

**BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD  
AGENDA**

**MONDAY 15 JUNE 2009**

**AT 5.00 PM**

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

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

**Community Board Adviser**  
Peter Dow  
Phone 941 5305 DDI  
Email: peter.dow@ccc.govt.nz

**PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**

**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

<b>INDEX</b>	<b>PG NO</b>		
<b>PART C</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 2 JUNE 2009</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>
		<b>3.1</b>	<b>Mairehau Road – Request For Pedestrian Refuge Island</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.</b>	<b>PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5.</b>	<b>NOTICE OF MOTION</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6.</b>	<b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7.</b>	<b>BRIEFINGS</b>
		<b>7.1</b>	<b>Transport and Greenspace Unit</b>
<b>PART A</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8.</b>	<b>POLICY OF VEHICLE ENTRANCES AND FOOTPATH REVIEW</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>9.</b>	<b>UNION STREET – PROPOSED BUS STOP UPGRADE</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>10.</b>	<b>DELAMARE PARK - TREE REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT PLANTING – REPORT BACK</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>11.</b>	<b>BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD’S 2008/09 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – PROPOSED ALLOCATION FOR CRIME CAMERA AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>12.</b>	<b>BURWOOD/PEGASUS 2008/09 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUNDING SCHEME - CHARRYL MOODY - APPLICATION</b>

**We're on the Web!**

[www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/](http://www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/)

15. 6. 2009

- 2 -

- |               |           |            |   |
|---------------|-----------|------------|---|
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>34</b> | <b>13.</b> | <b>BURWOOD/PEGASUS 2008/09 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUNDING SCHEME – TEGAN MADDEN – APPLICATION</b>    |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>37</b> | <b>14.</b> | <b>KEEP NEW ZEALAND BEAUTIFUL CONFERENCE 2009 – BOARD MEMBER ATTENDANCE</b>                     |
| <b>PART C</b> | <b>38</b> | <b>15.</b> | <b>BURWOOD/PEGASUS ARTWORKS IN PUBLIC PLACES SUBCOMMITTEE - MEETING REPORT OF 23 APRIL 2009</b> |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>40</b> | <b>16.</b> | <b>RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS</b>  |
|               |           |            | <b>16.1 Crossfire Youth With A Future Trust</b>   |
|               |           |            | <b>16.2 South New Brighton Residents' Association</b>   |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>40</b> | <b>17.</b> | <b>COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE</b>   |
| <b>PART B</b> | <b>40</b> | <b>18.</b> | <b>BOARD MEMBER'S QUESTIONS</b>   |

**1. APOLOGIES**

**2. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 2 JUNE 2009**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of 2 June 2009, are **attached**.

**3. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

**3.1 MAIREHAU ROAD – REQUEST FOR PEDESTRIAN REFUGE ISLAND**

Kath Hamilton, Electorate Agent for Hon Lianne Dalziel MP, will address the Board on behalf of a constituent requesting that the Council give consideration to providing a pedestrian refuge island in Mairehau Road in the vicinity of Inwoods Road.

**4. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

**5. NOTICES OF MOTION**

**6. CORRESPONDENCE**

**7. BRIEFINGS**

**7.1 TRANSPORT AND GREENSPACE UNIT**

Alan Beuzenberg, Manager, Transport and Greenspace Unit, will be in attendance at 6pm to brief the Board on the role and work of his Unit.

15. 6. 2009

- 4 -

ATTACHMENT TO CLAUSE 2

9. 7. 2009

**BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD  
2 JUNE 2009**

**Minutes of a meeting of the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board  
held on Tuesday 2 June 2009 at 5.04pm in the Board Room,  
corner Beresford and Union Streets, New Brighton.**

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

**APOLOGIES:** Nil.

The Board reports that:

**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**1. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

Nil.

**2. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS**

Nil.

**3. NOTICES OF MOTION**

Nil.

**4. CORRESPONDENCE**

The Board **received** tabled correspondence from the Christchurch City Council thanking the Board for its submission on the Proposal for Funding the Social Housing Portfolio and included also a copy of the Council's decision made on the matter.

**5. BRIEFINGS**

Nil.

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

The Board **received** an update on:

- Board related activity over the coming weeks including the June dates for the Celebrate Matariki at Nga Hau E Wha Marae event and the function details for the presentation of the Burwood/Pegasus 2009 Community Service Awards.
- Central New Brighton – Plan Change 27 – Council Decision.

15. 6. 2009

- 5 -

**ATTACHMENT TO CLAUSE 2 Cont'd**

- Burwood/Pegasus Community News Update – May 2009. A copy of the Board's feature article in the Pegasus Post and Pegasus Bay News was circulated to members for their information.

Members were invited to suggest items for inclusion in future issues covering the June to August 2009 period.

**7. BOARD MEMBER'S QUESTIONS**

Nil.

**PART C - REPORT ON DELEGATED DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE BOARD**

**8. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 18 MAY 2009**

The Board **resolved** that the minutes of its ordinary meeting of 18 May 2009 (both open and public excluded sections), be confirmed.

The meeting concluded at 5.12pm.

**CONFIRMED THIS 15TH DAY OF JUNE 2009**

**DAVID EAST  
CHAIRMAN**



## 8. POLICY OF VEHICLE ENTRANCES AND FOOTPATH - REVIEW

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Asset Planning and Network Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Weng Kei Chen, Asset Policy Engineer

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's recommendation to the Council regarding options in relation to the review of the existing policy of vehicle entrances and footpaths.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council resolved at its 13 March 2008 meeting to "undertake a review of the existing policy of vehicle entrances and footpaths."
3. The Council's current policy "That the Council will maintain vehicle entrances on roads with an adjacent footpath," was adopted on 25 May 2001.

The reasons for the current policy are:

- (a) Vehicle crossings adjacent to footpaths is recognised as integral part of the footpath system and thus registered as a footpath asset.
  - (b) Vehicle crossings where there is no footpath is directly attributable to the property owner rather than to the public good.
4. The Council's Traffic Bylaws 2008 Part 4 Vehicle crossing and Section 335 of Local Government 1974 Act requires owners of properties to form vehicle crossings.
  5. A previous review of the policy was carried out in 2004 and the Council at its meeting on 23 September 2004 resolved "that the current policy be confirmed". The reports of May 2001, September 2004 and December 2008 are included as **Attachments 1, 2 and 3**.
  6. The issues relating to the maintenance and resurfacing of vehicle entrances, not adjacent to footpaths was raised by the Riccarton/Wigram and Fendalton/Waimari Community Boards in 2007. The key issue being "Where there is a footpath on only one side of the road the current level of service is to only resurface driveways on the footpath side of the road. The driveways on the opposite side of the road do not get resurfaced."
  7. A Council seminar on the policy was held on 28 September 2007. The views of elected representatives on the current policy were mixed and staff did stress that any increased level of service would require additional funding. The Council requested staff to review the policy and in particular look at a potential change in level of service that applies to the flat urban part of the city only.

### OPTIONS

8. The policy review has considered **three** potential options:
  - (i) Status quo with the current policy reconfirmed.
  - (ii) The status quo remains for the hills and rural areas, with a change in the level of service for the urban flat areas of the city.
  - (iii) Change in the level of service throughout the Council's area.

In determining the implications of a change in the level of service options, the following issues have been brought to the attention of members.

8. Cont'd

9. Status quo with the policy reconfirmed.
  - The Council will continue to receive complaints from property owners when footway resurfacing works are undertaken on a particular road or street and their driveways are not included.
  - The budgets included in the Draft LTCCP (Long Term Council Community Plan) support the status quo option.
10. Status quo remains for the hills and rural areas, with a change in the level of service for the urban flat areas of the city.
  - As part of the review, external consultants MWH were commissioned to report on the cost implications of changing the level of service associated with the footpath re-surfacing programme. In the review, the footpath resurfacing programme for 2008/09 (refer **Attachment 4**), excluding the rural area, was used to estimate the additional funding required to resurface driveways on the opposite side to where there are no footpaths. An estimated cost of \$250,000 was attributed to resurfacing of these vehicle crossings.
  - In the urban flat area of the city there are a number of property accesses across waterways supported by existing structures e.g. pipes, culverts, or bridges that will require some maintenance works or their replacements, prior to resurfacing. It is estimated that \$50,000 per annum will be required to upgrade these structures prior to resurfacing works, this figure is an estimate only and could significantly increase once a detailed asset register has been compiled.
  - An increase in the maintenance budget of \$100,000 will be required.
  - Work will be required to clearly define the level of service to be adopted on a street/road basis.
  - The option provides for differing level of service within the Council's area, some property owners are likely to complain that this unfair.
11. Change in the level of service throughout the Council's area.
  - A change in the level of service that includes resurfacing of all vehicle entrances on legal roads will require an increase in the current resurfacing budget. The current resurfacing budget to resurface approximately 90 kilometres of footpath annually is \$4.45 million and this would need to be increased by \$400,000 per annum.
  - Across the city area there are property accesses supported by retaining structures on roads. It is estimated that \$150,000 per annum will be required to upgrade these structures prior to surfacing the accesses on legal road. Again this is a high-level estimate only and could significantly increase once the details of the assets are known.
  - For any change to the existing policy there will also be a need to review the current footpath operational repairs and maintenance budget of \$1.45 million per annum. Currently it is estimated that \$500,000 of the \$1.45 million is attributed to maintaining the vehicle crossings that form the footpath network.
  - The maintenance budget needs to be increased by \$300,000 per annum.
  - The level of service is common across the Council's area.
12. Currently the stand alone vehicle entrances i.e. without footpath adjacent to them, are not considered to be the Council's infrastructural assets to maintain, and hence are not included in the Council's asset register. Any change to the policy will require these "new" assets to be identified. Depreciation allowances for these assets will need to be included for any increase to the current level of service.
13. Any change in the level of service without any increase in funding will lead to a decreased level of service and an increase in the current footway resurfacing cycle from its existing 23 years cycle.

**8. Cont'd**

14. It must be noted that if a change of policy was agreed there will be a significant change to the management of this section of the Council's asset. The safe use of the entrances over waterways and supports to driveways would become the Council's responsibility. The management of these additional assets will be complex in particular the responsibility for the structural integrity of timber bridges across waterways, 'dry rock' walls supporting driveways on legal roads. There would be a need to review staff resources to manage these structures appropriately.
15. The responsibility for maintaining vehicle entrances on legal roads has always been a contentious issue and it is for this reason that the Council formally adopted the current practices as policy in 2001.
16. Any change of policy will potentially generate additional requests to maintain vehicle entrances from residents residing on roads that have no footpaths.
17. In the consultant's review it included a survey of the policies of five other Councils and the findings were:
- (a) Waimakariri, North Shore and Wellington have similar policies to Christchurch's existing policy;
  - (b) Napier has a policy to maintain driveways on legal roads for visual appearance;
  - (c) Auckland City is replacing asphaltic concrete footpaths with exposed aggregate concrete and will be replacing the old driveways to achieve uniformity.
18. It must be noted that any change of the present policy will require changes to both operational and capital works budgets for footpath resurfacing. Without appropriate budgets staff will not be able to deliver the change of level of service required.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

19. Summary of Additional Cost Implications

	Annual (\$000K)			
	Footpath resurfacing Capital Maintenance budget.	Maintenance of structures, culverts, etc.	Footpath operational, repairs and maintenance.	Total
Option 1 Status Quo	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Option 2 Status quo for Hills and rural areas, change in level of service for urban flat area.	\$250	\$50	\$100	\$400
Option 3 Change in level of service Throughout Council area.	\$400	\$150	\$300	\$850

20. There is currently no allowance in the Draft 2009/19 LTCCP to change the policy on private driveway resurfacing.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

21. The recommendations of the report could have an impact on the 2009/19 LTCCP budgets.



8. Cont'd

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

22. Sections 316, 317, and 319 of the Local Government Act 1974 confer a number of powers over roads on the Council. Specifically, section 316 (1) vests local roads in the Council, while section 317(1) provides that all roads in the district are under the control of the Council (excluding State Highways). Section 319 gives the Council power to do certain things in respect of roads (e.g. constructing and repairing roads etc). Section 319 (a) of the Local Government Act 1974 confers a power on the council *"to construct, upgrade and repair all roads with such materials and in such manner as the council thinks fit."* The section only confers a power to construct, upgrade and repair any road, rather than an express duty to do so.
23. These sections need to be read in light of the common law. The Courts have held that proceedings cannot be brought against a local authority for failure to maintain and repair a road even though a statute gives the Council the power to repair it. This is known as the "non-feasance rule." The rule is subject to a number of technical qualifications but it has a long history in New Zealand and other jurisdictions. In the last few years the non-feasance rule has been the subject of criticism. It has now been rejected in Australia. In England, the rule has been abolished since 1961 and a positive repair obligation has been placed on highway authorities. However, in the opinion of the Legal Services Unit, the rule is still good law in New Zealand until a court says otherwise or the rule is changed by statute.
24. The opposite of the non-feasance rule is the misfeasance rule. Once the Council decides to reconstruct or repair a road, then it is obliged to exercise reasonable care in the performance of its self-imposed task.

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

25. Yes. The current policy that the Council will maintain vehicle entrances on roads with a footpath complies with the Local Government Act 1974 and is consistent with the non-feasance and misfeasance rules. The Council has a power to maintain and repair footpaths and vehicle entrance ways but it is not under a duty to do so. If the Council exercises its power to maintain footpaths and vehicle entrance ways it must do so with reasonable care and skill.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

26. This review is to consider a potential change to the of level of service

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

27. Not applicable.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

28. If any significant changes are to be made to the existing Policy this will effectively initiate a change in level of service and therefore appropriate consultation will be part of a future LTCCP review or Annual Plan update.

**8. Cont'd**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board recommend to the Council:

- (a) To consider the options outlined in the report,
- (b) Decide which option should be adopted, requesting changes to be made to appropriate budgets for the 2009/19 LTCCP,  
  
or alternatively;
- (c) Identify the preferred long term policy and request staff to undertake a detailed analysis of the preferred option so that it can be adopted for the 2012/22 LTCCP.

## 11. POLICY OF VEHICLE ENTRANCES AND FOOTPATH REVIEW



<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, City Environment DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Asset Planning & Network Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Weng Kei Chen, Asset Policy Engineer

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is in response to the Council's resolution passed at the meeting of 13 March 2008 *"that the Council undertake a review of the existing policy of vehicle entrances and footpaths"*.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The current Council policy "That the Council will maintain vehicle entrances on roads with a footpath" was adopted on 25 May 2001. The reasons for the policy are:
  - (a) Vehicle crossing adjacent to footpaths is recognised as an integral part of the footpath system and thus registered as a footpath asset.
  - (b) Vehicle crossing where there is no footpath is directly attributable to the property owner rather than to the public good.
3. The Council's Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 Part 4 Vehicle Crossing and Section 335 of the Local Government Act 1974 requires owners of properties to form vehicle crossings.
4. A review of the policy was carried out in 2004 and the Council at its meeting of 23 September 2004 resolved *"that the current policy be confirmed"*. The reports of May 2001 and September 2004 are **attached**.
5. The maintenance and resurfacing of vehicle entrances, not adjacent to footpaths, was raised by the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board as well as the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board in 2007. A seminar on the policy was carried out on 28 September 2007. The views of elected representatives on the policy matters were mixed and staff did stress that any increased level of service would require additional funding.
6. As part of this review external consultant Montgomery Watson Harza (MWH) was commissioned to report on the cost implications of changing the level of service associated with the footpath re-surfacing programme. "Where there is a footpath on only one side of the road the current level of service is to only resurface driveways on the footpath side of the road. The driveways on the opposite side of the road do not get resurfaced."
7. In this review the footpath resurfacing programme 2008/09 excluding the rural area was used to estimate the additional funding required to resurface driveways on the opposite side where there are no footpaths. An estimated cost of \$250,000 was attributed to resurfacing of these vehicle crossings. No cost estimates were made for pipes, culverts, bridges and retaining walls replacements. The 2008/09 programme has no footpath resurfacing work programmed along the frontages of properties adjacent to waterways or in the older hill areas where long vehicle entrances are frequently encountered on legal roads.
8. There are a number of property accesses across waterways and the existing structures e.g. pipes, culverts, or bridges that will require some maintenance works or their replacements prior to resurfacing and likewise for hill properties' accesses with retaining structures within the road reserve. It is estimated that at least \$150,000 per annum will be required for upgrading these structures.
9. If there is a change to the existing policy that includes resurfacing of all vehicle entrances on legal roads there will be a need to increase the current resurfacing budget. The current resurfacing budget to resurface approximately 90km of footpath annually is \$4.45M and this would need to be increased by \$400,000 per annum.

**ATTACHMENT 1 TO CLAUSE 8 Cont'd**

10. For any change to the existing policy there will also be a need to review the current footpath operational maintenance budget of \$1.45M p.a. Currently it is estimated that \$500,000 of the \$1.45M is attributed to maintaining the vehicle crossings that formed the footpath network. If there is a change of policy to include resurfacing vehicle entrances as stated in paragraph 9 an increase of \$300,000 p.a. will be required for the maintenance budget. Currently these stand alone vehicle entrances i.e. without footpath adjacent to them are not considered to be the Council's infrastructural assets to maintain and hence are not included in the Council's asset register. Any change of policy will require these "new " assets to be identified. Depreciation cost for these assets will need to be included for any increase to the current level of service.
11. The change of service level without any increase in funding will lead to a decreased level of service increasing the current resurfacing cycle from 23 years to approximately 26 years and this option is not supported by staff.
12. The current policy has satisfied the majority of the city residents. However, from time to time staff do receive some complaints from residents, but by and large the majority of them reluctantly accept the staff's explanation of the policy.
13. It must be noted that if the change of policy was agreed there will be a significant change to the management of this section of the Council's asset. The safe use of the entrances over waterways and supports to driveways will become the Council's responsibility. The management of these new assets will be complex, in particular the responsibility of structural integrity of timber bridges across waterways, 'dry rock 'walls supporting driveways on legal roads. There will also be a need to review staff resources to manage these structures.
14. The responsibility of maintaining vehicle entrances on legal roads has always been a contentious issue and it is for this reason that the Council formally adopted its practice as policy in 2001.
15. Any change of policy will potentially generate additional requests to maintain vehicle entrances from residents residing on roads that have no footpath.
16. In the consultant's review it included a survey of five other councils' policies and the findings were:
  - (a) Waimakariri, North Shore and Wellington Councils have similar policies as Christchurch's existing policies.
  - (b) Napier has a policy to maintain driveways on legal roads for visual appearance.
  - (c) Auckland City Council is replacing asphaltic concrete footpaths with exposed aggregate concrete and will be replacing the old driveways to achieve uniformity.
17. It must be noted that any change of the present policy will require changes to both Operation and Capital Works budget for footpath resurfacing. Without appropriate budgets staff will not be able to deliver the change of level of service required.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

18. If the Council is to increase the current level of service to include resurfacing of all vehicle entrances on legal roads there will be a need to increase the annual capital budget for footpath resurfacing of \$4.45M by \$400,000 and the footpath maintenance of \$1.45M by \$300,000 and provide for additional depreciation costs of \$200,000.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

19. The projected increased costs for the change of the current footpath resurfacing policy to include resurfacing of all vehicle entrances on legal roads have been included in the aspiration list in the LTCCP process.

**ATTACHMENT 1 TO CLAUSE 8 Cont'd**

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

20. The Council received the following legal opinion in 1975:

“The Council has no legal obligation to maintain the surface of the access track any more that it has an obligation to maintain any other part of the public highway.”

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

21. Yes.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

22. This review is to consider the change of level of service.

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

23. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Council confirm the existing Footpath Policy.

ATTACHMENT TO CLAUSE 11 COUNCIL 19.12.2008

**5. RESURFACING OF VEHICLE ENTRANCES**

<b>Officer responsible</b> Transport and City Streets Manager	<b>Author</b> Weng-Kai Chen, Asset Policy Engineer, DDI 941-8655
--	---

The purpose of this report is to present information on the issues, options and additional costs of maintaining vehicle entrances as requested by the Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee at its March 2004 meeting.

**BACKGROUND**

In March 2004 the Committee considered a report advising of the request from the Fendalton/Waimairi and Riccarton/Wigram Community Boards that the Committee review the current policy/practice on the maintenance of vehicle entrances.

The report advised the Committee of the recommendations passed at recent meetings of the two Community Boards and the receipt of a petition from residents in Harkness Place to the Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board in November 2003.

The report noted that this policy had been considered by the Council in May 2001 and attached a copy of the report considered by the Committee at that time. In addition it updated the costs that had been included in that report in respect to the additional budget provision required for implementing the change in the policy to reseal all vehicle entranceways and noted that these were now estimated at \$285,000 per annum for resurfacing and \$55,000 for maintenance, total \$340,000.

The Committee decided to review the current policy on the maintenance of vehicle entrances and requested that a report on the issues, options and additional costs be presented to the Committee by July 2004.

**ISSUES**

There are many different situations where vehicle crossings are not maintained by the Council. The common reason is that the benefit of the crossing is directly attributable to the property owner rather than to the general public. A footpath provides a public benefit so where a footpath exists the Council maintains the footpath, which in most cases includes the vehicle crossing. Situations where the Council does not maintain the crossing are as follows:

1. Private ROW's and driveways in hill suburbs, where no footpath exists or from the back of the footpath if one does exist. Note that in the hill situation the actual road boundary can be many metres back from the edge of the road and if a footpath exists then it is normally immediately behind the kerb.
2. Hill side driveways supported by retaining walls.
3. Properties along waterways where the vehicle crossing includes a bridge or structure.
4. Industrial properties, where no footpath exists.
5. Rural properties.
6. Residential areas, excluding hill areas (Living H), where there is no footpath, eg Harkness Place.

In the above situations the property owners have the advantage of being able to decide on the type of material used in the construction, that is, they can choose to use the same material as they have on their own property.

In looking at the policy the following issues come to mind:

- The maintenance of property owner installed materials. The maintenance is clearly the responsibility of the property owner, but with changes in owners, and trenching by others, this responsibility does get questioned.

---

Report of the Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee to the Council meeting of 23 September 2004

**ATTACHMENT 2 TO CLAUSE 8 Cont'd**

- There is an inconsistency in that in situations where there is a footpath and it is not adjacent to the boundary then the section of driveway from the back of the path to the boundary is maintained by the Council when it could be considered a private benefit.

There are approximately 200 streets in residential areas with footpaths on one side, ie number 6 above where crossings are not maintained by the Council.

**OPTIONS AND COSTS**

A number of options exist:

1. Council to maintain all vehicle crossings from the kerb to the boundary including structures.  
Estimated additional cost - \$340,000 pa plus structures maintenance.
2. Council to maintain only those crossings covered by 6 above and excluding owner installed materials.  
Estimated additional cost - \$13,000 pa (\$5,000 maintenance, \$8,000 renewal).
3. Retain existing policy.  
Additional cost - nil.

**CONCLUSION**

There are a number of situations where the Council does not maintain vehicle crossings because the benefit is solely to the property owner and it would seem unfair for ratepayers in general to fund this private benefit. For the majority of these situations, especially hill driveways with supporting structures, it is clearly accepted that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance. There are a number, though, such as the Harkness Place situation, where it is not so well understood by property owners.

In reviewing, the policy officers are of the view that in general it operates satisfactorily, is fair and equitable and consistent with private/public good balance.

**Committee**

**Recommendation:** That current policy be reconfirmed.

## 6. FOOTPATH RESURFACING AND MOTOR VEHICLE ACCESSWAY MAINTENANCE

<b>Officer responsible</b> City Streets Manager	<b>Author</b> Weng-Kei Chen, Asset Policy Engineer DDI 371-1655
Corporate Plan Output: Footpath Resurfacing	

The purpose of this report is to advise the Council on the present practice regarding the footpath resurfacing programme and the likely financial implications if the Council were to extend this to include all vehicle crossings on legal roads. This report is provided as requested following a presentation by Mr Ross, of the Mt Pleasant Residents' Association, to the City Services Committee in March 2001 on maintenance of vehicle entrances on streets without footpaths.

### VEHICLE CROSSINGS AND THEIR MAINTENANCE

The Local Government Act and the Council's Public Places and Signs Bylaw 1992 require property owners to provide vehicle crossings across any footpath on any road, or any water channel on or adjoining any road by means of a crossing properly constructed. Vehicle crossing also includes crossings to all private right-of-ways or private roads. The issue of maintaining that part of the vehicle crossing on legal road has frequently arisen and legal opinion has indicated that "the Council has no legal obligation to maintain the surface of the access track any more than it has an obligation to maintain any other part of the public highway". The opinion was obtained in 1975 to assist the Council to make decisions not to maintain accessways to properties at the foot of St Andrews Hill Road and Rapaki Road (opposite Montgomery Terrace). These two accessways are substantially on legal roads. As recent as 1998 the residents using these accessways raised the maintenance issue with the Council again and these complaints were also subjected to investigation by the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman in both cases did not find any deficiencies or weaknesses in the Council's decisions in 1975.

In difficult hillside developments the construction of vehicle crossings often requires the construction of retaining walls on legal roads and permission is usually granted with owners entering into a Deed of Licence with the Council. One of the standard conditions is to identify that the owner "is responsible for the maintenance of retaining walls, vehicle crossings and any associated structures installed on legal road". The condition is consistent with the Council's maintenance on road. The Council's policy does permit property owners some flexibility in the installation of pavement materials on vehicle crossings where there is no formal footpath. There are also occasions where residents request the Council to maintain bridges or culverts over waterways on legal roads. These requests are declined for the reason that they don't serve the general public.

### CURRENT PRACTICE FOR FOOTPATH RESURFACING

The current practice for footpath resurfacing is to resurface the footpath and area adjacent to the infrastructure which includes vehicle crossings. This practice is to enable a consistent level of service for users of footpaths and recognises that adjacent vehicle crossings are an integral part of the footpath system. The existence of vehicle crossings also provide the users with convenient access and exit to destinations. The table below provides the level of expenditure in recent years.

	<i>Expenditure</i>	<i>Length Sealed</i>	<i>Unit Rate/km</i>
1998/99	\$1.762 m	94.4 km	\$18,670
1999/00	\$2.043 m	92.5 km	\$22,090*
2000/01	\$2.450 m	93.7 km	\$26,147*

\*Note the cost increase is due to historical low cost in tendering; increase costs of bitumen and labour; and installation of additional timber battens.

The upgrading cost of vehicle crossings adjacent to footpath amount to 18% of the total cost of the resurfacing programme.

### ROADS WITH ONE SIDE FOOTPATH

The City Plan requires subdividers to provide footpath facilities and also linkage to existing or future pedestrian infrastructure. In new subdivisions only one footpath is required for roads in the Living Hill zone or for roads that serve less than 25 dwelling lots. In Living Zones this requirement is consistent with the Council's past practices and also implies that the majority of the existing hillside roads do have only one footpath. The Council has some single footpath roads that serve more than 25 dwelling lots and the Unit has occasional requests to construct additional footpath facilities. The funding for this additional footpath is mostly obtained from Boards' discretionary funding. It is estimated that 100 km of the urban network has one footpath only.

24.5.2001



**ATTACHMENT 3 TO CLAUSE 8 Cont'd**

**FUNDING IMPLICATIONS**

For the Council to extend its service level to include resurfacing vehicle entrances on roads without a footpath it would need to increase the funding for the footpath resurfacing programme by \$220,000. In addition footpath maintenance expenditure would need to be increased by \$50,000 p.a. In summary \$270,000 is required to increase the level of service.

**Recommendation:** That the current Council footpath maintenance and resurfacing practice be retained.

<b>FOOTPATH RESURFACING 2008/09</b>						
Footpath on one side of road only						
RAMM Rd Id	Street	From	To	Side	RAMM Length	Evaluation of Structures
<b>NORTHERN</b>						
361	Brockhall Ln	Kedlestone	End	North	200	no structures
362	Brockham St	Veitches	Glennore	East	374	no structures
1195	Huntingdon Pl	Berkshire	End	North	200	no structures
1760	Oconnor Pl	Roydvale	End	North	270	no structures
2310	Strathean Ave	Withells	Avonhead	North	300	no structures
2370	Tavistock Pl	Apsley Dr	End	North	110	no structures
2640	Wiltshire Mews	Berkshire	End	West	120	no structures
<b>EASTERN</b>						
762	Drayton Dr	Mt Pleasant Rd	Assisi St	Right	560	yes - retaining walls
789	Dyers Rd	Ruru Rd	Maces Rd	Right	930	no structures
953	Glendevere Tce	Glenstrae Rd	End	Right	300	yes - retaining walls
964	Glenstrae Rd	Finish 2008			300	yes - structures
1162	Holland St	Dunaman St	Torlesse St	Left	160	no structures
1470	Luxton Pl	Drayton Dr	End	Left	90	no structures
2780	Main Rd (access)			Right	500	no structures
3121	Marine Pde (Cul de Sac)	Caspian St	End	Right	79	no structures
1677	Mt Pleasant Rd	Billys Track	Soleres Ave	Left	670	yes - retaining walls
2021	Revelation Dr	Clifton Tce	End	Right	1120	yes - retaining walls
2261	St Andrews Hill Rd	Main Rd	Te Awakura Tce	Right	250	yes - retaining walls
1847	Summervale Dr	Evans Pass Rd	End	Right	310	yes - pipes
3049	Waitikiri Dr	Alpine View L	Landfill Ave	Left	160	no structures
<b>SOUTHERN</b>						
2332	Sunvale Tce	Bowenvale Ave	End	Right	200	no structures
2594	Westfield Ave	Runnymede St	End	Left	260	no structures
Total length of road with footpath on one side only					7,463	metres
Assume typical street frontage 20m wide, and one entry per property					373	vehicle entrances
Standard vehicle crossing is 3.6m wide by 4.5m deep					16	typical vehicle crossing area
Total area of additional vehicle crossings to overlay with AC					5,968	square metres
Resurface vehicle crossings (including repairs)					40	\$ per square metre
Cost to resurface vehicle crossings					<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$238,720</b>
<b>Structural Extras</b>						
Waterways, pipe for entrance, 4.6m long + headwalls					<b>\$3,000</b>	each
Waterways, culvert/bridge for entrance, 4.6m wide + headwalls					<b>\$12,000</b>	each
Retaining Walls (assume 650 m <sup>2</sup> )					<b>\$20,000</b>	each

## 9. UNION STREET – PROPOSED BUS STOP UPGRADE

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Michael Thomson, Network Operations Team

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval for the existing bus stop on the west side of Union Street to be re marked to meet the current bus stop standard.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Council Network Operations Team has received a request from a bus patron that the inbound bus stop on the west side of Union Street between Tovey Street and Jervois Street, be marked on the road. Please refer to the **attached** plan.
3. Union Street is a minor arterial road and the main traffic route to South Brighton.
4. The bus stop is located outside No's 182 and 184 Union Street and at present is marked with a sign only. There is a seat at the rear of the footpath, adjacent to the fence at number 182. Opposite the bus stop are some local shops that include a dairy, a fish and chip takeaway, tattoo shop and hairdresser.
5. Land Transport (Road User) Rule 2004: Part 6.8 states "*A driver or person in charge of a vehicle must not stop, stand, or park the vehicle within 6 m of a bus stop sign.*" This applies when the bus stop is not marked on the road. Unfortunately, at this location, vehicles are regularly parked at the bus stop.
6. Due to the road geometry south of the bus stop location (see inset in site plan), patrons waiting at this stop are unable to see the approaching bus until it rounds the corner approximately 50 metres from the stop. The bus driver's visibility of waiting patrons is also restricted if vehicles are parked at the stop and patrons are forced to quickly walk out between vehicles and stand in the road to signal the bus to stop. The bus then has to stop in the traffic lane, creating a dangerous situation.
7. As the bus company is now introducing larger buses, the current recommended bus stop layout has a 14 metre painted bus stop area with an eight metre no stopping restricting before the bus stop and four metre no stopping restriction after the bus stop to allow the bus sufficient room to enter and exit the stop and park parallel to the kerb.
8. This proposal will install a 14 metre bus stop to meet the recommended standard, with the eight metre entry requirement made up by utilising two metres of existing vehicle entrance and six metres of no stopping restriction and the four metre exit clearance created by no stopping restrictions. This will result in the loss of one legal parking space.
9. Marking the bus stop on the road will indicate to motorists that parking is not permitted in this location. It will also eliminate the need for bus patrons to walk out onto the road to signal the bus and for the bus to stop in the traffic lane. It will increase visibility for both bus patrons and the bus driver.
10. The residents and property owners at 182 and 184 Union Street, the local dairy opposite the bus stop and the South New Brighton Resident's Association have been consulted. Refer to paragraphs 21, 22 and 23 for details.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

11. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$250.

**9. Cont'd**

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

12. The installation of road markings and signs is within the LTCCP Streets and Transport operational budgets.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

13. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides the Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
14. The community boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated April 2008. The list of delegations for the community boards includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
15. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/or markings must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

16. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

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

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

18. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

19. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, Pedestrian Strategy 2001, Road Safety Strategy 2004 and the Safer Christchurch Strategy 2005.

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

20. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

21. A letter and plan of the proposed bus stop layout was sent to the residents and the property owners of 182, 1/184, and 2/184 Union Street. No response has been received.
22. An email was sent to the South New Brighton Residents' Association. They responded that they were aware of the situation and asked whether the residents and property owners had been contacted.
23. The local business (dairy) opposite has been visited and the situation explained to them. They are concerned about the loss of parking directly opposite and the impact it may have on their business.
24. The Officer in Charge - Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.
25. The Transport and Greenspace, Public Transport Infrastructure Co-ordinator agrees with this recommendation.

**9. Cont'd**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board resolve:

- (a) That the existing bus stop on the west side of Union Street commencing at a point 49 metres south of Tovey Street and extending in a southerly direction for 12 metres be revoked.
- (b) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Union Street commencing at a point 45 metres south from its intersection with Tovey Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of four metres.
- (c) That a bus stop be installed on the west side of Union Street commencing at a point 49 metres south from its intersection with Tovey Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
- (d) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Union Street commencing at a point 63 metres south from its intersection with Tovey Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of six metres.



Original Plan Size: A4  
 ISSUE: 1 29/04/09  
 B90908108 RAH

**UNION STREET**  
 Proposed Bus Stop Upgrade  
 For Board Approval



\\msstroiafilelocation - R:\PROJECTS\001 TO 200\001 TO 025\01 NETWORK OPERATIONS\UNION STREET 90908108\UNION STREET.DWG

© Copyright Christchurch City Council. Aerial Photography Copyright Terralink International Ltd

**10. DELAMARE PARK - TREE REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT PLANTING – REPORT BACK**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace, Unit Manager
<b>Authors:</b>	Kim Swarbrick, Consultation Leader Greenspace and Shane Moohan, City Arborist

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to:
  - (a) Seek a decision by the Board on the removal or retention of three poplar trees in Delamare Park;
  - (b) Inform Board members of the upcoming tree work in Delamare Park.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Delamare Park is a medium sized local park located on St Heliers Crescent, Aranui.
3. A deputation to the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board meeting on 16 February 2009 was made by residents of Woodlands Place seeking the removal of black poplars from Delamare Park. The poplars were identified as a considerable nuisance due to the kapok fluff shed seasonally each year. A petition with 13 signatures was presented to the Board during the deputation. The petition requested removal of the offending trees and their replacement with a more appropriate species. Accordingly, the Board requested Council staff to investigate the issue and report back on:
  - “(a) *the removal of the black poplar trees from Delamare Park owing to the health and nuisance effects of the kapok from these trees on the neighbours, and;*
  - (b) *the general condition of the other trees in Delamare Park.*”
4. Female black poplars are considered a low allergenic plant that can cause a nuisance through shedding of seasonal debris. The Council has a large number of street and park trees (some of them protected trees) throughout the city and Banks Peninsula that shed seasonal debris and have an affect on neighbouring properties. Staff do not consider shedding of seasonal debris sufficient reason to have these trees removed.
5. The three poplars mentioned in the petition are currently exhibiting good health with few visible signs of poor structural integrity.
6. Because of the reasons given in points 4 and 5 staff above are recommending that the request to remove the poplars because of seasonal nuisance, be declined.

**BACKGROUND**

7. The Council parks Arborist carried out an assessment of all park trees on 24 February 2009.

Findings were as follows:

**8. Trees petitioned for removal**

The three poplars referred to in the petition are currently exhibiting good health with few visible signs of poor structural integrity. There are some previous branch failures present but this can be addressed through appropriate maintenance. Currently there is no arboricultural reason to have them removed.

**9. Allergenic properties**

The three trees referred to in the petition are believed to have a low allergenic rating. In his book “Allergy Free Gardening” (2000) Tom Ogren gives black poplars a rating of nine out of 10 where 10 is the worst most allergenic causing plant. In comparison silver birch is rated seven.

10. Cont'd

10. However, this rating applies only to the male tree which produces allergenic pollen and not kapok, which is produced solely by female trees. Due to the kapok nuisance factor, and the susceptibility to branch failure at maturity, Council staff no longer recommend planting this species into parks or other public open space where similar conflict may arise.

**Upcoming Tree Work**

11. During site investigation awareness of other tree issues arose. One mature gum tree adjacent to the aforementioned poplars shows evidence of structural defect due to poor root formation and abnormalities in the trunk. The arborist recommendation is for removal of this tree due to concern for a whole tree failure and the Council's health and safety obligations.
12. The entire line of gum trees (seven trees) planted along the northern boundary fence have been identified as a health and safety risk and have been programmed for removal accordingly. These trees are exhibiting evidence of decay, structural defects, and poor condition which is thought to be a result of poor stock, poor planting and lack of maintenance.
13. Plantings along the back fence (eastern side) contain a number of smaller trees being suppressed by mature trees resulting in weak growth and poor form. The Arborist's recommendation is that these smaller trees (five) be removed and replaced with more appropriate planting.
14. One individual tree in the middle of the park (ash) has been ring barked. This tree will not thrive hence, whilst other tree work is being carried out, it is suggested this tree be replaced simultaneously, perhaps in another location or with supplementary planting.
15. A single black poplar tree situated further along the eastern fence line poses no immediate risk of limb failure to neighbours. However, it exhibits poor form due to storm damage and previous branch failure. This tree is leaning in a westerly direction over public space and should be removed.
16. These trees (15 in total) will be removed under the Transport and Greenspace Manager's current delegation. Removal of these trees will take place during winter 2009 subject to ground conditions. A Start Work Notice (SWN) will be delivered to neighbours outlining the work and the reasons, prior to work commencing.
17. In the interest of park aesthetics and to maintain the level of service for provision of trees in urban parks, it is proposed to replace these trees with new species. New trees will be chosen for their tolerance to suit sandy soil conditions and exposure to easterly salt laden wind whilst regarding the northerly aspect of adjacent residential property. The timeframe for this planting is the winter of 2010.
18. Additionally, the southern boundary fence presents a mixed line of garages and assorted fences. It is proposed to plant a mixed native shrubbery as a park border to enhance the visual amenity along this boundary. The timeframe for this is not confirmed at this stage. The work will be assessed and prioritised alongside other planting projects and, subject to community consultation, will be undertaken within budgets once the time frame is confirmed.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

19. The STEM evaluation points for all three trees total 354.
20. The valuation for the three trees using STEM is \$63,900.

*STEM (A Standard Tree Evaluation Method) is the New Zealand national arboricultural industry standard for evaluating and valuing amenity trees by assessing their condition and contribution to amenity along with other distinguishable attributes such as stature, historic or scientific significance.*



**10. Cont'd**

21. The estimated cost to remove and replace the trees is \$10,000.
22. Funding for this project is provided in the 2009/10 capital tree renewal programme (removals and replacements) and the maintenance budgets (monitoring and pruning of the three poplars). There is sufficient funding to cover the estimated cost of this project.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align LTCCP budgets?**

23. Yes. Funding is provided from within the Draft 2009-19 LTCCP.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

24. The Greenspace Manager has the following delegation with respect to trees:
  - (a) "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".
25. While the Transport and Greenspace Manager has the delegation to remove the trees current practice is that in most cases requests to remove healthy and structurally sound trees are placed before the appropriate Community Board for a decision.
26. The Community Boards have the following delegation with respect to trees:
  - (a) "To plant, maintain and remove trees on reserves, parks and roads under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council".
27. Protected street trees can only be removed by a successful application under the Resource Management Act. These trees are not listed as protected under the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan.
28. The following City Plan Policies may be of some benefit when considering the options:

Volume 2: Section 4 City Identity

4.2.1 Policy: Tree Cover

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

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.

10. Cont'd

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:

- tree-lined streets and avenues
- 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.

29. An application to prune or remove the tree may be made to the District Court under The Property Law Amendment Act 1975.

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

30. The Council has the legal right to approve or decline the application to remove the trees.
31. The District Court can order the pruning or removal of the trees under The Property Law Amendment Act 1975.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

32. Draft LTCCP 2009-19

Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – page 121:

- (a) Safety – By ensuring our parks, open spaces and waterways are healthy and safe places.
- (b) Community – By providing spaces for communities to gather and interact.
- (c) Environment – By enabling people to contribute to projects that improve our environment.
- (d) Health – By providing areas for people to engage in healthy activities.
- (e) Recreation – By offering a range of recreational opportunities in parks, open spaces and waterways.

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

33. Yes, as per above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

34. Social wellbeing.

Safer Parks Policy.

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

35. Yes, as per above.

**10. Cont'd**

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

36. In February 2009 a petition with 13 signatories, was presented to the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board requesting the removal of four black poplars. The signatures represent 11 households from a cul-de-sac containing 15 residences. The owners of the remaining four households (all tenanted) were contacted during February and invited to submit comments in regard to the aforementioned trees. Only one land owner took up the opportunity to provide feedback and their comments matched those points raised through the petition.
37. Consultation leaflets were delivered to 120 local residents surrounding Delamare Park during April 2009. The consultation included information regarding the petitioned trees and other tree work (including replanting) proposed within the park. Only five replies were received. One respondent requested retaining the three black poplar trees and four requests to have them removed. In total 20 requests have been made for removal of the poplar trees (including phoned requests). All respondents will be contacted, once this report has been to the Community Board for decision and informed of the outcome.
38. All respondents were happy with the other work to be undertaken in the park.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board:

- (a) Decline the request to have the poplar trees removed solely because of their seasonal nuisance factor; and
- (b) Continue to maintain the trees to internationally accepted arboricultural standards and practices, and monitor them for their ongoing health and structural integrity.



**11. BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD'S 2008/09 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND – PROPOSED ALLOCATION FOR CRIME CAMERA AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Community Support Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Peter Dow, Community Board Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. To propose that the Board consider an allocation from its 2008/09 Discretionary Response Fund for a portable crime camera and associated equipment for use by the New Brighton Police.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. In early 2009 and again recently, the New Brighton Police has approached the Board with requests to fund a portable crime camera and recording equipment for use by the police as a deterrent for crime in the New Brighton Mall and general New Brighton area.
3. The Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board provided similar funding assistance to the Sydenham Police in 2008 to enable the purchase of like equipment. The camera has been used successfully in that area for investigating offences such as wilful damage, graffiti, assaults and arson.
4. Vaughan Penney, the Council's Traffic Systems Engineer, will be present at the meeting to demonstrate the equipment. Sergeant Gary Manch, New Zealand Police, will also be in attendance to comment on the benefits of utilising this equipment.
5. The cost of the equipment along with the necessary training and support is \$7,500. The components include the camera, recording, power supply and batteries. The system is capable of operating independently and records to an on board hard drive. Data viewing and retrieval can be done later by taking a laptop to the site and downloading the information or by exchanging the hard drive and viewing the images elsewhere.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

6. Yes, the Board has a current balance of \$6,549 available for allocation from its Discretionary Response Fund for 2008/09. The balance required could be sourced by the Board reallocating \$951 from the remaining \$1,150 in the 2008/09 Youth Development Fund.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

7. There are no direct legal issues involved.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

8. As per paragraph 6. above.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

9. Not applicable.

11. Cont'd

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES/POLICIES/OBJECTIVES**

10. Safer Christchurch Strategy 2008, Goal No. 3 to *'Enhance safety from crime through preventative and supportive actions'*, Strengthening Communities Strategy 2007 incorporating the Discretionary Response Fund policy for community boards, and the 2006/09 Board Objective No. 1 being *'The Board works towards/advocates for measures for the Burwood/Pegasus ward being a safer place for all residents.'*

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

11. Yes, as above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

12. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board consider:

- (a) Allocating \$6,549 from its 2008/09 Discretionary Response Fund to provide a portable crime camera, associated equipment and support costs for use by the New Brighton Police, and;
- (b) Allocating the remaining funding needed of \$951 from the residual balance in the Board's 2008/9 Youth Development Fund.

## 12. BURWOOD/PEGASUS 2008/09 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEME - CHARRYL MOODY - APPLICATION

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Recreation and Sports Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Sarah Benton, Community Recreation Adviser

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to present to the Board for consideration an application for funding assistance from the 2008/09 Youth Development Funding Scheme.
2. There is currently a balance of \$1,650 remaining in the fund for 2008/09.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. Funding is being sought by Charryl Moody, a 16 year old of Parklands, to represent the New Zealand Junior White Sox (softball) team at the Australia Friendship Games in Sydney from 9 to 17 July 2009.
4. Charryl received \$250 in 2006 from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board to compete in a soccer tournament in Australia.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. The following table details event expenses, fundraising and funding requested for the applicant:

<b>EXPENSES</b>	<b>Cost (NZ \$)</b>
Flights	570
Accommodation	710
Meals	150
Van Hire	250
Insurance	40
Incidentals	400
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$2120</b>
<b>OTHER FUNDING</b>	
Amount raised by applicant to date	\$673
Amount raised by Club on behalf of applicant	\$367
<b>Total amount raised</b>	<b>\$1040</b>
<b>Amount requested from Community Board</b>	<b>\$500</b>

### Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

6. Yes.

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. There are no legal issues to be considered.

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

8. Not applicable.

**12. Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

9. Yes, relates to 2008-09 Community Board funding allocations.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

10. Yes, as mentioned above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

11. Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy and Youth Strategy.

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

12. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

13. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board consider allocating \$200 to Charryl Moody from the Burwood/Pegasus 2008/09 Youth Development Funding Scheme to represent the New Zealand Junior White Sox (softball) team at the Australia Friendship Games in Sydney from 9 to 17 July 2009.



12. Cont'd

**BACKGROUND OF APPLICANT**

**Charryl Moody**

14. Charryl attends Marion College where she is described as a *“dedicated sportswoman”* by Kathy Seaward, Head of Sport, because she competes in several sports for her school. She has played softball for the Parklands Club since she was five years old. She has played for her club's Premier Team for the last two years and represented Canterbury at Under 17 and Under 19 level. She was recently named top batter in the tournament team at the National Under 19 tournament in January 2009. Charryl is one of four Cantabrians selected for the New Zealand Junior White Sox team to compete at the Australia Friendship Games.
15. The Softball Australia Youth Development Friendship Series is an annual event that has been running since 2002. Due to the increase in teams competing, Softball Australia has separated the friendship series into two events - boys and girls. Each year Softball Australia selects their own squad of 30 boys and 30 girls, and then an invite is sent out by to other teams around the country and internationally to participate. The Australia Friendship Games for girls runs from 12 to 15 July and the New Zealand team is attending a two day training camp prior to the event. The aim of the event is to develop players at this age group to enhance their skills and give them the opportunity to potentially step up to senior provincial and national programmes. According to Softball New Zealand's website, attending the Friendship Games is the beginning of the New Zealand Junior White Sox campaign to win the Junior World Series in 2011 in Capetown, South Africa.
16. Kathy Seaward, Head of Sport at Marion College says *“...in terms of her softball, Charryl is truly a leader. She brings her talent developed at the club level to school and without her the team would probably not exist.”* Charryl has been the captain of the school team for the last two years where she helps arrange trainings and this year helped with recruitment. This season Charryl was the co-coach for her club's under 13 girl's team who won the Little League qualifier tournament and was placed second in the Saturday competition.
17. Charryl's preparation for the Australia Friendship Games was set back when her softball gear was stolen in March this year. As a catcher she has had to 'break in' her new equipment, which takes time, and she was upset by the incident.
18. Charryl has saved from her part-time job to go towards the costs of attending the tournament. She has been fundraising by selling chocolate and wheat bags made by her grandmother. Her club ran a sausage sizzle with Charryl's help, to raise funds on her behalf.

**13. BURWOOD/PEGASUS 2008/09 YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUNDING SCHEME  
– TEGAN MADDEN - APPLICATION**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager Community Services, DDI 941-8534
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Recreation and Sports Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Sarah Benton, Community Recreation Adviser

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to present to the Board for consideration an application for funding assistance from the 2008/09 Youth Development Funding Scheme.
2. There is currently a balance of up to \$1650 remaining in the Burwood/Pegasus 2008/09 Youth Development Scheme.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

3. Funding is being sought by Tegan Madden, 15 year old of Burwood to compete at the Queensland Golden Gloves boxing tournament in Brisbane from 28 to 30 August 2009.
4. Tegan Madden received \$500 in 2007 from the Board to compete in the North Island Golden Gloves Tournament.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5. The following tables detail event expenses and funding requested for the applicants:

<b>EXPENSES FOR Tegan Madden</b>	<b>Cost (NZ \$)</b>
Flights	450
Insurance	75
Accommodation	150
Rental Car	100
Food	200
<b>Total Cost – includes above expenses</b>	<b>\$975</b>
Amount raised by applicant to date	<b>\$200</b>
Amount requested from Community Board	<b>\$500</b>

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

6. Yes.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

7. There are no legal issues to be considered.

**HAVE YOU CONSIDERED THE LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE ISSUE UNDER CONSIDERATION?**

8. Not applicable.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

9. Yes, relates to 2008-09 Community Board Funding Allocations.

**Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

10. Yes, as mentioned above.

**13. Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

11. Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy.

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

13. Yes.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

13. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board consider allocating \$300 to Tegan Madden from the Burwood/Pegasus 2008/09 Youth Development Funding Scheme to compete at the Queensland Golden Gloves Boxing Tournament in Brisbane from 28 to 30 August 2009.

**13. Cont'd**

**BACKGROUND OF APPLICANT**

**Tegan Madden**

14. Tegan Madden attends Catholic Cathedral College. She has been boxing since she was nine years old. Her father was a boxing coach and two of her siblings are also involved in boxing. Tegan has been competing for five years with the A-town Boxing Gym, located in Aranui. Tegan has four previous New Zealand Junior Championship titles and has competed against the world fifth-ranked female and senior New Zealand Champions.
15. Tegan's achievements in boxing are high especially for a female. In order to develop in the sport she needs to participate in regular and quality competitions. She is a great role model for young boxers at her club and young people in the area. She often helps with the junior boxers at the club.
16. Many of the boxing training camps and well run competitions are held in the North Island. A-town Boxing make every effort to assist promising young boxers including Tegan to attend these events throughout the year, which adds further costs. Tegan and her family have particularly been fundraising for her trip to Australia including, holding a garage sale, cake stall and sausage sizzle.
17. Tegan and her coach have set her many goals over the next few years including; becoming the first female in New Zealand to win six consecutive Junior New Zealand titles; attending the World Championships, Junior Olympics and the Olympics in London in 2012. Tegan is also interested in a career as a sports physiotherapist.

**14. KEEP NEW ZEALAND BEAUTIFUL CONFERENCE 2009 – BOARD MEMBER ATTENDANCE**

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

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is for the Board to consider appointing a Board member to attend the Keep New Zealand Beautiful Conference 2009 and Annual General Meeting in Rotorua from Friday 25 to Sunday 27 September 2009.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. The Board's representative on the Keep Christchurch Beautiful Committee is Linda Stewart.
3. The Committee is a voluntary organisation, which aims to promote a cleaner, more beautiful environment within Christchurch, and to raise the level of awareness of what the individual can do to improve his or her community and reduce litter. Notice of the national conference has been received. Christchurch has a member on the Keep New Zealand Beautiful Board.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. The cost for one member to attend the conference is approximately \$750, which would be met from the Board's 2008/09 operational budget. This covers travel, accommodation and the conference registration.

**Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?**

5. Yes.

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

6. There are no legal considerations involved.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS****Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2006-16 LTCCP?**

7. Yes, clause 4 above refers.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES****Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?**

8. Yes, page 61 of the LTCCP, Strategic Direction - Healthy Environment.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

9. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board consider approving the attendance of Linda Stewart to the Keep New Zealand Beautiful Conference and Annual General Meeting in Rotorua from 25 to 27 September 2008.

## 15. BURWOOD/PEGASUS ARTWORKS IN PUBLIC PLACES SUBCOMMITTEE – MEETING REPORT OF 23 APRIL 2009

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

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to submit the following outcomes of the Board's Artworks in Public Places Committee meeting held on Thursday 23 April 2009 at 5.30pm.

The meeting was attended by David East (Chairman), Tim Sintes, Linda Stewart, Denise Kerr, Dallas Matoe, Mary McCammon and Ranui Ngarimu.

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Nigel Dixon and Tina Lomax.

### 1. APPOINTMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON

It was suggested that for continuity and from the work carried out during the previous Board term, that Tina Lomax may be available to chair the Subcommittee.

As she was an apology however, it was **agreed** that David East would chair this particular meeting.

### 2. MEETING MINUTES – 30 OCTOBER 2008

The Subcommittee **received** and noted for record purposes the minutes of the Subcommittee's meeting of 30 October 2008 that had been held prior to the appointment of the community representatives.

### 3. SUBCOMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Subcommittee considered for recommending to the Board, the following proposed terms of reference for the Burwood/Pegasus Artworks in Public Places Subcommittee:

- Research and prove evidence of need.
- Confirm budget.
- Site location and commissioning process issues.
- Identify key stakeholders, cultural and interest groups.
- Facilitate and have input toward the artwork brief development.
- Chose artists to respond to the brief.
- Select a concept from invited artists.
- Establish and have input toward a communication plan.
- Sign-off on fabrication and installation of artwork.
- Agree unveiling and opening of artwork ceremony.

It was **agreed** that the first bullet point be amended to read "*Research the need for specific artwork initiatives.*"

The Subcommittee **decided** to recommend to the Board that the terms of reference for the Burwood/Pegasus Artworks in Public Places Subcommittee, as amended, be approved.

15. Cont'd

4. **SITE VISITS - REFLECTIONS**

Members agreed that the site visits undertaken in November 2008 had been informative and had helped as a basis for enabling the Subcommittee to consider artwork project possibilities within the Burwood/Pegasus area.

One noticeable feature of the visit sites was a lack of pre-European contact related artwork and as such, this aspect provided an opportunity for consideration in relation to Burwood/Pegasus.

In this regard, mention was made of the mana whenua aspects and it was **agreed** that staff discuss this further with the Council's Maori Arts Adviser.

5. **BURWOOD/PEGASUS – LOCAL ARTWORKS - OPPORTUNITIES**

On the suggestion of pre-contact recognition, mention was made of the local coastline area in particular and also other locations such as Travis Wetland.

Also referred to was the ongoing interest of the New Brighton Project of having a community notice board or similar installed in the vicinity of the pier end of the New Brighton Mall which could also feature an artwork and local history component ie an integrated artwork.

The group was invited to submit details of its proposal to the Subcommittee.

It was acknowledged that other areas of the ward should also be considered. The possibility of co-funding local artworks through partnerships with community groups/organisations and the seeking of expressions of interest from the community including residents associations, could also be pursued.

It was suggested that a portfolio of local artworks could be prepared and accessible online to showcase local projects, promote local artists etc.

The Subcommittee **resolved** that staff be asked to give consideration to preparing a portfolio of Burwood/Pegasus local artwork projects.

6. **NEXT STEPS**

It was **agreed** that a flowchart setting out the steps involved in implementing an artwork project would be of help to the Subcommittee.

7. **NEXT MEETING**

Thursday 23 July 2009, 5pm in the Board Room.

The meeting concluded at 7.07pm.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

That the report be received and the recommendation in clause 3 (Subcommittee's Terms of Reference), be adopted.

**16. RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS**

**16.1 CROSSROADS YOUTH WITH A FUTURE TRUST**

A representative(s) from the Crossroads Youth With a Future Trust will provide an update on activities.

**16.2 SOUTH NEW BRIGHTON RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION**

A representative(s) from the South New Brighton Residents' Association will provide an update on activities.

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

**18. BOARD MEMBER'S QUESTIONS**