

**HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

14 JULY 2010

AT 3PM

**IN THE BOARDROOM,
LINWOOD SERVICE CENTRE,
180 SMITH STREET, LINWOOD**

Community Board: Bob Todd (Chairperson), Rod Cameron, Tim Carter, David Cox, John Freeman, Yani Johanson, and Brenda Lowe-Johnson.

Community Board Adviser:

Jo Daly

Phone: 941 6601 DDI

Email: jo.daly@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 MINUTES – 30 JUNE 2010**
- PART B 3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**
- PART B 4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
- PART B 5. NOTICE OF MOTION**
- PART B 6. CORRESPONDENCE**
- PART B 7. BRIEFINGS**
- PART C 8. STARWOOD RESERVE – REQUEST FOR CHANGE OF NAME**
- PART A 9. PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES**
- PART A 10. KILMORE STREET – PROPOSED CHANGES TO PARKING**
- PART C 11. MARRINER STREET AND WAKEFIELD AVENUE – PROPOSED PARKING AND STOPPING RESTRICTIONS**
- PART C 12. MADRAS STREET – PROPOSED ALTERATION TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS**
- PART C 13. EASEMENT OF LOCAL PURPOSE (WATERWAY) RESERVE**

We're on the Web!

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

14. 7. 2010

- 2 -

PART B	62	14.	COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
PART B	62	15.	BOARD MEMBERS QUESTIONS
PART B	62	16.	BOARD MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE
PART C	62	17.	RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 30 JUNE 2010

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 30 June 2010 are **attached**.

CHAIRPERSON'S OR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 30 June 2010 be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 Mr Ken MacMaster, regarding clause 8. Starwood Reserve – Request for Change of Name.

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. BRIEFINGS

8. STARWOOD RESERVE – REQUEST FOR CHANGE OF NAME

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Asset and Network Planning Unit Manager
Author:	Joanne Walton , Consultation Leader Greenspace

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the recommendation of the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board to the Council to retain the existing name for Starwood Reserve.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Starwood Reserve is a small local neighbourhood reserve of 1269 metres squared, situated on the corner of Panorama Road and Starwood Lane on Clifton Hill. It became a public reserve when it was vested in the Council as a reserve for recreation in 1981 as part of a subdivision of land in this area.
3. The Christchurch City Council has received a request from the Starwood Lane Ratepayers Association to change the name of Starwood Reserve to Adamson Park. The Starwood Lane Ratepayers Association comprises 12 ratepayers residing in the private Starwood Lane on Clifton Hill but is not amongst those residents' groups currently recognised by the Council.
4. An information letter outlining the proposed change of name for Starwood Reserve was circulated to 115 neighbouring residents and absentee property owners, along with the Clifton Neighbourhood Committee and the Sumner Redcliffs Historical Society.
5. A total of 26 submissions were received from residents, with many offering additional comments, but the view on the choice of name was almost equally divided. Although three submitters did not indicate their preference, their written comments indicate that one is clearly in support of the change of name, and two are neutral having no objection to the change. Further details are provided under the Consultation Fulfilment section of this report.

Support for proposal	Starwood Reserve	Adamson Park	Other suggestion	Not indicated	Total
Number of responses	11	12	Nil.	3	26

6. The Starwood Lane Ratepayers Association has proposed the new name of Adamson Park in recognition of the historical connections of the Adamson family name with the area. Historical titles for the land in this area show that William Percy Adamson, a local accountant, acquired property here after World War I. According to family history, Mr Adamson brought daffodil bulbs to New Zealand from Holland in 1932, and the Adamson family then operated a daffodil bulb farm here for almost 50 years. Ownership of the land was later transferred to other Adamson family members, including a son, Douglas Adamson, a bacteriologist, who continued to pick and send the flowers to market until the land was subdivided into Starwood Lane. The site of the daffodil farm is now occupied by the residential properties on the lower side of Starwood Lane, below the reserve, and some of the remaining bulbs are still to be found flowering in the season on some of these properties. Douglas Adamson and his wife are now both deceased and there are no children.
7. The Council has a current naming practice for new reserves, which is to give them the name of the adjoining road. This convention makes it easy for people, and for emergency services, to locate the parks, since the names match the street names. Council staff have advised that Starwood Lane was named by one of the landowners, apparently in reference to the night sky, and the existing trees in the area at that time. The new reserve therefore became known as Starwood Reserve. As this reserve is subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977, its name should also be suffixed by the word "Reserve".

8 Cont'd

8. Further research has found that the Adamson family were not the original owners of the land in question but were one of various owners over time. Several residents in this area were known to have run small flower or fruit farms, including previous owners who planted pine, poplar and fruit trees, grew potatoes and kept fowls for egg sales. It is the view of staff that all landowners and residents in the area are in their own right notable for all were in some way an integral part of the social history of our communities. It is also the view of staff that a change of name in this case may contribute to setting a precedent for future requests to change the name of the more than 740 parks and reserves throughout the City.
9. Overall, taking into account research, community views and current parks practice, it is the view of staff that the existing name of Starwood Reserve should be retained.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. If the name Adamson Park is proposed, the financial implications (excluding staff time) would be limited to the cost of installing new park signage. The cost of installing a medium sized double post entrance sign in accordance with the new signage standards for park signs is approximately \$4,368. Staff have advised that the replacement of the sign would be a low priority under the current Transport and Greenspace Unit operational budgets.
11. If the name Starwood Reserve is retained, there are no further financial implications.

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

12. Yes. As above.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

13. The Council's Register of Delegations (No. 11, page 2, 10 December 2009) states that the following is a Council decision:
"To declare that a reserve shall be known by a specified name and can change the name of any reserve (by resolution): Section 16(10) Reserves Act 1977."
14. Starwood Reserve is classified as a recreation reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.

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

15. Yes. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

16. While the naming of features is not specifically mentioned in the LTCCP, the costs associated with this process are covered within the existing operational budgets.

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

17. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

18. The recommendations align with the Council's Policy Register's code of practice for the naming and re-naming of reserves.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

19. Yes. As above.

8 Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

20. A letter outlining the proposed change of name for Starwood Reserve was circulated to 115 neighbouring residents and absentee property owners, along with the Clifton Neighbourhood Committee and the Sumner Redcliffs Historical Society. Residents were presented with three options:
- (a) To retain the name Starwood Reserve, or;
 - (b) To change the name to Adamson Park, or;
 - (c) To suggest another name, indicating their reasons for doing so.

21. A total of 26 submissions were received from residents with many offering additional comments but the views were almost equally divided between the names Starwood Reserve and Adamson Park. Although three submitters did not indicate their preference, their written comments indicate that one is clearly in support of the change of name, and two are neutral having no objection to the change. There were no suggestions received for another alternative name for the reserve. Two submissions were received after the closing date but have been taken into account. There were no anonymous submissions.

Support for proposal	Starwood Reserve	Adamson Park	Other suggestions	Not indicated	Total
Number of responses	11	12	Nil	3	26

22. Ten of the 11 submitters who preferred retaining the name Starwood Reserve, provided additional comments. Several preferred the retention of the existing name for various reasons including:
- (a) Supporting the practice of naming after the street for ease of recognition and reducing confusion.
 - (b) The existing name was well known and established or had personal history for them.
 - (c) That the existing name is more appealing, beautiful or unique.
 - (d) The existing name is descriptive of the natural environment, relates to the night sky, honours the origins of the land, or is consistent with biblical and celestial street names in the area.
23. Five submitters did not support the proposed new name of Adamson Park for various reasons, including not wanting to name after property owners and the name not having any meaning for them.
24. Two submitters suggested a plaque and/or daffodil planting in the reserve to provide historical information as a more suitable way to recognise the Adamson family contribution to the community.
25. One of the submitters who did not indicate a preference did support the naming of the park in a manner descriptive of its location and thought that the existing name was nicer.
26. Five of the 12 submitters who supported the changing of the name to Adamson Park also provided additional comments, with two in agreement with the historical information or remembered the family, three indicating their support without any qualifying comments and one adding it was a delightful idea. The Sumner Redcliffs Historical Society were not able to indicate a preference on their email submission but provided some historical details and noted that the Society would be pleased to have the reserve named after these early settlers on the hill.

8 Cont'd

27. All respondents who provided contact details have been sent a final letter of reply thanking them for their input. The letter has also informed respondents that the final amended plan would be presented to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board for a recommendation to the Council to approve the plan. Details of the meetings were provided so that any interested people could attend.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board recommend to the Council that the name of Starwood Reserve be retained.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

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

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group, 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 request that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board consider and provide comments to the Council on the 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 (refer **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. At the Council workshop on 23 February 2010, it was 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 Cont'd

9. The amended Proposed Tree Policy is now attached (refer **Attachment 1**), together with a comments form template (refer **Attachment 6**), tree removal process map (refer **Attachment 3**), tree maintenance process map (refer **Attachment 4**) and tree planting process map (refer **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.

9 Cont'd

- (h) Public Works Act 1981.
- (i) Local Government Act 1974 and 2002.
- (j) Christchurch City Council Parks and 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.

9 Cont'd

- (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 (refer **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.

9 Cont'd

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 the Council for adoption.
- 31. No public consultation has been undertaken as this document is intended for internal use.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board:

- (a) Review and provide comment on the attached Proposed Tree Policy and the proposed changes to delegations.
- (b) Recommend 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) Recommend 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.

9 Cont'd

- (d) Recommend 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)"

- (e) Recommend 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

For discussion.

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 (eg 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)

9 Cont'd

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 ie business as usual verses 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 the 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 Unit Manager.

43. At a February 2010 workshop, the Council requested that an amended Proposed Tree Policy be brought to the 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 the Council for a decision".

6. Definitions

Affected Community table – delete - "<" and insert - "approximate maximum"

Affected Community table Local Park – delete - "key stakeholders eg 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. KILMORE STREET – PROPOSED CHANGES TO PARKING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Steve Hughes, Traffic Engineer-Community

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's recommendation to the Council that a Parking Restriction be installed on a section of the north side of Kilmore Street.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Staff have received a request from Deaf Aotearoa that a P60 Mobility Parking Space be installed near their premises at 237 Kilmore Street. This is near the Barbadoes Street intersection (refer **attached**).
3. Kilmore Street is a Major Arterial Road running between Fitzgerald Avenue and Park Terrace. The section of Kilmore Street that this reports relates to is the two way section between Barbadoes Street and Fitzgerald Avenue. February 2009 figures show an average volume of 8960 vehicles use this section of Kilmore Street per day.
4. This section of Kilmore Street comes within the area in which the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board has delegated authority as listed in the Councils Register of Delegations of 10 December 2009. Recently however changes to parking in this location were approved by the full Council as part of a Special Consultative Process used to install Cycle Lanes along Kilmore Street. Changes made by using the Special Consultative Process can only be approved by the Council, and not by a Community Board. Therefore any changes that are proposed to be made to these recent Council approved parking restrictions, have to be made by the full Council, as Community Boards do not have the authority to change the Council decisions.
5. As part of the Cycle Lane Project, a number of vehicle parking spaces were removed from outside the premises situated near the intersection with Barbadoes Street. The new parking configuration on the north side of Kilmore Street extending east from Barbadoes Street is:
 - (a) 25 metres of cycle lane.
 - (b) 10.5 metres of P10 parking.
 - (c) A commercial vehicle entrance.
 - (d) A five metre long P30 parking space.
 - (e) A residential vehicle entrance.
 - (f) A further 16.5 metres of P30 parking.
 - (g) Unrestricted parking to the intersection with Oxford Terrace.
6. Deaf Aotearoa moved into their premises at 237 Kilmore Street after the Special Consultative Process for the above changes was completed. They hold classes, events, and gatherings on weekdays, at night, and on weekends for hearing impaired people, their families, and associates. Some of these people have physical disabilities and therefore a disabled parking space that is available at any time close to their premises is desirable. There is no on street disabled parking space within 500 metres of this location, with the closest being near Oxford Terrace and Madras Street.

10 Cont'd

7. While it may appear that the existing five metre long P30 parking space between the two vehicle entrances would be the best location for the disabled parking space, there is a tree in the grass berm in the middle of this space that means that unloading wheelchairs or getting out the passenger side of vehicles could be difficult for disabled persons. This makes it unsuitable for a disabled parking space .
8. It is therefore proposed that the first six metres of the existing 16.5 metre length of P30 parking space extending east from the vehicle entrance into 241 Kilmore Street be changed to become a P60 disabled parking space that will apply at any time. This location is close to not only Deaf Aotearoa but also to the other shops, and also provides the space needed to unload wheelchairs and facilities for wheelchairs to access the footpath.
9. The proposed positioning of this single disabled P60 parking space in the existing P30 parking east of the second vehicle entrance means that to keep the parking configuration simple and consistent, the following further changes are proposed to the parking listed in paragraph 5:
 - (a) The existing 10.5 metres of P10 parking be increased to 15.5 metres by adding the five metre long P30 parking space (with the tree in the middle of the grass berm).
10. These proposed changes to the existing restricted parking area will result in a block of P10 parking spaces applying at any time, followed by one disabled parking space also applying at any time, followed by a block of P30 parking.
11. Consultation was carried out with businesses and residents nearby. Respondents were 50/50 in support or objection to this proposal. The Avon Loop Planning Association was contacted in regard to this proposal and support it. See paragraph 22 to 24 for full results of the consultation.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

12. The estimated cost of installing two new signs and re-arranging existing signs and road markings to show the changes is approximately \$500.

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

14. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides the Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
15. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated 10 December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices in this section of the Hagley/Ferrymead Ward area. However as the decision to install the current parking restrictions in Kilmore Street was approved by the Council, the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board can only recommend to the Council that these proposed changes be approved.
16. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

17. As above.

10 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

18. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community Outcomes Safety and Community.

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

19. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

20. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

21. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

22. Twenty consultation documents were distributed to residences and businesses nearby.

- (a) Four or 25 per cent were returned.
- (b) Two or 50 per cent of the respondents supported the proposal.
- (c) Two or 50 per cent of the respondents objected to the proposal.
- (d) A comment made by one objector was:

"The cycleway is making it difficult enough for the retailers. This would add to parking difficulties. Deaf Aotearoa was aware of the business nature of this area and they do have parking attached."

23. The Avon Loop Planning Association were consulted in relation to the proposed changes and support it.

24. The officer in Charge-Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board recommend that the Council resolve:

- (a) That all existing parking restrictions on the northern side of Kilmore Street commencing 25 metres east from its intersection with Barbadoes Street and extending east for a further 48 metres be revoked.
- (b) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 10 minutes on the north side of Kilmore Street commencing at a point 25 metres east from its intersection with Barbadoes Street and extending in a easterly direction for 22.5 metres. This restriction is to apply at any time.

(Note: six metres of this P10 parking area is across a vehicle entrance where vehicles cannot park).

10 Cont'd

- (c) That the parking of vehicles be reserved for disabled persons displaying the appropriate permit on their vehicle and restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes, (at any time), on the north side of Kilmore Street commencing at a point 56.5 metres east from its intersection with Barbadoes Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of six metres.
- (d) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 30 minutes on the north side of Kilmore Street commencing at a point 62.5 metres east from its intersection with Barbadoes Street and extending in a easterly direction for 10.5 metres.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

11. MARRINER STREET AND WAKEFIELD AVENUE – PROPOSED PARKING AND STOPPING RESTRICTIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Steve Hughes, Traffic Engineer – Community

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approval to install new and relocate existing parking at the intersection of Wakefield Avenue and Marriner Street.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Staff received a request from the owner of the Sumner Retreat Luxury Apartments on the corner of Marriner Street and Wakefield Avenue to install a 10 minute parking restriction on Marriner Street.
3. In the course of investigating this request it was discovered that there was a need to make other changes to parking in the area due to the removal of a vehicle entrance by the recent development of this corner site. It was also discovered that the defining of the footpath from the roadway could be improved at the intersection to improve the safety for pedestrians (refer **attached** for proposed changes).

P10 in Marriner Street

4. Marriner Street runs between Nayland Street and The Esplanade intersecting with Wakefield Avenue in the middle of the Sumner Shopping Centre. It is the section of Marriner Street east of Wakefield Avenue that this report relates to.
5. Sumner Retreat Luxury Apartments is a new building on an old service station site on the corner of Marriner Street and Wakefield Avenue. The ground floor is for retail activities with the upper floors for private car parking and for apartments. The service station used to have vehicle access from both streets, but the apartment's access to its car parking is from Marriner Street.
6. In this section of Marriner Street there are currently six P30 spaces, and approximately 40 plus unrestricted parking spaces. It has been requested that one P10 parking space be installed outside the apartments to provide short term parking for vehicles attending this and other nearby buildings.
7. It is therefore proposed that one 5.5 metre long P10 parking space be installed west of the vehicle entrance into the building. This location provides a short term parking space that can be used by visitors to both Marriner Street and to Wakefield Avenue.
8. Local residents and business owners were consulted in relation to this request. 61.5 per cent of the respondents supported this request, with 38.5 per cent objecting to it. The Sumner Residents Association was consulted and supports the proposal. Further details of the consultation can be found in paragraphs 26 to 28.

No Stopping Restrictions in Marriner Street

9. The intersection of Marriner Street with Wakefield Avenue is poorly defined. The sealed footpath along Wakefield Avenue actually extends across the front of Marriner Street. This apparent continuing of the footpath across the intersection can give pedestrians the impression that they have priority over vehicles entering or exiting from Marriner Street. However, as the pedestrians are crossing a roadway, the vehicles actually have priority over the pedestrians.

11 Cont'd

10. It is an appropriate time to install broken yellow "no stopping lines" from the apex of the intersection, over the footpath and along both sides of Marriner Street. This will not only prevent the approaches to the intersection being restricted by parked vehicles, but also more clearly indicate to pedestrians that they are approaching a roadway and have to give way to vehicles.
11. No further consultation was done with nearby residents or businesses as this irregularity was discovered after consultation was done on the other matters. As the installation of no stopping lines at this location is a safety matter of some significance, it is believed that further consultation is unnecessary and that the no stopping markings should be installed for safety reasons alone.

Disabled, P60 and No Stopping Restrictions in Wakefield Avenue.

12. The existing mobility parking space on Wakefield Avenue south of the Marriner Street corner commences 1.5 metres from the corner. This is closer than the six metres that is accepted as being the minimum distance a vehicle should park from an intersection. A road controlling authority can however authorise closer parking by installing signs or markings as has happened in this instance. The removal of the vehicle access off Wakefield Avenue into this corner site allows space to move the mobility parking space so it is six metres away from the intersection. This six metre gap should have no stopping lines installed to make it clear it is a no stopping/parking area.
13. To prevent this mobility parking space being parked in all day by one vehicle, thereby rendering it unavailable for the greatest possible number of users, it should be given a similar P60 time limit to the "normal" parking spaces in the area. In accordance with recent policy, this P60 time limit for the mobility parking space should be made to apply at any time.
14. The remaining 4.5 metres of the removed vehicle entrance can be added to the existing 5.5 metre long P60 parking space that was situated between the old vehicle entrance and the pedestrian crossing to the south making a 10 metre long P60 parking area in total.
15. Local residents and business owners were consulted in relation to the relocation of the mobility parking space and the adding of the redundant vehicle entrance space to the existing P60 parking area. One hundred per cent of the respondents supported the proposal. The Sumner Residents Association was consulted and supports this proposal. Further details of the consultation can be found in paragraph 26 to 28.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

16. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$750.

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

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

18. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides the Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
19. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board includes the authority to exercise resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices in this location.
20. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/ or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

11 Cont'd

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

21. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

22. Aligns with the Streets and Transport activities by contributing to the Council's Community Outcomes Safety and Community.

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

23. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

24. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

25. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

26. Forty two consultation documents were distributed to nearby residences and businesses.

(a) Thirteen or 31 per cent were returned.

(b) In relation to the proposed P10 in Marriner Street;

Eight or 61.5 per cent of the respondents supported the proposal.

Five or 38.5 per cent objected to the proposal.

(c) In relation to the proposed relocation of the Disabled Parking Space and the installation of a P60 parking space that was previously a vehicle entrance in Wakefield Avenue.

Thirteen or 100 per cent of the respondents supported this proposal.

27. The Sumner Residents Association support this proposal.

28. The officer in Charge-Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board:

Approve the following on Marriner Street:

(a) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 10 minutes on the south side of Marriner Street commencing at a point 28.5 metres east from its intersection with Wakefield Avenue and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 5.5 metres. This restriction is to apply at any time.

(b) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Marriner Street commencing at its intersection with Wakefield Avenue and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 12 metres.

11 Cont'd

- (c) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Marriner Street commencing at its intersection with Wakefield Avenue and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 14 metres.

Revoke the following on Wakefield Avenue:

- (d) That any existing parking restrictions on the eastern side of Wakefield Avenue commencing at the intersection with Marriner Street and extending south for 22 metres be revoked.

Approve the following on Wakefield Avenue:

- (e) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the eastern side of Wakefield Avenue commencing at its intersection with Marriner Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of six metres.
- (f) That the parking of vehicles be reserved for disabled persons displaying the appropriate permit in the vehicle and restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes (at any time) on the eastern side of Wakefield Avenue, commencing at a point six metres south of its intersection with Marriner Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of six metres.
- (g) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the eastern side of Wakefield Avenue commencing 12 metres south from its intersection with Marriner Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 10 metres.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

12. MADRAS STREET – PROPOSED ALTERATION TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Steve Hughes, Traffic Engineer – Community

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Boards approval that an existing Residents Parking Area on the east side of a section of Madras Street be revoked.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Staff have been requested by the new owner of 340 Madras Street to remove the existing six metre long Residents Parking Area outside that property to enable a vehicle entrance into the property to be installed.
3. The Council's Residential Parking Scheme was introduced in February 1991 for the Central City area and extended in September 1996 to all other areas of the city. Sometime between February 1991 and October 2009, an application to install an on street Residents Parking Area outside 340 Madras Street was approved for the occupant of that property. Subsequently a six metre long parking space signposted as being restricted to Authorised Residents Only was installed.
4. In October 2009 the property changed ownership. The new owner has decided to install off street parking for their vehicles. The Residents Parking Area outside the address has to be removed to allow for the installation of a vehicle kerb crossing into the property. The installation of this vehicle crossing has been approved by Council staff.
5. It is therefore proposed that the existing six metre long Residents Parking Area outside this address be revoked.
6. As this Residents Parking Area was installed only for the occupants of 340 Madras Street, no consultation has been done as no other people are affected.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$100.

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

8. The installation or removal of road markings and signs is within the LTCCP Streets and Transport Operational Budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides the Council with the authority to install or remove parking restrictions by resolution.
10. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.

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

11. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

12 Cont'd

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

13. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's Strategies?

15. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. There was no consultation done in regards to this request as it came from the property owner and occupant.

17. The Officer in Charge - Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approve that the area of parking on the eastern side of Madras Street commencing 55.5 metres north of Peterborough Street and extending six metres further north that is restricted to the use of authorised residents of 340 Madras Street under the Christchurch City Council's Residents Parking Scheme be revoked.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

13. EASEMENT OF LOCAL PURPOSE (WATERWAY) RESERVE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
Officer Responsible	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
Author:	Bill Morgan, Property Consultant

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of the report is to seek approval from the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board for a right to drain water in gross through a Local Purpose (Waterway) Reserve adjoining Cavendish Grove.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At the time Horncastle Homes obtained subdivision consent for its Cavendish Grove subdivision (off St Lukes Street) it secured a right to drain storm water from the subdivision across the Councils adjoining Local Purpose (Waterway) Reserve (depicted as Section 1 SO 20269 on the **attached** plan) and then discharging into the Linwood Canal. As part of the consent the company were required to construct a storm water basin within the reserve at its cost as well as paying the Council \$30,375 compensation. In addition it has a liability to maintain the basin for a 12 month period.
3. The Local Purpose (Waterway) Reserve was purchased by the Council some years ago from the previous owner to facilitate the enhancement of the Linwood Canal. This has been partially completed within the area fronting the Samoan Church and discussions are now in hand with Horncastle Homes over the possibility of completing the remainder of the project. The easement being sought and the storm water basin are part of the overall concept as it was always envisaged that storm water from the neighbouring subdivisions would discharge into the canal.
4. Although an easement in gross has been provided on the subdivision plan to protect the services they have not been created as required under Section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977. The creation of easements require both the Board's and Minister of Conservation consent. The Act under Section 48 states that providing the reserve is not materially altered or permanently damaged and the rights of the public in respect of the reserve are not likely to be permanently affected, the advertising requirement of the Act can be dispensed with. Given the reserve is held for these purposes the exemption applies in this case. Accordingly given the reserve is a Local Purpose Reserve, the Board can exercise its delegation from the Council to make the Council's decision and further it can also exercise the Minister of Conservation's consent which has been delegated to the administering authority. It is, therefore, in order for the Board to approve the easement under delegated authority.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. There are no financial implications. All costs are recovered from the developer.

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

6. There are no budget implications.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. There are no legal impediments to the transaction.

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

8. Yes it will satisfy the Councils obligations under the Reserves Act 1977.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

9. Yes.

13 Cont'd

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

10. Not applicable. This activity is not covered by the LTCCP.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

11. There are no Council Strategies relevant to this transaction.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

12. Yes, see above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

13. Not required as it complies with the exemption under the Reserves Act 1977 as the reserve is being utilised for the purpose for which it is held.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Board under delegated authority approve the right to drain water in gross over Section 1 SO 20269 and depicted as Parcels E and F on Deposited Plan 426566 pursuant to Section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977, and as the reserve is being utilised for the purposes for which it is held public notice under the Act not be given.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

- 14. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
- 15. BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS
- 16. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
- 17. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached.