

**HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD  
AGENDA**

**30 JUNE 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](mailto: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 – 16 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 A 8. DISPOSAL OF THE FORMER WOOLSTON POOL SITE**
- PART B 9. REVIEW OF CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANT FUND**
- PART A 10. PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES**
- PART C 11. MARLBOROUGH STREET (MARLBOROUGH CLUSTER) STREET RENEWAL**
- PART C 12. HAVELOCK STREET (MARLBOROUGH CLUSTER) STREET RENEWAL**
- PART C 13. CLIVE STREET (MARLBOROUGH CLUSTER) STREET RENEWAL**
- PART C 14. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - LINWOOD RESOURCE CENTRE – COMMUNITY VOICES RESEARCH PROJECT**

30. 6. 2010

- 2 -

- PART C 15. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME - LUKE WARD – SHANGHAI INTERNATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY EXPO
- PART C 16. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - LINWOOD AVENUE COMMUNITY CORNER TRUST
- PART B 17. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
- PART B 18. BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS
- PART B 19. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 16 JUNE 2010**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 16 June 2010 are **attached**.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 16 June 2010 be confirmed.

**3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

**5. NOTICES OF MOTION**

The following Notice of Motion is submitted by David Cox pursuant to Standing Order 3.10.1:

*That as the Council on professional advice decided not to fund the additional testing of McCormacks Bay following the culvert renewal, as recommended in the McCormacks Bay Steering Group Report, the Community Board consider accepting in principle the financial responsibility for defrayment of testing costs up to a maximum of \$15,000, dependant upon subsequent professional advice from Council staff.*


**6. CORRESPONDENCE**

**7. BRIEFINGS**

## 8. DISPOSAL OF FORMER WOOLSTON POOL SITE

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services Group, DDI 941 8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Recreation and Sport Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Justin Sims, Property Consultant

## PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 
1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board detail of the submissions received in response to the consultation process carried out pursuant to section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002 with respect to the proposed disposal of part of the former Woolston Pool site. It is further intended to seek approval to lease the land to Woolston School and to recommend to the Council to grant a lease for a term of 35 years at a peppercorn rent.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council owns land adjacent to Woolston School and Woolston Park which used to accommodate Woolston Pool (refer **Attachment 1**). The Woolston Community Centre remains on part of the site. The site itself falls within an Open Space 2 Zone which restricts the use for recreation and open space only.
3. Closure of the pool was identified in the 2009-2019 LTCCP with demolition and reinstatement works now having been completed reverting the area occupied by the pool back to grassland.
4. Consultation with Council's Asset and Network Planning Unit and Transport and Greenspace Unit confirmed that they did not wish for the land to be incorporated into Woolston Park as this would incur additional maintenance costs, it would create a secluded, unsafe area of the park and there was no requirement to increase the size of the existing park.
5. Discussions were subsequently initiated with Woolston School who occupy the adjoining site, who confirmed they wished to take a lease of the site to protect their boundary with the park and provide additional open space/play area for the benefit of the school.
6. In accordance with advice received from the Council's Legal Services Unit it was determined that consultation on the proposed disposal should occur to comply with section 138 of the Local Government Act 2002.
7. Consultation was therefore carried out to comply with section 138 and commenced on 27 March 2010 and concluded at 5pm on 23 April 2010.
8. The consultation consisted of:
  - A public notice in the Christchurch Press, Christchurch Star and the Observer.
  - Availability of consultation submission forms – distributed to Woolston School and Board of Trustees, the Ministry of Education, the Woolston Community Centre, Woolston Community Association, Woolston Library, Linwood Service Centre, neighbouring home owners and occupiers, Christchurch City Council Civic offices and available on request.
  - Have Your Say listing with an electronic submission form available on line.
  - A dedicated email address.
9. Twenty nine written submissions were received (one person submitted twice) (refer **Attachment 2** circulated to Board members previously). Of the 29 submissions:
  - (a) Twenty six were in favour of the proposal. The overarching reason for this was that the land would provide extra grass area for children to play sports and provide a greater social benefit for the children in the Woolston area.
  - (b) Three submissions were against the proposal. Reasons for this include:
    - The land should be retained as the site for a swimming pool. The site is very good for this purpose and is close to a number of schools and public transport.
    - The land should be kept for future development of the Woolston Community Centre.

**8 Cont'd**

- The Woolston Community Centre would like the opportunity to use the land for future expansion of the Community Centre if required. In the meantime, it could be used as a storage area.

In response to those submission received against the proposal:

- The consultation scope does not cover the development of a new swimming pool, as noted in point (3) above. The swimming pool was identified for closure and demolition following the Aquatic Facilities Plan, which was adopted in 2006. The purpose of this consultation was to establish community views on the disposal of the land.
- An expansion of the Woolston Community Centre has not been planned for in the 2009-2019 LTCCP and there are no identified plans or needs analysis for any future development.

10. Staff have considered the issues raised in the submissions and have concluded that no further action is required in respect of them. This report therefore recommends that the submissions be received and the content of them considered by the Council in determining the outcome of the consultation process.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

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

11. Yes - closure of Woolston Pool is identified in the 2009/19 LTCCP (p.109 Volume 1).

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

12. Yes, the Legal Services Unit has been consulted concerning the consultation process required by section 138 of the Local Government Act. Section 138 requires the Council to consult on any proposal to sell or otherwise dispose of land acquired or used principally for community, recreational, environmental, cultural or spiritual purposes (excluding land held under the Reserves Act 1977).
13. The Community Board do not have delegated authority to determine the outcome of the consultation process. This decision needs to be made by the full Council. However, the Community Board does have recommendatory powers to the Council.
14. The Council approval is also required for leases of occupation on land held under section 138 of the Local Government Act for terms exceeding five years

**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?**

15. Yes (page 108 Volume 2 of 2009-19 LTCCP).

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

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

16. Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

17. Consultation has been undertaken pursuant to section 138 of the Local Government Act and there is no statutory impediment to the Council adopting the recommendations of this report.

## 8 Cont'd

### ORIGINAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board recommend to the Council that it adopt a resolution in the following form:

- (a) That the 29 submissions received in response to the public consultation process conducted pursuant to section 138 of the Local Government Act in relation to the proposal to dispose of the former Woolston Pool land at 502 Ferry Road be noted; and
- (b) That having considered the submissions received, that the proposal to dispose of the land at 502 Ferry Road be adopted; and
- (c) That the Corporate Support Unit Manager be delegated authority to negotiate and conclude a lease to Woolston School for a term of 35 years at a peppercorn rental.

### BOARD CONSIDERATION

The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board considered this report at its meeting on 2 June 2010. A resolution was not passed and the Board requested that additional information be provided back to them before they make their recommendations to the Council. The additional information is set out below, along with an amended staff recommendation as a result:

18. During the consultation process that was carried out to fulfil the obligations of the Local Government Act, the Woolston Community Association (the Association) objected to the disposal of the former pool site on the grounds that they wished to retain it for possible future expansion.
19. Following consultation with the Association subsequent to the Board Meeting, staff have agreed to reduce the area of land to be disposed of as indicated on the attached plan (refer **Attachment 3**) to enable the Association to utilise the remaining land.
20. Furthermore, the lease proposed to be granted to the school would include a break clause operable for the benefit of the Council for any purpose. This would enable the whole site to be re-acquired by Council. A break clause operable for any purpose is beneficial to a clause that is confined for a specific reason to keep open future uses/options.
21. There is a legal obligation under the Fencing Act for the boundary between the pool site and the school to be fenced as indicated on the attached plan (refer **Attachment 4**). During discussions with the school it is clear that as they have recently expended considerable sums in fencing the entire school grounds, they would require the boundary to be fenced if they are not granted a lease of the pool site.
22. If however the school are granted a lease, the fence proposed on the boundary between Woolston Park and the pool site is 24 metres shorter than the boundary between the school and the pool site thereby saving fencing costs of approximately \$4,500.
23. The alternative to leasing the area to the school would be to incorporate the area with Woolston Park. There is however no requirement to increase the size of the park. Incorporation with the Park would also incur additional maintenance costs whilst leasing the land imposes those future maintenance costs with the lessee.
24. There are also concerns that if the boundary between the pool site and the park is not fenced, there would be an area behind the community centre shielded from view from Ferry Road, which could create a secluded location and pose potential safety issues.
25. With regard to the Communities Facilities Plan, work has been underway since July 2007 as part of the Strengthening Communities Strategy to develop a comprehensive plan for the future provision of community facilities in Christchurch and Banks Peninsula up until 2025. The final Community Facilities Plan informed the prioritisation for the 2009-19 LTCCP which in turn sets out any proposed changes to Council facilities.

**8 Cont'd**

26. When the Council consulted the public on the Strengthening Communities Strategy in 2007 it found strong public support for a network of suburban community facilities, evenly distributed across the city. Ward by ward consultation was subsequently carried out on the development of a citywide network of community facilities (halls, community centres and cottages) to serve community needs. The Plan as currently drafted does not propose any future expansion of the Woolston Community Centre given the large number of other facilities in the catchment area indicated in the plan.
27. The Community Facilities Network Vision was presented to a Council workshop in March 2010 with no change to that which was presented for consultation. The Community Facilities Implementation Plan, which includes operational planning as well as the Network Plan, is currently under development and is anticipated that signoff will take place in the 2010 calendar year.

**AMENDED STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board recommend to the Council by way of Chairperson's report to the Council's meeting of 8 July, that the Council adopt a resolution in the following form:

- (a) That the 29 submissions received in response to the public consultation process conducted pursuant to section 138 of the Local Government Act in relation to the proposal to dispose of the former Woolston Pool land at 502 Ferry Road be noted; and
- (b) That having considered the submissions received, that the proposal to dispose of the land at 502 Ferry Road be adopted; and
- (c) That the Corporate Support Unit Manager be delegated authority to negotiate and conclude a lease to Woolston School of the area indicated on the attached plan (refer **Attachment 3**) for a term of 35 years at a peppercorn rental including a break clause operable at the discretion of the Council at any time.
- (d) That if (c) above is approved, that a fence is constructed on the boundary of Woolston Park and the pool site as indicated by a purple line on the attached plan (refer **Attachment 4**).

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

## 9. REVIEW OF CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANT FUND

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Strategy and Planning DDI 941 8281
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Programme Manager Liveable Cities
<b>Author:</b>	Katie Smith, Neighbourhood Planner

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This report is to review the existing Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy and propose a revised policy for consideration by the eight Community Boards for grant funding of maintenance of character houses located within Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula. The views of the Community Board's will be reported back to the Council's Regulatory and Planning Committee.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In March 2004 the Council resolved to provide grant funding towards the external maintenance of pre-1945 character houses to assist in their retention and continuing contribution to the residential amenity and identity of their local areas. This was implemented for a period of four years from July 2006 to run until July 2010. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy required a review of the success of the grants after this initial four year period.
3. The historic fabric of Christchurch comprises both heritage listed and non-listed character buildings in both residential and commercial use. City Plan Listed Heritage Buildings and Items are protected by the rules set out in the City Plan and entitled to grants for internal and external repairs and maintenance under the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy. Listed heritage, however, makes up a small proportion of the older housing stock that contribute to the character and heritage of the city.
4. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants fulfil an important role in the retention of non-listed heritage buildings which contribute to the character and heritage of Christchurch. Without these maintenance grants there is no other source of financial help or encouragement for property owners to retain these buildings and the loss of such buildings has been noted in many areas of the city as eroding the character of the older suburbs.
5. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants were intended to provide a small financial contribution towards the external upgrading and maintenance of homes which have a distinctive visual character and make a key contribution to the quality of the local streetscape and the community identity. In 2009/10 a total of \$47,500 was available through the Character Housing Grant Fund with an average grant approval of \$1,408 over the 25 applications approved. Staff time on administration of the grants is approximately 0.3 of a full time equivalent position.
6. The objectives of the review are to ensure the Fund operates effectively both for the Council and the applicants, that it supports the retention of character homes, and to raise awareness of this grant fund.
7. The policy sets out the criteria by which the effectiveness of the grant scheme will be assessed and includes community acceptance, improvements in street amenity and local identify and retention of character houses. The policy also requires the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Panel to consider each annual round against these criteria. Those annual discussions have led to a number of the recommendations in this report aimed at making the Character Housing Maintenance Grants more effective. Feedback has also been received from some of the grant applicants.
8. The effectiveness of the grants against the criteria is assessed in the following:
  - o *Community acceptance*; there has been a significant interest in the grant scheme as shown by the receipt of 154 applications, and numerous enquiries each year.



## 9 Cont'd

- *Improvements in street amenity and local identity*; of the 154 applications, 72 (approximately 50 per cent) have uplifted grant funding in the past four years. These grants have been for a range of works including external painting, window and roof replacement and replacement/repair of building features such as veranda details. These improvements have all contributed to the amenity of the street scene and the identity of the local area.
  - *Retention of character houses in an area including those that have not received grants*; the grant process requires the applicant to commit to non demolition or relocation of the property for the next 10 years thereby ensuring the property continues to contribute to the street scene and local identity. It is difficult to quantify the impact upon the retention of character properties that have not received a grant as there are many other factors that would influence their retention including market conditions over the past four years.
  - *Effectiveness of the management and administration of the programme*; each year the grant fund has not been fully allocated nor all grants uplifted. The review identifies that there are three main factors that limit the success of the grants: the low quantum of grant funding; the restrictive grant conditions and criteria; the administrative process. All of these issues are explained in more detail in the background section of this report.
9. On the basis of this assessment the Character Housing Maintenance Grants have been a cost effective mechanism for recognising the contribution that character homes make towards street scene and local identity. The additional recommendations in this report are aimed at reinforcing the intention of the grants to focus at the local level and further supporting that effectiveness and administrative efficiency.
10. The background section of this report contains a summary of the effectiveness of the grant process, a review of the selection criteria, conditions of the grant and options for a revised policy.
11. Three options have been considered:
- the status quo;
  - continuing with the current Character Housing Maintenance Grants with minor changes to the existing policy and process;
  - applications being approved by each Community Board with the fund allocated between the eight Community Boards who can determine applications throughout the year, along with minor changes to the existing policy and process.

It is recommended that the third option is progressed. The share of the fund will be based on the number of residential properties within each ward built before 1945 (source: *Christchurch City Council Valuation Hub Database*).

12. The proposed revisions to the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy, should the preferred option be adopted, are shown in **Attachment 1**. The revised Policy will be reviewed in three years to monitor the effectiveness of the revised grants system.

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

13. Provision has been made for a Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund of \$45,310 per annum for 2010/11. Each property is restricted to a total maximum grant funding of \$5,000. Staff time is provided for in operational budgets.
14. The current policy has one pool of funding and is allocated by the Character Housing Grants Panel. In the preferred option outlined in this report each Community Board is allocated a proportion of the Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund. Allocating a proportion of the grant fund to each of the Community Boards will enable each Board to be responsible for making decisions on the grant applications it receives, reinforces an original intention of the grants scheme was to focus at the local level and would provide a stronger mechanism to encourage applications. The proportion for each Community Board is based on the number of properties located within its ward that were built before 1945. Table 1 below details the proposed distribution of funding between the Community Boards (note that figures have been rounded).

## 9 Cont'd

**Table 1: Character Housing Maintenance Grants Community Board Funding Allocation**

Community Board	Number of properties pre-1945	% of properties pre-1945	Budget
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert	760	4.1%	\$1,860
Akaroa/Waiwera	221	1.2%	\$540
Burwood/Pegasus	1,571	8.5%	\$3,845
Fendalton/Waimairi	1,977	10.7%	\$4,835
Hagley/Ferrymead	5,311	28.7%	\$12,990
Riccarton/Wigram	797	4.3%	\$1,950
Shirley/Papanui	2,966	16.0%	\$7,260
Spreydon/Heathcote	4,918	26.6%	\$12,030
<b>Total Christchurch</b>	<b>18,521</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$45,310</b>

15. The current policy requires that grants not uplifted within the financial year lapse.
16. The preferred option allows a period of 11 months for applicants to complete the works and uplift the grant. This will require the end of year carry forward of funds for those grants that will not be uplifted until the following financial year.
17. The current policy restricts the grant funding to a maximum of 10 per cent of the total costs of the external maintenance works (excluding GST) up to a maximum of \$5,000 per property.
18. The preferred option will give each Community Board the discretion to award applicants between 10 per cent and 20 per cent of the external maintenance cost (excluding GST) up to a maximum of \$5,000 per property. This increases from a maximum of 10 per cent in the current policy. It will also allow for additional applications for properties to be submitted once the original grant has been uplifted and will be dependent upon available funds and to a maximum limit of \$5,000 in total grants per property.

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

19. Yes, the Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund is provided for in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

20. The current policy requires the non-demolition and non-relocation of the property for a period of ten years. This condition has been dealt with through a written agreement from the applicant not to demolish or relocate the property and is monitored by placing a property note on the Land Information Memorandum (LIM). Whilst this does not have the legal standing of a covenant, it does require the owner to state their intention to retain the property and the agreement will be highlighted to the Council's consent planners should any application for demolition or relocation be received.
21. The preferred option will retain this need for the property owner to agree in writing not to relocate or demolish the property within 10 years of the uptake of the grant and will continue to be monitored through the LIM note on the property file. This is considered an appropriate form of agreement for implementing the non-demolition and non-relocation requirements of the policy given the low value of the individual grants.
22. The current policy is not explicit about grant payback should demolition or relocation occur within the ten-year period. The preferred option is to include a clause requiring payback under these circumstances. Should the grant recipient decide not to pay back the grant money upon demolition or relocation of the building then consideration would need to be taken on a case-by-case basis as to what, if any, legal proceedings should follow.

**9 Cont'd**

23. The existing Character Housing Maintenance Grants Policy also requires that should the property be sold within five years of the grant payment then the applicant must repay the grant to the Council for future reallocation. There have been a number of grants paid back due to applicants selling their properties within five years, yet post-sale these properties continue to contribute to the street scene. This approach is also inconsistent with the Heritage Incentive Grants, where there is no requirement for grants to be paid back should the property be sold.
24. The preferred option will not require the payback of the grant should the property be sold. The intent of the policy is around the character of the property and the contribution of the property to the street environment. This revision will not impact upon the intent of the policy and may encourage more applications.

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

25. Yes, see above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

26. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants are accounted for in the 2009-2019 LTCCP and align with the Activity Management Plans, Activity 1.4: Heritage Protection by providing grants in order to maintain and protect heritage items and values which contribute to a unique city and community identity, character and sense of place and provide links to the past.

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

27. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

28. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants align with the Liveable City Strategic Directions and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy in that it maintains and enhances the quality of the development and renewal of the city's built environment by protecting Christchurch's heritage buildings and neighbourhood character.

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

29. Yes, the recommendations will enable the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Fund to operate effectively.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

30. Each of the eight Community Boards will be consulted with in regards to the proposed changes to the policy and process and a summary of the Community Boards' comments and recommendations will be provided to the Council's Regulatory and Planning Committee for a recommendation to the Council.
31. Comments from the Character Housing Grant Panel and grant applicants have been taken into consideration in formulating the revised policy.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Community Boards:

- a) Consider the Character Housing Maintenance Grants Fund Review report and provide feedback for staff to report to the Council's Regulatory and Planning Committee; and
- b) Note the preferred option, Option C, for the allocation of the Character Housing Maintenance Grants to be determined by the individual Community Boards and the process as set out in the revised Operational Policy (refer **Attachment 1**).

## 9 Cont'd

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

32. The Character Housing Maintenance Grants have been available to owners of character dwellings in Christchurch and Banks Peninsula since July 2006 and have offered grants of 10 per cent (up to a maximum of \$5,000 excluding GST) for external maintenance works to upgrade the external appearance of residential properties that make a key contribution to the quality and identity of local streets.
33. The existing policy has been operating for the past four years with a budget of \$100,000 in the first three years and \$47,500 in the final year. The allocation of funds for each year are as shown in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Annual allocation of Character Housing Grants**

<b>Financial Year</b>	Number of grants approved	Total value of grants approved	Total number of grants uplifted	Total value of grants uplifted
<b>2006/07</b> Fund available \$100,000	42 of 64 applications	\$47,573 (average \$1,133)	22	\$22,883 (average \$1,040)
<b>2007/08</b> Fund available \$100,000	26 of 28 applications	\$33,039 (average \$1,271)	17	\$19,844 (average \$1,167)
<b>2008/09</b> Fund available \$100,000	27 of 36 applications	\$43,573 (average \$1,614)	17	\$25,893 (average \$1,523)
<b>2009/10</b> Fund available \$47,500	25 of 26 applications	\$35,192 (average \$1,408)	TBC	TBC

34. Decisions on grant applications are currently made by the Character Housing Grants Panel (comprising one member from each Community Board), following consideration and a recommendation by the relevant Community Board. This means that for each grant there is a two step process. This has resulted in a lengthy time from application to decision-making, and for the size of the fund and scale of the grants, increased the associated administration. The intention of this grants scheme was for this to remain focused at the local level. The preferred option reinforces this intention, recommending responsibility for decision making lies with each Community Board based upon an annual allocation of grant funds.
35. Operation of the grant system over the past four years has highlighted a number of weaknesses and disincentives associated with the current policy that provide areas for consideration in this review, including the following:
36. **Financial incentive**
- The grant fund has not been fully allocated.
  - Uptake of grants approved has been low, on average this is less than 25 per cent of total grant fund.
  - The maximum of 10 per cent of the total cost of the project excluding GST (maximum \$5,000) is too little to act as an effective incentive to promote retention of character houses. Average grants are \$1,243.

9 Cont'd

37. **Grant conditions and criteria**

- (a) If ownership changes within five years the applicant is required to pay back the grant, although the property will continue to make a contribution to the character of the area and street scene.
- (b) The Policy requires a non-demolition or relocation clause for 10 years.
- (c) The Policy only allows for one grant per property, there is no time limit after which further applications may be considered.
- (d) The criteria requires that the proposed works must be visible from a public place which excludes character houses on rear sections and essential maintenance works such as piling which are important to the retention of the building.
- (e) The policy excludes non-residential buildings which can make a significant contribution to the streetscape, character and history of the local area.

38. **Administrative process**

- (a) The grant process from opening the fund and receipt of applications through to completion of works spans just one financial year. The process results in only one window of opportunity for applicants to apply for a grant each year.
- (b) The decision making process can take up to four months and restricts time for completion of works to a maximum of seven months in order to claim the grant before the end of the financial year.
- (c) If works are not complete by the end of the financial year the grant offer lapses and the applicant either foregoes the grant or has to reapply to another funding year.
- (d) There are no opportunities to consider grants for urgent repair works or retrospective applications where works have been completed between the cut off in one financial year and the opening date in the next.
- (e) The Policy does not allow for funding to be carried forward to the next financial year even for those grants offered but where work is unable to be completed within the timeframe, even if the work has commenced.

39. These issues have been considered in light of the original intent of the policy and operational guidelines and that the Community Board involvement be retained as an important part of the decision making process.

40. Following recognition of these weaknesses and a review process a number of solutions were considered that would improve grant effectiveness including; making the grants more of an incentive by offering a greater quantum of funding; amending conditions; allowing access to the grants throughout the year and improving the process to allow for greater uplift of the grants.

41. Giving the Community Boards the discretion to award grants for between 10 per cent and 20 per cent would enable the opportunity to provide more of an incentive for those applications considered to make more of a contribution to the street scene and identity of the local area and will be more in line with the quantum of grant funding offered by the Heritage Incentives Grants Policy and should provide for a full allocation of the fund. This will also give the Community Boards the opportunity to make the decisions for properties within their wards and promote the grants within their ward.

42. Removing the condition to repay the grant should the property be sold within five years of the issuing of the grant, allows owners to sell a property. The grant funding is provided to retain the character house, irrespective of who owns the property and is consistent with the Heritage Incentive Grants Policy. The non demolition and relocation clause will be retained with a payback requirement.

43. Providing the opportunity for applicants to apply for subsequent grants after the first grant is uplifted, and dependent upon available funds, allows applicants to stage their maintenance works and manage their budgets for such works.

## 9 Cont'd

44. The criteria restricts the funding to properties that make a contribution to the street scene or public space therefore excluding character houses on rear sections and buildings in commercial use. Due to the reduction in the overall fund it is considered these conditions are appropriate.
45. Currently there is one opportunity for grant applications to be submitted each year. Allowing applications for grants to be submitted throughout the year will provide greater accessibility to the fund and enable applicants needing to undertake urgent repair works to access the grants within an appropriate timeframe. These changes to the process will allow for greater accessibility to the grants and will improve speed in decision making.
46. Changing the requirement for works to be completed within the same financial year that the grant was offered and allowing applicants 11 months for the uplift of their grant will provide greater accessibility to the fund and facilitate uptake and allocation of the fund. There are numerous examples whereby applicants have been unable to complete the works within the current prescribed timeframe. This makes the fund more inline with the Heritage Incentive Grants that are allowed 18 months for uplift their grant.
47. An amended policy has been formulated to address these issues to enable a more effective and efficient use of the grant funding. A revised policy is set out in **Attachment 1**.

**THE OBJECTIVES**

48. To efficiently and effectively administer the Character Housing Maintenance Grants to provide a real incentive to property owners to maintain and enhance character houses that display character elements and contribute to the street scene and the character and identity of the area.

**THE OPTIONS**

- (a) Maintain the Status Quo with the addition of a new review clause.  
To continue the Character Housing Maintenance Grants as per the current policy.
  - A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to the Council
- (b) Continue the Character Housing Maintenance Grants with minor changes to the existing policy and process to:-
  - Allow applications to be submitted twice a year dependent upon available funds.
  - Require the Grants Panel to sit twice a year.
  - Increase potential grant funding for each application to 10 per cent to 20 per cent (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Grants Panel.
  - Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.
  - Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once first grant completed dependent upon available funds and limited to a maximum of \$5,000 per property.
  - Remove the payback clause if the property is sold as the property still retains a relationship with the street scene or public open space.
  - Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with an added payback requirement.
  - A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to the Council.
- (c) Fund allocation to be determined by the Community Boards with the fund allocated between the eight Community Boards who can determine applications throughout the year by altering the policy and process to:-
  - Allow decisions on grants to be taken at Community Board level.
  - Allow applications to be submitted throughout the year.
  - Allocation of fund to Community Boards is based on the number of pre-1945's houses in each ward.
  - Increasing potential grant funding for each application to 10 per cent to 20 per cent (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Community Board.
  - Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.

9 Cont'd

- Remove the payback clause if property sold as property still retains relationship with street scene or public open space.
- Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with an added payback requirement.
- A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to the Council

**ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**

**The Preferred Option - Option C**

49. Each Community Board will be given a share of the overall Character Housing Maintenance Grant Fund to allocate to applicants of properties located within their ward. The share of the fund will be based on the number of residential properties within their ward built before 1945 (source: *Christchurch City Council Valuation Hub Database*).

The Community Boards will take responsibility for decision making for Character Housing Maintenance Grants in their ward based on the policy guidelines.

- (a) Applications can be submitted throughout the year and taken before the relevant Community Board for a decision on the quantum of grant funding dependent upon available funds.
- (b) Increasing potential grant funding for each application to 10 per cent to 20 per cent (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the individual Community Board on the merits of each application.
- (c) Applicants be permitted 11 months from approval of the grant to complete works and uplift the grant.
- (d) Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once first grant completed dependent upon available funds and limited to a maximum of \$5,000 per property.
- (e) Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with a payback requirement.
- (f) Remove the payback clause if the property is sold as the property still retains a relationship with the street scene or public open space.
- (g) A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to the Council.

## 9 Cont'd

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Community Board take responsibility for allocation of grants within their ward and support promotion of this grant scheme.	Potential for inconsistent application of the guidelines and grant approvals.
<b>Cultural</b>	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing.	
<b>Environmental</b>	Community Boards can promote improved amenity and character for streetscapes within each of their wards.	
<b>Economic</b>	Equitable distribution of funds across the city. Sustainable maintenance of a broader city housing stock. Expected to result in improved allocation and uplift of grants.	Reduces administrative complexity with simplified process. Will involve an accrual of funds for grants not uplifted within financial year.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>Aligns with Liveable City outcomes Contributes to a Cultural City</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>Improves the Council's contribution to the community and neighbourhood identity in a consistent process for improvements to local residential streetscapes.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Improved consistency with Heritage Incentive Grant Fund Process.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>The process allows more direct input by the Community Boards into applications within their own ward area. This report seeks feedback from the Community Boards on the revised process. Addresses feedback from applicants and the Grants Panel on the current process. No extra administrative work for Community Boards but retains administrative tasks currently undertaken by the Strategy and Planning Group.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p> <p>This brings the Character Housing Maintenance Grants process more in line with Community Board initiatives to promote positive outcomes for their ward. The focus remains on the retention of older character houses which make a contribution to the local streetscape and identity of the residential area through their street presence as perceived by the local community.</p>		



## 9 Cont'd

**Maintain the Status Quo (if not preferred option) – Option A**

50. The Community Boards recommend applications to the Character Housing Grants Panel who consider and determine grant approvals. A new review clause is added to allow for a three year review of the grant scheme.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Community Boards retain their input into the decision making process via the Grants Panel.	
<b>Cultural</b>	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing.	Limited success of current policy and process to date.
<b>Environmental</b>	Shared responsibility between Community Boards for improved amenity and character for streetscapes across the whole city.	Limited success of system to date with poor awareness of the grant scheme.
<b>Economic</b>	Sustainable maintenance of a broader city housing stock.	Administrative complexity and high costs when compared to limited success of policy and process so far. Limited allocation of fund and uplift of grants.
<p><b>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</b></p> <p>Alignment with community outcomes for a Liveable City. Contributes to a Cultural City</p> <p><b>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</b></p> <p>Maintains the Council's contribution to the community and neighbourhood identity in a consistent process for improvements to local residential streetscapes.</p> <p><b>Effects on Maori:</b></p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p><b>Consistency with existing Council policies:</b></p> <p>Some conditions of the grants are more onerous than the Heritage Incentive Grants Fund and process more complex.</p> <p><b>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</b></p> <p>Community Boards to retain a limited influence over grants within their ward. Applicants feedback on current process will not be addressed.</p> <p><b>Other relevant matters:</b></p> <p>The focus remains on the retention of older character houses which make a contribution to the local streetscape and identity of the residential area through their street presence as perceived by the local community.</p>		

## 9 Cont'd

**Continue with the Character Housing Maintenance Grants with minor amendments to Policy and Process – Option B**

51. To make minor changes to the existing policy and process by:
- (a) Increasing potential grant funding for each application to between 10 per cent and 20 per cent (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Grants Panel.
  - (b) Allow applications to be submitted twice a year dependent upon available funds.
  - (c) Require the Grants Panel to sit twice a year.
  - (d) Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.
  - (e) Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once the first grant has been uplifted and dependent upon available funds.
  - (f) Remove the payback clause if the property is sold as the property still retains a relationship with the street scene or public open space.
  - (g) Retain the non-demolition and non-relocation clause in the policy with a payback requirement.
  - (h) A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to the Council.

	<b>Benefits (current and future)</b>	<b>Costs (current and future)</b>
<b>Social</b>	Community Boards retain their input into the decision making process in a similar way to previous process but now biannually.	
<b>Cultural</b>	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing	
<b>Environmental</b>	Shared responsibility between Community Boards for improved amenity and character for streetscapes across the whole city.	
<b>Economic</b>	Will enable a more flexible process for applicants to apply for and to uplift grants. Will improve allocation and uplift to a limited degree.	Will double the administrative process and the time involvement for the Community Boards and Grants Panel. Will involve an accrual of funds for grants not uplifted within the financial year.

**Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:**

Alignment with community outcomes for a Liveable City.  
Also contributes to a Cultural City.

**Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:**

Greater commitment to scheme with biannual process shows a greater commitment to enhancing residential identity and amenity.

**Effects on Maori:**

Not applicable.

**Consistency with existing Council policies:**

Emphasis on local and Community Board participation.

**Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:**

Greater input from Community Boards and Grants Panel as process will need to undertaken twice a year and will address some of the feedback from applicants and Grants Panel.

**Other relevant matters:**

The focus remains on the retention of older character houses which make a contribution to the local streetscape and identity of the residential area through their street presence as perceived by the local community.

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

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941 8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	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.

**10 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.

**10 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.

10 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.

**10 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.

**10 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.



10 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)

10 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.

10 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.

## 11. MARLBOROUGH STREET (MARLBOROUGH CLUSTER) STREET RENEWAL

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Philippa Upton, Consultation Leader - Transport

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approval for the proposed Marlborough Street (Marlborough Cluster) renewal project as shown in **Attachment 1** (TP 319102 Issue 3).

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Marlborough Street Renewal project was initiated by the Transport and Greenspace Unit in June 2009 as one of three adjacent Linwood residential streets to undergo renewal as the Marlborough Cluster (Clive, Marlborough and Havelock). There are no bus routes or dedicated cycle routes on these streets, which are served on either side by footpaths; however there is a bus stop on Aldwins Road close to the Marlborough Street intersection. The area is close to Linwood College and Primary Schools, and to the Eastgate Shopping Centre and Mall.
3. Marlborough Street is approximately 210 metres long and 14 metre wide, widening to 19 metres at Aldwins Road, and is designated as a local road. It is located in a block bounded by Cashel Street (collector road) to the north, Aldwins Road and Linwood Avenue (major arterial routes) to the east, and becomes Clive Street to the north, at the right angle bend.
4. Traffic movements in Marlborough Street are affected by the surrounding road network (ie no right turn from Cashel Street to Linwood Avenue sending traffic via Clive Street or Havelock Street to Marlborough Street and Aldwins Road). Right turn movements are prohibited from Aldwins Road to Marlborough Street by a central median, however at peak times drivers will cut through from the south to avoid the build up at the Aldwins Road/Linwood Avenue lights.
5. In addition to replacing the kerb and channel, key project objectives are to maintain and improve safety for all users, and to ensure additional assets such as signage and footpaths, and drainage and lighting are upgraded to current standards. The proposed street tree and landscaping improvements are consistent with Council strategies.
6. Initial consultation and issues-gathering was carried out internally and via a survey sent to residents of the Cluster in October/November 2009. Key issues identified were speeding, shortcutting, and dangerous driving by hoon/boy racers, including the bend where Clive Street meets Marlborough Street. A pedestrian desire line was noted at the Aldwins Road corner as well as the need to slow traffic at this wide intersection. Drainage was also an issue, particularly at the Clive Street/Marlborough Street corner.
7. A number of responses to community consultation on the proposed plan in March/April 2010 reinforced these concerns, resulting in requests for further street calming via speed humps. Access and parking concerns were raised as a result of the proposed changes at the Aldwins Road corner.
8. Key features of the concept plan developed as a result of issues gathering and to meet project objectives are:
  - (a) A narrowed carriageway of nine metre width with a five metre wide narrowing at number 7 Marlborough Street, creating an overall slowed speed environment to benefit all road users.
  - (b) The alignment of the Aldwins Road is narrowed and slowed and a pedestrian island installed to improve safety in particular for school students and those using the bus stop immediately south of the corner. Access to properties Numbers 29 and 33 (veterinary clinic) is limited to Marlborough Street.

**11 Cont'd**

- (c) Pedestrian safety is improved through a shortened crossing distance and an informal pedestrian crossing facility is installed at the narrowing.
9. Traffic and speed counts undertaken in October 2009 do not support the need for further traffic calming in Marlborough Street. Survey results showed an 85th percentile speed of 50.4 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling eastbound and 50.8 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling westbound outside 11 and 13 Marlborough Street, and 41.8 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling eastbound and 34.9 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling westbound outside number 25 Marlborough Street. The street scored 26.2 in the Neighbourhood Improvement Assessment Process, which is below the 40 point threshold that indicates immediate work is required.
10. As a result of consultation on the Preferred Option concept plan for consultation, a modification to the pedestrian island, and to the access arrangement for numbers 29 and 33 (veterinary clinic) Marlborough Street has been proposed. Access is now from Marlborough Street only, and a turning area is provided in the driveway area for vehicles exiting these properties. An additional car park is provided on each side of Marlborough Street near the Aldwins Road intersection. This results in the final selected Plan for Board Approval.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

11. Funding for the proposed street renewal project in Marlborough Street is provided in the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) 2009–2019 Street Renewal Programme, as shown below:
- |     |         |           |
|-----|---------|-----------|
| (a) | 2009-10 | \$20,000  |
| (b) | 2010-11 | \$52,000  |
| (c) | 2011-12 | \$429,000 |
12. Based on current estimates, there is sufficient funding to complete the construction of this project.

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

13. Yes. Funding for this project is provided in the 2009-19 LTCCP, page 245. Street Renewal Programme.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

14. There is a minor land ownership issues associated with this project. Several property boundaries or services currently occupy the legal road reserve. The proposed scheme can be delivered without affecting this. It is proposed that the scheme can be delivered without changes to the above.
15. There are no Heritage or Historic buildings, places or objects shown along Marlborough Street in the City Plan.
16. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and parking Bylaw 2008 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
17. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated 23 December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.

**11 Cont'd**

18. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/or marking must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

19. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

20. Funding for the project is provided in the 2009-2019 LTCCP Street Renewal Programme and is consistent with Activity 10.0: Road Network in the Streets and Transport Asset Management Plan.

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

21. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

22. The recommendations in this report align with current Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, the Road Strategy 2004, the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy 1998, the Cycling Strategy 1998 and 2004 and the Pedestrian Strategy 2001; and are consistent with the requirements for arterial and local roads as defined within the City Plan.

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

23. As above

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

24. Initial issues gathering for Marlborough Cluster was undertaken in October and November 2009, via a survey of residents in the cluster of streets. Traffic speed, through traffic and street drainage were considered to be the most serious problems in all streets. A desire for landscaping improvements also raised, as well as car parking and concerns about vandalism, and maintenance of landscaping and berms.
25. A seminar was held with the Community Board on 3 March 2010 to introduce the preferred option before consultation was undertaken for Marlborough Cluster over a three week period in March and April 2010. An informal project information session was held at Linwood Community House on Tuesday 30 March, attended by approximately 12 people.
26. Approximately 270 households and absentee landowners, in the streets and surrounding area including Wellington Street, and relevant stakeholders were consulted, of which 27 responded. The majority of respondents were in general support of the proposal. Five indicated full support, 14 general support with comment or suggestion, three did not support the project and five did not specify.
27. Each submitter was sent an interim reply letter, acknowledging their submission had been received and would be considered at the end of the consultation period.
28. Key areas of concern for Marlborough Street were indicated throughout the Cluster and again focused on speeding, shortcutting and boy racer/hoons doing burnouts and driving dangerously, as well as drainage. It was noted that through traffic has been increasing owing to higher density housing, and since the right turn from Cashel Street to Linwood Avenue has been closed. At peak time cars turn left at Aldwins Road and cut through Marlborough Street and Clive Street to avoid the build-up to the Linwood Avenue/Aldwins Road traffic lights.

**11 Cont'd**

29. Several residents expressed strong concerns about the proposed changes to the Marlborough Street/Aldwins Road corner where the length of the pedestrian island limited access to two properties and parking was reduced. A number of residents throughout the Cluster requested additional street calming in the form of speed humps.
30. Marlborough Street traffic and speed counts did not warrant the addition of speed humps to the original plan, which provides a slowed and calmed environment through the narrowing of the streets and two five metre wide build outs, and the changes to the Aldwins Road intersection. The 85th percentile speeds are at or below the posted speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour. This environment is also expected to deter through heavy vehicles.
31. Following discussion with residents at numbers 25 and 29 Marlborough Street and with management of the Veterinary clinic at number 33, modifications were made to the pedestrian island and to the access arrangements for numbers 29 and 33. Both the vet clinic and number 29 now have access from Marlborough Street only, and have turning space allowed within the driveway area. Shortening of the pedestrian island has also allowed an additional parking space on either side of the corner, alleviating concerns expressed by the resident at number 25.
32. Drainage issues at the Clive Street/Marlborough Street corner have been assessed and are being addressed as a separate project, prior to the street renewal. The reallocation of road space will increase opportunities for landscaping and street trees along the street, and residents are encouraged to report vandalism.
33. All identified submitters have been sent a final reply letter thanking them for their input and including a copy of the Plan for Board approval. The letter informed respondents when the plan would be presented to the Board. Details of the meeting were provided so that any interested people could attend or request permission to address the Board prior to the decision being made.
34. As a result of community consultation the following changes have been made to the plan:
  - (a) Modification to the pedestrian island and access arrangement to numbers 29 and 33 Marlborough Street;
  - (b) Two additional parking spaces have been provided, one on each side of the road, as a result of the modification to the Aldwins Road corner.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approve:

- (a) That the Marlborough Street Renewal Plan for Board Approval as shown in **Attachment 1** (TP 319102 Issue 3).
- (b) That the following parking restrictions take effect following completion of construction:

**Remove Existing No Stopping**

- (i) That all existing stopping restrictions on the north side of Marlborough Street between Clive Street and Aldwins Road be revoked.
- (ii) That all existing stopping restrictions on the south side of Marlborough Street between Clive Street and Aldwins Road be revoked.
- (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Marlborough Street commencing at a point 97 metres west from its intersection with Havelock Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 18 metres.

11 Cont'd

**New No Stopping**

- (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Marlborough Street commencing at a point 55 metres west from its intersection with Havelock Street and extending along the kerb line in a westerly direction for a distance of 20 metres.
- (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Marlborough Street commencing at its intersection with Havelock Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 12 metres.
- (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Marlborough Street commencing at its intersection with Havelock Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
- (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Marlborough Street commencing at its intersection with Aldwins Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 24 metres.
- (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Aldwins Road commencing at its intersection with Marlborough Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
- (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Aldwins Road commencing at its intersection with Marlborough Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 31 metres.
- (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Marlborough Street commencing at its intersection with Aldwins Road and extending along the kerb line in a westerly direction for a distance of 24 metres.
- (viii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Marlborough Street commencing at a point 129 metres west from its intersection with Aldwins Road and extending along the kerb line in a westerly direction for a distance of 29 metres.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

35. The following issues have been raised:

- (a) There is evidence of boy racer activity in Marlborough Street, shown in extensive black tyre-markings, and resident concerns about noise and dangerous driving.
- (b) Residents have reported concerns with corner cutting at the Marlborough Street/ Clive Street bend.
- (c) There are resident concerns regarding rat-running from Aldwins Road, including heavy vehicles such as trucks and buses.
- (d) Speed has been reported as an issue in Marlborough Street. However the results of the speed surveys showed an 85 percentile speed of 50.4 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling eastbound and 50.8 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling westbound outside 11/13 Marlborough Street, and 41.8 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling eastbound and 34.9 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling westbound outside number 25 Marlborough Street.



**11 Cont'd**

- (e) **Traffic Volume and Flow:**  
In Marlborough Street east bound traffic volumes are higher than west bound volumes. This potentially reflects the restrictions to traffic movements on the surrounding roadway network at the Linwood Avenue/Cashel Street intersection. Right turn movements from Cashel Street to Linwood Avenue are prohibited at this intersection, and therefore vehicles can travel south on Clive Street or Havelock Street, use Marlborough Street and Aldwins Road, and right turn at the Linwood Avenue/Aldwins Road intersection. Marlborough Street at the intersection with Aldwins Road is restricted to left in/left out movements only.
- (e) **Crash History:**  
The Land Transport Safety Crash Analysis System show there have been two accidents recorded for the last five years on Marlborough Street. The reasons can be summarised as follows:
- (i) A car travelling northbound on Aldwins Road lost control turning left into Marlborough Street and hit a tree. An inexperienced driver was evading enforcement. The accident occurred on a Saturday at 2.43am.
  - (ii) Car travelling eastbound on Marlborough Street 10 metres east of Havelock Street lost control and went off the road. The driver was driving an unfamiliar vehicle and was showing off doing wheel spins etc. The accident happened on a Tuesday at 12.45pm.
- (f) There are 66 kilo-vault cables running along the southern side of Marlborough Street from Aldwins Road to Clive Street.

**THE OBJECTIVES**

36. The objectives for the project are as follows:
- (a) Meet budget and achieve lowest overall cost solution.
  - (b) Maintain or improve user safety and level of service.
  - (c) Renew the kerbs and channels to suit drainage and adjacent street drainage needs as required.
  - (d) Renew street drainage pipes as required.
  - (e) Renew carriageway(s) as required.
  - (f) Renew footpaths as required.
  - (g) Renew berms as required.
  - (h) Renew streetlight assets as required.
  - (i) Renew signs and markings as required.
  - (j) Renew other Transport and Streets assets eg cycle, traffic signals, retaining walls, fences, railings, etc if required.
  - (k) Install traffic calming infrastructure to suit the speed environment required.
  - (l) Install new landscaping and street trees to meet Council's Community Outcomes.

**11 Cont'd****THE OPTIONS**

37. All schemes provide wider berms and improved landscaping and trees.
38. Option One.  
This option recommends replacement of the kerb and channel and related assets on the same alignment. This option does not change road widths, the cross section, speed environment, priority controls or pedestrian facilities calm or improve safety, or discourage cut throughs, all of which are perceived issues for residents in the street.
- This option does not meet all project objectives, and was not selected as the Preferred Option.
39. Option Two  
In addition to a narrowed nine metre carriageway one speed hump is proposed at number 18 Marlborough Street to reduce traffic speeds and through traffic. A speed hump is proposed at the entry from Aldwins Road. New wider kerb-side berms for landscaping and street trees are provided. Pedestrian safety and service is improved with a 1.5 metre wide footpath and on street parking retained apart from the speed hump. Cyclists would benefit from the slowed environment.
40. This option was not chosen as the Preferred Option. Speed surveys do not justify the addition of speed humps. The scheme would have conflicts with the 66 kilo-vault cables running along the length of Marlborough Street.
41. Option Three  
This option features a nine metre carriageway, taking into account underground cables on the southern side of the street, with one 75 millimetre high speed platform in a six metre narrowing outside number 10 Marlborough Street. The scheme would also provide a pedestrian refuge island on Marlborough Street at the intersection with Aldwins Road.
42. Speed platforms are effective in calming traffic speed, and are consistent with treatments carried out in neighbouring streets off Aldwins Road, but as in Option Two, could not be justified from speed counts.
43. Option Three is further developed to the Preferred Option for consultation.

**THE PREFERRED OPTION**

44. The Preferred Option features:
- (a) Provision of a nine metre wide carriageway with new kerb and channel, taking into consideration the 66 kilo-vault cables running along the southern side of Marlborough Street, in addition to the scheme proposals for Clive Street and Havelock Streets.
  - (b) A five metre wide narrowing is to be provided at number 7 Marlborough Street to create a slowed environment and improved safety for all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists
  - (c) Pedestrian safety is improved through shortened crossing distances including the narrowing at number 7 and the pedestrian refuge at Aldwins Road.
  - (d) The pedestrian refuge and narrowed carriageway will also slow traffic at this Aldwins Road intersection.
  - (e) Removal of the footpath (minimum width 1.5 metres) from the boundary to the outside of the service strip, allowing for renewal of berms, landscaping and trees, and clearance from power poles and overhanging vegetation. Proposed trees include flowering cherries, tulip magnolias and sweet michelins.

**11 Cont'd**

- (f) An extensive drainage upgrade will be carried out prior to renewal of the street.
- (g) Lighting will be upgraded.
- (h) There will be a slight reduction in parking owing to the proposed narrowing.
- (i) Standard kerb cut down treatments and tactile pavers will be installed at the narrowing outside number 7 and on Marlborough Street close to Aldwins Road.
- (j) All signage, markings and other assets to be maintained or upgraded to current standards/requirements.

**The Final Selected Option**

- 45. The Final Selected Option differs from the Preferred Option for consultation as described in Consultation Fulfilment Sections 24 to 34 and is presented as the Plan for Board Approval.

**12. HAVELOCK STREET (MARLBOROUGH CLUSTER) STREET RENEWAL**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Philippa Upton, Consultation Leader - Transport

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approval for the proposed Havelock Street (Marlborough Cluster) Street Renewal Project as shown in **Attachment 1** (TP 319103 Issue 2).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Havelock Street Renewal project was initiated by the Transport and Greenspace Unit in June 2009 as one of three adjacent Linwood residential streets to undergo renewal as the Marlborough Cluster (Clive, Marlborough and Havelock). There are no bus routes or dedicated cycle routes on these streets, which are served on either side by footpaths. The area is close to Linwood College, Primary Schools, and the Eastgate Shopping Centre and Mall.
3. Havelock Street is approximately 190 metre long and 14 metres wide and is designated as a Local Road under the City Plan. It is located in a block bounded by Cashel Street (Collector Road) to the north and Aldwins Road and Linwood Avenue (major arterial routes) to the east. It intersects Cashel Street to the north and Marlborough Street to the south, and is calmed with a speed hump at the Cashel Street intersection.
4. Traffic movements in Havelock Street are affected by the surrounding road network (ie no right turn from Cashel Street to Linwood Avenue sending traffic via Clive Street or Havelock Street to Marlborough Street to Aldwins Road). Right turn movements are prohibited from Aldwins Road to Marlborough Street by a central median.
5. In addition to replacing the kerb and channel, key project objectives are to maintain and improve safety for all users, and to ensure additional assets such as signage and footpaths and drainage and lighting are upgraded to current standards. The proposed street tree and landscaping improvements are consistent with Council strategies.
6. Initial consultation and issues gathering was carried out internally and via a survey sent to residents of the Cluster. Key issues identified were speeding, shortcutting to and from Cashel Street to Marlborough Street, and dangerous driving by hooners/boy racers.
7. A number of responses to the community consultation on the proposed plan reinforced these concerns, resulting in requests for further street calming. Requests to close off the street at Marlborough Street were counterbalanced by those who were not happy about the inconvenience this would cause, especially given the restrictions to the surrounding road network, and traffic engineer concerns that additional flow would be diverted through Clive and Marlborough Streets instead.
8. Key features of the proposed plan developed as a result of issues gathering and to meet project objectives are
  - (a) A narrowed carriageway of nine metre width with two build outs narrowing the road to five metres at numbers 6 and 17 Havelock Street, spaced at distances to meet engineering standards for best practice.
  - (b) The existing speed hump at the Cashel Street/Havelock Street intersection will be retained, creating an overall slowed speed environment, which will benefit all road users.
  - (c) Pedestrian safety is improved through a shortened crossing distance and informal pedestrian crossing facilities installed at the narrowings.

**12 Cont'd**

9. Traffic and speed counts do not support the need for further treatment and the Plan for Board Approval remains unchanged following consultation. Results of speed surveys carried out in October 2009 showed an 85 percentile speed of 51.1 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling southbound and 50 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling northbound outside number 16 Havelock Street. The street scored 28.8 in the Neighbourhood Improvement Assessment Process, which is below the 40 point threshold that indicates immediate work is required.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

10. Funding for the proposed street renewal project in Havelock Street is provided in the 2009–19 LTCCP Street Renewal Programme, as shown below:
- |     |         |           |
|-----|---------|-----------|
| (a) | 2009-10 | \$20,000  |
| (b) | 2010-11 | \$52,000  |
| (c) | 2011-12 | \$429,000 |
11. Based on current estimates, there is sufficient funding to complete the construction of this project.

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

12. Yes. Funding for this project is provided in the 2009-19 LTCCP, page 245, Street Renewal Programme.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

13. There are no land ownership issues associated with this project.
14. There are no Heritage or Historic buildings, places or objects shown along Clive Street in the City Plan.
15. 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.
16. The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated 23 December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
17. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/or marking must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

18. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

19. Funding for this project is provided in the 2009-2019 LTCCP Street Renewal Programme and is consistent with Activity 10: Road Network, in the Street and Transport Asset Management Plan.

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

20. Yes.

**12 Cont'd****ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

21. The recommendations in this report align with current Council strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, the Road Strategy 2004, the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy 1998, the Cycling Strategy 1998 and 2004 and the Pedestrian Strategy 2001; and are consistent with the requirements for arterial and local roads as defined within the City Plan.

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

22. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

23. Initial issues gathering for the Marlborough Cluster was undertaken in October and November 2009, via a survey of residents in the cluster of streets. Traffic speed, through traffic and street drainage were considered to be the most serious problems, with a desire for landscaping improvements also mentioned.
24. On 3 March 2010, a seminar was held with the Community Board on the preferred option before consultation was undertaken for the Cluster over a three week period in March and April 2010. An informal project information session was held at Linwood Community House on Tuesday 30 March 2010, attended by approximately 12 people.
25. Approximately 270 households and absentee landowners, in the streets and surrounding area including Wellington Street, and relevant stakeholders were consulted, of which 27 responded. The majority of respondents were in general support of the proposal. Five indicated full support, 14 general support with comment or suggestion, three did not support the project and five did not specify.
26. Each submitter was sent an interim reply letter, acknowledging their submission had been received and would be considered at the end of the consultation period.
27. Key areas of community concern for Havelock Street were indicated throughout the Cluster and focused on speeding, shortcutting and boy racer/hoons doing burnouts and driving dangerously. It was noted that through traffic has been increasing owing to higher density housing and since the right turn from Cashel Street to Linwood Avenue turn has been blocked off, and that at peak time cars turn left at Aldwins and cut through Marlborough Street and Clive Street to avoid the build up to the Linwood Avenue/Aldwins Street traffic lights.
28. Havelock Street traffic and speed counts taken in October 2009 did not warrant the addition of speed humps to the original plan, which provides a slowed and calmed environment through the narrowing of the street and two five metre wide build outs and the retention of the platform at the Cashel Street entrance. The 85 percentile speeds are at or very close to the posted speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour. This environment is expected to also deter through heavy vehicles.
29. The suggestion that the street be closed off is not considered necessary or appropriate for the reasons stated above, and because preventing or further discouraging traffic through Havelock Street would be likely to cause diversion through Clive Street and Marlborough Street.
30. The reallocation of road space will increase opportunities for landscaping and street trees along the street, and there is minimal loss of parking in the plan at the proposed narrowings.
31. All identified submitters have been sent a final reply letter thanking them for their input, including a copy of the Plan for Board Approval. The letter informed respondents when the plan would be presented to the Board. Details of the meeting were provided so that any interested people could attend or request permission to address the Board prior to the decision being made.

**12 Cont'd**

32. There have been no changes made to the Preferred Plan for Havelock Street as a result of consultation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approve:

- (a) The Havelock Street Renewal Plan as shown in **Attachment 1** (TP 319103 Issue 2).
- (b) That the following parking restrictions take effect following completion of construction.

**Remove existing No Stopping**

- (i) That all existing stopping restrictions on the west side of Havelock Street between Cashel Street and Marlborough Street be revoked.
- (ii) That all existing stopping restrictions on the east side of Havelock Street between Cashel Street and Marlborough Street be revoked.
- (iii) That all existing stopping restrictions on the south side of Cashel Street commencing at its intersection with Havelock Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 11 metres be revoked.

**New No Stopping**

- (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Cashel Street commencing at its intersection with Havelock Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of six metres.
- (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Havelock Street commencing at its intersection with Cashel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
- (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Havelock Street commencing at a point 82 metres south from its intersection with Cashel Street and extending along the kerbline in a southerly direction for a distance of 20 metres.
- (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Havelock Street commencing at a point 138 metres south from its intersection with Cashel Street and extending along the kerbline in a southerly direction for a distance of 32 metres.
- (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Havelock Street commencing at its intersection with Marlborough Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
- (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Havelock Street commencing at its intersection with Marlborough Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
- (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Havelock Street commencing at a point 146 metres south from its intersection with Cashel Street and extending along the kerbline in a southerly direction for a distance of 18 metres.
- (viii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Havelock Street commencing at a point 75 metres south from its intersection with Cashel Street and extending along the kerbline in a southerly direction for a distance of 25 metres.

**12 Cont'd**

- (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Havelock Street commencing at its intersection with Cashel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
- (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Cashel Street commencing at its intersection with Havelock Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 11 metres.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

33. The following issues have been raised:

- (a) There is evidence of boy racer activity in Havelock Street, shown in extensive black tyre markings, and resident concerns about noise and dangerous driving.
- (b) There are resident concerns regarding rat-running from Aldwins Road, including heavy vehicles such as trucks and buses.
- (c) Speed has been reported as an issue in Havelock Street. However the results of the speed surveys showed an 85 percentile speed of 51.1 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling southbound and 50 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling northbound outside number 16 Havelock Street.
- (d) **Traffic Volume and Flow:**  
In Havelock Street south bound traffic volumes are higher than north bound volumes. This potentially reflects the restrictions to traffic movements on the surrounding road network at the Linwood Avenue/Cashel Street intersection. Right turn movements from Cashel Street to Linwood Avenue are prohibited at this intersection, and therefore vehicles can travel south on Clive Street or Havelock Street, use Marlborough Street and Aldwins Road, and right turn at the Linwood Avenue/Aldwins Road intersection. Marlborough Street at the intersection with Aldwins Road is restricted to left in/left out movements only.
- (e) **Crash History:**  
The Land Transport Safety analysis system shows there has been one accident recorded during the past five years in Havelock Street. A car travelling south bound on Havelock Street lost control turning into Marlborough Street and hit a fence, kerb or post on the right hand bend. The accident occurred at 8pm on a Friday and was caused by loss of control and over reaction under heavy acceleration.

**THE OBJECTIVES**

34. The objectives for the project are as follows:

- (a) Meet budget and achieve lowest overall cost solution.
- (b) Maintain or improve user safety and level of service.
- (c) Renew the kerbs and channels to suit drainage and adjacent street drainage needs as required.
- (d) Renew street drainage pipes as required.
- (e) Renew carriageway(s) as required.



**12 Cont'd**

- (f) Renew footpaths as required.
- (g) Renew berms as required.
- (h) Renew streetlight assets as required.
- (i) Renew signs and markings as required.
- (j) Renew other Transport and Streets assets eg cycle, traffic signals, retaining walls, fences, railings, etc if required.
- (k) Install traffic calming infrastructure to suit the speed environment required.
- (l) Install new landscaping and street trees to meet Council's Community Outcomes.

**THE OPTIONS****35. Option One**

Option One considered replacement of the kerb and channel and related assets on the same alignment. This option does not change road widths, the cross section, speed environment, priority controls or pedestrian facilities calm or improve safety, or discourage cut throughs, all of which are perceived issues for residents in the street.

36. Option One does not meet all project objectives, and was not selected as the preferred option.

**37. Option Two**

This option considered a nine metre wide carriageway and retention of the threshold at Cashel Street with two speed humps at numbers 2 and 16 Havelock Street to reduce traffic speeds and through traffic. New wider kerb side berms for landscaping and street trees would be provided. Pedestrian safety and service is maintained or improved with a minimum 1.5 metre wide footpath and narrowed carriageway and crossing points, and on-street parking is retained apart from the speed bumps. Cyclists would benefit from the slowed environment. The speed hump at the Cashel Street intersection is retained.

38. Option Two was not chosen as the preferred option. Speed surveys do not justify the addition of speed humps.

**39. Option Three**

This option features a nine metre wide carriageway, with two 75 millimetre high speed platforms spaced 60 metres apart at six metre narrowings outside numbers 2 and 16 Havelock Street. The southern platform would also provide a crossing location. The speed hump at Cashel Street is retained and new wider kerb side berms provide landscaping and street trees.

40. Speed platforms are effective in calming traffic speed, and are consistent with treatments carried out in neighbouring streets off Aldwins Road, but as in Option Two, could not be justified from speed counts.

41. Option Three is further developed to the Preferred Option for consultation

**THE PREFERRED OPTION**

42. The Preferred Option features:

- (a) Provision of a nine metre wide carriageway with new kerb and channel.
- (b) Two five metre wide narrowings at numbers 6 and 17 Havelock Street at distances in compliance with the City Plan create a slowed environment and improved safety for all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists.

**12 Cont'd**

- (c) Pedestrian safety is improved through shortened crossing distances, and informal crossing facilities at the narrowings.
- (d) The type C threshold at Cashel Street will be retained, and signage information upgraded to 25 kilometres per hour for this treatment.
- (e) Removal of the footpath (minimum width 1.5 metres) from the boundary to the middle of the two berms, allowing for renewal of berms, landscaping and trees, and clearance from power poles and overhanging vegetation. Proposed trees include flowering cherries, tulip magnolias and sweet michelias.
- (f) A drainage upgrade will be carried out as part of the renewal.
- (g) Lighting will be upgraded.
- (h) There will be a slight reduction in parking owing to the proposed narrowings.
- (i) Kerb cut down treatments and tactile pavers have been included at Clive Street close to the intersection with Cashel Street and the narrowing at number 6.
- (j) All signage, markings and other assets to be maintained or upgraded to current standards/requirements.

**The Final Selected Option**

- 43. The Final Selected Option does not differ from the Preferred Option for consultation and is presented as the Plan for Board Approval.

**13. CLIVE STREET (MARLBOROUGH CLUSTER) STREET RENEWAL**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941 8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Philippa Upton, Consultation Leader - Transport

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approval for the proposed Clive Street (Marlborough Cluster) Street Renewal Project as shown in **Attachment 1** (TP 319101 Issue 2).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Clive Street Renewal project was initiated by the Transport and Greenspace Unit in June 2009 for one of three adjacent Linwood residential streets to undergo renewal as the Marlborough Cluster (Clive, Marlborough and Havelock). There are no bus routes or dedicated cycle routes on these streets, which are served on either side by footpaths. The area is close to Linwood College, Primary Schools, and to the Eastgate Shopping Centre and Mall.
3. Clive Street is approximately 250 metres long and 14 metres wide and is designated as a Local Road under the City Plan. It is located in a block bounded by Cashel Street (Collector Road) to the north and Aldwins Road and Linwood Avenue (major arterial routes) to the east, and changes at the right angle bend to become Marlborough Street to the south. It intersects with the eastern end of Wellington Street, and is calmed with a speed hump at the Cashel Street intersection.
4. Traffic movements in Clive Street are affected by the surrounding road network (ie no right turn from Cashel Street to Linwood Avenue, sending traffic via Clive Street or Havelock Street to Marlborough Street to Aldwins Road). Right turn movements are prohibited from Aldwins Road to Marlborough Street owing to the central median.
5. In addition to replacing the kerb and channel, key project objectives are to maintain and improve safety for all users, and to ensure additional assets such as signage and footpaths and drainage and lighting are upgraded to current standards. The proposed street tree and landscaping improvements are consistent with Council strategies.
6. Initial consultation and issues gathering was carried out via a survey sent to residents of the Cluster. Issues identified were speeding, short-cutting, and dangerous driving by hoons/boyracers, particularly at the Wellington Street intersection. A number of responses to the community consultation on the proposed plan reinforced these concerns, resulting in requests for further street calming via speed humps. Drainage concerns were also raised, particularly at the Clive Street/Marlborough Street corner.
7. Key features of the proposed plan, developed as a result of initial issues gathering and to meet project objectives are:
  - (a) Narrowed nine metre wide carriageway with two build outs narrowing the road to five metres at number 6 and 25 Clive Street, spaced at distances to meet traffic engineering standards for best practice.
  - (b) The entrance at Wellington Street is reduced to seven metres, and the existing speed hump at the Cashel Street/Clive Street intersection will be retained, creating an overall slowed speed environment, which will benefit all road users.
  - (c) Pedestrian safety is improved through a shortened crossing distance and an informal pedestrian crossing facility installed at the narrowing outside number 6 Clive Street.

**13 Cont'd**

8. Traffic and speed counts do not support the need for further treatment and the Plan for Board Approval remains unchanged following consultation. October 2009 speed survey results showed an 85 percentile speed of 47.9 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling southbound and 48.6 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling northbound outside numbers 25 and 27 Clive Street. The street scored 8.8 in the Neighbourhood Improvement Assessment Process, which is below the 40 point threshold that indicates immediate work is required. A drainage upgrade will be carried out prior to the renewal.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

9. Funding for the proposed street renewal project in Clive Street is provided in the 2009–19 LTCCP Street Renewal Programme, as shown below:
- |     |         |           |
|-----|---------|-----------|
| (a) | 2009-10 | \$20,000  |
| (b) | 2010-11 | \$52,000  |
| (c) | 2011-12 | \$429,000 |
10. Based on current estimates, there is sufficient funding to complete the construction of this project.

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

11. Yes. Funding for this project is provided in the 2009-19 LTCCP, page 245, Street Renewal Programme.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

12. There are minor land ownership issues associated with this project. Several property boundaries or services currently occupy the legal road reserve. The proposed scheme can be delivered without affecting these properties
13. There are no Heritage or Historic buildings, places or objects shown along Clive Street in the City Plan or on the intranet.
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 23 December 2009. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
16. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/or marking must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

17. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

18. Funding for this project is provided in the 2009-2019 LTCCP Street Renewal Programme and is consistent with Activity 10: Road Network in the Street and Transport Asset Management Plan.

13 Cont'd

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

19. Yes.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

20. The recommendations in this report align with current Council strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, the Road Strategy 2004, the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy 1998, the Cycling Strategy 1998 and 2004 and the Pedestrian Strategy 2001; and are consistent with the requirements for arterial and local roads as defined within the City Plan.

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

21. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

22. Initial issues gathering was undertaken in October and November 2009, via a survey of residents in the cluster of streets. Traffic speed, through traffic and street drainage were considered to be the most serious problems, with a desire for landscaping improvements also mentioned.
23. A seminar was held with the Community Board on 3 March 2010 to introduce the preferred option before consultation was undertaken for Marlborough Cluster over a three week period in March and April 2010. An informal project information session attended by approximately 12 people was held at Linwood Community House on Tuesday 30 March 2010.
24. Approximately 270 households and absentee landowners, in the streets and surrounding area including Wellington Street, and relevant stakeholders were consulted, of which 27 responded. The majority of respondents were in general support of the proposal. Five indicated full support, 14 general support with comment or suggestion, three did not support the project and five did not specify.
25. Each submitter was sent an interim reply letter, acknowledging their submission had been received and would be considered at the end of the consultation period.
26. Key areas of community concern for Clive Street were indicated throughout the Cluster and focused on speeding, shortcutting and boy racer/hoons doing burnouts and driving dangerously. Issues specific to Clive Street included concerns about dangerous driving/speeding through the Wellington Street/Clive Street intersection, and a request for a speed hump there. It was observed that through traffic has been increasing owing to higher density housing and since the right turn into Linwood Avenue from Cashel Street has been closed. At peak times cars turn also left at Aldwins Road and cut through Marlborough Street and Clive Street to avoid the build up to the Linwood Avenue/Aldwins Road traffic lights.
27. Drainage issues at the Clive Street/Marlborough Street corner have been assessed and are being addressed as a separate project, prior to the street renewal. The reallocation of road space will increase opportunities for landscaping and street trees along the street.
28. There were no changes made to the plan for Clive Street as a result of consultation, as the street traffic and speed counts taken in October 2009 did not warrant the addition of speed humps to the original plan, which provides a slowed and calmed environment through the narrowing of the streets and two five metre wide build outs, and the reduction in width of the entrance to Wellington Street to seven metres. The 85 percentile speeds are below the posted speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour. This environment is expected to also deter through heavy vehicles.

**13 Cont'd**

29. All identified submitters have been sent a final reply letter thanking them for their input and including a copy of the Plan for Board Approval. The letter informed respondents when the plan would be presented to the Board. Details of the meeting were provided so that any interested people could attend or request permission to address the Board prior to the decision being made.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board approve:

- (a) The Clive Street Renewal Plan as shown in **Attachment 1** (TP 319101 Issue 2).
- (b) That the following parking restrictions take effect following completion of construction.

**Remove existing No Stopping**

- (i) That all existing stopping restrictions on the west side of Clive Street between Cashel Street and Marlborough Street be revoked.
- (ii) That all existing stopping restrictions on the east side of Clive Street between Cashel Street and Marlborough Street be revoked.

**New No Stopping**

- (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Cashel Street commencing at its intersection with Clive Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of six metres.
- (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Clive Street commencing at its intersection with Cashel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 24 metres.
- (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Clive Street commencing at a point 69 metres south from its intersection with Cashel Street and extending along the kerb line in a southerly direction for a distance of 21 metres.
- (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Clive Street commencing at its intersection with Wellington Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of six metres.
- (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Wellington Street commencing at its intersection with Clive Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 16 metres.
- (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Wellington Street commencing at its intersection with Clive Street and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 17 metres.
- (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Clive Street commencing at its intersection with Wellington Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of six metres.
- (viii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Clive Street commencing at a point 23 metres south from its intersection with Wellington Street and extending along the kerb line in a southerly direction for a distance of 22 metres.
- (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Clive Street commencing at a point 190 metres south from its intersection with Cashel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.

**13 Cont'd**

- (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Clive Street commencing at a point 150 metres south from its intersection with Cashel Street and extending along the kerbline in a southerly direction for a distance of 25 metres.
- (xi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Clive Street commencing at a point 67 metres south from its intersection with Cashel Street and extending along the kerbline in a southerly direction for a distance of 22 metres.
- (xii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Clive Street commencing at its intersection with Cashel Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 18 metres.
- (xiii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Cashel Street commencing at its intersection with Clive Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of six metres.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

30. The following issues have been raised:

- (a) There is evidence of boy racer activity in Clive Street, shown in extensive black tyre markings, and resident concerns about noise and dangerous driving.
- (b) Residents have reported concerns with corner cutting at the Marlborough Street/ Clive Street bend.
- (c) There are resident concerns regarding rat-running from Aldwins Road, including heavy vehicles such as trucks and buses.
- (d) Speed has been reported as an issue in Clive Street. However the results of the speed surveys showed an 85 percentile speed of 47.9 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling southbound and 48.6 kilometres per hour for vehicles travelling northbound outside numbers 25 and 27 Clive Street.
- (e) **Traffic Volume and Flow:**  
In Clive Street south bound traffic volumes are higher than north bound volumes. This potentially reflects the restrictions to traffic movements on the surrounding road network at the Linwood Avenue/Cashel Street intersection. Right turn movements from Cashel Street to Linwood Avenue are prohibited at this intersection, and therefore vehicles can travel south on Clive Street or Havelock Street, use Marlborough Street and Aldwins Road, and right turn at the Linwood Avenue/Aldwins Road intersection. Marlborough Street at the intersection with Aldwins Road is restricted to left in/left out movements only.
- (f) **Crash History:**  
The Land Transport Safety Crash Analysis System show two accidents have been recorded for the last five years on Clive Street. Both accidents happened in 2006. The reasons can be summarised as follows:
  - (i) A cyclist travelling westbound on Cashel Street was hit by a car turning right from Clive Street to Cashel Street. The car driver failed to give way or did not see or look when required. The accident happened on a Tuesday at 8.45am. There was dazzling sunshine.

13 Cont'd

- (ii) A car travelling southbound on Clive Street lost control turning right to Wellington Street. The driver was entering the corner too fast. The accident occurred on a Monday at 8.01pm.
- (g) The presence of 66 kilo-vault cables under the western side of the carriageway on Clive Street from Marlborough Street and the location of a water main on the eastern side of the carriageway have affected the alignment of the carriageway.

**THE OBJECTIVES**

31. The objectives for the project are as follows:

- (a) Meet budget and achieve lowest overall cost solution.
- (b) Maintain or improve user safety and level of service.
- (c) Renew the kerbs and channels to suit drainage and adjacent street drainage needs as required.
- (d) Renew street drainage pipes as required.
- (e) Renew carriageway(s) as required.
- (f) Renew footpaths as required.
- (g) Renew berms as required.
- (h) Renew streetlight assets as required.
- (i) Renew signs and markings as required.
- (j) Renew other Transport and Streets assets eg cycle, traffic signals, retaining walls, fences, railings if required.
- (k) Install traffic calming infrastructure to suit the speed environment required.
- (l) Install new landscaping and street trees to meet the Council's Community Outcomes.

**THE OPTIONS**

32. **Option One**

This option considered replacement of the kerb and channel and related assets on the same alignment. This option does not change road widths, the cross section, speed environment, priority controls or pedestrian facilities calm or improve safety, or discourage cut throughs, all of which are perceived issues for residents in the street.

33. This option does not meet all project objectives, and was not selected as the preferred option.

34. **Option Two**

This option considered narrowing the carriageway to nine metres and retention of the threshold at Cashel Street with two speed humps located at numbers 6 and 25 Clive Street to reduce traffic speeds and through traffic. New wider kerb side berms for landscaping and street trees would be provided mainly on the western side of the carriageway. Pedestrian safety and service is improved with a 1.8 metre wide footpath and on street parking retained apart from the speed bumps. Cyclists would benefit from the slowed environment.



**13 Cont'd**

35. Option two was not chosen as the preferred option. Speed surveys do not justify the addition of speed humps. In addition, if the carriageway was aligned to one side the berms on the opposite would have been very wide, exacerbating some concerns about resident maintenance responsibilities, ie mowing.
36. **Option Three**  
This option featured a nine metre carriageway, taking into account underground cables on the western side of the street, with two 75 millimetre high speed platforms spaced 60 metres apart at six metre narrowings outside numbers 6 and 27 Clive Street. The southern platform would also provide a crossing location.
37. Speed platforms are effective in calming traffic speed, and are consistent with treatments carried out in neighbouring streets off Aldwins Road, but as in Option two, could not be justified from speed counts.
38. Option Three was further developed to the Preferred Option for consultation.

**THE PREFERRED OPTION**

39. The Preferred Option features:
- (a) Provision of a nine metre wide carriageway with new kerb and channel, taking into consideration the 66 kilo-vault cables running from Marlborough Street to Wellington Street on the western side of the carriageway in addition to the scheme proposals for Marlborough Street and Havelock Streets.
  - (b) Two five metre wide narrowings at numbers 6 and 25 Clive Street at distances in compliance with the City Plan, create a slowed environment and improved safety for all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists
  - (c) Pedestrian safety is improved through shortened crossing distances including the Wellington Street intersection, and an informal crossing facility at the narrowing outside number 6 Clive Street
  - (c) A seven metre wide narrowed entrance from Wellington Street
  - (d) The speed hump at Cashel Street will be retained, and signage information upgraded to 25 kilometres per hour for this treatment.
  - (e) Removal of the footpath (minimum width 1.5 metres) from the boundary to the outside of the service strip, allowing for renewal of berms, landscaping and trees, and clearance from power poles and overhanging vegetation. Proposed trees include flowering cherries, tulip magnolias and sweet michelias.
  - (f) An extensive drainage upgrade will be carried out prior to renewal of the street.
  - (g) Lighting will be upgraded.
  - (h) There will be a slight reduction in parking owing to the proposed narrowings.
  - (i) Kerb cut down treatments and tactile pavers have been included at Clive Street close to the intersection with Cashel Street and the narrowing at number 6.
  - (j) All signage, markings and other assets to be maintained or upgraded to current standards/requirements.

**The Final Selected Option**

40. The Final Selected Option does not differ from the Preferred Option for consultation and is presented as the Plan for Board Approval.

**14 APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - LINWOOD RESOURCE CENTRE – COMMUNITY VOICES RESEARCH PROJECT**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941 8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Community Support Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Shupayi Mpunga, Community Development Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding from Linwood Resource Centre to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.
2. The request is for \$15,000 towards the Community Voices Research Project to be coordinated by the Linwood Resource Centre.
3. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has \$16,201 available in its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

4. The Linwood Resource Centre Trust (the Centre) has been operating for 11 years in a Christchurch City Council owned facility. The Centre has a community development worker position which is managed under Family and Community a Division of Anglican Care, the Centre's activities are governed by a Trust. The Centre relies on volunteer and Trust Board members to help run its activities and programmes.
5. The Centre was set up to provide a welcoming, stimulating and safe environment for local people to build an inclusive community where creativity can be explored and skills and resources shared. It seeks to empower local people to take action on issues of importance to them.
6. Over the past few months the Centre has been involved in discussions (with other organisations in Bromley, Charleston, Linwood, Phillipstown, Inner City and Woolston) to discover what is happening within the community in terms of community pride, participation and strengths. Discussions have taken place to find out how to engage in participatory methods to find out from the community's grassroots what the strengths are and how these can be built on. A working title that has emerged for this project is the Community Voices Research Project.
7. The Community Voices Research Project (the Project) seeks to understand community views; build and strengthen connections within community; identify and build on community strengths; identify opportunities for groups, organisations, agencies, institutions and other stakeholders to engage in greater collaboration; and to update research in these areas.
8. The Project will be implemented under the umbrella of the Linwood Resource Centre in close collaboration with Te Whare Roimata. It will also include but will not be limited to the Bromley and Phillipstown Community Centres, the Woolston Community Association and the Charleston Residents' Association.
9. In addition, the Project will integrate a capacity building component to ensure that community workers themselves develop skills to undertake research within their own areas of operation in future.
10. The outcomes of the Project include increased awareness of community strengths; increased awareness of barriers to engagement and community needs; basis on which to develop and implement new community initiatives, projects and programmes; and greater collaboration amongst stakeholders to ensure better coordination and better resource allocation.
11. It is anticipated that the outcomes of the Project will be compiled into a report with recommendations, which will be shared with the community through community and resource centres, residents' associations and various stakeholders at organisational level.

**14 Cont'd**

12. The Project is scheduled to begin in June 2010 and end in May 2011. A coordinator will be engaged to ensure the Project is implemented within participating communities and to report on progress to key stakeholders. The Coordinator's role will include organising community consultations using focus groups, interviews and questionnaires as may be deemed necessary, holding meetings with interested groups, organisations, agencies, institutions and other interested parties to find areas of collaboration and reporting on findings.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

13. Sound financial practices are in place. The Linwood Resource Centre has its accounts audited annually.
14. Total cost of the project is estimated at \$25,000. This application is seeking \$15,000 to carry out the first phase of the Project and will seek another \$10,000 from the Community Board for the final phase which will include compiling and printing of the final reports.
15. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has \$16,201 available in its Discretionary Response Fund.

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

16. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

17. No legal implications have been identified.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

18. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, pages 172 and 176.

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

19. Yes, Strengthening Communities (page 172 of the 2009-19 LTCCP).

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

20. This application meets the following Council Community Grants Funding Outcomes:
- Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups.
21. It also helps to meet the following Community Board objectives:
- Acknowledge diversity and support measures for a vibrant, inclusive and strong communities.
  - Support/advocate for initiatives that support lifelong learning.

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

22. Yes, Strengthening Communities Strategy.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

23. None required.

**14 Cont'd**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board allocate \$15,000 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to the Linwood Resource Centre, towards the Community Voices Research Project.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**15. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME LUKE WARD – SHANGHAI INTERNATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY EXPO**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941 8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Community Support Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Shupayi Mpunga, Community Development Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding from Luke Ward to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board from its Youth Development Scheme.
2. The request is for \$1,000 to enable Luke Ward to attend the Shanghai International Youth Science and Technology Expo in China.
3. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has no remaining funds available in its 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

4. Luke Kodey Ward 15 years old and lives in Bromley. He is a Year 11 student at Christchurch Boys' High School. He has achieved NCEA Level One with Excellence.
5. A group of seven students and two teachers from Christchurch Boys' High School have recently been invited to attend the 2010 Shanghai International Youth Science and Technology Expo from 8 to 18 July 2010. They will be joining other secondary school students from all over the world. Each participating school will be allocated an exhibition area to display their work and is required to bring a piece of scientific creation work and a multimedia animation work.
6. Luke was required to submit a thesis on Climate Change with a PowerPoint presentation for the selection. The Organising Committee has sent an official invitation to short listed participants. The Christchurch Boys' High School group has done well for being selected as the only group to represent New Zealand in this important international event.
7. The group has had only two months to fund raise for this trip. Luke is an essential member of the team and will through this get to visit China, do public speaking in front of hundreds of overseas students to present his uniquely New Zealand view of climate change, work as part of the team to sell the group's idea of a Greenhouse Controller and use his knowledge in science and think creatively to find novel ways to combat climate change. Luke personally looks forward to learning more about the field he hopes to have a career in.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. The total cost for airfares, food, transport and accommodation is \$3,500. Luke has raised \$800 towards this trip and continues to do some work to raise more funds.
9. This is the first time that the applicant has applied to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board for financial support.

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

10. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

11. No legal implications have been identified.

15 Cont'd

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

12. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, pages 172 and 176.

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

13. Yes, Strengthening Communities (page 172 of the 2009-19 LTCCP).

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

14. This application meets the following Council Community Grants Funding Outcomes:
- Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups.
15. It also helps to meet the following Community Board objectives:
- Acknowledge diversity and support measures for a vibrant, inclusive and strong communities.
  - Support/advocate for initiatives that support lifelong learning.

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

16. Yes, Strengthening Communities Strategy.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

17. None required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board decline this funding request from its 2009/10 Youth Development Scheme, as there are no funds available.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board allocate \$500 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to Luke Ward to attend the Shanghai International Youth Science and Technology Expo in China in July 2010.

**16. APPLICATION TO THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD 2009/10 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - LINWOOD AVENUE COMMUNITY CORNER TRUST**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941 8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Community Support Unit, Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Shupayi Mpunga, Community Development Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding from Linwood Avenue Community Corner Trust to the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.
2. The request is for \$500 contribution towards the cost of running Nigel Latta's '*Revenge of the Teenager*' Presentation.
3. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has \$16,201 available in its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

4. Linwood Avenue Community Corner Trust (LACCT) was incorporated as a Trust in October 1998. The Trust seeks to provide a caring and supportive environment for people in need, develop like skills programmes especially for people in need, and respond to issues that arise from community.
5. LACCT have through their work identified continued need to support parents by creating opportunities to educate them on positive parenting. Some of the parents LACCT works with lack skills to parent, are single parents who have to raise children on their own and find it hard to cope, and sometimes need assistance to cope with teenagers going through difficult stages in their lives and who do not always make positive choices.
6. LACCT has invited Nigel Latta to give a presentation at Linwood College entitled '*Revenge of the Teenager*' on 26 July 2010 from 7.30pm to 9.30pm. The presentation has been widely publicised in the area especially through schools. It is expected that there will be about 500 people attending the presentation. Through the schools, and through interaction with parents, LACCT became aware that some of the parents who would benefit from the presentation would not be able to afford the \$10 entry fee. Local schools and LACCT have identified parents who would benefit from this and seek to support these specific parents by providing tickets so that they can attend.
7. Nigel Latta is a well known psychologist who gives lectures and talks primarily about helping family relations, mostly through upbringing. He has written several books including '*Before your Teenager drives you Crazy*', '*Battlefield wisdom for Stressed-out Parents*' and '*Raising Teenagers: A practical Guide for Parents*'. Latta also had a TV series entitled '*The Politically Incorrect Parenting Show*'.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. Sound financial practices are in place. Linwood Avenue Community Corner Trust has its accounts audited annually.
9. The Trust is seeking a grant of \$500 to assist parents who cannot afford to pay the \$10 required to attend Nigel Latta's presentation at Linwood College.
10. LACCT received a total of \$4,694.50 in 2009/10 for various programme costs and activities from Small Grants Fund.
11. The Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board presently has \$16,201 available in its Discretionary Response Fund.

**16 Cont'd**

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

12. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

13. No legal implications have been identified.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

14. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, pages 172 and 176.

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

15. Yes, Strengthening Communities (page 172 of the 2009-19 LTCCP).

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

16. This application meets the following Council Community Grants Funding Outcomes:
- Support, develop and promote the capacity and sustainability of community, recreation, sports, arts, heritage and environment groups.
17. It also helps to meet the following Community Board objectives:
- Acknowledge diversity and support measures for a vibrant, inclusive and strong communities.
  - Support/advocate for initiatives that support lifelong learning.

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

18. Yes, Strengthening Communities Strategy.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

19. None required.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board give a grant of \$500 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund to the Linwood Avenue Community Corner Trust, towards the cost of Nigel Latta's presentation '*Revenge of the Teenager*'.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.



**30. 6. 2010**

- 57 -

- 17. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
- 18. BOARD MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**
- 19. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE**