

**BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

MONDAY 12 JULY 2010

AT 5PM

**IN THE BOARDROOM,
CORNER BERESFORD AND UNION STREET,
NEW BRIGHTON**

Community Board: David East (Chairman), Nigel Dixon, Tina Lomax, Gail Sheriff, Tim Sintes, Linda Stewart and Chrissie Williams.

Community Board Adviser
Peter Dow
Phone: 941-5305 DDI
Email: peter.dow@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 MEETING MINUTES – 28 JUNE 2010**
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
 - 3.1 Parklands Bowling Club**
- PART B 4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
- PART B 5. NOTICES OF MOTION**
- PART B 6. CORRESPONDENCE**
- PART B 7. BRIEFINGS**
- PART C 8. DE COURCY PLACE - STREET TREES REPLACEMENT**
- PART A 9. PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES**
- PART C 10. BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING - 2010/11 ALLOCATIONS**
- PART C 11. BURWOOD/PEGASUS YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUNDING SCHEME - APPLICATIONS – AMANDA NORRIS, LAUREN DENNY, SAMANTHA LAKIN, LOUIS HARRISON-AYDON, AND RUTH JOHNSON**

12. 7. 2010

- 2 -

- PART B 12. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
12.1 Upcoming Board Activity
12.2 Board Funding Update
12.3 Customer Service Requests Report 1 April to 30 June 2010
- PART B 13. BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 28 JUNE 2010

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 28 June 2010, are **attached**.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 Parklands Bowling Club

Representatives from the Parklands Bowling Club will address the Board on a proposal regarding the Club's carpark at the Arthur Adcock Memorial Reserve, Chadbury Street.

Information from the Club is **attached**.

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

5. NOTICE OF MOTION – KEEP NEW ZEALAND BEAUTIFUL INC

Pursuant to Standing Order 3.10, the following notice of motion, moved by Linda Stewart, regarding the Keep New Zealand Beautiful 2011 Conference to be held in Christchurch, is submitted for the Board's consideration:

1. *That the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board grant \$2,000 from its 2010/11 Burwood/Pegasus Discretionary Response Fund to Keep New Zealand Beautiful Inc to assist with the financial arrangements the organising committee need to allocate for Conference arrangements.*
2. *That the Board request the Christchurch City Council to provide staff assistance to the Keep New Zealand Beautiful 2011 Conference Organising Committee.*

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. BRIEFINGS

8. DE COURCY PLACE - STREET TREES REPLACEMENT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Shane Moohan, City Arborist

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend to the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board that the street trees in De Courcy Place be replaced (**Attachment 1** refers).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. On 16 November 2009, a residents petition requesting the replacement of the street trees in De Courcy Place, was presented to the Board by Mr Tony Dowell (**Attachment 2** refers).

The reasons for the request were:

- (a) continued mess from leaf drop all year round;
 - (b) root growth threatening fences and pools;
 - (c) growth impeding views into park;
 - (e) increasing maintenance costs to keep at a reasonable size;
 - (f) tree not a good choice and akin to silver birch as it is banned from street frontage plantings;
 - (g) residents want lower growing less messy tree.
3. The Board received the petition and decided *'to seek a report from staff responding to the request of the residents for the removal and replacement of the trees in De Courcy Place'*.
 4. An arboricultural assessment shows that of the original eight trees planted, four are in an average condition, two are in a poor condition, one is in a very poor condition and one has been removed and not replaced. Two trees (numbers three and eight) have been inappropriately pruned by residents.
 5. For these reasons, staff recommend that the trees be replaced.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6. The cost to remove and replace the tree with PB95 grade trees is estimated at \$12,000, including the cost of watering and mulching the tree over the first three years.

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

7. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. 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".
9. While the Transport and Greenspace Manager has the delegation to remove the 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.

8. Cont'd

10. Under the delegations to Community Boards, the Board has the authority to “plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads” under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council.
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 provision of the Christchurch City Plan.
12. The following City Plan Policies may be of some benefit when considering the options:

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.

- (a) 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.
- (b) 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.
- (c) 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) 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:
 - (i) tree-lined streets and avenues;
 - (ii) 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

- (a) 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.

8. Cont'd

13. An application to prune or remove the tree may be made to the District Court under the Property Law Amendment Act 1975.
14. The District Court can order the pruning or removal of a tree under the Property Law Amendment Act 1975.
15. The removal and replacement of the tree is to be completed by a Council approved contractor.

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

16. Yes, as per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

17. LTCCP 2009-19:

Streets and Transport Volume 1, Page 77:

- (a) Governance - By enabling the community to participate in decision making through consultation on plans and projects.
 - (b) City Development - By providing a well-designed, efficient transport system and attractive street landscapes.
18. Retention of the tree is consistent with the Activity Management Plan provided the tree is structurally sound and healthy.
 19. Removing and not replacing the tree is not consistent with the Activity Management Plan.

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

20. Yes, as per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

21. Removing and replacing the tree would be consistent with the following strategies:
 - (a) Biodiversity Strategy.
 - (b) Christchurch Urban Design Vision.
 - (c) Garden City Image as per the City Plan.
22. There is currently no policy for the pruning or removing of trees in public places. A draft Tree Policy is being worked on.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

23. Yes, as per above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

24. No consultation has been undertaken at this point in time. Consultation regarding replacement species will be undertaken in March/April 2011.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board approve the replacement of all of the street trees in De Courcy Place.

8. Cont'd

BACKGROUND

25. The trees were planted in 1986. Of the three trees that have nearly reached their full height potential one has been topped (number three) and is considered in a very poor condition. The other two are considered to be in average condition. The remainder of the trees in the street show average health but are stunted and small for their age.

26. There are three recorded requests for tree maintenance and one for removal of the trees since 2005.

27. In response to resident concerns staff advise:

(a) Continued mess from leaf drop all year round.

Every tree or shrub sheds leaves, flowers etc. It is a normal part of nature's life cycle. Irrespective of whether or not trees are evergreen or deciduous Council has discussions with residents about leaf fall.

(b) Root growth threatening fences and pools.

The trees are approximately 4.5 metres from the residential boundaries and their roots are not sufficiently large enough to be causing damage to either fences or pools. It is highly unlikely that, given the species, that roots will ever be a problem in this regard. There is no root damage to the berms or footpath, and little to the kerb and channel.

(c) Growth impeding views into park.

While there may be a slight impediment to some residents, there are still sufficient view shafts to the side of the trees to enable passive surveillance of the park. Private fences and vegetation, along with vegetation within the park itself, form the greatest impediment to residents' views into the park

(d) Increasing maintenance costs to keep at a reasonable size.

There are no overhead services in De Courcy Place therefore Council would not be spending money controlling the height of the trees. *Pittosporum eugenoides* grow to seven metres in height. Three of them are around five metres tall (one has been topped) and the others are reasonably small for their age.

(e) Tree not a good choice and akin to silver birch as it is banned from street frontage plantings.

The Infrastructure Design Standards classifies some "tree" species as woody shrubs and therefore their planting as specimen trees is discouraged.

(f) Residents want lower growing less messy tree.

Given that the height these will grow to is only seven metres, they are considered small. Irrespective of whether trees are deciduous or evergreen, residents will experience leaf fall throughout the year.

Options

28. Decline the petitioners request to replace the trees in De Courcy Place and continue to maintain them to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural practices, standards and procedures.

8. Cont'd

29. Decline the petitioners request to replace all of the trees in De Courcy Place:
 - (a) offer to replace the trees that have been inappropriately pruned with the cost incurred by those residents (numbers three and eight), and
 - (b) replace the missing tree at the Council's cost, and
 - (c) continue to maintain the remaining trees to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural practices, standards and procedures.
30. Replace all of the trees in De Courcy Place.

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

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941- 8608
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Transport and Greenspace
Author:	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 the Council in a Memorandum on 10 December 2009.
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 the Council for adoption.
 - (b) That the Working Party Memorandum be presented to the Council for consideration.
7. The Council workshop on 23 February 2010 requested that an amended Proposed Tree Policy be presented to the 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 the 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 (**Attachment 1**), 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.

9. Cont'd

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 of the 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 and Reserves Bylaw 2008.

9. Cont'd

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.

9. Cont'd

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.

9. Cont'd

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 the 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)"

9. Cont'd

- (e) 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.

9. Cont'd

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	Lyttelton/Mt Herbert (Chairperson)
Matt Morris	Shirley/Papanui (Deputy Chairperson)
Tim Carter	Hagley/Ferrymead
Mike Mora	Riccarton/Wigram

9. Cont'd

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 versus 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 (Planning 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.

9. Cont'd

- (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.

10. BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD STRENGTHENING COMMUNITIES FUNDING - 2010/11 ALLOCATIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services, Ph 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Community Support
Author:	Natalie Dally, Community Development Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is for the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board to allocate the Burwood/Pegasus Strengthening Communities Fund for 2010/11.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This report provides information to Community Board members on the applications received for the Strengthening Communities Fund and includes updated information following Board discussions at the Burwood/Pegasus Board Funding Workshop on 14 June.
3. The total pool available for allocation in 2010/11, as outlined in the LTCCP, is \$238,918. Pre-existing commitments total \$35,705, leaving \$203,213 to be allocated. Applications totalling \$394,858 were received. Current staff recommendations total \$203,213.
4. Attached (as **Attachment 1**) is a Decision Matrix, which outlines the projects that funding is being sought for. Following staff collaboration meetings, staff have ranked all projects as either Priority 1, 2, 3 or 4 and have made recommendations as to funding.
5. The Burwood/Pegasus Community Board Funding Workshop on 14 June 2010 gave Community Board members the opportunity to go through the applications received in order to clarify any issues or questions about applications.
6. The Burwood/Pegasus Community Board has put forward one project as a Key Local Project (KLP) in 2010/11. This project is not included on the attached matrix as it now appears on the Metropolitan matrix. If approved it will be funded from the Metropolitan funding pool. Burwood/Pegasus also has one existing KLP that receives funding from the Metropolitan funding pool.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

7. Yes, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes including Board funding.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

8. Yes. Community Board funding decisions are made under delegated authority from the Council.

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?

9. Yes Strengthening Communities Funding and Community Board Funding, see LTCCP pages 176 and 177 regarding community grants schemes, including Board funding.

10. Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

10. The funding allocation process carried out by Christchurch Community Boards is covered in the Council's Strengthening Communities Strategy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

11. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board give consideration to the projects detailed in the attached decision matrix and approve allocations from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board Strengthening Communities Funding for 2010/11.

10. Cont'd

BACKGROUND

Strengthening Communities Strategy

12. The Council adopted the Strengthening Communities Strategy on 12 July 2007. The Strengthening Communities Grants Funding Programme comprises four funding schemes:
 - (a) Strengthening Communities Fund
 - (b) Small Grants Fund (previously Small Projects Fund)
 - (c) Discretionary Response Fund
 - (d) Community Organisations Loan Scheme
13. For detailed information on the Strengthening Communities Strategy's Outcomes and Priorities see **Attachment 2**. The specific criteria for the Strengthening Communities Fund is also attached, as **Attachment 3**, and the Board's Objectives are attached, as **Attachment 4**.

The Decision Matrix

14. Information on the projects is presented in a Decision Matrix, **Attachment 1**. To ensure consistency, the same Decision Matrix format and presentation has been provided to the Metropolitan Funding Committee and all Community Boards.
15. Applications are project-based; information is provided that relates specifically to the project for which funding is being sought, not the wider organisation.
16. All applications appearing on the Decision Matrix have been assigned a Priority Rating. The Priority Ratings are:
 - Priority 1** Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes significantly to Funding Outcomes and Priorities. Highly recommended for funding.
 - Priority 2** Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities. Recommended for funding.
 - Priority 3** Meets all eligibility criteria and contributes to Funding Outcomes and Priorities but to a lesser extent than Priority 2 applications. Not recommended for funding.
 - Priority 4** Meets all eligibility criteria and has minimum contribution to Funding Outcomes and Priorities; or Insufficient information provided by applicant (in application and after request from Advisor); or Other funding sources more appropriate. Not recommended for funding.
17. Staff have used the following criteria to determine whether an application is a Priority One:
 - Impact the project has on the city.
 - Reach of the project
 - Depth of the project
 - Value for Money
 - Best Practice
 - Innovation
 - Strong alignment to Council Outcomes and Priorities
 - Noteworthy leverage or partnership/match funding from other organisations or government departments.
18. A draft matrix was presented to the Board at a workshop on 14 June, no decisions were made at the workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to enable the Board and staff to discuss the projects, clarify any issues and seek further information, if necessary.

10. Cont'd**Key Local Projects**

19. Each Board may nominate Key Local Projects (KLPs) in its area that are put forward to the Metropolitan Funding Committee for consideration for metropolitan funding.
20. The Burwood/Pegasus Community Board has put forward one project as Key Local Projects in 2010/11. This project is not included on the attached matrix as it now appears on the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund matrix. This project is:

Name of Group and Project	Amount Funded
Project Employment and Environmental Enhancement Programme - <i>Community Work and Training</i>	\$35,000

21. The Burwood/Pegasus Community Board already has one existing KLP. This is funded from the Metropolitan Strengthening Communities Fund. This KLP is:

Name of Group and Project	Amount Funded
Aranui Community Trust Incorporated Society - <i>Aranui Community Co-ordinator wages/AFFIRM - Family Festival</i>	\$31,000

Existing Commitments

22. The Board currently has four multi-year funded projects. Each of these projects was funded for a period of three years in 2008/09. This year is the final year of the agreement. Please see table below for details.

Name of Group and Project	Amount Funded
Burwood Day Care Centre for the Elderly (Inc) - <i>Daily Co-ordinators Wages</i>	\$ 6,000.00
Project Early Charitable Trust - <i>Case Worker Salaries</i>	\$ 10,000.00
New Brighton and Districts Historical Society Inc - <i>Rental of premises for museum</i>	\$ 9,705.00
Wainoni/Avonside Community Services Trust - <i>Community workers wages and operational expenses</i>	\$ 10,000.00

Ineligible Applications

23. No ineligible applications were received.

Timeline and Process

24. Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to make final decisions on the Strengthening Communities Funding for their respective wards. The Board's decisions will be actioned immediately following the decision meeting. All groups will then be informed of the decisions and funding agreements will be negotiated where relevant. All funding approved is for the period of September to August each year, therefore grants will be paid out in early September 2010.

11. **BURWOOD/PEGASUS YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUNDING SCHEME 2010/11 - APPLICATIONS – AMANDA NORRIS, LAUREN DENNY, SAMANTHA LAKIN, LOUIS HARRISON-AYDON, AND RUTH JOHNSON**

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Recreation and Sport Unit Manager
Author:	Jacqui Miller, Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present for the Board's consideration, five applications for funding assistance from the Board's 2010/11 Youth Development Funding Scheme

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Funding is being sought by five applicants, Amanda Norris 15 year old from Bexley, Lauren Denny a 16 year old from Queenspark, Samantha Lakin a 15 year old from North New Brighton, Louis Harrison-Aydon a 14 year old from North New Brighton, Samantha Lakin a 15 year old from North New Brighton, Ruth Johnson 16 year of from Aranui.
 - (a) Amanda Norris has been accepted as a New Zealand representative for New Zealand Sea Scouts to sail in the William Koch International Sea Scout Cup to be held in New London Connecticut, USA from 1 to 7 August 2010.
 - (b) Lauren Denny is going to Vietnam for two weeks from 3 to 17 July 2010 as part of history in year 12 at Christchurch Girls' High School to learn more about the Vietnam war.
 - (c) Samantha Lakin has been selected to represent GymSport New Zealand at the 2010 Rhythmic Australian Gymnastics Championships from 4 to 13 July 2010.
 - (d) Louis Harrison-Aydon is going with twelve other students from Unlimited Paenga Tawhiti (secondary school in the central city) to Samoa from 2 to 12 August 2010 on a student lead project named Project Iva, which aims to support a village school in Samoa.
 - (e) Ruth Johnson, is to attend the Southern Skies Touch tournament from 4 to 10 July 2010 in Brisbane, Australia.
3. **Amanda Norris**, 15 years old who attends Linwood College. Amanda has been accepted as a New Zealand representative for New Zealand Sea Scouts to sail in the William Koch International Sea Scout Cup to be held in New London Connecticut, USA from 1 to 7 August 2010. This is an international event with approximately 15 International and 25 American teams competing. New Zealand representatives have finished second in the past five of this regatta.

Amanda has been involved in sailing for the last five years sailing optimists, P Class, Starling Sunburst and 420's. Amanda has been a member of Scouts for approximately eight years and for the past three years a member of the Lyttelton Sea Scouts. Amanda is a member of the Naval Point Yacht Club, she does most of her sailing in the Lyttelton area and is coached by her father. Amanda attended the Queensland Youth Week in Brisbane in July 2009 in a double handed 420, she finished 12th overall from twenty five boats, this event was fully funded by her parents. Scouting New Zealand are not providing any funding assistance for individuals to get to this Regatta, however Amanda has received funds from her Club and the Mander Yachting Trust.

Amanda feels that this international event will provide a great opportunity for her to develop her sailing skills and mix with other elite sailors. The William Koch International Sea Scouts Cup is privately funded and owned event produced for the benefit of Sea Scouts and International Scouts and is not sponsored or endorsed by the US Coast Guard Academy. This regatta is open to young men and women between the ages of 14 to 21 years who are actively registered in the Sea Scout Programme. Prizes are awarded for camaraderie, sportsmanship, and sailing skills. Amanda is also a member of the of the Linwood College Orchestra who are travelling to Europe next year.

11. Cont'd

4. **Lauren Denny**, 16 year old from Queenspark, is going to Vietnam for two weeks from the 3 to 17 July 2010 to learn more about the Vietnam war as part of history in year 12 at Christchurch Girls' High School. In 2009, Lauren received Excellence for her NCEA level one and she also gained academic merit colours from school for achieving such high excellence levels. The subject that Lauren has enjoyed the most and excelled in has been history.

As well as academics, Lauren is also heavily involved in sports, especially water polo. She has been a member of the Christchurch Girls' High School A team since year 10 and the team won the South Islands Secondary Schools Tournament in March this year. Lauren also coaches the school's B team and in 2009 she received full sports colours for her service to this sport. Lauren does other voluntary work, working in the January 2010 school holidays as a volunteer on the YMCA holiday programmes. She thoroughly enjoyed this experience and hopes to continue gaining skills in this way.

Lauren feels that going to Vietnam is going to be of huge benefit for her, to gain knowledge and experiences which can't be learnt in the classroom. Lauren recently started work at Vbase as a casual food and beverage attendant. The trip will include Ho Chi Minh Mausoleum, Hoa Lu Prison, Ho Chi Minh Head Quarters, Military Museum, Mekong Delta and River.

5. **Samantha Lakin** has been selected into the New Zealand team to attend the 2010 Rhythmic Australian Gymnastics Championships from 4 to 13 July 2010. Samantha has been a member of the Canterbury team for 4 years and her best achievement was winning the Nationals in Level 6 and in Level 5 she came third overall. Last year she made it into the Canterbury team and was injured at the time of the nationals, however she came first in the trials (Level 8) which saw her qualify for this trip.

Samantha is in year 11 at Catholic Cathedral College. Her parents and two siblings all live together and attend the Linwood Union Church. Her 17 year old sister does trampolining with the Canterbury School of Gymnastics, and will be attending an Interclub Competition in Auckland in June 2010. Her parents are supporting her with the costs of this trip. Samantha's younger brother, 12 years of age, is also very sports orientated and involved in swimming and water polo for the Queen Elizabeth II Club.

Samantha's interests include drama, music, swimming and old movies. Samantha trains 12 hours per week, she also coaches Level 1 and 2 Rhythmic girls for four hours each week. Samantha started coaching in term 3 in 2009 when she injured herself and could not train for a period. She loves sharing her knowledge and passion for her sport with others. She has achieved one of her long term goals to wear the New Zealand tracksuit and represent her country.

6. **Louis Harrison-Aydon** is going with twelve other students from Unlimited Paenga Tawhiti to Samoa from 2 to 12 August 2010 on a student lead project named Project Iva, which aims to support a village school in Samoa. Project Iva will deliver a container of good quality school equipment to a school in the village of Alva in Samoa. This initiative is a significant community service/outreach activity being undertaken by Louis and fellow students. The aims of the project are learning empathy through service, and inspiring others to give service to others in need. The equipment to be donated has already been sourced and there is funding through sponsorship and fundraising to guarantee the transport of the container to Samoa by the middle of July this year. Now Louis is seeking further support to enable a personal handover of the container at the beginning of August. The Director of Unlimited Paenga Tawhiti, John Mather states that he has been impressed with the commitment of Louis and fellow students to this project and believe the cultural learning that will come from delivering the container will add significantly to the learning already acquired through this project. John Mather, personally supports Louis in his endeavours to raise funds for Project Iva, an initiative that has been developed within the school.

11. Cont'd

The school is in a village called Iva on the island of Savaii and was forced to relocate owing to coastal erosion. The village received a grant that covered the cost of building the new school, but they had no funding for any school supplies. Project Iva's aim was to send a shipping container full of new and used school supplies like desks, chairs, books, pencils and blackboards etc. The students have put an enormous amount of effort into this project, along with many challenging fundraising ventures, including source to sea, North Canterbury school tour (telling children about this project), Variety concert, selling t-shirts, a quiz night, busking, firewood sales, marshalling at the Masters Games, church fair plus many more.

Louis is one of three children, living with his mother and other siblings aged 10, 12, and 14 years. His mother works part-time at Unlimited but does at least 15 to 20 hours of voluntary work as part of this role. His father has recently started a new business and is building his client base.

7. **Ruth Johnson** is to attend the Southern Skies Touch Tournament from 4 to 10 July 2010 in Brisbane, Australia. This is an annual touch tournament with 1500 people attending from around the world. Ruth attends Middleton Grange School and has been playing touch for just over a year. The school is sending a seniors mixed tour team which Ruth has been selected for. Ruth is a member of the schools Girls Touch Team which came third in the Girls Open Division at the Canterbury Secondary Schools Competition. The Touch team plays once week in the summer season and has been practicing two to three times per week in the months leading up to the Southern Skies tournament.

Ruth also plays netball and participates in a after-school Drama School called Original Scripts. Ruth volunteers at the church she attends 'Grace Vineyard' working in the kids church and also volunteers at the Canterbury Museum for their holiday programme. Currently she works two afternoons each work at the SHARP after school programme on a volunteer basis, although she does receive a koha. Ruth enjoys all aspects of school and last year passed NCEA Level 1 endorsed with excellence and received hours English, French and Physical Education.

Ruth helped to raise money for World Vision at Easter camp this year. She also participated in a play for KidsFest last year. The production is put on for the community and all the actors are unpaid.

Ruth's parents have provided evidence of their earnings which indicates a level of financial support is required for Ruth to attend this tournament.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8. The following tables detail event expenses and funding requested by the applicants:

EXPENSES FOR AMANDA NORRIS	Cost (NZ \$)
Regatta entry fees includes accommodation and food	260
Flights to America	3,000
Total Costs per applicant	3,400
Amount raised by applicant:	
Event Security, babysitting and odd jobs	500
Navel Point Club	200
Mander Yachting Trust	400
Amount requested (each)	\$500

11. Cont'd

EXPENSES FOR LOUIS HARRISON-AYDON	Cost (NZ \$)
Accommodation	100
Flights	500
Food	100
Transport	50
Miscellaneous	50
Travel insurance	80
Total Costs per applicant	\$880
Amount raised by applicant:	
Sausage Sizzle	200
Fundraising at Gym	300
Amount requested	\$500

EXPENSES FOR LAUREN DENNY	Cost (NZ \$)
Package cost per student	5,326
Flights	
Food	
Transport	80
Visa	115
Travel insurance	63
Total Costs per applicant	\$5,644
Amount raised by applicant:	
Fashion Evening – Destination Style – School event	300
Working part-time at Vbase	300
Amount requested	\$500

EXPENSES FOR SAMANTHA LAKIN	Cost (NZ \$)
Flights	1,378
Accommodation	1,195
Uniform	350
Total Costs per applicant	\$2,928
Amount raised by applicant:	300
Sport Canterbury application pending	500
Amount requested	\$500

EXPENSES FOR RUTH JOHNSON	Cost (NZ \$)
Cost of tournament (covers all means and accommodation)	1,100
Flights	828
Travel insurance	40
Total Costs per applicant	\$1,968
Amount raised by applicant:	
Busking	28
Part-time job on holiday programme	260
Sausage Sizzle	to be confirmed
Cake Stall	to be confirmed
Take a kid to footy packs	500
Selling chocolate	to be confirmed
Amount requested	\$300

11. Cont'd

9. Lauren Denny, Samantha Lakin, Louis Harrison-Aydon, Ruth Johnson are all first time applicants for the Burwood/Pegasus Youth Development Scheme Fund.

Amanda Norris is also a first time applicant, however at the time of writing this report a second application to this fund is in the process of being brought to the Board in August/September as part of Linwood College Orchestra group application.

10. Subject to separate ratification by the Board at the present meeting, there is a balance of **\$7,500** available in the 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme fund.

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

11. Yes.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

12. There are no legal issues to be considered.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. This fund aligns with the 2009-19 LTCCP.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Application aligns with the Youth Strategy and the Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board allocate from its Burwood/Pegasus Youth Development Scheme Fund 2010/11, the following:

- (a) Amanda Norris \$400 towards the costs of her attendance at the William Koch International Sea Scout Cup to be held in New London Connecticut, USA from the 1 to 7 August 2010.
- (b) Lauren Denny \$400 towards the costs of her trip to Vietnam for two weeks from 3 to 17 July 2010.
- (c) Samantha Lakin \$500 towards the costs of representing GymSport New Zealand at the 2010 Rhythmic Australian Gymnastics Championships from 4 to 13 July 2010.
- (d) Louis Harrison-Aydon \$400 towards the costs of going to Samoa from 2 to 12 August 2010 on a student lead project named Project Iva.
- (e) Ruth Johnson \$300 towards the costs of attending the Southern Skies Touch Tournament from 4 to 10 July 2010 in Brisbane, Australia.

12. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE

12.1 UPCOMING BOARD ACTIVITY

(Tabled)

12.2 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

(Attached)

12.3 CUSTOMER SERVICE REQUESTS REPORT – 1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE 2010

(Attached)

13. BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS