

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

Held in the Council Chambers, Civic Offices
on Tuesday 25 September 2007 at 9.30am

PRESENT: **Christchurch City Council**
Councillor Sue Wells (Chairperson),
Councillors Sally Buck, David Cox, Carole Evans (from
9.50am), Pat Harrow, Bob Parker (to 10.30am) and
Gail Sheriff.

Community Board
Stuart Bould and Val Carter

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Mayor Garry Moore, Councillors Barry Corbett,
Bob Shearing, Norm Withers and Yani Johanson.

1. PROTECTION OF TREES

Jane Anderson provided a PowerPoint presentation covering.

- Presentation overview
- Tree protection in the City Plan
- Issues
- Tree protection provisions
- Options for tree protection provisions
- Assessing trees
- Options for assessing trees
- Subdivision trees
- Options for subdivision trees
- Trees in special purpose (road)
- Option for street trees
- Future protection of Riccarton Bush
- Other tree issues to be addressed
- Where to from here
 - Issues and options paper prepared
 - Consultation
 - Section 32 analysis and potential Plan Change development
 - If Council accepts section 32 then proceed to confirm and notify Plan Change

John Alexander and Tony Gemmill also spoke in support of the protection of the Riccarton Bush and the City's trees.

Questions and comments were made in respect of:

- A blanket coverage to protect all trees throughout the city does not seem to be appropriate, it should be recognised that numerous complaints are received from developers. Trees have a certain life-span and it is a waste of space to allow some trees in inappropriate positions to remain.
- In any comprehensive development there is need to have a balance between that of good urban design and landscape values.
- The protection of Riccarton Bush was fully supported.
- In any planting of trees in parks and reserves, care needed to be taken as to the placement so they will not eventually shade adjoining properties.
- There were carbon issues to be taken into account.
- Non-invasive ways were needed in any streetscape scheme.
- Various problems existed throughout the Banks Peninsula area.
- The loss of trees to the city was a huge issue.
- The city was losing its 'garden' image status through the mass destruction of trees.
- No attempt was being made by developers to protect existing trees.
- The Riccarton Bush Trust would like to see a case advanced for moving the Plan Change work further forward.
- Was the City Plan the best method of protecting all the city trees, perhaps it should be used only for very significant trees.
- More use of caveats or other private arrangements should be examined.
- To carry out a Plan Change will take an immensely long time.
- A law change could be investigated for the protection of trees in the Riccarton Bush.
- It would be better to have a small register of significant trees and be more vigorous in their defence.
- As the Council already own the trees in the streets, it didn't need the City Plan to seek compensation for any damage.
- People who wanted to see their trees protected would find other methods than relying on the City Council.
- Encouragement needed to be given to those people willing to protect their trees in some manner.
- It may be that the Urban Development Strategy through its area plans could be used in the identification of appropriate trees.
- There are individual property rights to be considered.
- Trees need to be valued.
- A policy needed to be formulated on the planting of evergreen trees.

OUTCOME

1. The issues and options paper needed to be considered by the new Council prior to its release for public consultation.
2. The budgetary implications of any proposal needed to be provided for.
3. There is support for ensuring the protection of the Riccarton Bush.

The seminar concluded at 10.15am

CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

NOTES OF A SEMINAR OF THE COUNCIL

**Held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices
on Tuesday 25 September 2007 at 10.45am**

PRESENT:

Christchurch City Council

Councillor Sue Wells (Chairperson),
Councillors Sally Buck, David Cox, Carole Evans (from
10.58am to 11.38am), Pat Harrow and Gail Sheriff.

Community Board

Stuart Bould, Val Carter, Claudia Reid and Tony Sutcliffe
(from 11am).

APOLOGIES:

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from
Mayor Garry Moore and Councillors Barry Corbett,
Bob Shearing and Norm Withers.

1. ELDERLY PERSON HOUSING

The seminar took the form of a PowerPoint presentation presented by Peter Lovell and covered:

- Overview
- Introduction
- General issues
- Changing demographics
- Age – sex pyramid, 2006
- Age – sex pyramid, 2026
- Age – sex pyramids, 1986–2051
- History of provisions
- Existing planning provisions
- Statistics
- Issues
- What are the options?
- What has happened to date?
- Matters that were considered for review
- General requirements
- Some specific issues

A series of photographs of differing housing units followed showing aspects of poor visual appearance, problems with access and vehicle removal, as well as those having good visual appeal and good manoeuvring space.

- Gaps in the market
- Age limitation
- Elderly person definition
- Specific changes
- Conclusion
- Recommendations
 - that the Council proceed with a planned change to amend a variety of the elderly person housing provisions so as to:
 - (1) Protect the character of the Living 1 and 2 zone environments
 - (2) More readily meet the accommodation needs of the elderly
 - (3) Consider a comprehensive long term view of the provisions for smaller housing units for all ages and then undertake a further planned change or action at the next city plan review.

Questions and comments followed covering:

- Who defines what elderly is?
- The biggest problem is getting the mix of people right.
- There is need to address how the elderly persons' housing fitted in with the UDS strategy.
- There are a number of issues that needed to be looked at in terms of non-complying units.
- Measures need to be taken to control landscaping, given such issues as hard surface water run-off.
- A number of the internal aspects of the units were not elderly friendly.
- There was need for comprehensive site plans to examine, the current minimal site was not always appropriate.
- Non-compliance seems to be more the rule.
- The Banks Peninsula community currently has no elderly persons provisions and this needs to be followed up on.

OUTCOME

There was general support for the recommendations including the provision of a Section 32 report.

The seminar concluded at 11.50am.