

**SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD**

**AGENDA**

**TUESDAY 28 SEPTEMBER 2010**

**AT 5.00PM**

**IN THE HALL OF HOHEPA CANTERBURY  
23 BARRINGTON STREET, BARRINGTON, CHRISTCHURCH**

**Community Board:** Phil Clearwater (Chairperson), Oscar Alpers, Barry Corbett, Chris Mene, Karolin Potter, Tim Scandrett and Sue Wells.

**Community Board Adviser**  
Jenny Hughey  
Telephone: 941-5108  
Email: [jenny.hughey@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:jenny.hughey@ccc.govt.nz)

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

**PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

**PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

**INDEX**

	<b>CLAUSE</b>	
<b>PART B</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MEETING MINUTES – 3 SEPTEMBER 2010</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>3.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT</b>
	3.1	Mr and Mrs Hawksbury-Browne – Mountain-bike ‘pump’ track
	3.2	Mr John Whitford – Fruit Tree garden
<b>PART B</b>	<b>4.</b>	<b>PETITIONS</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>5.</b>	<b>NOTICE OF MOTION</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>6.</b>	<b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>7.</b>	<b>BRIEFINGS</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>8.</b>	<b>STUDHOLME STREET (BARRINGTON STREET TO SOMERFIELD STREET) TREE REPLACEMENT</b>
<b>PART A &amp; C</b>	<b>9.</b>	<b>NEW PLAYGROUND DEVELOPMENT AND NAMING HUNTER TERRACE AND SLOAN TERRACE ROADWAY ENHANCEMENTS</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>10.</b>	<b>RISINGHOLME PARK – TREE REMOVAL REQUEST</b>

	<b>CLAUSE</b>	
<b>PART C</b>	<b>11.</b>	<b>DYERS PASS / HACKTHORNE ROAD INTERSECTION (LOWER INTERSECTION) PROPOSED PARKING CHANGES AND BUS STOP UPGRADE</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>12.</b>	<b>CASHMERE VIEW STREET TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>13.</b>	<b>SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE 2010/11 YOUTH ACHIEVEMENT FUNDING APPLICATION – JESSICA WATSON, YVETTE PUGH, VERONICA PUGH</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>14.</b>	<b>SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE 2010/11 YOUTH ACHIEVEMENT FUNDING APPLICATION – EMILIA GRIBBIN</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>15.</b>	<b>APPLICATION TO SPREYDON/ HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD 2010/11 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - LANDSDOWNE TERRACE PLAYCENTRE</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>16.</b>	<b>CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD WEEK FUNDING</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>17.</b>	<b>COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER’S UPDATE</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>18.</b>	<b>ELECTED MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE</b>
<b>PART B</b>	<b>19.</b>	<b>MEMBERS QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS</b>

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MEETING REPORT – 3 SEPTEMBER 2010**

The minutes of the Board's ordinary meeting of Friday 3 September 2010 are **attached**.

**CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION**

That the minutes of the Board's meeting of 3 September 2010 be **confirmed**.

3. **DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT**

3.1 Madeline and Malcolm Hawksbury-Browne, representing the Canterbury Secondary School Mountain Bike Club will discuss with the Board their desire to design and build an off-road 'pump' bicycle track in the Spreydon/Heathcote ward.

3.2 Mr John Whitford, will discuss with the Board his vision for a community Fruit Tree garden in Garlands Road (Opawa Road end), following the removal of the Scout Den.

4. **PETITIONS**

## 5. NOTICE OF MOTION

The following Notice of Motion was submitted by Oscar Alpers under Council Standing Orders 3.10.1.

That the Spreydon Heathcote Community Board urge the Council to improve the amount and quality of information provided in Land Information Memoranda.

### *Explanatory Note*

Most City residents have obtained a LIM prior to purchasing their homes since Section 44 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (copy attached) came into force on 1 December 1992.

The Christchurch City Council's practice has always been to provide only the minimum level of information required by the Act to be contained in a LIM, presumably for financial reasons or fears of exposure to claims. The Council now charges \$215 for a LIM and an additional \$25 for a CD containing Building Act and Resource Management Act information which has to be obtained separately.

This minimalist approach is particularly relevant where information regarding the risk of liquefaction is concerned. Although the liquefaction potential in Christchurch has been known to vary from high to very low, the standard statement in a LIM for all residential properties in recent times has been under the heading:

#### **"Other Related Property Information"**

- **Property located in XYZ Community Board Area.**
- **Property located in XYZ Ward.**
- **Property or part of property located within urban area.**
- **ECan Liquefaction Assessment**

ECan holds indicative information on liquefaction hazard in the Christchurch area. Information on liquefaction can be found on the ECan website at [www.ecan.govt.nz/liq](http://www.ecan.govt.nz/liq) or by calling ECan Customer services on Ph.03 353 9007. The Christchurch City Council may require site-specific investigations before granting future subdivision or building consent for the property, depending on the liquefaction potential of the area that the property is in.

- **ECan Natural Resources Regional Plan**

There may be policies or rules within Environment Canterbury's Natural resources Regional Plan that regulate land use on this site. Queries regarding the impact of the Natural resources Regional Plan on the property should be made to ECan Customer services on Ph.03 353 9007

Following the link to the ECan website leads to a single page of information including 4 lines on liquefaction risk in Christchurch City which I have underlined on the attached pages, which tells you that the City Council has the detailed information,(not ECan!) and now provides 4 relevant FAQs including a recently added information sheet regarding liquefaction risk potential.

I think most City homeowners affected by liquefaction would say that the LIM they got from the Council gave them no idea of the hazard they faced.

Other Councils have provided much more information with their LIMs, including planning maps and other information that is in the District Plan, copies of building and resource consent applications and plans, information regarding planned Council work in the vicinity and even non- Council information such as school zones etc. Waimakariri District have provided with LIMs for properties in Kaiapoi maps showing the level of risk of liquefaction, as well as the other information mentioned, for \$170.

**44A Land information memorandum**

(1) A person may apply to a territorial authority for the issue, within 10 working days, of a land information memorandum in relation to matters affecting any land in the district of the authority.

(2) The matters which shall be included in that memorandum are—

(a) Information identifying each (if any) special feature or characteristic of the land concerned, including but not limited to potential erosion, avulsion, falling debris, subsidence, slippage, alluvion, or inundation, or likely presence of hazardous contaminants, being a feature or characteristic that—

(i) Is known to the territorial authority; but

(ii) Is not apparent from the district scheme under the Town and Country Planning Act 1977 or a district plan under the Resource Management Act 1991:

(b) Information on private and public stormwater and sewerage drains as shown in the territorial authority's records:

(c) Information relating to any rates owing in relation to the land:

(d) Information concerning any consent, certificate, notice, order, or requisition affecting the land or any building on the land previously issued by the territorial authority (whether under the Building Act 1991, the Building Act 2004, or any other Act):

(e) Information concerning any certificate issued by a building certifier pursuant to the Building Act 1991 or the Building Act 2004:

(ea) information notified to the territorial authority under section 124 of the Weathertight Homes Resolution Services Act 2006:

(f) Information relating to the use to which that land may be put and conditions attached to that use:

(g) Information which, in terms of any other Act, has been notified to the territorial authority by any statutory organisation having the power to classify land or buildings for any purpose:

(h) Any information which has been notified to the territorial authority by any network utility operator pursuant to the Building Act 1991 or the Building Act 2004.

(3) In addition to the information provided for under subsection (2) of this section, a territorial authority may provide in the memorandum such other information concerning the land as the authority considers, at its discretion, to be relevant.

(4) An application for a land information memorandum shall be in writing and shall be accompanied by any charge fixed by the territorial authority in relation thereto.

(5) In the absence of proof to the contrary, a land information memorandum shall be sufficient evidence of the correctness, as at the date of its issue, of any information included in it pursuant to subsection (2) of this section.

(6) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Act, there shall be no grounds for the territorial authority to withhold information specified in terms of subsection (2) of this section or to refuse to provide a land information memorandum where this has been requested.

### *ECan's website*

#### **The link provided in the LIM to ECan's website still provides the following information:**

##### **Earthquakes and hazards**

Canterbury is susceptible to significant adverse effects from earthquakes and tsunamis. While it is not possible to reduce the incidence of these events, steps can be taken to reduce the vulnerability of the community to their impacts. Lessening the impacts of earthquakes and tsunamis will save lives, reduce damage and disruption, and enable a faster recovery.

##### **Introduction**

Canterbury is susceptible to significant adverse effects from earthquakes and tsunamis. While it is not possible to reduce the incidence of these events, steps can be taken to reduce the vulnerability of the community to their impacts. Lessening the impacts of earthquakes and tsunamis will save lives, reduce damage and disruption, and enable a faster recovery.

##### **Earthquake source information**

Environment Canterbury has a database of known active faults and fold structures in Canterbury and nearby. Earthquakes are generated on faults, fold and other structures. The faults are mapped at a scale of 1:250,000 for the whole region and at 1:50,000 for part of the northern area of the region. Information on fault type, length, average displacement, slip rates, last rupture and recurrence interval is available for most of the faults.

Fault location information is largely restricted to the hilly and mountainous parts of the region. Some offshore fault information north of Christchurch is also available.

Instrumentally recorded seismicity beneath the Canterbury Plains is indicative of active earth deformation. However, there are very few known ground surface expressions of active faults or fold structures on the Canterbury Plains. For this reason, there is very limited information on earthquake sources beneath the Canterbury Plains.

##### **Historic earthquake hazard information**

Information on historic earthquakes impacting on Christchurch, Hurunui District and Timaru District is available.

##### **Earthquake effects information**

###### **General**

Earthquake scenarios and general likely damage information for Kaikoura, Arthur's Pass, Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Christchurch, Ashburton, Temuka and Timaru is available. Peak ground acceleration, spectral acceleration and Modified Mercalli Intensity for 50, 150, 475 and 1000 year return times are also available for these urban areas. This information is available as contour maps (hard copy) for the whole region.

###### **Tsunami**

Tsunami inundation information is available for Timaru and Hurunui Districts, and Christchurch City.

###### **Liquefaction**

General information on the potential for liquefaction in the Waimakariri District (the area between the coast and State Highway 1) is available.

Liquefaction information for Christchurch (1:35,000 scale) is also available. More detailed work on the liquefaction susceptibility in Christchurch is currently being carried out. Christchurch City Council has detailed information on the potential effects of liquefaction in some parts of Christchurch.

Regional scale liquefaction information is also available for Hurunui and Timaru Districts.

## **Ground shaking**

Regional scale information on the variation in ground shaking hazard in Timaru and Hurunui Districts, and within Christchurch City is available. No information on the modification of ground shaking from topographic shielding or focusing is available. These generally localised effects can be very pronounced.

### **Limitations and constraints of the information**

\* Earthquake and tsunami hazard information available is regional in scope and cannot be substituted for a site specific investigation. Local variation in ground response from earthquakes is likely to occur. The site specific potential for and consequent damage from earthquakes and tsunami should be assessed by a suitably qualified and experienced practitioner.

\* Hazard information provided is based on the best information available at the time of the studies and was supplied to Environment Canterbury under specific contract arrangements including financial and time constraints.

\* The hazard information may be liable to change or review if new information is made available.

\* Earthquake hazard and tsunami inundation zone boundaries are approximate and indicative only.

\* The liquefaction and ground shaking hazard classifications are indicative only, and do not imply any level of damage to particular structures or services.

## **Trolling through the FAQ's on the page can give you this information:**

### **What is liquefaction?**

Liquefaction (pronounced "lick-we-fack-shin") happens during earthquakes.

The ground shaking that occurs during an earthquake can cause some soils to liquefy. This means during an earthquake these soils will behave more like a liquid than a solid.

Sometimes a Land Information Memorandum (LIM) issued by a territorial authority mentions that a property is part of the Liquefaction Risk Study area and that the property may potentially be susceptible to liquefaction problems if there is an earthquake.

Environment Canterbury has maps of Christchurch City showing which parts of the City are potentially more susceptible to liquefaction than others.

### **What does the liquefaction hazard rating for my property mean?**

There are four classes of liquefaction potential for Christchurch: high, moderate, low and no or unknown liquefaction potential.

\* Areas of Christchurch rated as high liquefaction potential have soil types that are the most prone to liquefaction.

\* Areas rated as low liquefaction potential have soil types that are least prone to liquefaction.

\* Areas of moderate liquefaction potential have soil types between the high and low classes.

\* Areas rated as having no or unknown liquefaction potential generally do not have soils prone to liquefaction, or there is currently not enough soil information to determine liquefaction potential.

Additionally there are five classes of liquefaction ground damage potential for Christchurch: very high, high, moderate, low and no liquefaction ground damage potential. These give a more detailed indication of the damage to the ground that can occur during an earthquake.

The liquefaction potential and liquefaction ground damage potential ratings are only an indication of the liquefaction potential in your area based on available soil and water table information. The information is not specific to your individual property.

**What does the note from Christchurch City Council on my LIM about liquefaction mean?**

The note about liquefaction is about a study the Christchurch City Council has undertaken in the Christchurch metropolitan area, looking at known soil types and other available data to work out what is likely to happen to the soil in the event of a large earthquake.

For instance sandy soils will react differently to strong ground shaking than clay or gravel soils. What may happen is that buildings may tilt or pipes and tanks may work their way out of the ground. The Christchurch City Council puts this note on all LIMs it issues (including those for Banks Peninsula that were outside the study area). The study was not site or property specific.

If you are redeveloping the site (particularly if you are building a multi-storey building) you may need to get specialist advice for foundation requirements, otherwise it should not affect what you can do on your property. If you want more information I can send you our booklet on liquefaction.

**What can be done to reduce the chance of liquefaction?**

There are two main ways to reduce the effects of liquefaction – by improving the ground condition or by specific foundation design.

There are various methods available to reduce the susceptibility of a soil to liquefaction. These methods increase the density of the soil thereby increasing the resistance of the soil to liquefaction. Most of the methods are expensive and would be uneconomic for residential structures. Lower cost compaction methods such as repetitive dropping of a heavy weight or using a heavy roller may be economic for residential developments.

Specific foundation designs reduce the likelihood of damage to the foundation and deformation of the structure. Stronger foundations, deep piles and piling to non-liquefiable soil layers are the more common methods used to reduce the effect of liquefaction on structures.

For further assistance please contact Customer Service on 03 353 9007 or toll free on 0800 324 636.

You can also visit our website [www.ecan.govt.nz](http://www.ecan.govt.nz)



**6. CORRESPONDENCE**

Letter received from Mrs Dudson, regarding Neighbourhood Week. (**Circulated separately**).

**7. BRIEFINGS**

## 8. STUDHOLME STREET (BARRINGTON STREET TO SOMERFIELD STREET) TREE REPLACEMENT

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, City Environment, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Transport & Greenspace
<b>Author:</b>	Angela Abel, Consultation Leader, DDI 941-5112

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board approval for the Studholme Street (Barrington to Somerfield) Trees replacement to proceed, as shown in **Attachment 1**.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Studholme Street is a local road which runs between Barrington Street and Ashgrove Terrace. The street trees along the section between Barrington Street and Somerfield Park are in decline and require removal as a result of their poor condition and the safety risks that they pose. The street trees between the Somerfield Park and Somerfield Street are also in decline and will also be removed and replaced as part of this project.
3. A start work notice was sent to the residents in early December 2009 outlining the need for tree maintenance and removal in Studholme Street. A street meeting was held on the 14 December 2009 with council staff, Board members and residents who had expressed concerns with the proposal. The issues raised were if the removal of 37 trees was really necessary, on going drainage issues and grass verge protection needed to be addressed. During discussions with the residents it was decided that a concept plan would be developed for consultation and would also include the street trees on Studholme Street from Somerfield Park to Somerfield Street, wheel stops, bollards and the restoration to the berms and verges.
4. In April Council staff again met with residents. Residents unanimously agreed on the type of replacement trees and were in favour of concrete bollards. In late June 2010 a concept plan was circulated to the residents in the street. The concept plan proposed to remove and replace all trees between Barrington Street and Somerfield Street (a total of 67 trees) and to repair and protect the grass berms to ensure the replacement trees have the best possible conditions in which to thrive and improve the streetscape. The new street trees proposed are Field Maples (*Acer Campestre*) which are the same as the existing trees planted in Studholme Street between Somerfield and Ashgrove Terrace.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5. The estimated cost for the removal of the trees and replanting is \$58,000 and will be funded from the Street Tree Renewals Budget.
6. The estimated cost for new bollards and verge and berm maintenance is \$48,000 and will be funded from the Berm Renewal Budget.

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

7. Yes. Funding would be provided from within the Transport and Greenspace Road Renewal Budget, Page 81 and 82, 2010-11 Annual Plan – project 118, Road Network Renewal and Replacement.

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

8. There are no legal considerations that would have a direct impact on this proposal. None of the trees identified for removal are listed in the City Plan as Protected or Notable Trees.

## 8 Cont'd

### ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

9. Funding for trees that are no longer an appropriate species or those that are no longer appropriate in their current position requiring removal and replacement is available from the Transport and Greenspace Unit Street Tree Capital Renewals budget.
10. Removal and replacement of the trees is consistent with the Activity Management Plan.
11. Retention of the trees is consistent with the Activity Management Plan provided the tree is structurally sound and healthy.

### ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

12. The recommendations in this report align with current Council strategies including social well being.

### CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

13. A Community Board Seminar was held to introduce the proposed design and the project's consultation programme on the 15 June 2010. The feedback period was from 28 June 2010 to 14 July 2010. The publicity pamphlet (including concept plan) was distributed to residents and other interested parties in the immediate area. (refer **Attachment 2**).
14. There are approximately 103 properties in Studholme Street. Thirty nine responses were received, of which 33 (85 percent) responses were in support of the proposal, two (five percent) responses did not support the proposal and four (10 percent) did not indicate a preference.
15. Key issues raised and comments from the submitters and the project team's responses are;
  - (a) Requests for more concrete bollards, wooden bollards and wheel stops.
  - (b) Requests for verges and berms to be re-levelled and re-sown.
  - (c) A request was received to remove a disused driveway outside 76 Studholme Street.
  - (d) Several expressed concern about drainage issues.
  - (e) Problems at the school crossing point outside the school.
16. Responses to community consultation and changes to the proposed plan are as below.
  - (a) Extra concrete bollards, wooden bollards and wheel stops will be provided where appropriate as shown on the attached plan, to protect the new trees, berms and the verges.
  - (b) All damaged verges and berms will be repaired.
  - (c) A disused driveway outside 76 Studholme Street to be removed.
  - (d) All kerb and channel has been resurveyed and there is adequate fall to Barrington Street and Somerfield Park. Some properties are very low which means the vehicle crossings are shallow and wide. This can result in a wide band of water at the crossings when it rains. The channel is prone to ponding during leaf fall. Sweeping the channel reduces this.
  - (e) The Council's Safe Routes to School co-ordinator has been advised of concerns regarding the paved areas of the carriageway being dangerous for school children to crossing the road, and will work with the school to improve the situation.

**8 Cont'd**

17. All respondents in the June/July 2010 consultation has been sent a final reply letter thanking them for their input and an A3 colour copy of the finalised plan for their street. The letter informed respondents when the plan would be presented to the Board for approval to reconstruct. Details of the meeting (time, venue etc) were also provided so that any interested people could attend or address the Board prior to the decision being made. All submitters will be notified of the decision.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board approve the proposed replacement of the existing street trees and associated work in Studholme Street (Barrington Street to Somerfield Street), as shown in **Attachment 1** TP322201 issue 2.

**CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**BACKGROUND (THE ISSUES)**

18. An independent tree assessment and audit has been done for Studholme Street. The independent auditor states the existing Ash Trees are rated as being in a poor and very poor condition due to the extensive decay and structural deterioration of the trees. Beside the ongoing loss of tree health and visual amenity, there is the potential for significant structural failures to occur, which could cause damage to property or injure members of the public. Therefore, it is recommended that trees are removed and replaced.
19. If the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board approves the report, the tree removal work will begin in October 2010. The tree replanting and the installation of the bollards and verge and berm restoration will take place in November 2010.

## 9. NEW PLAYGROUND DEVELOPMENT AND NAMING HUNTER TERRACE AND SLOAN TERRACE ROADWAY ENHANCEMENTS

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport & Greenspace Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Ann Campbell, Consultation Leader, DDI 941-5111

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board approval for; the final landscape plan for the new reserve playground, Hunter Terrace Roadway Enhancements, and Sloan Terrace Roadway Enhancements. This report also includes a recommendation to the Council for the preferred name of the new reserve at 54 Colombo Street.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### Playground Development

2. "Pipeyards Reserve" is located on the old Council pipeyards site between the Cashmere Club and South Library Service Centre, on Hunter Terrace. The site is currently fully fenced and undeveloped, apart from an existing BMX track on the Hunter Terrace. The Mid-Heathcote River/Opawaho Linear Park Master Plan identified this site to be developed as a new reserve in Section One.
3. The Project Team developed three theme options for the style of playground to be installed within the new reserve area, these being:
  - (a) Natural Play Theme (to reflect the area);
  - (b) Industrial Play Theme (to reflect the past use of the site);
  - (c) Bubble Play Theme (to reflect the connection to the Heathcote River).

These themes were consulted on and submitters given the opportunity to vote for their preferred option.

4. The new reserve will incorporate the existing BMX track while the current planting around this site will either be removed or pruned to improve sightlines and blend it into the new development. A new pathway, new trees and landscaping and a new tennis court are also proposed as part of this development.
5. As this reserve has not yet officially been named, the Project Team took this opportunity of consultation to seek an official name for the reserve.

#### Road Enhancements

6. Section One and Section Two of the Masterplan identified vehicular circulation issues and opportunities for both Hunter Terrace and Sloan Terrace to support: **Key Goal – 03 Community Use and Enjoyment** – *This key goal was identified to improve the use and enjoyment of the river and its corridor for a diversity of communities that value or have an interest in the river, one of the methods to achieve this goal was to address vehicular circulation.*

#### Hunter Terrace and Sloan Terrace

7. The legal closure of Hunter Terrace occurred by Council resolution in May 2003 as part of the development of the new South Library/Service Centre. The physical closure of the intersection of Colombo Street and the closed section of Hunter Terrace was closed as part of the Colombo Street bus priority project in 2010.

**9 Cont'd**

8. The proposed works for Hunter Terrace roadway enhancements are:
  - (a) Improvements to the new Colombo Street/Hunter Terrace intersection, including a new stop sign;
  - (b) New 20 space car park south of the existing car park with access from the new Hunter Terrace, pedestrian crossing points on Hunter Terrace and through the existing library car park. Extension of the existing library carpark, at the river end, to provide an additional 11 spaces;
  - (c) Narrowing of Hunter Terrace from 14 metres to nine metres wide, with two narrowings of six metres;
  - (d) A 5 minute loading zone on the east side of Hunter Terrace opposite the BMX track;
  - (e) New shared cycle and pedestrian path measuring 2.5 metres wide from Colombo Street along the northern side of the South Library/Service Centre and then south along the eastern side of Hunter Terrace to Malcolm Avenue;
  - (f) Modifications to the existing island on Colombo Street to widen the middle section to improve the crossing for pedestrians and cyclists;
  - (g) Pedestrian paths surrounding and connecting the open lawn area and the BMX area;
  - (h) Give Way signs at each end of the library car park.
9. The proposed works for Sloan Terrace roadway enhancements are:
  - (a) Standardising Sloan Terrace to a consistent seven metres wide;
  - (b) New flat paved inset at Centaurus Road;
  - (c) A new raised 75 millimetre platform with build outs at the crossing from Remuera Reserve across to the footbridge, to assist pedestrian and cycle crossings.
10. The public consultation indicated support for the proposed plans and we received an excellent amount of feedback on a theme for the new playground.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

11. The proposed works in Hunter Terrace and Sloan Terrace are programmed in the LTCCP for implementation in the 2010/11 and 2011/12 financial years.
 

(a)	2010/11	Hunter Terrace	\$536,530
(b)	2010/11	Sloan Terrace	\$155,000
(c)	2010/11	Hunter Terrace Reserve	\$370,285
(d)	2011/12	Hunter Terrace Reserve	\$237,730
(e)	2010/11	Playground	\$20,000
(f)	2011/12	Playground	\$152,978
12. Based on current estimates, staff believe there is sufficient funding in the budget to implement the proposed plans.

**9 Cont'd**

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

13. Yes. Funding is provided from within the Waterways and Land Drainage Renewals and Replacements (Natural Waterways) in the 2009-19 LTCCP, refer page 239. Funding is also provided from within the Neighbourhood Parks Growth Programme (Playgrounds and Recreational Facilities and Planted Areas and Trees) in the 2009-19 LTCCP, also refer page 239.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

14. Part 1, Clause 5 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2008 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.
15. The Council has the authority to approve the name for the new reserve.
16. The Community Boards have delegated authority from Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations dated 13 December 2007. The list of delegations for the Community Board includes the resolution of parking restrictions and Traffic Control Devices.
17. The installation of any parking restriction signs and/or marking must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.
18. The Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority to approve the concept plans (refer **Attachments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5**).
19. All necessary Resource Consents and Building Consents will be obtained before any construction is undertaken.
20. All work will be carried out by a Council approved contractor with the appropriate health and safety and work site management controls in place.

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

21. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

22. **LTCCP 2009-19**  
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) Recreation – by offering a range of recreational opportunities in parks, open space and waterways;
  - (f) City Development – by providing and inviting, pleasant and well care for environment.

**9 Cont'd**

**23. Parks and Open Spaces Activity Management Plan**

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.

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

24. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

25. Aligns with:

- (a) Parks and Waterways Access Policy;
- (b) Safer Christchurch Strategy;
- (c) Youth Strategy;
- (d) Recreation and Sport Strategy.

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

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

27. Yes, as above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

**Consultation Process**

28. Prior to the development of a concept for Hunter Terrace and Sloan Terrace, initial issues gathering was undertaken in 2005, when the public were asked how they would like the central section of the Heathcote River/Opawaho to be development. The draft Master plan was then developed based on the information gathered in 2005, and the community was consulted in July and August 2008.

29. During the 2008 consultation process, two workshops were run, whereby the community could come along and ask questions of the project team in relation to any concerns they may have. All submitters were also given the opportunity to verbally present their comments to the Community Board on 31 October 2008.

30. Following this consultation period, the Mid-Heathcote River/Opawaho Linear Park Masterplan was adopted by Council in April 2009.



## 9 Cont'd

31. The consultation on Section One and Section Two of the Masterplan was open from Monday 21 June 2010 to Monday 12 July 2010. A public information leaflet (refer to **Attachment 6**) was delivered to approximately 270 properties within the vicinity of the areas and a number of other interest groups and key stakeholders. A public information leaflet was also sent to six local schools requesting they put an article in their school newsletter, feedback received was that a number of the schools did this, which was fantastic. This leaflet included a summary of the concepts, three theme options for the new playground, landscape plan including new roadway enhancements and a feedback form. The project team sought feedback from the community on their preferred theme option for the new playground, and feedback on a name for the reserve, and any other general feedback they may have. The proposal was posted on the CCC *Have Your Say* website.
32. Further to this, during the three weeks the consultation was open, a display was held in the foyer of the South Library/Service Centre. This display provided all the plans out for comment and provided a 'voting slip' for people, especially children, to vote on their choice of playground theme. The public information leaflet was also available at this display for those people wanting to make a more detailed submission.
33. Each submission (not the voting slips), 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 the consultation, the project teams preferred plan, the decision making process and how they can be involved in this, and the expected timeline for the project.

**Consultation Outcome**

34. The consultation received 66 responses (22 percent response rate) via the comment form either from the PIL document or through the *Have Your Say* website. We also received 225 votes for the playground theme via the display which was held in the library foyer. The feedback received was largely positive and the voting responses (both from the comment form and voting slips) were as follows:

OPTION 1: *Natural Play Theme*      86

OPTION 2: *Industrial Play Theme*    109

OPTION 3: *Bubble Play Theme*        71

A number of submissions requested that swings were included in the final design and this came through on all option votes.

35. The other option provided on the feedback form was in relation to the naming of the reserve, this will be addressed later in the report.
36. Submitters also provided comments about this proposal. There were numerous comments of support for the proposal and also a number of issues raised for the project team's consideration. The qualitative community feedback and project team responses will be circulated to elected members prior to the meeting, and this feedback will also be made available to all submitters on request.
37. The key issues raised in the public consultation and project team responses, were as follows:

(a) **Traffic and cyclist movement at the northern end of Sloan Terrace**

There is insufficient road reserve and the location of existing vehicle entrances does not allow room to provide a turning area, however, No Stopping on the riverside is being installed;

9 Cont'd

- (b) **Proposed crossing point across Hunter Terrace at western end to the library entrance**  
This is no longer proposed;
- (c) **Pedestrian and cyclist safety across Cashmere Club carpark**  
The riverbank behind this carpark is low lying with a number of existing mature trees, therefore the pathway cannot run behind the carpark. Pedestrians and cyclists will be given priority, therefore, a Give Way is proposed for the carpark exit;
- (d) **Concerns regarding the Hunter Terrace/Colombo Street intersection**  
At the Community Board meeting of 30 July 2010, approval was given to install a Stop control at the intersection of Hunter Terrace and Colombo Street. This has now been forwarded to the contractor for installation. The pedestrian island will be upgraded with new signs and kerb top markers. Road paint marking is also being considered to help guide drivers around the island. Modification of the existing pedestrian island on Colombo Street will include widening of the middle section to improve crossing for pedestrians and cyclists. The existing treatment of the intersection at Colombo Street and Hunter Terrace is a Type B treatment, which is designed for roads with less than 1,500 vehicles per day. It is proposed to upgrade this intersection to a Type C treatment due to the higher volume;
- (e) **Comments regarding the BMX track**  
A number of submissions from interested individuals/groups regarding the future enhancement of the BMX track. It is intended to set up a small working party of interested people and Council staff, to be involved in the new layout for the BMX track;
- (f) **Comments regarding tree species and the attraction for birdlife**  
All trees will be selected from the Masterplan and it is proposed to use a number of the trees which attract birdlife and provide food for them;
- (g) **Provision of disabled parking and pedestrian facility in new southern carpark**  
One disabled carpark is proposed in the new carpark adjacent to the new reserve. A pedestrian facility will also be installed in this new carpark to access the Hunter Terrace crossing point, resulting in the loss of one carpark, bringing the number of spaces to 19;
- (h) **Concern over the loss of parking with the removal of the old Hunter Terrace**  
An additional 30 carparks are being provided in this development with the two new carparks;
- (i) **Request for drinking fountain in the new reserve**  
A new drinking fountain will be installed as part of this development;
- (j) **Safety of cars exiting the library carpark onto Hunter Terrace**  
New Give Way signs will be installed at the two exit points;
- (k) **New 75 millimetre raised platforms at all pedestrian crossing points and the provision of a speed hump outside 104 Hunter Terrace**  
The only addition to the proposed roading enhancements is the addition of three speed humps along Hunter Terrace and a raised crossing platform from the library to the playground area. The other three crossing points to the river bank were seen as part of a permeable road crossing strategy. Speeds were expected to be low with a formalised road edge on the river side, on street parking and the road narrowing outside the library and the Cashmere Club. Consultation feedback included the request/suggestion for a lowered speed limit, enhanced crossing points. In order to achieve a formalised lower speed limit, the road environment must reflect the speed limit proposed. In this situation, CCC Transport Networks Operations Team advise that raised platforms (as already proposed at the new carpark/playground) would be required at each of the formal crossing points, plus one AC road hump outside 104 Hunter Terrace. Hunter Terrace could be included in next year's consultation as a proposal for a speed reduction to the Speed Limits Review;

9 Cont'd

- (l) **Request for directional paving**  
Addition of direction paving as required at crossing points to be included;
  - (m) **Cycle path at northwest corner of library should be 2.5 metres not 2.2 metres as proposed**  
It is not proposed to increase the width of the shared path from 2.2 metres to 2.5 metres that connects the Colombo Street pedestrian island with the shared path alongside the river and the existing path to the library entrance. It is considered that 2.2 metres is a sufficient width in this instance because it reduces the visual impact of the path across the frontage of the library, allows for the landscaping at the Colombo Street end of the path and maintains a separation between the path and the trees, and the range of paths allows for choice so not all users will take this route.  
Note: the path from the Colombo Street bridge will be 2.5 metres.
38. The project team considered the consultation feedback and have responded in the following way:
- (a) Plan amendments:
    - (i) Addition of new 75 millimetre raised platforms at all pedestrian crossing points on Hunter Terrace;
    - (ii) Provision of speed hump outside 104 Hunter Terrace;
    - (iii) Addition of six metres of No Stopping lines on Hunter Terrace from the intersection with Malcolm Avenue;
    - (iv) Proposed Loading Zone on Hunter Terrace be changed to a P5;
    - (v) Give Way sign at the exit of the carpark opposite the Cashmere Club;
    - (vi) Inclusion of disabled carpark in the new carpark adjacent to the playground;
    - (vii) The loss of one space in the carpark adjacent to the playground to provide a pedestrian facility;
    - (viii) Removal of proposed crossing point opposite library entrance;
    - (ix) Addition of directional paving as required at crossing points;
    - (x) Drinking fountain to be installed in the playground;
    - (xi) Shared path from Colombo Street bridge increased from 2.2 metres to 2.5 metres (path from Colombo Street pedestrian island to remain at 2.2 metres).
39. The owners of the property at 104 Hunter Terrace, where the proposed new speed hump is to be installed, have been contacted directly and have no objection to it's installation. The final outcome letter has also been sent to all property owners along Hunter Terrace, due to the inclusion of the speed hump on the final plan for approval. At the time of writing this report no objections had been received.
40. Following consultation and feedback received, the Industrial Theme has been selected for the design of the new playground and this is now reflected in the final plan being presented for Community Board approval.

9 Cont'd

**Reserve Name**

41. On the comment form there was an opportunity to either support the name "Pipeyards Reserve" proposed by Council staff for the name of the new reserve at 54 Colombo Street or to provide another option.
42. The feedback received on the reserve name is as follows:
  - (a) Pipeyards Reserve (20 submitters supported this option);
  - (b) Other names proposed:
    - (i) John Harper Reserve (A long time life member of the Cashmere Rifle Club);
    - (ii) Ella's Place;
    - (iii) Riverview Reserve;
    - (iv) Retreat Reserve;
    - (v) Cashmere Reserve (Cashmere Playground already exists);
    - (vi) Heathcote Reserve (Heathcote Domain is an existing reserve);
    - (vii) Hunter Reserve (4 votes);
    - (viii) Bookmark Reserve;
    - (ix) Paipaparae (pipepark: from paipa – a hose or pipe, and parae – park);
    - (x) Paipapaka (pipepark: from paipa, and paka – park);
    - (xi) Paipaiari (pipeyard: from paipa, and iari – a yard);
    - (xii) Paipawahi (pipeplace/site: from paipa, and wahi – place or site);
    - (xiii) Riverside Reserve (3 votes);
    - (xiv) South Riverside Park;
    - (xv) Christchurch Library Reserve;
    - (xvi) Heathcote Riverbank Reserve;
    - (xvii) Riverbend Park/Reserve;
    - (xviii) Pippy Long Stocking Park;
    - (xix) South Park;
    - (xx) Pumpstation Playground;
    - (xxi) Mid-Heathcote Playground;
    - (xxii) Beckenham South Playground;
    - (xxiii) Cloud Nine Playground;

9 Cont'd

- (xxiv) Opawaho papa takaro – Heathcote Playground (Heathcote Domain an existing reserve);
- (xxv) Te takaro wahi (the place of playing);
- (xxvi) Isla Reserve, Isla's Reserve, Miss Hunter Reserve (the eldest child of Charles Hunter, the original owner of the site. She was a local identity and awarded a QSM for her long service to education and the Anglican Church. As a resident she was asked by Gary Moore (previous Mayor) to cut the ribbon at the opening of South Library/Service Centre);
- (xxvii) South Library Carpark.

- 43. Through this process we received a large and varied list of options for the name of the reserve, with Hunter Reserve being proposed by four submitters and Riverside Reserve being proposed by three submitters. The Council proposal of Pipeyards Reserve received 20 submissions of support.
- 44. The top three names proposed for the site at 54 Colombo Street were Pipeyards Reserve, Hunter Reserve and Riverside Reserve.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board approve the final landscape plan for the new playground at 54 Colombo Street (**Attachment 1** LP326302, Issue 1);

It is recommend that Council:

- (a) Approve the name for the new reserve located at 54 Colombo Street as Hunter Terrace Pipeyards Reserve;
- (c) Approve Hunter Terrace Roadway Enhancement Plans (TP322701, Issue 1: pages 1-3) (refer **Attachment 2**);
- (d) Approve Sloan Terrace Roadway Enhancement Plan (TP322701, Issue 1: page 4) (refer **Attachment 3**);
- (d) Support the inclusion of Hunter Terrace in the next round of the Citywide Speed Limit Review;
- (e) Approve the following parking restrictions to take effect following completion of construction:

**Revocation of Existing Parking Restrictions:**

- (i) That all existing parking restrictions on the north and east side of Hunter Terrace between Colombo Street and Malcolm Avenue be revoked;
- (ii) That all existing parking restrictions on the south and west side of Hunter Terrace between Colombo Street and Malcolm Avenue be revoked;
- (iii) That all existing parking restrictions on the west and southwest side of Sloan Terrace be revoked;
- (iv) That all existing parking restrictions on the east and northeast side of Sloan Terrace be revoked.

**Adopt New No Stopping Restrictions On Hunter Terrace:**

- (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Hunter Terrace commencing at its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 15 metres.

**9 Cont'd**

- (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time commencing on the northeast side of Hunter Terrace at a point 55 metres east of its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in a south easterly and then easterly direction for a distance of 198 metres.
- (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Hunter Terrace commencing at a point 296 metres southeast of its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 23 metres.
- (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Hunter Terrace commencing at a point 375 metres southeast of its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in a south westerly direction for a distance of 41 metres.
- (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of Hunter Terrace commencing at a point 432 metres southeast of its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in a south westerly direction for a distance of 22 metres.
- (vi) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Hunter Terrace commencing at its intersection with Malcolm Avenue and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 80 metres.
- (vii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Hunter Terrace commencing at its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in a easterly and then south easterly direction for a distance of 249 metres.
- (viii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Hunter Terrace commencing at a point 280 metres southeast of its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in a south and then south westerly direction for a distance of 49 metres.
- (ix) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Hunter Terrace commencing at a point 360 metres southeast of its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in a south westerly direction for a distance of 39 metres.
- (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Hunter Terrace commencing at its intersection with Malcolm Avenue and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of six metres.

**Adopt New No Stopping Restrictions On Sloan Terrace:**

- (i) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Sloan Terrace commencing at its intersection with Centaurus Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 68 metres.
- (ii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Sloan Terrace commencing at a point 176 metres north of its intersection with Centaurus Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 32 metres.
- (iii) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Sloan Terrace commencing at a point 314 metres north of its intersection with Centaurus Road and extending in a northerly direction and then an easterly direction across the end of Sloan Terrace for a total distance of 23 metres
- (iv) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited on the west side of Sloan Terrace commencing at the intersection of Centaurus Road and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 328 metres.

**9 Cont'd**

**Adopt New Parking Restrictions – P5**

- (i) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 5 minutes on the northeast side of Hunter Terrace commencing at a point 253 metres southeast from its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in a southeast direction for a distance of 14 metres.

**Adopt New Parking Restrictions – P10**

- (i) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 10 minutes At Any Time on the north side of Hunter Terrace commencing at a point 15 metres east from its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 40 metres.

**Adopt New Shared Pedestrian/Cycle Path**

- (i) That the pathway on the east side of Hunter Terrace commencing at Malcolm Avenue and extending in a northerly direction and then a westerly direction, following the river, to its intersection with Colombo Street be resolved as a shared pedestrian/cycle pathway.
- (ii) That the pathway to the west of South Christchurch Library between Colombo Street and the pathway to the north of South Christchurch Library be resolved as a shared pedestrian/cycle pathway.

**Adopt New Give-Way Controls**

- (i) That a give way control be placed against the exit of the western most South Christchurch Library Car Park access at its intersection with Hunter Terrace.
- (ii) That a give way control be placed against the exit of the eastern most South Christchurch Library Car Park access at its intersection with Hunter Terrace.
- (iii) That a give way control be placed against the exit of the Cashmere Club Car Park at its intersection with Hunter Terrace (the car park situated on the river bank east of Hunter Terrace).

**CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

10. RISINGHOLME PARK - TREE REMOVAL REQUEST

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager Transport & Greenspace
<b>Authors:</b>	Tony Armstrong, Parks Arborist, DDI 941- 8578 Ann Campbell, Consultation Leader, DDI 941-5111

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to present a resident’s request for the removal of a western red cedar tree (*Thuja plicata*) from Risingholme Park and to make recommendation for the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board decision. It is also to present information on other requests (CSR) for trees within the park.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. A request has been received from the resident at 173 Fifield Terrace, Opawa, for the removal of a large conifer tree (western red cedar) tree within Risingholme Park adjacent to their property.
3. The reasons given for the request are because of adverse shading to the property, being their garden all year and including the house during winter also. Previous requests by this resident for this tree have been received in 2002, 2006 and 2009.
4. An arboricultural assessment of the tree concludes that it is in good condition with typical form. There has been some pruning historically i.e. canopy lifting on the trunk and further (pruning) work is possible. This would be limited to further canopy lifting and removal of deadwood.
5. There are five other trees of this species recorded in Risingholme Park, notably at the entrance and another along this particular boundary. However, this tree is most visible from the entrance to the Community Centre building (see **Attachment 1**).
6. Since 2002 there has been sixty-two customer service requests (CSR) received and recorded by Council for Risingholme Park. These include the three for this tree by this resident. These (62) have all been actioned and closed with only this current issue pending a decision.
7. A capital programme project was initiated and implemented over the years 2004 to 2006. This identified and actioned priority tree removals and some replacement planting over this period. The project is no longer active for the current LTCCP.
8. The resident has expressed that they would be “willing to contribute to the costs of any work”
9. The recommendation is not to remove the tree based on its assessment as being a healthy tree and the public consultation being divided.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

10. The cost to remove the tree and replace it with a PB95 grade tree is estimated at \$1,359.65 (including watering and maintenance for one year following planting).
11. The STEM evaluation including the nuisance factor is 96  
The STEM evaluation without the nuisance factor is 102  
  
The STEM valuation including the nuisance factor is \$9,000  
The STEM valuation without the nuisance factor is \$9,300

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

12. Obtaining reimbursement from the applicant to remove and replace a structurally sound and healthy tree is consistent with the current LTCCP.



10 Cont'd

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

13. The Greenspace Manager has the following delegation with respect to tree:
  - (a) "In consultation with any other units affected and the relevant Community Board, authorise the planting or removal of tree from any reserve or other property under the Manager's control".
14. While the Transport and Greenspace Manager has the delegation to remove the tree, current practice is that in most cases requests to remove healthy and structurally sound trees that are not causing other health and safety or infrastructure damage concerns are placed before the appropriate Community Board for a decision.
15. Under the delegations to Community Boards, the Board has the authority to "plant, maintain and remove tree on reserves, parks and roads" under the control of the Council within the policy set by the Council.
16. Protected trees can only be removed by a successful application under the Resource Management Act. The tree in question is not listed as protected under the provision of the Christchurch City Plan.
17. 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 tree identified as "heritage" or "notable" and the subdivision process protects other tree which are considered to be "significant". The highest degree of protection applies to heritage tree.

Because Christchurch is largely built on a flat plain, tree 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 tree 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:

- Tree-lined streets and avenues.
- Parks and developed areas of open space.

10 Cont'd

**14.3.2 Policy: "Garden City" image identity**

**To acknowledge and promote the "Garden City" identity of the City by protecting, maintaining and extending planting which compliments this image**

18. An application to prune or remove the tree may be made to the District Court under The Property Law Act 2007.
19. The District Court can order the pruning or removal of a tree under the Property Law Act 2007.
20. Any work carried out in relation to the western red cedar is to be completed by a Council approved contractor.

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

21. Yes, as per above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

22. LTCCP 2009-19

**Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Pg. 117**

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

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

26. Yes, as per above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

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

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

29. Yes, as per above.

## 10 Cont'd

### CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

30. In February/March 2010 a letter and a feedback form were delivered to ten properties adjacent to Risingholme Park in the vicinity of the tree, including the Risingholme Community Centre. This provided an opportunity for the community to indicate their preference along with any additional comments or feedback.
31. The consultation received five responses (a 50% response rate) and community feedback was divided (please refer to the full schedule of community feedback and project team responses attached to this report – **Attachment 2**) Note; the resident requesting the removal did not respond:
  - (a) two responded "I support the removal of the tree".
  - (b) three responded "I support retaining the tree".
32. As part of the consultation all residents were advised of when the staff report would be presented to the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board for their decision. Details of the meeting date, time and venue were provided to enable residents to either attend or make a deputation to the Board prior to a decision being made. They were also advised of how they could access the report prior to the meeting.

### Arboricultural Assessment

33. Risingholme Park is listed as a Garden and Heritage park that lies in a predominantly residential area near the Heathcote River in Opawa. The Risingholme Community Centre exists within the park.
34. There are 235 trees listed in the park of which 25 are listed as protected in the City Plan. The vegetation in the reserve is mixed age and species. The landscape comprises specimen trees, shrub borders and beds, ornamental collections, native plant collection in the watercourse and open lawn areas. The predominant trees are the large exotic deciduous and evergreen species. There are five other western red cedar trees recorded in Risingholme Park, notably at the entrance and another along this particular boundary.
35. The tree which is subject of this report is situated to the north east of 173 Fifield Terrace in a shrub and tree border. Its location alongside the residential boundary contributes to the general amenity and landscape of the reserve by providing screening, shade and shelter.
36. The western red cedar is approximately ten metres in height with a canopy spread of approximately eight metres. It is a mature tree showing typical form and condition for a tree of such species and age. There is nothing apparent or abnormal which would warrant its removal for tree health and safety concerns.
37. There has been some pruning historically ie. canopy lifting on the trunk to clear property boundary and further (pruning) work is possible. This would be limited to further canopy lifting to 'balance' the canopy and removal of deadwood only.
38. The tree is not fully mature and could be expected to grow to perhaps twice its existing height.
39. Council has received three CSR (customer service requests) from the resident at this address relating to this tree. CSR 90116231 was received in September 2002 requesting pruning, CSR 90574991 in August 2006 once again requesting pruning and more recently in May 2009 requesting pruning or removal.

**10 Cont'd**

40. The current request (September 2009) has not been logged as a CSR but following a site inspection and meeting with the resident it was addressed as a letter to the local Community Board seeking a deputation to request removal. The matter is now reported to the Board for a decision.
41. Other CSR and work undertaken as part of capital renewals programme have not identified this tree as a specific concern and therefore a decision on this tree has not previously been considered,
42. If the decision is made to remove the western red cedar tree it would be appropriate to replace the tree with another species, and possibly to another location within the park. The resident states that they would be willing to contribute to the costs of any work.

**Options**

43. Decline the request to remove the tree and continue to maintain the tree to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural practices, standards and procedures.
44. Remove and replace the tree. Costs of \$1,359.65 are to be borne by the applicant. All work is to be carried out by an approved Council tree contractor.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board decline the request to remove the tree and continue to maintain the tree to internationally recognised and accepted arboricultural practices, standards and procedures.

**CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

## 11. DYERS PASS / HACKTHORNE ROAD INTERSECTION (LOWER INTERSECTION) PROPOSED PARKING CHANGES AND BUS STOP UPGRADE

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager City Environment Group, DDI 941-8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager Transport and Greenspace,
<b>Author:</b>	Steve Dejong, Traffic Engineer Transport

### PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's approval to install P120 and P3 Parking Restrictions in the vicinity of the Dyers Pass Road/Hackthorne Road Intersection and that adjustments are made to the existing bus stops to upgrade these to the new standards. (refer to **Attachment 1**).

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In 2009 staff received three separate requests from stakeholders in Dyers Pass Road and Hackthorne Road asking that parking changes be made in the vicinity of the Hackthorne Road and Dyers Pass Road intersection to more fairly allocate kerb side parking, reduce congestion and improve safety. Due to the major parking plans being undertaken in other areas by staff at the time, the stakeholders were informed that an investigation would be undertaken after the completion of the other major projects.
3. Dyers pass Road is designated as a minor arterial road and has an average annual daily total of approximately 4,000 vehicles per day. Hackthorne Road is designated as a collector road and has an average annual daily total of approximately 2,850 vehicles per day. Both of these roads are bus routes
4. Located at the lower intersection of Dyers Pass Road and Hackthorne Road are five local businesses. All of these businesses are legally established and operate under existing use rights or the conditions of their respective resource consents. *(There are two intersections of Dyers Pass Road and Hackthorne Road this report and all its proposed resolutions relate to the lower intersection and its immediate vicinity only).*
5. The initial parking change request came from Cashmere Primary School who asked if the existing P5 Loading Zone along the school frontage with Hackthorne Road could be improved. Staff agreed that the P5 could be replaced with the new P3 drop off/pick up zone. The proposed P3 would encourage more efficient drop off/pick up, shorter turn over times and dissuade care givers/parents from leaving their vehicle unattended. The proposed P3 would also go some way to reducing congestion on the road along the school frontage and around the pedestrian crossing resulting in improved safety for all road users. As a result of consultation Cashmere Primary School requested that the Proposed P3 could be extended additional two spaces east. Staff are happy to support this request and the plan has been adjusted accordingly, (uphill) and still outside the school frontage.
6. The further request was received from a business owner asking if some time limited parking could be installed outside the businesses to provide turnover parking for customers of the businesses located around the intersection. The final request came from an elderly resident concerned that he was unable to park near his property. While investigating these requests it became apparent to staff that the requests could be combined and that changes to the parking in the area could be made to benefit the school, residents, and businesses while also improving safety in the immediate vicinity of the intersection.
7. On the 1 November 2009 the older, smaller busses servicing route No 10; Airport – Cashmere, along Hackthorne Road and route No 14; Harewood – Dyers Pass, along Dyers Pass Road, were replaced with the larger tag axel busses. It has been observed that these busses are having difficulty manoeuvring into and out of the Stops on both routes around this intersection due to vehicles parking hard up against the Bus Stops. Often Busses can not get out of the live lane which impedes the flow of traffic.

**11 Cont'd**

8. It was therefore proposed to up grade the existing bus stops to the new standard, which includes the eight metre entry and four metre exit. It was further thought advantageous to relocate the bus stop presently situated outside 97 Dyers Pass Road, 50 metres south (up hill) to outside number 105. This is a desirable location and has been made possible by the support of the property owner of no 103 and 105 Dyers Pass Road. (refer **Attachment 1**)
9. The proposed relocation of the previously mentioned bus stop will provide available space for a P120 Parking Restriction to be located outside the businesses at No 95 Dyers Pass Road. A further portion of P120 Parking restriction is proposed for the north side of Hackthorne Road outside the Masonic lodge. In response to the consultation the property owner of No 124 Hackthorne Road (down hill) from Dyers Pass Road, has also requested a portion of P120 parking restriction outside their property. This is ideal as it will provide some medium term parking to service the businesses located at 127 Hackthorne Road and will greatly improve pedestrian safety as often people park up hill and wander across this wide intersection to gain access to the businesses on this side of the road. (refer **Attachment 1**).
10. Initially a portion of P120 Parking Restriction was proposed for outside No 130 Hackthorne Road however this was not supported by the resident of 130 and their immediate neighbours. Staff were happy to withdraw this from the proposal, as these residents supported the rest of the proposal and this portion of P120 is not necessary now that the better location as previously mentioned has become available outside No 124 Hackthorne Road. (refer **Attachment 1**).
11. Consultation was undertaken with all affected residents and Businesses owners in the vicinity of the intersection, in person with those most affected by the proposal and also via a consultation letter and plan to those residents located further out. Overwhelming support has been received from all residents businesses and stakeholders in the immediate vicinity of the proposal. The Cashmere Residents Association was also consulted and supports the proposal. (See paragraphs 22-25 for greater consultation detail).

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

12. The estimated cost of this proposal is approximately \$3,000.

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

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

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

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

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

17. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

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

**11 Cont'd**

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

19. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

20. The recommendations align with the Council Strategies including the Parking Strategy 2003, Pedestrian Strategy 2001, Road Safety Strategy 2004

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

21. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

22. Residents and stakeholders in the vicinity of the proposal were consulted via mail. A total of 50 consultation packages were sent out and some residents/ stakeholders were consulted verbally as well. Staff received 26 responses. All 26 supported the Proposed P3 School Drop off / Pickup Zone and the Proposed Bus Stop upgrade, while 21 supported the Proposed P120 Parking Restrictions. While supporting the rest of the proposal 5 residents indicated their opposition to the proposed P120.
23. Initially a portion of P120 Parking Restriction was proposed for outside No 130 Hackthorne Road however this was not supported by the resident of 130 and their immediate neighbours. Staff were happy to withdraw this from the proposal, as these residents supported the rest of the proposal and this portion of P120 is not necessary now that the better location as previously mentioned has become available outside No 124 Hackthorne Road.
24. The Cashmere Residents Association was consulted and support the proposal.
25. The officer in Charge- Parking Enforcement agrees with this recommendation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

(There are two intersections of Dyers Pass Road and Hackthorne Road. This report and all its proposed resolutions relate to the lower intersection and its immediate vicinity only).

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board

**Revoke the following parking restrictions:**

- (a) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the south side of Hackthorne Road commencing its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 25 metres be revoked.
- (b) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the north side of Hackthorne Road commencing its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 15 metres be revoked.
- (c) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the north side of Hackthorne Road commencing at a point 52 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 28 metres be revoked
- (d) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the south side of Hackthorne Road commencing its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 19 metres be revoked.
- (e) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the south side of Hackthorne Road commencing at a point 60 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 95 metres be revoked.

**11 Cont'd**

- (f) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the east side of Dyers Pass Road commencing its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of eight metres be revoked.
- (g) That the stopping of vehicles currently prohibited at any time on the east side of Dyers Pass Road commencing at a point 44 metres south of its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 21 metres be revoked.
- (h) That the bus stop currently located on the north side of Hackthorne Road commencing a point 28 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 15 metres be revoked.
- (i) That the bus stop currently located on the south side of Hackthorne Road commencing a point 26 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 15 metres be revoked.
- (j) That the bus stop currently located on the east side of Dyers Pass Road commencing a point 27 metres south of its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 12 metres be revoked.
- (k) That the unmarked bus stop currently located on the west side of Dyers Pass Road 17 metres south of its intersection with Hackthorne Road be revoked.
- (l) That the loading zone restricted to a maximum period of 5 minutes (8.00 to 9.00 am 2.30pm to 3.30 pm), school days, currently located on the north side of Hackthorne Road commencing at a point 80 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for at distance of 58 metres be revoked.

**Approve the following No Stopping Restrictions:**

- (m) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Hackthorne Road commencing its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 30 metres.
- (n) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Hackthorne Road commencing its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
- (o) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Hackthorne Road commencing at a point 30 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of eight metres.
- (p) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Hackthorne Road commencing at a point 52 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 28 metres.
- (q) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Hackthorne Road commencing at its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 19 metres.
- (r) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Hackthorne Road commencing at a point 33 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of eight metres.
- (s) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the south side of Hackthorne Road commencing at a point 60 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 39 metres.
- (t) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Dyers Pass Road commencing its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of eight metres.



**11 Cont'd**

- (u) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Dyers Pass Road commencing a point 44 metres south of its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 21 metres.
- (v) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Dyers Pass Road commencing a point 99 metres south of its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of eight metres.
- (w) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the east side of Dyers Pass Road commencing a point 121 metres south of its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of four metres.
- (x) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Dyers Pass Road commencing its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 17 metres.
- (y) That the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the west side of Dyers Pass Road commencing a point 31 metres south of its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of eight metres.

**Approve the following Bus Stops:**

- (z) That a Bus Stop be installed on the north side of Hackthorne Road commencing a point 38 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
- (aa) That a Bus Stop be installed on the south side of Hackthorne Road commencing a point 19 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
- (ab) That a Bus Stop be installed on the east side of Dyers Pass Road commencing a point 107 metres south of its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.
- (ac) That a Bus Stop be installed on the west side of Dyers Pass Road commencing a point 17 metres south of its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 14 metres.

**Approve the following Parking Restrictions:**

- (ad) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the north side of Hackthorne Road commencing a point 15 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 15 metres.
- (ae) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 3 minutes (8.15am to 9.15am and 2.30pm to 3.30pm) school days, on the north side of Hackthorne Road commencing a point 80 metres east of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a easterly direction for a distance of 74 metres.
- (af) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the east side of Dyers Pass Road commencing a point eight metres south of its intersection with Hackthorne Road and extending in a southerly direction for a distance of 29 metres.
- (ag) That the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the south side of Hackthorne Road commencing a point 30 metres west of its intersection with Dyers Pass Road and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.

**CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

## 12. CASHMERE VIEW STREET TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, City Environment, DDI 941 8608
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Transport and Greenspace Manager
<b>Authors:</b>	Philippa Upton, 941 8808 Steve Dejong 841 6428

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board of the results of an investigation into the traffic management along Cashmere View Street in response to a petition received from residents of the street and to recommend to the Board that the installation of further traffic calming devices within Cashmere View Street are not considered necessary.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Cashmere View Street kerb and channel renewal and full Carriageway construction was completed in early 2010. (**Attachment 1**). The street is wholly residential and is located between Rose Street and Ashgrove Terrace, close to the Heathcote River. Cashmere View Street contains a small park, and is also close to Cashmere High School and several homes for the elderly.
3. Prior to the renewal, initial issues gathering for Cashmere View Street reinforced strong resident concerns about short-cutting, speeding and antisocial driving. The plan developed for consultation reduced the carriageway width to nine metres, narrowed both entrances at each end of the street to seven metres and provided two six metre wide mid-block narrowing's without vertical elements.
4. Traffic counts prior to the rebuild placed outside numbers 11 and 45 revealed an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile of 40 km/h and a seven day average daily total of 1,600 vehicles per day. Although the through traffic movements were at the higher end of those expected for a local road the speeds were below the levels expected to qualify for further calming treatment. This data was collected during the school term break of 5 -20 July 2008.
5. Key issues raised again during consultation on the concept plan were short-cutting and to a lesser extent speeding. A number of residents requested further measures to slow traffic speeds and limit through traffic. Therefore the plan was adjusted to provide raised platforms within the narrowing's at either end of the street. The 17 March 2009 report approved by the Community Board approved these changes.
6. The report of 17 March 2009 also included the provision within paragraphs 26 and 27, under Consultation Fulfilment, that 'should a future speed survey confirm there is a speeding issue in Cashmere View Street,' additional measures could be undertaken for traffic calming. However this situation remains unchanged following recent traffic counts, and this data does not support any additional action.
7. Following construction between November 2009 and January 2010, a petition from residents was presented to the Community Board on 16 February 2010. The petition stated that 'the recent reconstruction in the street has resulted in a significant increase in traffic speed' and included the request to install 'at least three speed humps' to deter the 'boy racers' and speeding traffic that is making our street unsafe.' The petition showed 100% resident support.
8. As a result of receiving the petition from the residents of Cashmere View Street, staff undertook post construction traffic counts during the week of Wednesday 7 April through Wednesday 14 April 2010, in the same locations as the pre construction data was collected. This data was also collected during a School term break, being 1 - 19 April 2010.

**12 Cont'd**

9. The data collected from the April 2010 tube count surprisingly showed post construction 85 percentile speeds of 48 km/h an increase in speed of 8 km/h. However the through traffic movements in the street dropped dramatically from 1600 in July 2008 to 600, a decrease of 1,000 vehicular movements per day. It is important to note that although the speeds for Cashmere View Street had increased, speeds were still within the lower levels for an 85 percentile speed expected within residential streets. This however may not be much consolation for the residents of Cashmere View Street who may still perceive that vehicles speeds are too fast.
10. Staff found this a very interesting case and undertook a second lot of post construction tube counts to verify the previous findings. These counts were taken during the school term on the week of Tuesday 3 August through Friday 13 August 2010 in the same locations as the two previous counts were taken.
11. These August 2010 counts showed a further increase of 1.7 km/h on the April 2010 counts, bringing the latest 85 percentile speed reading for Cashmere View Street to 49.7 km/h. Once again although this is no consolation to the residents of the street, these speeds are not considered high speed readings.
12. If Network Operations staff were to consider Cashmere View Street separately from the recent rebuild and accessed it on the latest data for calming, Cashmere View Street would not meet the minimum criteria for the installation of further calming. Staff can empathise with the residents of this street however there is a direct correlation between the decrease in the numbers of vehicles moving through the street and the increase in speed recorded in the street; but overall there are fewer vehicles travelling at slightly faster speeds. It is also likely that these faster speeds being recorded are people who are more familiar with this street.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

13. There is no funding available in the 2009-2019 LTCCP for additional traffic calming in Cashmere View Street.

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

14. Yes, the recommendations of this report align with LTCCP budgets, as above.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

15. There are no land ownership or other legal issues associated with this project.

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

16. Yes, as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

17. Yes, currently there is no funding available in the CLIP and staff are not recommending any additional street calming.

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

18. Yes as above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

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

**12 Cont'd**

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

20. As above.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

21. No further consultation was undertaken in relation to the collection of data for this report as the purpose of this report is to supply technical data and information to the Board.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board:

- (a) Receive the information. .
- (b) That no additional traffic calming measures be undertaken in Cashmere View Street at this time.

**CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**13. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE 2010/11 YOUTH ACHIEVEMENT FUNDING APPLICATION – JESSICA WATSON, YVETTE PUGH, VERONICA PUGH**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services DDI 941-8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Recreation and Sport 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, three applications for funding assistance from the Spreydon/ Heathcote 2010/11 Youth Achievement Scheme fund.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Funding is being sought by the following applicants:
- Jessica Watson, 12 year old from Addington to attend the 19th NZ Scout Jamboree, with Holmes Park Scout Group, at Mystery Creek Hamilton from 29 December 2010 to 6 January 2011.
  - Yvette Pugh, 13 year old from Cashmere, to compete in the 2010 New Zealand DanceSport Championships (Class A) in Auckland from 23-24 October 2010.
  - Veronica Pugh, 15 year old from Cashmere, to attend the 2010 New Zealand DanceSport Championships (Class A) in Auckland from 23-24 October 2010.
3. Jessica Watson's application is not considered high priority as her participation is not based on a selection process due to outstanding achievement rather, its part of a scout group trip. Veronica Pugh's application is not considered high priority as her participation in this competitive event is non-competitive.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. The following tables detail event expenses and funding requested for each applicant:

**a) Jessica Watson**

<b>EXPENSES</b>	<b>Cost (NZ \$)</b>
Jamboree fee	\$645
Travel (airfares and coach)	\$302
Uniform	\$95
Pre-Jamboree training camp	\$40
Equipment Hire	\$85
Subsidy of leaders fee	\$243
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$1,410</b>
Amount raised with group	\$147
Other grants (Riccarton/Wigram and Pub Charity)	\$204
<b>Amount requested</b>	<b>\$200</b>

**b) Yvette Pugh**

<b>EXPENSES</b>	<b>Cost (NZ \$)</b>
Accommodation	\$168.75
Flights	\$140
Insurance	\$20
Registration Fee	\$60
Ground Transport	\$111
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>\$499.75</b>
Amount raised	\$0
<b>Amount requested</b>	<b>\$499.75</b>

## 13 Cont'd

## c) Veronica Pugh

<b>EXPENSES</b>	<b>Cost (NZ \$)</b>
Accommodation	\$168.75
Flights	\$140
Insurance	\$20
Spectator Fee	\$60
Ground Transport	\$111
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>\$499.75</b>
Amount raised	\$0
<b>Amount requested</b>	<b>\$499.75</b>

5. This is the first time all applicants have applied for funding from the Spreydon/ Heathcote Youth Achievement scheme.
6. Holmes Park Scout Group has been granted \$1,250 from Riccarton Wigram 2010/11 Small Grants fund towards the 19<sup>th</sup> NZ Scout Jamboree fees for 12 scouts. Other members of the scout group have also applied to their Community Board Youth Development Scheme for funding.
7. There is currently a balance of \$5,950 available in the 2010/11 Youth Achievement Scheme fund.

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

8. Yes see page 184, regarding Board funding.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

9. There are no legal issues to be considered.

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

10. Not applicable.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

11. Yes.

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

12. Yes, Community Grants (pg 176), Strengthening Communities (pg 172), and Recreation and Sports Services (pg.108).

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

13. Application aligns with the Strengthening Communities Strategy, Youth Strategy and the Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy.
14. Application also aligns with the following Spreydon/ Heathcote Community Board Objectives: 'Increased participation of Spreydon/Heathcote residents in local and city-wide recreation events/ programmes.'

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

15. Not applicable.

**13 Cont'd**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Board decline the application from Jessica Watson for \$200 from the 2010/11 Youth Achievement Scheme fund to assist her to attend the 19th NZ Scout Jamboree to be held at Mystery Creek, Hamilton from 29 December 2010 to 6 January 2011.

It is recommended that the Board allocate Yvette Pugh \$150 from the 2010/11 Youth Achievement Scheme fund to assist her to compete in the 2010 New Zealand DanceSport Championships (Class A) in Auckland from 23-24 October 2010.

It is recommended that the Board decline the application from Veronica Pugh for \$499.75 from the 2010/11 Youth Achievement Scheme fund to attend the 2010 New Zealand DanceSport Championships (Class A) in Auckland from 23-24 October 2010. This is because Veronica is not competing.

**CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

### 13 Cont'd

#### BACKGROUND OF EACH APPLICANT

##### **Jessica Watson**

16. Jessica has been a scout for five years. She loves sport, adventure and also plays touch and hockey. Jessica has never been on the Jamboree and is really looking forward to the opportunity. She aims to achieve bronze, silver and gold badges in scouts in the future.
17. The aim of The Scout Association of New Zealand is to "encourage the physical, mental, social and spiritual development of young people so that they may take a constructive place in society". Thereby building a better community.
18. The Holmes Park Scout Group meet at the Scout hall on English Street in Upper Riccarton. They currently have seven leaders, 13 scouts, 12 keas, 14 cubs members that meet weekly during school term. The Jamboree is being held in December 2010 at Mystery Creek Hamilton and the Holmes Park Scout Group plan to take 12 Scouts and two leaders.
19. The scout Jamboree is only held every three years, so most scouts only get one opportunity to attend. Over a nine day period up to 5,000 youth and adults will be engaged in activities ranging from confidence courses, team building, abseiling, plus life skills which range from cooking, keeping their tents tidy to hand washing their clothes.
20. The Holmes Park Scout Group have raised over \$4,000 dollars towards the total cost of \$16,800. Jessica has helped the group fundraise by running sausage sizzles, cleaning up rubbish at Motukarara Races and selling chocolate.

##### **Yvette Pugh**

21. Yvette attends Aidenfield Christian School and has been dancing competitively in Ballroom and Latin dance for seven years. She currently holds a number of age-group national titles including the Juvenile Level 4 Titles in Standard (Ballroom), Latin and New Vogue and Juvenile Open Titles in Latin, Standard and New Vogue. Yvette has also performed demonstrations at several community events including Dancing Under the Stars (Fendalton/ Waimairi), The Christchurch Art Gallery and the city-wide 'Dancing Like the Stars' school program in 2010. Yvette has also featured on television in 'Dancing with the Stars' and 'New Zealand's got Talent'.
22. The New Zealand Dance and DanceSport Council is the controlling body for Dancesport in New Zealand. New Zealand Dance and DanceSport Council recognise multiple dance championships throughout the year of which seven are chart ranking events. Of these seven events only two events are Class A such as the event Yvette is competing in.
23. The New Zealand DanceSport Championships in Auckland is open to Junior, Juvenile and Youth competitors in Ballroom, Latin and New Vogue dancing in Class A. Yvette plans to defend the national titles that she holds at this event in Auckland. In July, Yvette competed at the other Class A event, New Zealand Open DanceSport Championships, held at Pioneer Leisure Centre in Christchurch. At this event Yvette and her partner Kurt won the Junior Level 2 and 3 Latin and took third place in the Junior Open Latin.

##### **Veronica Pugh**

24. Veronica attends Middleton Grange School and is an accomplished Ballroom Dancer although she currently does not have a dance partner in order to compete. She has won and placed in Ballroom, Latin and New Vogue at the South Island Championships. Veronica plans to attend the New Zealand DanceSport Championships to support her younger sister and the other Canterbury dancers, and to gain experience through attending the lectures and practical workshops put on by national and international champions.



**14. SPREYDON/HEATHCOTE 2010/11 YOUTH ACHIEVEMENT FUNDING APPLICATION – EMILIA GRIBBIN**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services DDI 941-8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Recreation and Sport 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 an application for funding assistance from the Spreydon/Heathcote 2010/11 Youth Achievement Scheme fund.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Funding is being sought by Emilia Gribbin, 14 year old from Cashmere to assist with costs associated with attending the Brisbane Football Academy with Mainland Football from 23 September to 2 October 2010.
3. Emilia recently applied for funding from the Spreydon/Heathcote Youth Achievement scheme for a New Zealand Secondary Schools football competition (report for the Spreydon/ Heathcote Community Board meeting, 3 September 2010). This application was withdrawn as she has reached a higher level of achievement and has the opportunity to go on a higher priority trip, of which she would like assistance. The Board requested further information about this trip at their meeting on 3 September 2010.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4. The following table details event expenses and funding requested by Emilia Gribbin:

<b>EXPENSES</b>	<b>Cost (NZ \$)</b>
Airfares, ground transport, accommodation at a school, food, insurance and activities.	\$1,969
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$1,969</b>
Amount raised	\$220
<b>Amount requested</b>	<b>\$500</b>

5. There is currently a balance of \$5,950 available in the 2010/11 Youth Achievement Scheme fund.

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

6. Yes see page 184, regarding Board funding.

**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.

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

10. Yes, Community Grants (pg 176), Strengthening Communities (pg 172), and Recreation and Sports Services (pg.108).

## 14 Cont'd

### ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

11. Application aligns with the Strengthening Communities Strategy, Youth Strategy and the Physical Recreation and Sport Strategy.
12. Application also aligns with the following Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board Objectives: 'Increased participation of Spreydon/Heathcote residents in local and city-wide recreation events/ programmes.'

### CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

13. Not applicable.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board allocate Emilia Gribbin \$350 from the Spreydon/Heathcote 2010/11 Youth Achievement Scheme fund to assist with costs associated with attending the Brisbane Football Academy with Mainland Football from 23 September to 2 October 2010.

### CHAIRPERSONS RECOMMENDATION

To be discussed.

### BACKGROUND OF THE APPLICANT

#### Emilia (Millie) Gribbin

14. Emilia (known as Millie) attends Cashmere High School where she plays football in the Wednesday school competition. She also trains for the Canterbury School of Football (Academy), has represented Canterbury for the last three years and her Under 14 team recently won the national tournament unbeaten. For the past season Millie has also played for the Canterbury United Academy Under 16 squad in the women's league. Millie trains five days per week and has a passion for football.
15. Emilia has been selected to join the New Zealand Football National Talent Centre (NZTC) in Christchurch in October. The introduction of three National Talent Centres centralised in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch is part of New Zealand Football's plan to speed the rate of player development and progress on the world stage.
16. Emilia has also been given the opportunity to attend the Brisbane Football Academy with Mainland Football from 23 September to 2 October 2010. The Brisbane Football Academy tour includes training sessions, fitness classes and four matches against other football academies. She will also have a video analysis, training analysis with Wellington Phoenix and the opportunity to watch the Phoenix play Gold Coast. Millie is excited about the training analysis and is looking forward to taking her new skills back to her school team and NZTC.
17. Emilia has been involved in various fund raising efforts for this tour including a quiz night, food demonstration night and garage sale. She is also putting aside babysitting money to help fund the trip.

**15. APPLICATION TO SPREYDON/ HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD 2010/11 DISCRETIONARY RESPONSE FUND - LANDSDOWNE TERRACE PLAYCENTRE**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services Group, DDI 941-8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Recreation and Sports Unit Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Sarah Benton, Community Recreation Advisor, DDI 941 5107

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is for the Spreydon/ Heathcote Community Board to consider an application for funding from its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund from Landsdowne Terrace Playcentre. This project is to replace a wooden playground that is 15 years old and does not comply with current playground safety regulations. Contribution is sought towards the playground fort, engineer fees, demolition costs and temporary fencing.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. In 2010/11, the total pool available for allocation for the Spreydon/Heathcote Discretionary Response Fund is \$51,197. The Discretionary Response Fund opens each year on 1 July and closes on 30 June the following year, or when all funds are expended.
3. The purpose of the Fund is to assist community groups where the project and funding request falls outside other council funding criteria and/or closing dates. This fund is also for emergency funding for unforeseen situations.
4. At the Council meeting of 22 April 2010, Council resolved to change the criteria and delegations around the local Discretionary Response Fund.
5. The change in criteria limited the items that the local Discretionary Response Fund does not cover to only:
  - (a) Legal challenges or Environment Court challenges against the Council, Council Controlled Organisations or Community Boards decisions;
  - (b) Projects or initiatives that change the scope of a Council project; and
  - (c) Projects or initiatives that will lead to ongoing operational costs to the Council.

Council also made a note that: *"Community Boards can recommend to the Council for consideration grants under (b) and (c)."*

6. Based on this criteria, the application from Landsdowne Terrace Playcentre for 'Playground fort replacement' is eligible for funding. This application has been referred to the Spreydon/ Heathcote Discretionary Response Fund because it is considered 'building renovation' which is not eligible in the criteria for Strengthening Communities and Small Grants funding.
7. Detailed information on the application and staff comments are included in the attached Decision Matrix. (**Attachment 1**).

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

8. There is currently \$41,697 remaining in the Board's 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund.

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

9. Yes, see page 184 of the LTCCP regarding community grants schemes including Board funding

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

10. There are no legal considerations.

**15 Cont'd**

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

11. Aligns with LTCCP and Activity Management Plans, page 172 and 176.

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

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

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

13. Refer to the attached Decision Matrix.

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

14. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Spreydon/ Heathcote Community Board approve a grant of \$2,500 from its 2010/11 Discretionary Response Fund to Landsdowne Terrace Playcentre towards a Playground fort.

**CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

**16. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD WEEK FUNDING**

<b>General Manager responsible:</b>	General Manager, Community Services, DDI 941-8607
<b>Officer responsible:</b>	Unit Manager, Community Support Manager
<b>Author:</b>	Mary O'Reilly, Community Engagement Adviser, DDI 941 5116

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to consider applications for Neighbourhood Week funding and to set in place a process should any late applications need to be considered.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

2. Local community groups, including residents' associations and neighbourhood support groups will be sent information inviting them to apply for the Neighbourhood Week Funding that has been set aside by the Board. (**Attachment 1**).
3. Neighbourhood Week is a dedicated week in which individuals and groups are encouraged to get together and get to know one another locally. Neighbourhood Week 2010 is to be held from 30 October – 7 November 2010. Applications for funding close on 3 September 2010.
4. A matrix outlining the applications and staff recommendations will be circulated to Board members separately prior to the meeting.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5. The Board has allocated \$4,000 from the Strengthening Communities Fund to assist individuals and groups run events. It is not the intention of this funding to totally fund events. Those applying for funding are expected to partially resource events themselves either financially or through supply of materials.

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

6. Page 170 off the LTCCP under Community support – Strengthening communities and page 176 of the LTCCP under Community support – Community grants.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

7. Under Council Standing Order 12.10 (Powers of Delegation), a sub committee may be appointed and given the power to act.

**ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

8. Page 170 off the LTCCP under Community support – Strengthening communities and page 176 of the LTCCP under Community support – Community grants.

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

9. As above.

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

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

10. Funding for Neighbourhood Week activities aligns with the Council's Strong Communities strategic outcomes.

**16 Cont'd**

**CONSULTATION FULFILMENT**

11. Not applicable.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board;

- (a) Consider the applications as set out in the circulated matrix and allocate Neighbourhood Week funds accordingly. (refer **Attachment 2**).
- (b) Assign delegated authority to the Board Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson to consider any additional applications and allocate funding, should any funds remain.
- (c) Allocate an additional \$1,000 from the Board's Discretionary Response Fund, if required, to assist individuals and groups run events.

**CHAIRPERSONS' RECOMMENDATION**

For discussion.

28. 9. 2010

- 47 -

17. COMMUNITY BOARD ADVISER'S UPDATE
18. ELECTED MEMBERS INFORMATION EXCHANGE
19. MEMBERS QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS