

**SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD
AGENDA**

WEDNESDAY 30 JUNE 2010

AT 4PM

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

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

Community Board Adviser:
Peter Croucher
Phone 941 5414 DDI
Email: peter.croucher@ccc.govt.nz

**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**
 - 3.1 Peter Simpson – Sheldon Park Tree Renewal**
- PART B 4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**
- PART B 5. NOTICES OF MOTION**
- PART B 6. BRIEFINGS**
- PART B 7. REVIEW OF CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANT FUND**
- PART C 8. APPLICATION TO THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD - ESTABLISHMENT OF A YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME**
- PART C 9. APPLICATION TO SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND – KEITH BOULTON, LIVIO PETROSINO, KAYNE REED, IN HOO JEON, RHYS LASORSA, ROSALIE STEWART, LAURA CADIGAN**
- PART C 10. REDWOOD PARK TREE RENEWAL**
- PART C 11. SHELDON PARK TREE RENEWAL**
- PART C 12. REQUEST FOR FUNDING WESTMINSTER SPORTS INC**
- PART C 13. CHRISTCHURCH PUBLIC SERVICE CHILDCARE CENTRE**
- PART A 14. PROPOSED TREE POLICY FOR TREES ON PUBLICLY OWNED LAND OR SPACES**

- PART B 15. CORRESPONDENCE**
- PART B 16. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE**
 - 16.1 Current Issues**
 - 16.2 Update on Local Capital Projects**
 - 16.3 Board Funding Update for 2009/10**
 - 16.4 CSR Report for May 2010**
- PART B 17. ELECTED MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE**
- PART B 18. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
- PART C 19. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

1. APOLOGIES

Ngairé Button and Norm Withers

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES– 16 JUNE 2010

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

CHAIRPERSON'S OR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

3.1 PETER SIMPSON – SHELDON PARK TREE RENEWAL

Peter Simpson will outline his view on this project.

4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

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

That the Board request staff to prepare a report to the Board on the feasibility of a pedestrian crossing or light-controlled pedestrian crossing on Harewood Road, approximately outside 84 Harewood Road in recognition of the needs of the older community in this area.

6. BRIEFINGS

Nil.

7. REVIEW OF CHARACTER HOUSING MAINTENANCE GRANT FUND

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Liveable Cities
Author:	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 contributes 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 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:
 - *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.

7 Cont'd

- *Improvements in street amenity and local identity*; of the 154 applications, 72 (approximately 50%) 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.

7 Cont'd

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).

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
Total Christchurch	18,521	100.0%	\$45,310

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% of the total costs of the external maintenance works (excl 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%-20% of the external maintenance cost (excl GST) up to a maximum of \$5,000 per property. This increases from a maximum of 10% 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 10 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.

7 Cont'd

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.
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 Council.

7 Cont'd

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 Board:

- (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 (**attachment 1**).

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

7 Cont'd

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% (up to a maximum of \$5,000 excl 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

Financial Year	Number of grants approved	Total value of grants approved	Total number of grants uplifted	Total value of grants uplifted
2006/07 Fund available \$100,000	42 of 64 applications	\$47,573 (ave \$1,133)	22	\$22,883 (ave \$1,040)
2007/08 Fund available \$100,000	26 of 28 applications	\$33,039 (ave \$1,271)	17	\$19,844 (ave \$1,167)
2008/09 Fund available \$100,000	27 of 36 applications	\$43,573 (ave \$1,614)	17	\$25,893 (ave \$1,523)
2009/10 Fund available \$47,500	25 of 26 applications	\$35,192 (ave \$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. The 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% of total grant fund.
 - The maximum of 10% of the total cost of the project excl GST (max \$5,000) is too little to act as an effective incentive to promote retention of character houses. Average grants are \$1,243.
37. **Grant conditions and criteria**
- 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.
 - The Policy requires a non-demolition or relocation clause for 10 years.
 - The Policy only allows for one grant per property, there is no time limit after which further applications may be considered.

7 Cont'd

- (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 a 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 the 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%-20% 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 5 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.

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.

7 Cont'd

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 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%-20% (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 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%-20% (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Community Board.
 - Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.
 - 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 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*,

7 Cont'd

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%-20% (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 Council.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	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.
Cultural	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing.	
Environmental	Community Boards can promote improved amenity and character for streetscapes within each of their wards.	
Economic	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.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Aligns with Liveable City outcomes
Contributes to a Cultural City

Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:

Improves the Council's contribution to the community and neighbourhood identity in a consistent process for improvements to local residential streetscapes.

Effects on Maori:

NA.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Improved consistency with Heritage Incentive Grant Fund Process.

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

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.

Other relevant matters:

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.

7 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.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Community Boards retain their input into the decision making process via the Grants Panel.	
Cultural	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing.	Limited success of current policy and process to date.
Environmental	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.
Economic	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>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Alignment with community outcomes for a Liveable City. Contributes to a Cultural City</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</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>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>NA.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Some conditions of the grants are more onerous than the Heritage Incentive Grants Fund and process more complex.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</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>Other relevant matters:</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>		

7 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:
- Increasing potential grant funding for each application to between 10%-20% (maximum \$5,000) at the discretion of the Grants Panel.
 - Allow applications to be submitted twice a year dependent upon available funds.
 - Require the Grants Panel to sit twice a year.
 - Allow 11 months from offer of grant for completion of works.
 - Allow applicants to apply for additional grants for further works once the first grant has been uplifted and dependent upon available funds.
 - 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 a payback requirement.
 - A three year review of the Fund to evaluate success and report to Council.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Community Boards retain their input into the decision making process in a similar way to previous process but now biannually.	
Cultural	Continuity of sense of place and community through reduction in loss of older housing	
Environmental	Shared responsibility between Community Boards for improved amenity and character for streetscapes across the whole city.	
Economic	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.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:</p> <p>Alignment with community outcomes for a Liveable City. Also contributes to a Cultural City.</p> <p>Impact on the Council's capacity and responsibilities:</p> <p>Greater commitment to scheme with biannual process shows a greater commitment to enhancing residential identity and amenity.</p> <p>Effects on Maori:</p> <p>NA.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies:</p> <p>Emphasis on local and Community Board participation.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</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>		

8. APPLICATION TO THE SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD - ESTABLISHMENT OF A YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Recreation and Sports Unit
Author:	Helen Miles, Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Board to set aside \$10,000 from its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund for the purpose of establishing a Youth Development Scheme.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The purpose of the Youth Development Scheme is to celebrate and support young people living in the Shirley/Papanui ward by providing financial assistance for their development. The Community Board also seeks to acknowledge young people's effort, achievement and potential excellence in the community.

3. The Youth Development Scheme will consider applications for the following activities:

Personal Development and Growth - For example leadership training, Outward Bound, Spirit of Adventure, extra curricular educational opportunities.

Representation at Events - Applicants can apply for assistance if they have been selected to represent a school, team or community at a local, national or international event or competition. This includes sporting, cultural and community events.

4. The following eligibility criteria must be met:

Age groups 12-25 years.

Projects must have obvious benefits for the young person and if possible the wider community.

Only one application permitted per year.

Applicants should be undertaking other fundraising activities and not relying solely on Community Board support.

Successful applicants will be required to report back on their experiences to the Community Board.

5. Each application will be assessed by the appropriate staff member and presented to the Board for its consideration.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6. This proposal transfers funds from the Board's Discretionary Response Fund into a separate Youth Development Scheme fund. This reduces the total amount available in the Board's Discretionary Response Fund in 2010/11 by \$10,000. The opening balance of the Discretionary Response fund for 2010/11 is \$51,197.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. There are no legal considerations.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

9. As above.

8 Cont'd

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

10. Aligns with the Strengthening Communities Strategy goals, Council's Youth Strategy and local Community Board objectives.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

11. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

12. No external consultation needs to be undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Shirley/Papanui Community Board:

- (a) Establish a Youth Development Scheme for the 2010/11 year.
- (b) Approve the transfer of \$10,000 from the Shirley/Papanui Community Board's 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund to the Shirley/Papanui Youth Development Scheme.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approves a transfer of \$12,000 from the Shirley/Papanui Community Board's 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund to the Shirley/Papanui Youth Development Scheme.

9. APPLICATION TO SHIRLEY/PAPANUI COMMUNITY BOARD'S YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUND – KEITH BOULTON, LIVIO PETROSINO, KAYNE REED, IN HOO JEON, RHYS LASORSA, ROSALIE STEWART, LAURA CADIGAN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Community Support Unit
Author:	Bruce Meder, Community Development Adviser Helen Miles Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present four Youth Development Fund applications for funding in the 2010/2011 financial year to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board. The attached table also includes the recommendations for allocation made by the Community Development Adviser and Community Recreation Adviser.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Attached is a table summarising the applications for funding via the Youth Development Fund. The total cost of projects is \$15,188. One applicant has requested \$500, the other six applicants have not indicated an amount that they are seeking.
3. The Board has \$10,000 available for distribution from its Youth Development Fund. The Community Development Adviser has made recommendations totalling \$3000. However, the final decision relating to funding belongs with the Community Board.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. The Shirley/Papanui Community Board has available \$10,000 from the Youth Development Fund.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

5. There are no legal considerations.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

7. As above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

9. As above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

10. Not applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board consider the attached table in its deliberations and make the following allocations from the Board's 2010/2011 Youth Development and Discretionary Fund to each applicant as follows:

9 Cont'd

- (i) Keith John Allan Boulton – \$400 to visit Japan as an invited guest of students in Japan (October 2010)
- (ii) Livio Davino Petrosino – \$300 to travel to Samoa as part of Project Iva (August 2010)
- (iii) Kayne Leonad Richard Reed – \$300 to travel to Samoa as part of Project Iva (August 2010)
- (iv) In Hoo Jeon – \$400 to attend the 2010 Shanghai International Youth Science and Technology Expo (8–18 July 2010)
- (v) Rhys David Lasorsa – \$400 to attend 13th Grade Nomads Football team Gold Coast skill development tour from the 4–14 July 2010.
- (vi) Rosalie Toese Stewart – \$800 to represent New Zealand under 17 Volleyball team at the Australian Youth Volleyball Championships.
- (vii) Laura Amy Cadigan – \$400 to represent New Zealand at the Australia National Rhythmic Championships being held in Perth from 5–11 July 2010

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

1. That In Hoo Jeon, Rhys David Lasorsa, Rosalie Toese Stewart and Laura Amy Cadigan be funded from the Board's 2009/10 Discretionary Response fund.
2. That Keith John Allan Boulton, Livio Davino Petrosino and Kayne Leonad Richard Reed be funded from the Board's 2010/11 Youth Development Scheme.

10. REDWOOD PARK TREE RENEWAL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment Group DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Lorraine Correia, Consultation Leader

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Shirley/Papanui Community Board for the Redwood Park Tree Renewal Plan following consultation with the local community, as **attached** (LP321505 – Issue 1).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Redwood Park is located in Belfast and is designated as a sports park. The trees in this park have been surveyed and assessed in order to identify trees for immediate and longer term removal and replacement. Landscape issues such as screening and shelter/shade are a focus for tree maintenance, removal and planting in order to maintain and improve upon the general amenity of the park.
3. This tree renewal project resulted from the need to consider replacement planting for the two large Poplars that had failed during high winds and had to be removed from the Sturrocks Road entrance.
4. A tree removal and replacement plan was prepared and circulated to the affected community. The key features of the plan are:
 - (a) Replacement planting of declining Redwood trees along Sturrocks Road.
 - (b) Sustain an effective and attractive screen along Western boundary, near the railway line and around the clubrooms.
 - (c) Maintain an appropriate planting along the Eastern boundary.
 - (d) Maintain an appropriate planting along the boundary with residential properties and the school to the South.
 - (e) Maintain safe planting in the centre of the park between the school and tennis courts.
 - (f) Remove and replace the trees around the Library, Kindergarten and car park adjacent to Main North Road.
5. Some of these trees need to be removed as priority, due to poor or declining condition, and the remainder are to be programmed as part of the current and future LTCCP and as budgets permit. Where trees exist in inappropriate or conflicting locations with residential, school, club or other park areas, they will be considered for future replacement. A mixture of replacement tree species has been chosen for the site. Native, exotic, flowering, nut and deciduous trees were proposed in the consultation plan.
6. The public consultation in March 2010 indicated a good level of support for the proposed concept. The final concept plan, which has been amended slightly in response to feedback from the community, is included as **attached** (LP321505 – Issue 1) and recommended for approval by the Community Board.
7. Implementation of the proposal will take approximately five years to complete. Priority tree removals are scheduled as follows:
 - (a) Priority tree removals and maintenance will commence in summer from October 2010 to March 2011 – Commencing with Areas 8 & 9 and other individuals with a high hazard rating
 - (b) New replacement trees will be planted in winter between May to August 2011 – Commencing with Areas 8 & 9
 - (c) Future work will proceed each subsequent year based on funding availability

10 Cont'd

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

8. Based on current estimates, staff believe there is sufficient funding in the LTCCP 2010/11 to implement the priority tree removals, maintenance and the new replacement trees in areas 8 and 9 as outlined in the final plan. Future funding will be sought after in 2012-22 LTCCP budgets for other work proposed on the plan.

▪ Park Tree Renewal (Capital) Programme	2009/10	\$5,000
▪ Park Tree Renewal (Capital) Programme	2010/11	\$25,000

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

9. All work to be carried out by a Council approved contractor. The Shirley/Papanui Community Board have the delegated authority to approve the proposed plan. No other legal considerations have been identified.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**10. LTCCP 2009-2019****Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Page 116**

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

11. Parks and Open Spaces Activity Management Plan

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**12. Safer Christchurch Strategy**

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

- (a) Ensure the phased adoption of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Principles (CPTED) into city-wide planning and policy;
- (b) To promote CPTED principles for application by owners and occupiers of existing buildings and spaces;

10 Cont'd

- (c) Provide active support to locally led initiatives that make significant contributions to reducing the incidence and effect of crime.

13. Parks and Waterways Access Policy

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

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

Consultation Process & Outcome

- 14. A seminar was held with the Shirley/Papanui Community Board on 3 March 2010. The publicity pamphlet which included the initial concept plan and a feedback form was distributed to approximately 364 residents and other stakeholders for consultation. The consultation period was open for a three week period from 15 March to 2 April 2010, submissions received until 7 April 2010 were also accepted and were included in the consultation document.
- 15. The consultation received 38 responses and community feedback was in general support of the proposal with some residents indicating they had mixed views.
 - (a) 23 submitters responded "YES – I support the tree renewal project".
 - (b) 2 submitters responded "NO – I do not support the tree renewal project".
 - (c) 13 submitters responded "MIXED VIEWS".
- 16. The submissions that indicated that they did 'NOT' support the project thought the money would be better spent on traffic lights on Main North Road and Sturrocks Road or upgrading of footpaths in Rossiter Avenue.
- 17. Several submitters who agreed to the proposal also made the following suggestions:
 - (a) Would like to see more Copper Beeches planted in the park.
 - (b) Two Alder trees causing issues to residents guttering along Woodfield Lane.
 - (c) Concerns about planting walnut and chestnut trees near railway lines could cause some people to throw nuts at passing trains.
 - (d) Ash and Alder trees cause shading and drop rubbish onto property along Woodfield Lane.
- 18. The submissions that indicated that they had mixed views cited the following reasons:
 - (a) Concerns about the proposed removal of the Eucalyptus trees in area nine as they are a wintering place for Monarch butterflies.
 - (b) Concern with regards to replacing proposed trees with low allergen species.
 - (c) Would like the Oak tree on Main North Road retained.
 - (d) Would like to see all the trees plus the new plantings limbed to improve sight lines in the park.
 - (e) Too many deciduous trees proposed – would like to see more shade trees in the park.
 - (f) Don't plant Sweet Chestnuts as users of the park will want to help themselves to the nuts and may end up 'bashing' the trees.
 - (g) Suggestion to plant Kowhais or shrubs.
 - (h) Does not want to see all the Swamp Cypress trees removed.
 - (i) Would like to see a hedge planted to cover the Cricket Clubrooms.
 - (j) Suggestion to plant flowering Cherries near School boundary.
 - (k) Concern about the proposed new Copper Beach trees along Sturrocks Road that would shade property and block drains.
 - (l) Tone down the Redwood theme.

10 Cont'd

19. Following are the project team's responses to the suggestions, concerns and recommendations to the proposal raised in points 17 and 18:
- (a) Included an extra Copper Beech to the South of the Cricket Club.
 - (b) Two Alder trees along Woodfield Lane have been recommended for removal.
 - (c) We do not consider that these nuts could be problematic to passing trains.
 - (d) One Ash and one Alder tree along Woodfield Lane have been recommended for removal and are being replaced with a flowering Cherry tree.
 - (d) The project team have considered the wintering place for the Monarch butterflies, only four of the five Eucalyptus trees have been proposed for removal due to poor health or structure. Consideration will be given to the time of their removals based on the life cycle of the butterflies. We have also considered that there are Eucalyptus trees near the playground and are hoping that the butterflies will find a new habitat in these trees.
 - (e) Trees selected from the Council nursery are currently approved plantings for within Christchurch.
 - (f) The species selected is varied native, exotic, evergreen and deciduous.
 - (g) Fruit and nut trees have been included in this plan as this request has come through from the Community Board. Members of the public are encouraged to help themselves to the fruit and nuts that grow off the trees in the park.
 - (h) We have included the planting of a Kowhai tree in the park.
 - (i) Only the Swamp Cypress trees that are in decline will be removed, the others will be retained.
 - (j) We have included on the plan some replacement trees around the plant bed between the car park and cricket nets as well as a Beech tree on the other side of the building which should help screen part of it.
 - (k) Flowering Cherry trees have been included as part of the plantings near the School boundary.
 - (l) Staff spoke to the concerned resident and advised him that the Copper Beech that is proposed to be planted in this area will take numerous years to reach maturity that would cause shading and as a species tend to pose less maintenance issues than Poplar.
 - (m) The project team have considered that the park being named Redwood Park should have a Redwood theme; the new plantings will mainly replace the existing Redwood trees that are in decline.
20. All respondents have been sent a final letter together with a copy of the revised plan and the consultation document with the project team's response. Details of the Shirley/Papanui Community Board meeting (date, time and venue) were provided to residents wishing to make a deputation to the Board prior to a decision being made; a copy of this letter and consultation document have been circulated separately to the Board members.
21. The final concept plan, which includes the above amendments, is **attached** (LP321505 – Issue 1) and is recommended for approval by the Community Board.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approve the **attached** (LP321505 – Issue 1) plan in order to implement the Redwood Park Tree renewal project.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

11. SHELDON PARK TREE RENEWAL

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, City Environment Group DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Mary Hay, Consultation Leader Tony Armstrong, Arborist

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the approval for the Sheldon Park Tree renewal development plan.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Sheldon Park is located in Belfast and future planning in the draft Belfast Area Plan identifies the park as the 'hub' of the area. The trees in Sheldon Park have been surveyed and assessed in order to identify trees for immediate and longer term removal and replacement. Landscape issues such as screening and shelter/shade are a focus for tree maintenance, removal and planting in order to maintain and improve upon the general amenity of the park.
3. A tree removal and replacement plan was prepared and circulated to the affected community. The plan aims to:
 - (a) Preserve and enhance the Redwood tree theme in the park.
 - (b) Sustain an effective and attractive screen along eastern boundary, near the railway line.
 - (c) Maintain an appropriate planting along the waterway area to the south.
 - (d) Maintain safe planting in the vicinity of the playground in the south west of the park.
 - (e) Address the declining condition of the Silver birch trees outside the rugby clubrooms and in the north east corner in general. Note: the removal of the two Silver birch trees immediately east of the Belfast Rugby Club's changing rooms has already been approved as part of an application to extend the club's leased area.
 - (f) Plan for the long term removal/replacement of Lombardy poplars at south western entrance.
 - (g) Plan for removal/replacement of trees in Area 15 and general enhancement of trees surrounding open space and other recreational areas.
4. It is proposed to remove trees in poor or declining condition as a high priority. Where trees exist in inappropriate or conflicting locations with residential, school, club or other park areas, they have been considered for future replacement. A mixture of tree species has been chosen for the site. Native trees, such as Kowhai and Totara will be planted near the waterway, the accesses and near the tennis courts. A number of exotic tree species are suggested to complement the existing trees in the park.
5. The public consultation in March/April 2010 indicated a good level of support for the proposed concept. The final concept plan, which has been amended slightly in response to feedback from the community, is included as **attachment 1** and recommended for approval by the Community Board.
6. Implementation of the proposal will take approximately 5-10 years to complete. Priority tree removals are scheduled as follows:
 - (a) Tree maintenance will begin next summer (October 2010 to March 2011).
 - (b) Replacement planting will proceed in the subsequent winter (May-August 2011).
 - (c) Future work will proceed each subsequent year as funding is prioritised.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The priority works in Sheldon Park are programmed in the LTCCP for implementation in the 2011/12 and 2012/13 financial years.
8. Based on current estimates, staff believe there is sufficient funding in the budget to implement the proposed plan.

11 Cont'd

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

9. Yes. Funding is provided from within the Park Tree Renewal Programme in the 2009-19 LTCCP

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

10. The Community Boards have the following delegation with respect to trees:

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

11. The following City Plan Policies apply –

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.

4.2.2 Policy: Garden City

To recognise and promote the "Garden City" identity, heritage and character of Christchurch

4.3.2 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

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

12. All work will be carried out by a Council approved contractor with the appropriate health and safety and work site management controls in place.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. **LTCCP 2009-2019
Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Page 116**

Safety – by ensuring our parks, open spaces and waterways are healthy and safe places;

Community – by providing welcoming areas for communities to gather and interact;

Governance – by involving people in decision-making about parks, open spaces and waterways;

Health – By providing areas for people to engage in healthy activities;

Recreation – by offering a range of recreational opportunities in parks, open spaces and waterways;

City Development – by providing an inviting, pleasant and well cared-for environment

11 Cont'd

14. Parks and Open Spaces Activity Management Plan

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

15. Safer Christchurch Strategy

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

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

16. Parks and Waterways Access Policy

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

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

Consultation Process

17. The project team developed a concept plan and advised the Community Board, at a seminar on 17 February 2010, that they would be seeking public feedback on this. This seminar also sought feedback from Board members about stakeholders in this project.
18. The community consultation was open from 24 March to 12 May 2010. A public information leaflet was delivered to approximately 380 local residents and a number of other interest groups and key stakeholders. This leaflet included a summary of the concept, an initial concept plan and a feedback form. The project team sought feedback from the community to see whether the proposal was supported and asked for any comments. Also included was an offer to meet onsite, if requested. The proposal was posted on the CCC Have Your Say website.
19. Each submission received an interim reply letter, which acknowledged that the submission had been received and that it would be considered, once the consultation period had closed. Submitters were also advised that they would receive further correspondence prior to a decision being made. This would outline the outcome of consultation, the project team's preferred concept plan, the decision making process and how they could be involved in this and the expected timeline for the project.

Consultation Outcome

20. The consultation on the concept plan received 23 responses (6% response rate), which is a low response to this proposed concept. The feedback received was largely supportive of the proposal, as indicated by the following:

11 Cont'd

Number of respondents	Feedback option selected
14 respondents (61%)	<i>"YES – I fully support the proposal"</i>
8 respondents (35%)	<i>"MIXED VIEWS – I have some concerns that I would like to be considered"</i>
0 respondents (0%)	<i>"NO – I completely oppose the proposal"</i>
1 respondents (4%)	No preference indicated

21. The quantitative responses above clearly indicate support for the proposal, with 61% indicating that they fully support the proposal and 0% completely opposed to it. Numerous positive comments were also received about this proposal.
22. A range of issues were raised in the consultation and each of these has been responded to by the project team. A schedule of the community feedback and project team responses will be circulated to submitters and elected members, prior to the meeting.
23. Two submitters sought the retention of the willow near the southern entrance to the park – the project team notes that immediate removal of the willow is not required, but it will be pruned as required and if it loses a limb or dies back it will need to be removed. It is proposed to replace it with a Dawn Redwood, which will also provide shade.
24. Belfast School has sought the removal of at least two, and ideally four, large Redwood trees that are located boundary of the school (between the pool and the school). The Arborist and Consultation Leader met with the principal of the school to discuss their concerns and aspirations about these trees. The school's primary concern is that the line of large Redwood trees create shading on the school's hard court area, creating an issue with ice on this play area, restricts light to the classrooms and does not allow an open view into the pool area. They have asked that two to four of these trees be removed. The Arborist advised that these trees have significant landscape values for the area and are an integral park of the park's treescape. The Arborist does not recommend that any of these trees be removed but advised that these trees will be monitored and pruned as required. He advised that considerable benefit could be gained by removing other large trees which are on the school's boundary. It is noted by the project team that the retention of the Redwoods was one of the aims of the project and this has been supported by feedback received from the community.
25. The project team considered this consultation feedback and revised the concept in the following way:
 - (a) In response to feedback from the community, an alternative species to Kowhai, such as Cherry, will be planned for Area one.
 - (b) Clarification of species to such as Dogwood and Magnolia will be planned in Area two, in response to feedback from the community.
 - (c) A setback of three metres of the fence line adjacent to Area four will be maintained, to ensure a visible area to the adjacent storage facility is retained for security reasons (this allows for a two metre planting strip and a three metre setback for playing field).
 - (d) In response to feedback from the community, no additional planting in Area 10.
 - (e) In Area 11 two groups of six kowhai will be planted, grouped either side of entrance, in order to replace existing exotic trees to be removed because of poor condition.
 - (f) An additional Alder on the southern boundary of the park, adjacent to Area 12, will be tagged for removal, as a result of a resident request.
26. The final concept plan, which includes the above amendments, is included as **attachment 1**.

11 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approve the **attached** plan in order to implement the Sheldon Park Tree renewal project.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

12. REQUEST FOR FUNDING WESTMINSTER SPORTS INC

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941 8607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager Recreation and Sport Unit
Author:	Helen Miles Community Recreation Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a funding application to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board to be considered under discretionary funds for the Westminster Sports. Westminster Sports is requesting \$17,000 to assist with the costs of employing a KiwiSports co-ordinator.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Westminster Sports Incorporated (WSI) was established in July 2006. The organisation combines the interests of a number of sports clubs and organisations clustered around Christchurch Park/Westminster Park on Westminster Street, Mairehau. The clubs and organisations that form the membership of WSI cover eight different codes. In total around 2,412 people are members of WSI's constituent clubs. The vision of WSI is "To enhance and encourage the participation of our members and the community by providing appropriate facilities and leadership".
3. KiwiSport is a new fund that aims to increase the numbers of school-age children participating in organised sport. It is expected that this programme will be run both in and out of school hours. It is hoped that this programme will strengthen links with the sports clubs and the schools especially during out of school hours. It is envisaged that the fund will increase the availability and accessibility of sport opportunities for all school-aged children and support children in developing skills that will enable them to participate effectively in sport at both primary and secondary level.
4. Canterbury West Coast Sports Trust undertook an extensive community consultation to identify priorities for Regional Project Fund investment. A top priority was the establishment of "KiwiSport Coordinators" in local communities. It is anticipated that these positions will be funded through the utilisation of the KiwiSport Direct Fund (money from schools), the Regional Partnership Fund as well as additional locally based funding to coordinate the delivery of sport at a community level.
5. The Westminster KiwiSport Coordinator will be responsible for increasing the number of primary school-aged children participating in in-school and out-of-school organised sport, increasing skills and improving the linkages between schools and other community groups/clubs. It is planned that the KiwiSport Coordinator will be working daily in a cluster of eight primary and intermediate schools in the Shirley/Papanui ward. These schools are Mairehau Primary, Glenmoor School, Hammersley Park, Our Lady of Fatima, Shirley Intermediate, St Albans Catholic, and St Albans School.
6. The eight schools have all had discussions with Westminster sports and agree in principal to supporting a Kiwi sport position. The total roll numbers for this cluster is 1913 children. Westminster sports is still working on the details on what this programme would look like however it is their intention and objective deliver the following outcomes;
 - Develop cluster based school/community sports competitions
 - Support Fundamentals programmes, teacher professional development and coach education, establishment of in school and after school programmes
 - Linking of children to clubs/community groups
 - Introducing children to secondary school sport
 - Starting to address the issue of transportation (getting kids to sports events)
 - WSI expect to establish this position before the start of term four. With programmes commencing at the start of term four.

12 Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The Shirley Papanui Community Board currently have \$11,928 in their 2009/10 Discretionary Response fund available to allocation.

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

8. Yes, see page 172, Discretionary Fund.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. Not applicable

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

10. Not applicable

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. Page 176 of the LTCCP, level of service under Community Board funding Strong Communities.

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

12. Recommendation is in line with Community board discretionary budget and meets level of support within strong communities

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

13. Community and Strengthening Communities Strategy

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Yes

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. Not applicable

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board approve a grant of \$11,928 from their 2009/10 discretionary funds to go towards the KiwiSport Coordinator salary subject to monies received from the Sport Canterbury Regional Partnership fund and from the Schools KiwiSports direct funding pool.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

13. CHRISTCHURCH PUBLIC SERVICE CHILDCARE CENTRE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager, Community Services Group DDI 9418607
Officer responsible:	Unit Manager, Community Support Unit
Author:	Bruce Meder, Community Development Adviser

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present a request for funding of \$25,000 from the Christchurch Public Service Childcare Centre Inc. (t/a Forfar Nursery and Preschool) to the Shirley/Papanui Community Board from its Discretionary Response Fund.
2. The request is for \$25,000 towards the cost of providing further car park space at the Preschool.
3. There is currently a balance of \$11,928 remaining in the Boards 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4. The Christchurch Public Service Childcare Centre Inc. (trading as Forfar Nursery and Preschool) is located in Forfar Street, St Albans. The Centre has been in existence since 1989.
5. The Centre is licensed to cater for 47 children. There are 68 families with 83 children who utilise these spaces. Around 60% of the children come from the Shirley/Papanui Ward with most of the remainder coming from Burwood/Pegasus Ward. The Centre is open from 7.30 am to 5.30 pm five days a week over 50 weeks of the year. Fees - \$6.50 per hour with a minimum booking of 3 hours.
6. In January 2008 the Centre had a fire on the premises which caused considerable damage and meant they had to close for three months. During the process of rebuilding and obtaining consents it was found that in order to comply with a Resource Consent the Centre needed to provide seven extra car parks. The Centre has obtained two quotes for this work and wishes to accept the lower of these; \$46,127 (plus GST). The upgrade will mean that there is more off-street parking for parents as well as a disability car park.
7. The Centre hopes to begin this work in June and expects the work to take three weeks to complete. During construction the entrance area will be a hazardous area and so temporary fencing will be needed at this time to safeguard children and parents/caregivers.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

8. The Centre is located in the middle of a mixed area of deprivation. The proportion of children aged under five years in the immediate vicinity is higher than the city average.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. The Christchurch Public Service Childcare Centre provides the following with respect to the costs of the car park upgrade:

Costs (incl GST)	\$51,893
Funds on hand	\$18,893
User fees	\$ 5,000
Other grants	\$ 3,000
S/P community Board	\$25,000
TOTAL	\$51,893

13 Cont'd

10. The latest Annual Audited Accounts of the Centre show an annual turnover of almost \$900,000 with a surplus of \$9,700. Their balance sheet showed a term deposit of \$280,000, however, this figure appears high because of the nature of bulk funding that the Centre obtains from the Ministry of Education (MoE). MoE bulk funding cannot be used for the purposes for which this application is made.
11. The Centre also needs to put some funds aside over the next two years to enable the Centre to be repainted and to provide for building repairs.
12. There is currently a balance of \$11,928 remaining in the Boards 2009/10 Discretionary Response Fund.

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

13. Yes page 184

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

14. Yes

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

15. 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?

16. Yes Strengthening Communities page 172 (2009-19 LTCCP).

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

17. 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.

This application helps to meet the following goals of the Strengthening Communities Strategy:

Ensuring that communities have access to community facilities that meet their needs

It also helps to meet the following Community Board objectives:

- Embraces diversity and strives to facilitate and advocate for a vibrant and engaged community without barriers to inclusion.
- Supports local lifelong learning opportunities in all forms and advocates for resources to empower all residents to up skill and grow.

DO THE RECOMMENDATIONS ALIGN WITH THE COUNCIL

18. Strengthening Communities Strategy

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

19. Not applicable.

13 Cont'd

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Shirley/Papanui Community Board agree to grant \$11,928 from its 2009/10 Discretionary Response fund to the Christchurch Public Service Childcare Centre Inc (t/a Forfar Nursery and Preschool) towards the upgrade of their car parking facility.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the application from the Christchurch Public Service Childcare Centre be declined due to insufficient funds being available and that priority funding for preschools is for Council Lessees

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

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

The amendments to the Proposed Tree Policy included changes to –

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

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

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

14 Cont'd

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

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

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

16. The recommendations align with the current LTCCP budgets.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

14 Cont'd

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

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

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

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

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

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

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

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

- 25. There is currently no overarching city wide policy for vegetation management. In the Memorandum from the Tree Policy Working Party (**attachment 2**) it is suggested that funding for the commencement of a City wide policy be included for consideration in the next LTCCP.

14 Cont'd

26. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with the following Strategies–

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

27. The Proposed Tree Policy aligns with Council Policies –

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

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

Volume 2: Section 4 City Identity.

4.2.1 Policy: Tree Cover.

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

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

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

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

4.2.2 Policy: Garden City

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

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

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

14.3.2 Policy: “Garden City” image identity.

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

14 Cont'd

Volume 3: Part 8 Special Purpose Zone

14.3.5 Street Trees

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

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Greenspace Manager:

"In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control. (CR 23.10.96)"

Community Boards:

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

14 Cont'd

(f) That the Board recommends to the Council that the following changes to delegations be made-

That the following delegations for the policy be made:

- (i) The Transport and Greenspace Manager on the recommendation of the City Arborist and relevant infrastructure Manager where appropriate has delegated authority for the planting of trees under Section 3.3 and the removal of trees under Section 3.4 and the pruning of trees under Section 3.7 of this policy.
- (ii) The relevant Community Board has delegated authority in consultation with the Transport and Greenspace Manager and relevant infrastructure Manager to decide on any tree matter that either falls outside of the Transport and Greenspace Manager's delegation or, after consultation with affected parties, has remained contentious and is unable to be resolved by the Transport and Greenspace Manager.
- (iii) In emergency situations, the Transport and Greenspace Manager or the City Arborist have full delegated powers to negate immediate danger.
- (iv) Where the relevant Community Board and the Transport and Greenspace Manager do not agree on the recommended course of action, the matter will be referred to the Council for a decision.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

14 Cont'd

BACKGROUND

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

Currently delegations are:

Greenspace Manager -

"In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of trees from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control. (CR 23.10.96)"

Community Boards -

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

33. Changes were suggested to enable:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 Cont'd

Val Carter	Fendalton/Waimairi
Stewart Miller	Akaroa/Wairewa
Linda Stewart	Burwood/Pegasus
Karolyn Potter	Spreydon/Heathcote
Tim Scandrett	Spreydon/Heathcote (proxy)

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

14 Cont'd

- (ii) The relevant Community Board has delegated authority in consultation with the Transport and Greenspace Manager and relevant infrastructure Manager to decide on any tree matter that either falls outside of the Transport and Greenspace Manager's delegation or, after consultation with affected parties, has remained contentious and is unable to be resolved by the Transport and Greenspace Manager.

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

The suggested amendments were –

3.1 Tree Management

Delete - "ecology - by"

Insert - "Enhancing and protecting the surrounding environment and safeguarding biodiversity"

3.4 Removal of Trees in Public Spaces

- (i) Delete - "significant" and insert "have only a minor detrimental effect".
- (k) Insert - "Control of roadside pests that are listed in the Canterbury Regional Pest Management Strategy 2005-2015 in Banks Peninsula remain the responsibility of the adjacent land owner".
- (m) Insert - "that is not listed as a threatened or endangered species either locally or nationally or internationally".

Section 4 - Relevant Delegations

Insert - paragraph 3

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

6. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

15. CORRESPONDENCE

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

16. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE

16.1 CURRENT ISSUES

16.2 UPDATE ON LOCAL CAPITAL PROJECTS

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

16.3 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE FOR 2009/10 (attached).

16.4 CSR REPORT FOR MAY 2010 (attached).

17. ELECTED MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

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

18. MEMBERS QUESTION

19. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Attached