cultural tour in September 2010.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. **Attached** is a table summarising the applications for funding via the Youth Development Fund. The total cost of the project is \$3,223. The applicants have not indicated an amount that they are seeking.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The Shirley/Papanui Community Board has \$10,150 available for distribution from its Youth Development Fund. The Community Development Adviser has made recommendations totalling \$500.

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

5. There are no legal considerations.

### ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

6. Aligns with page 184 in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

### Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

7. As above.

### ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

8. Application aligns with the Council's Youth Policy and Strategy and with local Community Board objectives.

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

9. As above.

### CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

10. Not applicable.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- (a) That the Board grant Amelia Rachel Link \$250 from its 2010/11 Youth Development Fund to visit Korea as part of a student exchange with Jamsin School in Christchurch's sister city (Songpa-gu) in October 2010.
- (b) That the Board grant Courtney Alesha Reynolds \$250 2010/11 Youth Development Fund to visit Cook Islands as part of a cultural tour in September 2010.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**10. ELLINGTON RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION - BOARD RECOGNITION**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941 8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
<b>Author:</b>	Caren Shrubshall, Community Engagement Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of the report is to seek formal recognition by the Shirley/Papanui Community Board of the newly formed Ellington Residents' Association and its boundaries.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. A group of residents in the Ellington Estate (Mairehau) have recently formed a group, motivated by concerns about a local road development issue. They have called their group the Ellington Residents' Association, comprising residents on both sides of the following streets: East Ellington Drive, Holiday Drive, Cole Porter Drive and Teagarden Close. The official contact for the group is Karlene Rogers (03 385 3002; ellington.residents@xtra.co.nz).
3. The Ellington Residents' Association seeks formal recognition of the group and its proposed boundaries. As the group is situated within the area of an existing residents' group, St Albans Residents' Association (SARA), the boundaries of the latter would have to be amended to allow the new group space. This amendment has been communicated with SARA (via Maggy Tai Rakena and Christoph Hensch) and no issues were raised.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. There are no financial implications, beyond provision of limited photocopying

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?**

5. Not applicable.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6. Approval for recognition as a Residents' Group and associated boundary recognition is sought under the Residents' Associations – Formation and Recognition Policy 2001 (attached). Although this policy is currently under review, this report follows its guidelines as the current guiding policy.

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

7. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

8. Recognition of residents' groups reflects the Council's provision of Strengthening Communities, within the Community Support activity management plan, Page 172 of the 2009-19 LTCCP.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?**

9. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

10. Recognition of the Ellington Residents' Association aligns with the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy

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

11. Yes, as above.

#### **CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

12. Karlene Rogers (the representative of Ellington Residents' Association) has been in touch with the residents in the area by mail drop and personal communications. Maggy Tai Rakena and Christoph Hensch of St Albans Residents' Association were approached regarding the proposed changes to boundaries, and no issues were raised.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board:

- (a) Consider formally recognising the Ellington Residents' Association and approving the proposed boundaries as follows: residents on both sides of East Ellington Drive, Holiday Drive, Cole Porter Drive and Teagarden Close.
- (b) Approve an amendment to the boundaries of the St Albans Residents' Association (SARA) to allow the new Ellington Residents' Association to form. The new boundaries for SARA would be as before (i.e. bound by Springfield St, Rutland St, Innes Road, Cranford St, Winters Road, Hills Road and Bealey Avenue), with the exception of the streets in (a) above, i.e. both sides of East Ellington Drive, Holiday Drive, Cole Porter Drive and Teagarden Close.

#### **CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

## 11. NEW ZEALAND COMMUNITY BOARDS' BEST PRACTICE AWARDS 2011

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Regulation and Democracy Services, DDI 941-8462
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Democracy Services Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Peter Croucher, Community Board Adviser

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Shirley/Papanui Community Board's views as to whether it wishes to submit any entries to the New Zealand Community Board Conference Best Practice Awards 2011.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The eighth biennial Community Board Conference is scheduled to take place in Rotorua from 5-7 May 2011. One of the highlights of the conference is the Community Boards' Best Practice Awards which acknowledge excellence in the implementation of projects in local government. Prizes will be presented to the winners of each category and the best overall project. The objectives of the Awards are to:

- recognise significant contributions made by Community Boards to the achievement of excellence in local government
- promote quality improvements in the functioning of Community Boards
- foster the exchange of best practice and innovative ideas.

The categories are:

<b>Consultation</b> (eg how the Board has actively consulted with its community)	<b>Significant Project</b> (eg a major project led by the Board (jointly or singularly) that achieved a desired outcome)
<b>Facilitation</b> (eg identification of a situation/s where the Board has taken a facilitation role to overcome a community problem)	<b>Partnership</b> (eg a partnership with parent council / other Boards / community organisation/s to address an issue)
<b>Heritage</b> (eg a heritage project in your community in which your Board has played an active role)	<b>Working with Maori</b> (eg projects which feature your Board working with a local Maori organisation or in a Maori community)
<b>Working with Children and Youth</b> (eg projects in your community in which your Board has been involved with children and youth)	<b>Harmonious Relations</b> (eg projects in which your Board has promoted diversity and harmonious relations)
<b>Safety</b> (Sponsored by NZ Police) (eg projects in which your Board and the Police have achieved safety outcomes for your community)	
<b>Leadership</b> The Yvonne Palmer leadership trophy is given for outstanding leadership, for enhancing the work of Community Boards and the recipient will hold it for two years	For any elected member including a Community Board, a community Board member, a Councillor or Mayor or for a Council staff member

3. It should be noted that the Young People and Harmonious Relations categories are sponsored respectively by UNICEF and the Human Rights Commission. Separate criteria may apply. These will be distributed once finalised and approved. In addition, from each of these categories an overall winner will be selected.

4. This Board has a history of success with Community Board Best Practice Awards:
- 2003 First place in the 'Significant Project' category for the 40 Year Vision of the Styx river
  - 2003 Highly Commended in the 'Facilitation' category for Neighbourhood Week
  - 2005 First place in the 'Working with Children' category for children's Day.
  - 2005 First place in the 'Facilitation' category for Northlands Shopping Mall Redevelopment
  - 2007 Supreme Award for the Papanui Youth Facility, Casebrook Intermediate School and Children's Day projects.
  - 2007 First place in the 'Working with Children and Youth' category for the Papanui Youth Facility, Casebrook Intermediate School and Children's Day projects.
  - 2007 Highly Commended in the 'Consultation' category for the Long Term Council Community Plan.
  - 2009 First place in the 'Safety' category for Host Responsibility.
  - 2009 Highly Commended in the 'Working with Children' category for Junior Neighbourhood Support Canterbury.
6. The application form and supporting information which will outline the format of entries should take are expected shortly. In the meantime the Board is encouraged to reflect on what activities the Board has been involved in that are innovative, have made a real difference to the community and would be suitable as applications to the awards. All entries will be reviewed by the Conference Organising Committee's Judging Panel and must be submitted **by 4 February 2011**. Given this timing, most of the work to prepare the entry will need to occur prior to the Christmas break, hence the views of the Board on its entry or entries are now being sought. Depending on those views, staff will then report back on likely financial implications and any staff capacity required to be able to assist with preparing entries.
7. In previous years this Board established a small working party of Board members or used its Recess Committee to consider the preparation of its entries for these Awards.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

##### **Do the recommendations of this report align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?**

8. There are no costs associated with lodging an entry for a Best Practice Award. However, in 2004, 2006 and 2008 this Board has allocated \$3,000, \$4,000 and \$4,000 respectively from its discretionary funding to cover nomination preparation costs, which have included a consultant's costs for preparing the entry. As indicated in paragraph 6 above, staff will assess any financial implications relevant to any entry that the Board wishes to submit, and report back to the Board.

#### **LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

9. There are no legal considerations.

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

##### **Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009/19 LTCCP?**

10. Not applicable.

#### **ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

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

11. Not applicable.

#### **CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

12. Not required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board give consideration as to whether it wishes to submit any entry to the New Zealand Community Boards Best Practice Awards 2011.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.



**12. CORRESPONDENCE**

Any items of correspondence that have been received will be separately circulated to members.

**13. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**

**13.1 CURRENT ISSUES**

**13.2 UPDATE ON LOCAL CAPITAL PROJECTS**

That the Board receives the July Local Capital Project Update for information (**attached**).

**13.3 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE 2010/11 (attached)**

**13.3 CSR REPORT FOR JULY 2010 (attached).**

**14. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short brief to other members on activities that have been attended or to provide information in general that is beneficial to all members.

**15. MEMBERS QUESTION**