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**Strategic Framework**

The Council’s Vision – Christchurch is a city of opportunity for all.
Open to new ideas, new people and new ways of doing things – a city where anything is possible.

**Whiria ngā whenu o ngā papa Honoa ki te mau rua ō whai ki te taukiuki**

Bind together the strands of each mat
And join together with the seams of respect and reciprocity.

The partnership with Papatipu Rūnanga reflects mutual understanding and respect, and a goal of improving the economic, cultural, environmental and social wellbeing for all.

**Overarching Principle**
Partnership – Our people are our taonga – to be treasured and encouraged. By working together we can create a city that uses their skill and talent, where we can all participate, and be valued.

**Supporting Principles**
- Accountability
- Affordability
- Agility
- Equity
- Innovation

**Community Outcomes**
What we want to achieve together as our city evolves

**Strong communities**
Strong sense of community
Active participation in civic life
Safe and healthy communities
Celebration of our identity through arts, culture, heritage and sport
Valuing the voices of children and young people

**Liveable city**
Vibrant and thriving central city, suburban and rural centres
A well connected and accessible city
Sufficient supply of, and access to, a range of housing
21st century garden city we are proud to live in

**Healthy environment**
Healthy waterways
High quality drinking water
Unique landscapes and indigenous biodiversity valued
Sustainable use of resources

**Prosperous economy**
Great place for people, business and investment
An inclusive, equitable economy with broad-based prosperity for all
A productive, adaptive and resilient economic base
Modern and robust city infrastructure and community facilities

**Strategic Priorities**
Our focus for improvement over the next three years and beyond

- Enabling active citizenship and connected communities
- Maximising opportunities to develop a vibrant, prosperous and sustainable 21st century city
- Climate change leadership
- Informed and proactive approaches to natural hazard risks
- Increasing active, public and shared transport opportunities and use
- Safe and sustainable water supply and improved waterways
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1. **Apologies**  
   At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. **Declarations of Interest**  
   Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant and to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**  
   That the minutes of the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board meeting held on Monday, 4 February 2019 be confirmed (refer page 5).

4. **Public Forum**  
   A period of up to 30 minutes will be available for people to speak for up to five minutes on any issue that is not the subject of a separate hearings process.

5. **Deputations by Appointment**  
   There were no deputations by appointment at the time the agenda was prepared.

6. **Presentation of Petitions**  
   There were no petitions received at the time the agenda was prepared.
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The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. **Apologies**

   Part C
   Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00001

   Community Board Decision
   
   That an apology for lateness from Sara Templeton be accepted.

   Alexandra Davids/Jake McLellan

   **Carried**

2. **Declarations of Interest**

   Part B
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**

   Part C
   Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00002

   Community Board Decision

   That the minutes of the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board meeting held on Monday, 3 December 2018 be confirmed.

   Tim Lindley/Alexandra Davids

   **Carried**

4. **Public Forum**

   Part B

   **4.1 Rates Reduction For Residents Who Have Their Own Grey Water Disposal System Proposal**

   Part B

   Ms Nicola Wilkie addressed the Board regarding a proposal to consider a rates reduction for property owners who have grey water disposal systems on their properties.

   Following questions the Chairperson on behalf of the Board, thanked Ms Wilkie for her attendance.
The Board requested a letter to be sent to Ms Wilkie giving staff advice on individual property owners having greywater and blackwater disposal systems.

Sara Templeton joined the meeting at 3.09pm.

4.2 Wyon Street Renewal and Traffic Calming

Part B

Mr Evan Chadwick and Ms Lesley Wallaby addressed the Board regarding Wyon Street being used as a shortcut by motorists and excessive speeding.

Following questions the Chairperson on behalf of the Board thanked Mr Chadwick and Ms Wallaby for their attendance.

5. Deputations by Appointment

Part B

5.1 Improvements to Woolston Village Centre - WL1

Part B

1. Rosemary Neave, local resident, spoke to the Board regarding the Woolston Village Improvements Project, and raised concerns around the planting of Kauri trees.

2. Gail Brewer local resident spoke to the Board highlighting her concerns on the proposed 15 minutes parking restrictions outside the chemist shop in Woolston, stating that is not enough time to collect prescriptions.

Following questions the Chairperson on behalf of the Board thanked Mesdames Neave and Brewer for their attendance.

Item 16 of these minutes refers.

6. Presentation of Petitions

Part B

6.1 During the consultation for the Improvements to Woolston Village Centre – WL1 staff received a petition from Mr Simon Payne regarding the proposed removal of 14 on-street car parks on Ferry Road as part of the submissions received.

The petition, which contained 1024 signatures, was tabled.

The prayer of the petition states:

_We, the undersigned, do not agree with the proposal to remove 14 car parks from the Woolston Village and ask that these carparks be retained._

Item 16 of these minutes refers.

**Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00003**
That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Receives the petition from Mr Simon Payne requesting that no car parks in the Woolston Village Centre be removed.

Alexandra Davids/Jake McLellan Carried

Brenda Lowe-Johnson abstained from voting and asked for this to be recorded.

Attachments
A Petition against the removal of 14 car parks from Woolston Village

16. Improvements to Woolston Village Centre - WL1

Board Comment

Staff in attendance spoke to the accompanying report. The Board also took into consideration the deputations from Mesdames Neave and Brewer and the tabled petition from Mr Bane. (Items 5.1, 5.2 and 6.1 of these minutes refers).

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00004 Original Staff Recommendations accepted without change.

Part C

For the purposes of the following resolutions:

(a) An intersection is defined by the position of kerbs on each intersecting roadway; and
(b) The resolution is to take effect from the commencement of physical road works associated with the project as detailed in this report; and
(c) If the resolution states "Note 1 applies", any distance specified in the resolution relates the kerb line location referenced as exists on the road immediately prior to the Community Board meeting of the 3rd December 2018; and
(d) If the resolution states "Note 2 Applies", any distance specified in the resolution relates the approved kerb line location on the road resulting from the resolution as approved on 4 February 2019 for resolutions 1 – 13, and at the following Council meeting for resolutions 14 – 91.

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

4. Approves all intersection traffic controls at the intersection of Ferry Road with Portman Street be revoked.

5. Approves all intersection traffic controls at the intersection of Ferry Road with Oak Street be revoked.

6. Approves all intersection traffic controls at the intersection of Ferry Road with Catherine Street be revoked.

7. Approves all intersection traffic controls at the intersection of Ferry Road with St Johns Street be revoked.

8. Approves all intersection traffic controls at the intersection of Ferry Road with Maronan Street be revoked.
9. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 16 metres be revoked.

10. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with St Johns Street be revoked. Note 1 applies.

11. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 145 metres be revoked.

12. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 82 metres be revoked.

13. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Catherine Street be revoked.

14. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Catherine Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Maronan Street be revoked. Note 1 applies.

15. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 71 metres be revoked.

16. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northwest side of Portman Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 68 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

17. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southeast side of Portman Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 70 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

18. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northwest side of St Johns Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 29.5 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

19. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southeast side of St Johns Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 81 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

20. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northwest side of Oak Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction to its intersection with Heathcote Street be revoked.

21. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southeast side of Oak Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction to its intersection with Heathcote Street be revoked.

22. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northwest side of Catherine Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 45 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

23. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southeast side of Catherine Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 150 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.
24. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the northwest side of Maronan Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 30 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

25. Approves that all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the southeast side of Maronan Street, commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 13 metres be revoked. Note 1 applies.

26. Approves the lane marking changes, kerb alignment changes, pedestrian refuge islands, landscaping, tree planting and road surface changes, on Ferry Road, Portman Street, Oak Street, St Johns Street, Catherine Street and Maronan Street, as detailed in Attachment A.

27. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 116 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

28. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 75.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

29. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 15 minutes on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 75.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 16.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

30. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 92 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 10 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

31. Approves that a Bus Stop be created on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 102 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

32. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 116 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 52.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

33. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of ten minutes on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 168.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 23 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

34. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 191.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with St Johns Street, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

35. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 77 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

36. Approves that a Bus Stop be created on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at point 77 metres southeast of its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

37. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northeast side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 91 metres southeast of its intersection with St Johns Street...
and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 55.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

38. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 15 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

39. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point 15 metres northwest of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 16.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

40. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 31.5 metres northwest of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 50 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

41. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of seven metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

42. Approves that a Bus Stop be created on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point seven metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

43. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 21 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

44. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point 35 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 46 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

45. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 81 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 16 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

46. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point 97 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 53.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

47. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 150.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 13.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

48. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point 164 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 26 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

49. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 190 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Catherine Street, as detailed on Attachment A.
50. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Catherine Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of four metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

51. Approves that a Bus Stop be created on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point four metres southeast of its intersection with Catherine Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

52. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 17.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Catherine Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Maronan Street, as detailed on Attachment A.

53. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 13 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

54. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 60 minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at point 13 metres southeast of its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 18.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

55. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southwest side of Ferry Road commencing at a point 31.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 24 metres, as detailed on Attachment A.

56. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of three minutes on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at a distance of 55.5 metres southeast of its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 16.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. This restriction is to apply between the times of 8.15am and 9.15am and 2.30pm and 3.30pm on school days only.

57. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Portman Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 15.5 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

58. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the northwest side of Portman Street commencing at a point 15.5 metres northeast of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 53 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

59. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of Portman Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 16 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

60. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the southeast side of Portman Street commencing at a point 16 metres northeast of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 53 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

61. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of St Johns Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 16 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

62. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of five minutes on the northwest side of St Johns Street commencing at a point 16 metres northeast of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 14 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.
63. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of St Johns Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 25 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

64. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 30 minutes on the southeast side of St Johns Street commencing at a point 25 metres northeast of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a northeasterly direction for a distance of 56 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

65. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Oak Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction to its intersection with Heathcote Street, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

66. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of Oak Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction to its intersection with Heathcote Street, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

67. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Catherine Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 20 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

68. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the northwest side of Catherine Street commencing at a point 20 metres southwest of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 25 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

69. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of Catherine Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 150 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

70. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northwest side of Maronan Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 12 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

71. Approves that the parking of vehicles be restricted to a maximum period of 120 minutes on the northwest side of Maronan Street commencing at a point 12 metres southwest of its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 18 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

72. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the southeast side of Maronan Street commencing at its intersection with Ferry Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 13 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

73. Approves that a Stop control be placed against the Portman Street approach to its intersection with Ferry Road, as detailed on Attachment A.

74. Approves that a Stop control be placed against the Oak Street approach to its intersection with Ferry Road, as detailed on Attachment A.

75. Approves that a Give Way control be placed against the St John Street approach to its intersection with Ferry Road, as detailed on Attachment A.

76. Approves the installation of a bus shelter at the following locations:
   a. 729 Ferry Road (Attachment A),
   b. 650 Ferry Road (Attachment A), and
   c. 608 Ferry Road (Attachment A).
77. Approves that the pathway on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 51 metres, be resolved as a bi-directional shared pedestrian/cycle path. This shared path is authorised under clause 21 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, as detailed on Attachment A.

78. Approves that the pathway on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 28 metres, be resolved as a bi-directional shared pedestrian/cycle path. This shared path is authorised under clause 21 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, as detailed on Attachment A.

79. Approves that the section of road reserve situated between the north-western boundary of 689 Ferry Road and south-eastern boundary of 687 Ferry Road, be resolved as a bi-directional shared pedestrian/cycle path. This shared path is authorised under clause 21 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017. As detailed on Attachment A.

80. Approves the removal of nine trees as identified on Attachment A.

81. Approve that these resolutions take effect when parking signage and/or road markings that evidence the restrictions is/are in place (or removed in the case of revocations).

Sara Templeton/Deon Swiggs

Carried

Brenda Lowe-Johnson and Yani Johanson voted against the resolution, and requested that their votes be recorded

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00005

Part B

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Request staff to increase the green cycleway surfacing on the Woolston Village cycleways when implementing the Woolston Village Improvements Project – WL1 to make the cycleways more visible to motorists.
2. Request staff to investigate extending the 30kmh speed restriction down St Johns Street from Ferry Road to Glenroy Street.
3. Request staff to investigate larger or additional signage to highlight the off street parking in the Woolston Village, behind the shops and adjacent to the Woolston Library.
4. Request staff to investigate the phasing of the signalised pedestrian crossing in Woolston Village to lessen the wait time for pedestrians.
5. Request staff to advise if there was provision for a EV charger within the Woolston Library rebuild project.

Sara Templeton/Deon Swiggs

Carried

Community Board Recommendation LCHB/2019/00006

Part A

For the purposes of the following resolutions:

(a) An intersection is defined by the position of kerbs on each intersecting roadway; and

(b) The resolution is to take effect from the commencement of physical road works associated with the project as detailed in this report; and
That the Council:

1. Approves the improvements to Woolston Village Centre (WL1) preferred option for detailed design and construction as shown in Attachment A.

   a. Approves that all traffic controls except the speed limit on Ferry Road, commencing at a point 16 metres west of its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to a point 71 metres east of its intersection with St Johns Street be revoked.
   b. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of south-eastbound cycles only, be established on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 20 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.
   c. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of south-eastbound cycles only, be established on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Portman Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with St Johns Street, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.
   d. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of south-eastbound cycles only, be established on the northeast side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with St Johns Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 146 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.
   e. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of north-westbound cycles only, be established on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of 82 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.
   f. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of north-westbound cycles only, be established on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Oak Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Catherine Street, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.
   g. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of north-westbound cycles only, be established on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Catherine Street and extending in a southeasterly direction to its intersection with Maronan Street, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.
h. Approves that a Special Vehicle Lane for the use of north-westbound cycles only, be established on the southwest side of Ferry Road, commencing at its intersection with Maronan Street and extending in a southeasterly direction for a distance of 71 metres, as detailed on Attachment A. This Special Vehicle Lane is authorised under clause 18 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017.

i. Approves that a signalised pedestrian crossing be duly established and marked in accordance with sections 6 and 8.5 (3) of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Devices 2004, on Ferry Road, located at a point 28 metres southeast of its intersection with Oak Street, as detailed in Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

j. Approves that a signalised pedestrian and cycle crossing be duly established and marked in accordance with sections 6 of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Devices 2004, on Ferry Road, located at a point 22 metres southeast of its intersection with Catherine Street, as detailed in Attachment A. Note 2 applies.

3. In pursuance of the powers vested in it by Section 8.3(1) of the Land Transport Rule- Traffic Control Devices 2004 (Rule 54002), and pursuant to the powers vested in it by the Local Government Act 1974 and 2002, the Christchurch City Council hereby authorises the head teacher of St Anne’s Catholic School to appoint appropriately trained persons to act as school patrols at the Ferry Road school crossing point as shown on Attachment A, located at a point more or less 36 metres southeast of its intersection with Maronan Street.

Sara Templeton/Deon Swiggs  
Carried

Brenda Lowe-Johnson and Yani Johanson voted against the resolution, and requested that their votes be recorded

5. Deputations by Appointment (Continued)

5.3 Redcliffs Transport Project

Part B

1. Darren Fidler representing the Redcliffs School Board of Trustees and Rose McInerney, School Principal spoke to the Board on the Redcliffs Transport Project Report regarding the proposed speed restriction and area of coverage.

2. Gordon Macadam, resident, spoke to the Board on the Redcliffs Transport Project Report.

Following questions, the Chairperson, on behalf of the Board, thanked Mr Fidler, Ms McInerney and Mr Macadam for their attendance.

Clause 17 of these minutes refers.

7. Correspondence

Staff Recommendations

That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the correspondence report dated 04 February 2019.

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00007
Part B

That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the correspondence report dated 04 February 2019.
2. Receive the tabled correspondence from Daphne Rolston regarding the Redcliffs Transport Project – Redcliffs School Transport Safety Requirements.

Sara Templeton/Deon Swiggs  Carried

Attachments

A. Correspondence from Daphne Rolston regarding the Redcliffs School Transport Safety Requirements

The meeting adjourned at 5.04pm and reconvened at 5.10pm.

17. Redcliffs Transport Project - Redcliffs School Transport Safety Requirements

Board Comment

Staff in attendance spoke to the accompanying report. The Board also took into consideration the deputations from Messrs Fidler, McInerney, and Macadam. The Board also considered the tabled correspondence from Ms Rolston (Items 5.3, 5.4 and 7 of these minutes refers).

Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approve the preferred Option, consisting of the following (in accordance with Attachment A)
   a. Establish a turning restriction, banning the right turn movement from Main Road (from the east) to Beachville Road (to the north/east).
   b. Extend the traffic island at the intersection of Main Road/Beachville Road intersection, as per Attachment A.
   c. Disestablish the bus stop on the south side of Main Road, including the indented bay, (located approximately 70 metres east of McCormacks Bay Road).
   d. Resolve no stopping markings in place of the bus stop (entirely) on the south side of Main Road (approximately 70 metres east of McCormacks Bay Road).
   e. Establish a zebra crossing, to operate as a School patrol crossing, outside of 25-27 Main Road, including kerb build outs.
   f. Remove the pedestrian crossing opposite the proposed Redcliffs Park (the ‘old School site’).
   g. Construct a refuge island and kerb build outs in place of the pedestrian crossing, opposite the proposed Redcliffs Park.
   h. Establish a kerb extension and pedestrian crossing refuge island, at the intersection of Beachville Road / Celia Street.
   i. Establish a footpath on Celia Street, between 53 Celia Street and Beachville Road (a distance of approximately 93 metres).
2. That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board recommend to the Council to approve:
   a. A new variable speed limit of 40km/h (School Zone), as per Attachment A:
      i. On Main Road, commencing approximately 42 metres west of the McCormacks Bay Road centre line, for a distance of approximately 480 metres.
      ii. On Beachville Road, from Main Road (at Main Road / Beachville Road/McCormacks Bay Road intersection), to outside 107 Beachville Road; a distance of approximately 320 metres.
      iii. On Celia Street, outside 47 Celia Street to the intersection of Beachville Road/Celia Street; a distance of approximately 140 metres.
      iv. On McCormacks Bay Road for a section of approximately 20m south of Main Road.
   b. Cycle lanes on approaches to proposed zebra crossing and refuge island, in accordance with Attachment A.

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00008

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approve the preferred Option, consisting of the following (in accordance with Attachment A)
   a. Establish a turning restriction, banning the right turn movement from Main Road (from the east) to Beachville Road (to the north/east).
   b. Extend the traffic island at the intersection of Main Road / Beachville Road intersection, as per Attachment A.
   c. Disestablish the bus stop on the south side of Main Road, including the indented bay, (located approximately 70 metres east of McCormacks Bay Road).
   d. Resolve no stopping markings in place of the bus stop (entirely) on the south side of Main Road (approximately 70 metres east of McCormacks Bay Road).
   e. Establish a zebra crossing, to operate as a School patrol crossing, outside of 25-27 Main Road, including kerb build outs.
   f. Remove the pedestrian crossing opposite the proposed Redcliffs Park (the ‘old School site’).
   g. Construct a refuge island and kerb build outs in place of the pedestrian crossing, opposite the proposed Redcliffs Park.
   h. Establish a kerb extension and pedestrian crossing refuge island, at the intersection of Beachville Road / Celia Street.
   i. Establish a footpath on Celia Street, between 53 Celia Street and Beachville Road (a distance of approximately 93 metres).
   j. Request staff to engage with the community on the potential for 30kph speed restrictions on Beachville Road and Celia Street.

Yani Johanson voted against the resolution and requested that this be recorded.
Sarah Templeton voted against resolution clauses 1c and d and requested that this be recorded.

Sally Buck/Deon Swiggs  
Carried

**Community Board Recommendation LCHB/2019/00009**

**Part A**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board recommends that the Council approves:

1. A new variable speed limit of 40km/h (School Zone), as per **Attachment A**:
   a. On Main Road, commencing approximately 42 metres west of the McCormacks Bay Road centre line, for a distance of approximately 480 metres.
   b. On Beachville Road, from Main Road (at Main Road/Beachville Road/McCormacks Bay Road intersection), to outside 107 Beachville Road; a distance of approximately 320 metres.
   c. On Celia Street, outside 47 Celia Street to the intersection of Beachville Road/Celia Street; a distance of approximately 140 metres.
   d. On McCormacks Bay Road for a section of approximately 20 metres south of Main Road.
   e. Cycle lanes on approaches to proposed zebra crossing and refuge island, in accordance with **Attachment A**.
   f. Advocates with New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) for 30kph school speed zones in line with other slow speed zones in the city.

Yani Johanson voted against the resolution, and requested that his vote be recorded

Sally Buck/Deon Swiggs  
Carried

**24. Resolution to Include Supplementary Agenda**

**Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00010**

That the reports be received and considered at the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board meeting on Monday 4 February 2019.

25. **Briefing - Risingholme Community Centre.**

Sally Buck/Tim Lindley  
Carried

**25. Briefing**

Wendel Karati, Director Risingholme Community Centre, updated the Board on the progress of Risingholme Homestead opening planned for 5 June 2019.

**Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00011**

**Community Board Resolved**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Notes the information supplied during the Briefings.

Sally Buck/Tim Lindley  
Carried
8. **185 Peterborough Street, Central Christchurch - Proposed P60 Restrictions**

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00012 Original Staff Recommendations accepted without change.

**Part C**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Peterborough Street, as indicated in the attached drawing TG133713 Issue 1, dated 4/2/2019, forming part of the resolution is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 60 minutes between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in the staff report are in place.

Deon Swiggs/Sara Templeton  
Carried

9. **Cass Street near Durham Street South, Sydenham - Proposed Loading Zone**

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00013 Original Staff Recommendations accepted without change.

**Part C**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Cass Street, as indicated in drawing TG133705 Issue 1, dated 13/12/2018, attached to the agenda for the meeting and forming part of the resolution is specified as a loading zone for goods vehicles only and be restricted to maximum period of five minutes.

2. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Cass Street, as indicated in drawing TG133705 Issue 1, dated 13/12/2018, attached to the agenda for the meeting and forming part of the resolution is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 30 minutes.

3. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

4. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1 and 2 are in place.

Deon Swiggs/Sally Buck  
Carried
10. 173 Waltham Road, Sydenham - Proposed P60 Restrictions

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00014 Original Staff Recommendations accepted without change.

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Waltham Road, as indicated in drawing TG133490 Issue 1, dated 20/11/2018, attached to the agenda for the meeting and forming part of the resolution is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 60 minutes between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1 are in place.

Tim Lindley/Alexandra Davids  Carried

11. Ferry Road near Hart Street, Woolston - Proposed P10 Restrictions

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00015 Original Staff Recommendations accepted without change.

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Ferry Road, as indicated in drawing TG133711 Issue 1, dated 20/12/2018, attached to the agenda for the meeting and forming part of the resolution is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 10 minutes at any time.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1 are in place.

Alexandra Davids/Jake McLellan  Carried
12. Major Hornbrook Road at Muritai Terrace, Mount Pleasant - Proposed Amendment to Time Restricted Parking

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00016 Original Staff Recommendations accepted without change.

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That pursuant to section 591 of the Local Government Act 1974 and Part 1 section 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw, approve that the part of Major Hornbrook Road, as indicated in drawing TG133008 Issue 2, dated 04/01/2019, attached to the agenda for the meeting and forming part of the resolution is specified as a parking place for any vehicles and be restricted to maximum period of 10 minutes at any time.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1 are in place.

Tim Lindley/Darrell Latham

Carried

13. Mount Pleasant Road - Proposed No Stopping Restrictions

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00017 Original Staff Recommendations accepted without change.

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles on the parts of Mount Pleasant Road as shown by broken yellow lines on drawings TG133482 issue 1 dated 8/11/18, TG133478 issue 1 dated 8/11/18 and TG133479 issue 1 dated 8/11/18, attached to the agenda for the meeting is prohibited.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1 are in place.

Tim Lindley/Sara Templeton

Carried

14. Beachville Road, Redcliffs - Proposed Accessible Parking

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00018 Original Staff Recommendations accepted without change.
Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. That the parking of vehicles be reserved for vehicles with an approved disabled person’s parking permit, prominently displayed in the vehicle, in accordance with section 6.4.1 of the Land Transport - Road User Rule 2004 on the north east side of Beachville Road as shown on drawing TG133488 issue 1 dated 15/11/2018, attached to the agenda for the meeting and.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1 are in place.

Sara Templeton/Brenda Lowe-Johnson Carried

15. Ocean View Terrace near Awaroa Lane - Proposed No Stopping Restrictions

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00019 Original Staff Recommendations accepted without change.

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve:

1. Under clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017, that the stopping of vehicles on the part of Ocean View Terrace as shown by broken yellow lines on drawing TG133715 issue 1 dated 11/01/19, attached to the agenda for the meeting is prohibited.

2. That any previous resolutions pertaining to traffic controls made pursuant to any bylaw to the extent that they are in conflict with the traffic controls described in this report are revoked.

3. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in 1 are in place.

Sara Templeton/Tim Lindley Carried

Alexandra Davids left the meeting at 05:50 p.m..

18. Christchurch Northern Corridor Downstream Effects Mitigation Plan (Draft)

Community Board Recommendation LCHB/2019/00020 Original Staff Recommendations accepted without change

Part A

That the Council:
1. Receive the Draft Downstream Effects Management Plan for staff to commence engagement with the community on the recommendations contained within the draft plan.

Yani Johanson abstained from voting and requested that this be recorded.

Deon Swiggs/Darrell Latham

Carried

26. Item of Business not on the Agenda

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00021

Part B

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Resolve to deal with the new item of business Provision for a Levy for Hire Mobility Providers at this meeting.

Sara abstained from voting and requested that this be recorded.

Jake McLellan/Darrell Latham

Carried

26. Hire Mobility Providers Levy

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00022

Part B

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Request staff to provide as part of their advice to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee and the Council on the review of the Lime scooter trial, whether or not a fee could be charged to all hire mobility providers who use the public realm under permit, with the revenue being used for footpath repairs and maintenance.

Sara Templeton abstained from voting and requested that this be recorded.

Jake McLellan/Darrell Latham

Carried


Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00023 Original Staff Recommendation accepted without change

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approves a grant of $1,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Bamford School towards Rock Band Equipment.

2. Approves a grant of $3,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Delta Community Support Trust towards Advocacy services.
3. Approves a grant of $4,000 from its 2018/19 Discretionary Response Fund to Richmond Residents and Business Association towards set-up and projects.

Darrell Latham/Tim Lindley

Carried

Sara Templeton left the meeting at 06:04 p.m.


Staff Recommendation

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approves a grant of $16,000 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to the Friends of Edmonds Factory Garden Incorporated towards the cost of four Sunrise Seats.

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00024

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approves a grant of $8,000 from its 2018-19 Discretionary Response Fund to the Friends of Edmonds Factory Garden Incorporated towards the cost of two Sunrise Seats.

Jake McLellan/Brenda Lowe-Johnson

Carried


Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00025 Staff Recommendation accepted without change.

Part C

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board resolve to:

1. Approve a grant of $150 each (total of $450) from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Team Lhotshampa members Bishwas K C, Biswa Nishan, and Pranesh Regmi towards participating in the Tenzing Hillary Cup in Auckland from 2 to 3 February 2019.

Yani Johanson/Sally Buck

Carried

22. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Area Report - February 2019

Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:


2. Nominate Board members to join the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Edible Garden Awards judging panel.
3. Nominate one Board member to attend the Brougham Street/Moorhouse Avenue Area Project Stakeholders workshop to be held on 27 February 2019.

4. Consider items for inclusion for the Board Report to the Council’s 14 February 2018 meeting.

**Community Board Resolved LCHB/2019/00026**

**Part B**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:


2. Appoint Jake McLellan, to be the Board representative for the Brougham Street/Moorhouse Avenue Area Project Stakeholders workshop to be held on 27 February 2019.

3. Request the following items to be included in the Board newsletter:
   b. Update on the Woolston Park Transportation Project (FR4).
   c. Advise the community on the availability of Woolston Park during the upcoming park works.
   d. Advise the community on the status of the Ensors Road Passenger Transport Project.

Jake McLellan/Sally Buck  Carried

23. Elected Members’ Information Exchange

**Part B**

The Board shared the following information:

- **Homeless Picnic** - The Board were advised that a picnic for the homeless had been held at the Groynes recently.

- **New Zealand Transport Agency/Kiwirail** – the Board discussed establishing relationships with New Zealand Transport Agency and Kiwirail.

Jake McLellan left the meeting at 06:41 p.m.

23.1 **Bromley Odour**

The Board have been contacted on various issues that residents within the vicinity of the Bromley industrial area have with odour.

**Part B**

The Board requests a meeting with Environment Canterbury to discuss the Bromley Odour issues that the community have brought to the attention of the Board.
23.2 Richmond Village Pedestrian Crossing
The Board discussed the Richmond Village Pedestrian Crossing including the crossing’s lack of visibility to motorists.

Part B
The Board requests staff advice on appropriate road markings around the Richmond Village Pedestrian Crossing adjacent to Avalon Street to make the crossing more visible to motorists.

23.3 Purchas and Madras Streets Intersection
The Purchas and Madras Street Intersection has come to the notice of the Board through a resident who has highlighted accidents at the intersection.

Part B
The Board requests staff advice on the safety of the Purchas and Madras Streets Intersection.

23.4 Street Renewals
The Board discussed the condition of Dacre and Wyon Streets.

Part B
The Board requests a seminar on the street renewal programme within the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Board area.

Meeting concluded at 6.50pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 20th DAY OF FEBRUARY 2019

SALLY BUCK
PECHAIRPERSON
7. Briefings

Reference: 18/1213331
Presenter(s): Liz Beaven, Community Board Advisor

1. Purpose of Report
   The Board will be briefed on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
<th>Unit/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risingholme Homestead</td>
<td>Ritchie Moyle</td>
<td>Programme Manager Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tania Rohleder</td>
<td>Senior Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Staff Recommendations
   That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:
   1. Notes the information supplied during the Briefings.

Attachments
There are no attachments to this report.
8. Installation of a NIWA Electronic Weather Station - Bromley

Reference: 18/1183729
Presenter(s): Mike Pursey – Leasing Consultant

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

   Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to grant a Licence to the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Limited (NIWA), over part of the land commonly known as the Bromley Oxidation Ponds and the Bromley (Te Huingi Manu) Wildlife Refuge, Bromley, Christchurch, for the installation of an Electronic Weather Station (EWS).

   Origin of Report
   1.2 This report is staff generated on behalf of Council’s Three Waters & Waste group to seek the required approvals for the installation of this Electronic Weather Station on land held by the Parks group.

2. Significance

   2.1 The decisions in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the low number of people interested or directly affected, low impact on the environment and low risk to Council.
   2.1.2 The proposal to install this Electronic Weather Station was advertised publicly as required under section 48a(4) of the Reserves Act 1977. No objections were received.
   2.1.3 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

   That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:
   1. Grant a Licence to Occupy for an area measuring approximately 20m x 20m on the land commonly known as the Bromley Oxidation Ponds and the Bromley (Te Huingi Manu) Wildlife Refuge, Bromley, Christchurch for a total lease term of 20 years including renewals to the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Limited (NIWA), for the installation of an Electronic Weather Station.
   2. In its capacity of holding the Minister of Conservation’s Delegation, recommend the Chief Executive gives consent to the licence in accordance with 48A(1) of the Reserves Act 1977.
   3. Grant delegated authority to the Manager Property Consultancy to conclude and administer all necessary licence negotiations and documentation.

4. Key Points

   4.1 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):
   4.1.1 Activity: Flood Protection & Control Works
   - Level of Service: 14.1.6.3 Reduce risk of flooding to property and dwellings during extreme rain events - Number of monitoring sites (flow, level, rainfall): +2 (69).
4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 - Grant a Licence to the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Limited (preferred option).
- Option 2 – Decline a Licence to the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Limited.

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- This station would provide meteorological data from an area of east Christchurch which is currently not well monitored.
- Operational data would be provided to Council at no cost. This would include storm surge levels in the estuary as well as helping to provide improved flood modeling.
- This station would be used as a training facility for NIWAs and its client’s staff as well as providing a test bed for new technology and innovations to enhance NIWAs expertise.
- Once established, it is also possible that this station could be incorporated into the NIWA national climate Network.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Council will need to be mindful if this area is planted. Extensive planting particularly tall vegetation and trees would interfere with the operation of this station. This area is not currently tagged long term for planting that would effect this station.

Summary – Brief Rational for the Preferred Option:

4.3.3 Staff recommend and support option one as NIWA have worked closely with Council staff to identify a location in the east of Christchurch which currently is not well monitored. This site is relatively out of the way and secluded while meeting the needs of NIWA and Council. This station will be of substantial benefit to both NIWA and to Council.

5. Context/Background

The Land

5.1 The Christchurch City Council is the owner of an estate in fee simple in all that parcel of land being Part Lot 3 and Lot 4-5 DP 5306, Part Lot 4-7 DP 8686, Part Lot 1 and Lot 3 DP 20628, Rural Section 4542, Rural Section 6194, Rural Section 6339, Rural Section 9907, Rural Section 36819, Rural Section 38239, Rural Section 39200, Rural Section 39203, Part Rural Section 39201, Part Rural Section 6135, Part Rural Section 6367, Part Rural Section 26474, Part Reserve 2171 and Reserve 900 held under title number CB40A/82 at the Canterbury Registry and commonly known as the Bromley Oxidation Ponds and the Bromley (Te Huingi Manu) Wildlife Refuge, Bromley, Christchurch.

5.2 This location was not the first or preferred choice for NIWA. The preferred location was a site near Cuthberts Road, however this has since been discounted as that site is confirmed for extensive vegetation planting over the next few years. This would interfere with the stations operation due to signal interference and the equipment on the station is susceptible to environmental interference and / or disturbance.

5.3 The internal asset owner of the land is the Council’s Parks Unit who approve the proposed use of the site for the NIWA Electronic Weather Station.
Electronic Weather Station (EWS)

5.4 The primary purpose of this weather station would be to provide a test bed for developing data collection technology and trialing new meteorological instrumentation and innovations to advance NIWA's expertise.

5.5 The station will also serve as a training facility to demonstrate installation and methodology to NIWA and its client's technical staff. This station will also benefit the Christchurch City Council by providing data in relation to storm surge levels in the estuary as well as helping to provide improved flood modeling.

5.6 No services will be required for the site as it will be 100% solar powered and fully stand alone. The 20m x 20m station site will be fully fenced as shown in the attached Licence Plan.

5.7 Attached to this report is the recent and positive new story from the 6 December 2018 issue of The Press for your information.

Licence Terms

5.8 The proposed Licence to NIWA would include an initial term of five years plus three rights of renewal for five years each (being 20 years in total).

5.9 The Licence Fee proposed is $1,200.00 plus GST per annum which is consistent with other similar licences of this nature.

5.10 The Licence Fee would be reviewed every five years from the licence commencement date by way of CPI adjustment.

Public Advertising

5.11 There is no approved Management Plan for the Bromley Oxidation Ponds and the Bromley (Te Huingi Manu) Wildlife Refuge. Due to this it is required under section 48a(4) of the Reserves Act 1977 (the “Act”) to give ‘Public Notice’ of the proposal to grant this licence.

5.12 This proposed licence to NIWA was advertised in The Press as a ‘Public Notice’ and was open for one month as required under The Act. There were no submissions or feedback received against the installation of this Electronic Weather Station.

Delegation

5.13 Community Boards have the delegated authority for the granting of licences on reserves pursuant to section 48A of the Reserves Act 1977, but require consent from the Minister of Conservation.

Minister of Conservation Consent

5.14 The consent of the Minister of Conservation is required for this transaction. On 12 June 2013, the Minister of Conservation delegated to all territorial authorities powers, functions and duties where the territorial authority is the administering body of the relevant reserve. Council has sub-delegated the delegated Reserves Act ministerial powers to the Chief Executive Officer.

5.15 In exercising the Minister’s delegation, the delegate must give consideration to those matters previously applied by the Minister, for example ensuring that:

- The land has been correctly identified;
- The necessary statutory processes have been followed;
- The functions and purposes of the Reserves Act have been taken into account in respect to the classification and purpose of the reserve as required under section 40 of the Act;
- The administering body has considered submissions and objections from affected parties and that, on the basis of the evidence, the decision is a reasonable one;
Pursuant to the requirements of section 4 of the Conservation Act 1987, the administering body has consulted with and considered the views of tangata whenua or has in some other way been able to make an informed decision.

5.16 Council officers have publically notified that the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board, under delegation from the Christchurch City Council is proposing to grant a licence to the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Limited for the installation of an Electronic Weather Station over part of the land commonly known as the Bromley Oxidation Ponds and the Bromley (Te Huingi Manu) Wildlife Refuge, Bromley, Christchurch,

5.17 Council officers are satisfied that the proposed licence complies with the Minister’s requirements.

6. Option 1 - Grant a Licence to the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Limited (preferred)

Option Description

6.1 Grant a Licence to Occupy approximately 20m x 20m of the land commonly known as the Bromley Oxidation Ponds and the Bromley (Te Huingi Manu) Wildlife Refuge, Bromley, Christchurch for a total lease term of 20 years including renewals to the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Limited (NIWA), for the installation of an Electronic Weather Station.

Significance

6.2 The decisions in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

6.2.1 The level of significance was determined by the low number of people interested or directly affected, low impact on the environment and low risk to Council.

6.2.2 The proposal to install this Electronic Weather Station was advertised publicly as required under section 48a(4) of the Reserves Act 1977. No objections were received.

6.3 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

Impact on Mana Whenua

6.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

6.5 The proposal to install this Electronic Weather Station was advertised publicly as required under section 48a(4) of the Reserves Act 1977. No objections were received.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

6.6 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications

6.7 Cost of Implementation – No cost to Council.

6.8 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – No cost to Council.

6.9 Funding source – Not applicable.

Legal Implications

6.10 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision

6.11 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit
6.12 The legal consideration is the Reserves Act 1977 and the Council’s Leasing Council Property Policy. The preparation of a licence is a routine matter on which the legal situation is well known and settled.

Risks and Mitigations
6.13 There is a risk that citizens that may not have seen this advertised during the one month public notice period may later lodge some objection to this tower being in the reserve.

6.13.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk will be low as all legal requirements have been met. NIWA looked at various sites and this site chosen is relatively secluded and not in a residential area.

6.13.2 Public notice was given for a period of one month and no objections were received.

Implementation
6.14 Implementation dependencies - Subject to final licence negotiation and documentation.
6.15 Implementation timeframe - Two weeks from the date of the Community Board meeting.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
6.16 The advantages of this option include:

- This station would provide meteorological data from an area of east Christchurch which is currently not well monitored.
- Operational data would be provided to Council at no cost. This would include storm surge levels in the estuary as well as helping to provide improved flood modeling.
- This station would be used as a training facility for NIWAs and its client’s staff as well as providing a test bed for new technology and innovations to enhance NIWAs expertise.
- Once established, it is also possible that this station could be incorporated into the NIWA national climate Network.

6.17 The disadvantages of this option include:

- Council will need to be mindful if this area is planted. Extensive planting particularly tall vegetation and trees would interfere with the operation of this station. This area is not currently tagged long term for planting that would effect this station.

7. Option 2 - Decline a Licence to the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Limited.

Option Description
7.1 Decline a Licence to the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Limited (NIWA), for the installation of an Electronic Weather Station.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.

7.3 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

Impact on Mana Whenua
7.4 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.
Community Views and Preferences
7.5 The specific organisations and individuals that benefit from the installation of the Weather Station would not be supportive of this proposal as it would impact their day to day operational needs and future opportunities.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
7.5.1 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications
7.6 Cost of Implementation – Not applicable.
7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – Not applicable.
7.8 Funding source – Not applicable.

Legal Implications
7.9 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.
7.10 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

Risks and Mitigations
7.11 There is a risk that it may take a significant amount of time to find another suitable location in the east, if there is one at all. This may cause negative publicity to the Council.

7.11.1 The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment is implemented will be medium and significant for NIWA as further time and resources will be required in finding another location that works.

7.11.2 Council officers can work with NIWA and its contractors as appropriate to assist in finding another suitable location for the Weather Station.

Implementation
7.12 Implementation dependencies - Not applicable.
7.13 Implementation timeframe – Not applicable.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.14 The advantages of this option include:
- Ensures that there is no additional built structure on the wildlife reserve.

7.15 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Further resources and time will be required to seek another suitable location. There may not be a location that fits all the requirements for a Weather Station in the east.
- This area of east Christchurch which is currently not well monitored would remain so.
- Council would not benefit from the operational data this station would provide. This would include storm surge levels in the estuary as well as providing improved flood modeling.
- NIWA and its client’s staff would not have this facility that would provide a test bed for new technology and innovations.
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Fenced area 20m x 20m square

Vehicle access off Bridge street, via CCC access road

Fence is 2.0m total height. Chain-link mesh, topped with 2 strands of plain wire. Steel galvanised posts with concrete footings.
Weather data to help understand city’s flood risk

Paul Gorman

Tens of thousands of residents in flood-prone parts of Christchurch may benefit from weather data that could soon be collected in the Avon-Heathcote Estuary for water modelling.

The National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (Niwa) has applied to the Christchurch City Council for consent to install an automatic weather station in Bromley.

The station – costing up to $30,000 – would measure wind speed and direction, temperature and humidity, and other weather data, at a 20-square-metre site near Bridge St and Dyers Rd. The data could be used to help model water levels and how they change and affect waterways in southerly gales, or during spring tides or storm surges.

Niwa South Island environmental monitoring group manager Marty Flanagan said there was a “bit of a gap in terms of monitoring” in eastern Christchurch. “We were aware the city council was interested in getting information there to model what is happening in the estuary, and we were looking for a new site where we can trial some new equipment.

“It’s quite tricky measuring meteorological information in the city. We need an exposed location like this, away from buildings and trees.”

If consent was granted, he hoped the Bromley station would be ready for action by May next year.

Council senior water and wastewater planning technician Mike Bourke said if approval was given for the Niwa station, it would allow better understanding of how wind affected water levels in the estuary.

“We use a whole lot of their different weather stations and data. But there is a hole in the estuary in terms of data, particularly in terms of storm surges and tide levels...”

...there is a hole in the estuary in terms of data, particularly in terms of storm surges and tide levels...”

Council senior water and wastewater planning technician Mike Bourke

In a strong southerly, the wind could push the water level at the northern end of the estuary up to 300 millimetres higher than at the southern end, he said.

“We quite often see a difference between the Ferrymead bridge and the Bridge St bridge.”

A strong northerly had similar effects, but the rise in water levels in that case was at the southern end.

Opening this week’s joint Meteorological Society and Hydrological Society conference, Christchurch mayor Lianne Dalziel said the Canterbury earthquakes had changed the city’s physical landscape and its hydrology.

“The earthquake sequence has left significant parts of our city far more vulnerable to flooding than before.

“It’s increasingly important that we apply science and are creating even better tools. Civil society and technical experts need to work together.

“If there is one thing we have learnt after the Canterbury earthquake sequence, it is that no-one can do it alone.”
Item 9

9. Gloucester Street at Latimer Square - No Stopping

Reference: 18/1156937
Presenter(s): Michael Thomson, Transport Engineer

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to approve the extension of No Stopping restrictions on Gloucester Street, east of Latimer Square in accordance with Attachment A.

Origin of Report
1.2 This report is staff generated in response to requests from Bus operators about the difficulty of turning right from Latimer Square (East) into Gloucester Street.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by comparing factors relating to this decision against the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Approves that any previous resolutions pertaining to parking or stopping restrictions made on the north side of Gloucester Street, for the area referred to as Proposed No Stopping, as indicated on Attachment A, drawing TG 133485, dated 11/12/2018 are revoked.

2. Approves that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the north side of Gloucester Street, as indicated on Attachment A, drawing TG 133485, dated 11/12/2018.

3. Approves that these resolutions take effect when parking signage and/or road markings that evidence the restrictions is/are in place (or removed in the case of revocations).

4. Key Points

4.1 This recommendations in this report are consistent with the anticipated outcomes of the Traffic Safety & Efficiency Service Plan in the Councils Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028)

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

- Option 1 – Extend the No Stopping Restriction (preferred Option).
- Option 2 - Do Nothing

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

- Provision of adequate turning area for larger vehicles.

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
5. **Context/Background**

5.1 The reconstruction of Manchester Street resulted in a route change for scheduled public transport vehicles. These vehicles were required to turn right from Latimer Square (the east side of Latimer) into Gloucester Street.

5.2 Vehicles parked all day on the north side of the roadway cause difficulties for turning buses and any large vehicles, if a westbound vehicle was waiting on Gloucester Street at the signals limit line.

5.3 Buses have been observed having to reverse within the intersection, or if possible, queueing motorists have backed up to allow the bus to turn.

5.4 Removal of the north side car parking provides the road space required for larger vehicle to complete the right turn.
6. **Option 1 - Install No Stopping (preferred)**

**Option Description**
6.1 Extend the No stopping on the north side of Gloucester Street, from the Latimer Square (East) intersection to a point east of Latimer Square.

**Significance**
6.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report. Engagement requirements for this level of significance includes the consultation with the owner and occupier of any property likely to be injuriously affected by the option.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**
6.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**
6.4 The No Stopping restriction removes unrestricted parking, presently utilised by commuters. The land adjacent is vacant. No consultation has been undertaken with the adjacent land owner.
6.5 The Team Leader Parking Compliance supports this option.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**
6.6 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

**Financial Implications**
6.7 Cost of Implementation - $200 for the installation, plus $750 for the preparation of this report.
6.8 Funding source - Traffic Operations Budget.
6.9 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - Covered under the area maintenance contract and effect will be minimal to the overall asset.

**Legal Implications**
6.10 Part 1, Clauses 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to install parking and stopping restrictions by resolution.
6.11 The Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations.
6.12 The installation of any signs and/or markings associated with parking and stopping restrictions must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

**Risks and Mitigations**
6.13 There is no identified risks associated with this parking change.

**Implementation**
6.14 Implementation dependencies - Parking Restrictions Subcommittee approval.
6.15 Implementation timeframe - Approximately two weeks once the area contractor receives the request.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**
6.16 The advantages of this option include:
   - Provides adequate road space for larger right turning vehicles at the intersection.
6.17 The disadvantages of this option include:
   - Removes three car parking spaces.
7. **Option 2 - Do Nothing**

**Option Description**

7.1 Retain existing parking.

**Significance**

7.2 The level of significance of this option is low and is consistent with section 2 of this report.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

**Community Views and Preferences**

7.4 This option is inconsistent with community requests for turning improvements to the intersection.

**Alignment with Council Plans and Policies**

7.5 This option is inconsistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

7.5.1 Inconsistency - does not align with policy the improve intersection safety and efficiency.

**Financial Implications**

7.6 Cost of Implementation - $750 for the preparation of this report.

7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - $0.

7.8 Funding source - Not applicable.

**Legal Implications**

7.9 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this option.

**Risks and Mitigations**

7.10 There is a risk that larger vehicles have to take evasive action (reversing etc) may cause a traffic incident at the intersection.

**Implementation**

7.11 Implementation dependencies - Not applicable.

7.12 Implementation timeframe - Not applicable.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

7.13 The advantages of this option include:

- Has no impact on-street parking.

7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:

- It does not address the restricted road space at the intersection and therefore the safety risk is not dealt with.
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10. Gloucester/Worcester St Park - Proposed Name and Landscape Plan

Reference: 19/10383
Presenter(s): Sarah Blows – Parks Planner, Nicki Williams – Landscape Architect, Jennie Hamilton – Engagement Advisor

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to:
   1.1.1 To approve and recommend to the Council for adoption the proposed park name.
   1.1.2 Approve the landscape plan for the development of a new community park located at 300, 302, 304 Gloucester Street and 261 Worcester Street (Attachment A).

Origin of Report
1.2 This report is staff generated following a seminar with the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board on 17 September 2018.
1.3 The report presents a proposed name and landscape concept plan for a new community park located at 300, 302, 304 Gloucester Street and 261 Worcester Street. The proposed name and landscape plan was prepared in consultation with the community and affected stakeholders.

2. Significance

2.1 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by using the engagement and significance matrix. While there are strong social and environment benefits in developing the park in this densely populated residential area, the project area is small and there is minimal risk to the Council in implementing the proposals.
   2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report exceed the requirements for this level of significance because a decision was made at the outset of this project for staff to work closely with the surrounding community to develop a landscape plan and name for the neighbourhood park.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:
1. Approve and recommend to the Council for adoption the proposed name as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Reserve Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Ara a Rongo – Gloucester/Worcester Park</td>
<td>300 Gloucester Street</td>
<td>Part Town Reserve 88</td>
<td>0.0506</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302 Gloucester Street</td>
<td>Lot 1 Deposited Plan 7674</td>
<td>0.0508</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Approve the landscape plan (reference number LP373602) for the development of the new community park located at 300, 302, 304 Gloucester Street and 261 Worcester Street (Attachment A).

4. **Key Points**
   4.1 This report supports the [Council's Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028)](#):
      4.1.1 Activity: Parks & Foreshore
         - Level of Service: 6.8.5.0 Satisfaction with the range and quality of recreation opportunities within parks - Resident satisfaction with range and quality of recreation facilities within Parks: = 85%.
   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
      - Option 1 – Approve and recommend to the Council the proposed name and approve the landscape plan (preferred option)
      - Option 2 – Do not recommend the proposed name to Council and; do not approve the landscape plan
   4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)
      4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
         - Improvement to the habitat, biodiversity and amenity values of the new park.
         - Encourages community ownership of the new park.
         - Implementing the outcome of the public consultation.
      4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
         - Closure of the park during the construction period of the implementation of the landscape plan is approved.

5. **Context/Background**

   **Background**
   5.1 The Public Open Space Strategy 2010-40 identified the residential neighbourhoods in the east of the central city as an area requiring additional open green space with an inner city pedestrian connection.
   5.2 Following the 2010 and 2011 earthquake an opportunity arose to purchase 300, 302 and 304 Gloucester Street and 261 Worcester Street. On 19 September 2012 the Council resolved:
5.2.1 “(a) Approve the purchase of the property situated at 300, 302 and 304 Gloucester Street and 261 Worcester Street in the inner City as a Recreation Reserve pursuant to Section 17 of the Reserves Act 1977, as part of the Neighbourhood Parks Programme.”

5.2.2 “(c) Pursuant of Section 16 (2)(A)(a) of the Reserves Act 1977 the reserve be classified as a Recreational Reserve.

5.3 The unoccupied, earthquake damaged houses located at 300, 302 and 304 Gloucester Street were demolished and the land returned to grass.

5.4 The property located at 261 Worcester Street was subject to a residential lease until 18 January 2013. Once the residential lease expired the house was demolished and the land returned to grass.

5.5 The development of the park was put on hold until funding became available.

5.6 Once funding was identified in the Long Term Plan 2018-2028, staff carried out a site investigation.

5.7 Staff attended a seminar with the Community Board on Monday 27 November 2017 to discuss the name and landscape plan.

**Engagement with the community**

5.8 Staff met a representative of Te Whare Roimata on 30 November 2017 to gain an understanding of the area and identify those who might wish to be involved with the development of the park.

5.9 The former owner of the properties attended a meeting on 15 January 2018 to discuss the family’s knowledge of the land and to gain an understanding of the existing trees and plants on site.

5.10 Staff met with local residents on 17 January 2018 to talk about the project. From this meeting an informal community advisory group was formed.

5.11 Approximately 60 residents and several Community Board members attended a sausage sizzle on Wednesday 7 March 2018. This was an opportunity for local residents to meet onsite, share their ideas for the park and to meet other local residents.

5.12 Staff drafted a landscape plan based on the ideas that were raised during the drop-in evening. The draft plan was discussed and revised at two further drop-in sessions with the advisory group.

5.13 Efforts were made to involve Christchurch East School at every stage. Staff met the student council on several occasions throughout the project to hear their ideas for the development of the site. The draft landscape plan was revised to include their suggestions, such as a chess board, prior to consultation.

5.14 A theme throughout the project was the inclusion of artwork in the park. An idea raised at the drop-in evening was for the school to create a community artwork on the side of the garage which borders the park. The owner of the garage has given permission to use the neighbouring wall which borders the park for a community artwork. A local artist has been working alongside a group of Christchurch East School students to design and install a mural. This is a separate project which is running alongside the development of the park and is following the process outlined in the Artwork in Public Places Policy 2002.

5.15 Space has been set apart to allow room for a communal garden if the community wish to pursue this in the future. This will require a lease due to the recreation reserve status of the land and will need to follow the Christchurch City Gardens Guidelines.

5.16 Staff are working with the neighbours through the Fencing Act 1978 to replace some boundary fencing, which is currently outside the scope of this project.
5.17 A Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) assessment was undertaken in September 2018. This assessment recommended against providing lighting in the park. Lighting of parks is only proposed where there is facilities and associated car parks that allow for night time use (community halls for example), or where there is no alternative safe route. In this instance, the roading network is the alternative safe route.

5.18 A landscape concept plan was presented to the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board at a seminar on Monday 17 September 2018.

**Name of the park**

5.19 Prior to consultation a resident asked the Council to find a Maori translation for a pathway link. As a result Ngāi Tahu gifted the name Te Ara a Rongo. The definition of Te Ara a Rongo is:

5.19.1 Ara is defined as a path between two locations (in this case the two streets).

5.19.2 Rongo is the Māori Atua/deity who has a number of names depending on the following:

- Rongomātāne - deity of cultivated foods. In this case (and this reserve) would include the fruit trees.
- Rongomaraeroa - deity of peace. In this case (and on this reserve) would include a safe space to reflect, and for our children to play and to flourish.

5.20 Some local residents had suggested the name Gloucester/Worcester Park because it was simple and described the location. This was offered as a descriptive name that sits with Te Ara a Rongo.

5.21 Naming options were discussed at the seminar with the Community Board on Monday 17 September 2018.

5.21.1
6. **Option 1 – Approve and recommend to the Council the proposed name and approve the landscape plan (preferred)**

**Option Description**

6.1 This option recommends to the Council to approve the dual name Te Ara a Rongo – Gloucester/Worcester Park and to approve the landscape plan.

6.2 Mana Whenua were consulted and Ngāi Tahu have gifted the name: Te Ara a Rongo. (See 5.19 for how the name was derived.)

6.3 Some local residents suggested an English translation of Gloucester/Worcester Park to support Te Ara a Rongo.

6.4 The landscape plan, refer Attachment A, has been prepared in consultation with the community and affected stakeholders. The landscape plan features bug hotels, native trees, seating which are planned alongside a formal pathway linking Gloucester and Worcester Street.

**Significance**

6.5 The level of significance of this option is low, consistent with section 2 of this report.

6.6 Engagement requirements for this level of significance have been exceeded because of a decision made at the outset of this project for staff to work closely with the surrounding community to develop a landscape plan and name for the neighbourhood park.

**Impact on Mana Whenua**

6.7 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water. However, the park is in the vicinity of the pā site of the Ngāi Tahu chief Tautahi, by the Ōtākaro/Avon River on what is now Kilmore Street.

6.8 Mana Whenua approached Ngāi Tahu who have gifted the name Te Ara a Rongo for the new park located at 302, 304 Gloucester Street and 261 Worcester Street. The link with Ngāi Tahi is also acknowledged in the proposed planting of native trees.

**Community Views and Preferences**

6.9 Formal consultation on the Gloucester/Worcester Park landscape plan, name for the park and potential artwork was undertaken from 15 November to 10 December 2018.

6.10 More than 600 consultation leaflets were delivered to properties in the surrounding area. Sixty five consultation leaflets were posted to absentee owners and information about the project was emailed to Housing New Zealand and other key stakeholders.

6.11 The response form asked three questions:

   6.11.1 Do you support the proposed landscape plan for the new park?

   6.11.2 Ngāi Tahu have gifted the name Te Ara a Rongo for the park. Local residents have suggested Gloucester/Worcester Park as the descriptive name. Do you support Gloucester/Worcester Park as the descriptive name?

   6.11.3 What artwork would you like to see in the park?

6.12 At a consultation drop-in meeting at the park on 29 November new suggestions included whether a local resident could donate a *Dacrydium cupressinum* (Rimu) tree, additional planting, an extra seat, and repairs to a neighbouring fence.

6.13 A letter has been sent to all submitters advising the outcome of the consultation, including details of the Board meeting and how they can request speaking rights. Also included in this letter was a link to the feedback summary with project team responses.

**Proposed landscape plan**
6.14 Of the 20 submissions received during the consultation, 17 (85%) supported the proposed landscape plan, two (10%) did not support the plan and one respondent (5%) did not indicate a view.

6.15 Positive comments included: “We think that this park is a great idea. The kids will love it! Also a nice place for people to sit in.”

6.16 A submitter suggested Hoheria augustifolia (Narrow-leaved Lacebark) rather than Hoheria lyalli (Mountain Lacebark) for the avenue of trees leading from Worcester Street. The project team had opted for the Hoheria Lyalli (Mountain Lacebark) because it was a smaller variety. However, after reviewing both species again staff accepted this suggestion.

6.17 As a result of feedback, one of the two proposed Acer platum ‘Bloodgood’ trees has also been changed to a Fagus sylvatica (Copper Beech) to bring a larger specimen tree into the park. A Rimu tree, which a nearby resident wishes to donate, has also been included in the plan for approval.

6.18 About 20 of the park’s existing trees will remain. Eighteen of these are exotics, including five fruit trees.

6.19 Three submissions wanted lighting to be included in the plan, while one respondent did not. The project team advised that a safety review had confirmed that lighting should not be included. At night, there were safer alternative routes available and lighting could give people a false sense of security.

6.20 Four submitters queried the provision of chess pieces that would be stored in seats, saying these pieces were likely to disappear. The project team supports a submitter’s suggestion to label round draught pieces as specific chess pieces so they can be used for both games.

6.21 A submitter was unsure about the relevance of bug hotels in this urban setting. The project team advised that a key aspect of the play elements in the park is to give young visitors a taste of nature.

6.22 Two requests for a rubbish bin in the park were not accepted as these are not included in neighbourhood parks as people normally live close by and can take their rubbish home with them.

6.23 A communal garden requested by another submitter is outside the scope of the project. However, space has been retained next to the barbeque area where they can be added in future. This will require a lease due to the recreation reserve status of the land and will need to follow the Christchurch City Gardens Guidelines.

6.24 Two submissions mentioned that there have been alcohol-related issues in the park and have requested appropriate signage.

6.24.1 The recently reviewed Christchurch City Council Alcohol Restrictions in Public Places Bylaw 2018 notes that the park falls within a permanent alcohol ban area (central city) and that the ban applies at all times, 24 hours, seven days a week.

6.24.2 The Bylaw also notes that where it is practicable or reasonable to do so, the Council will erect signage within Alcohol Ban Areas to provide information to the public about the restrictions. The size, location and content of the signage will be at the Council’s discretion. Project funding has been set aside to erect signage.

6.25 Exercise/fitness facilities, additional Sophora microphylla (Kowhai) trees, another seat and a drinking fountain were not included in the plan. Reasons are outlined in the table of submissions and responses in Attachment B.
Changes to the draft landscape plan as a result of consultation are:

6.26 The avenue trees on 261 Worcester Street changed from *Hoheria lyalli* to *Hoheria angustifolia*. As this is a taller species than the *H.lyalli* (6m rather than 4m) they have been moved closer to the path to create greater distance from the property boundaries.

6.27 Two *Acer plamatum* ‘Bloodgood’ trees were originally proposed for the site. The *Acer plamatum* ‘Bloodgood’ tree closest to 310 Gloucester St has been retained and the other has been changed to a Copper Beech to bring a larger specimen tree into the park and to provide shade.

6.28 A Rimu tree has been added to the garden bed next to the nature play area. This location has been selected because a Rimu does best among other planting to keep the roots cool. This part of the site is slightly wetter and is well away from the property boundaries. It also has good visibility in this location.

6.29 Chess pieces changed to draughts pieces which are labelled with the names of the chess pieces. This allows people to play both draughts and chess. It makes the pieces less attractive to steal and they require less space for storage. The pieces will be kept in a storage seat that will have a combination lock on it. The combination will be shared with the local community.

6.30 Three storage seats were originally proposed. By changing the chess pieces to draught pieces less storage is required in the park. Two of the storage seats have been removed and replaced with standard park benches. This has reduced the overall cost and allowed for an extra seat to be added next to the chess board; this extra bench seat will contain the draughts pieces and creates a U shaped seating area. Users of the bench seat can face either direction making this a more flexible space.

6.31 Appropriate signage indicating that alcohol is banned in the park.

Name of the park

6.32 During the consultation submitters were asked if they agreed with Gloucester/Worcester Park as the descriptive name or did they have any other suggestions.

6.33 Twelve submissions agreed with Gloucester/Worcester Park as the descriptive name. Of the seven who did not agree, six said the park should have only one name: Te Ara a Rongo.

6.34 One submitter suggested Two Links Park or Counties Park.

Future artwork

6.35 In the consultation plan a site near the Gloucester Street entrance was identified for a potential artwork for the park. A sculpture was the most popular choice for this space but options will be considered in a separate project.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

6.36 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

6.37 The Council Policy: Naming of Reserves and Facilities, outlines the procedure for the naming of reserves, which is for the proposed reserve name to be referred to the Community Board in the first instance and then to the Council for adoption.

Financial Implications

6.38 Cost of Implementation – The cost of implementing the current landscape plan is approximately $117,500.

6.39 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – The approximate cost to maintain this new park is $1300 per annum.
6.40 Funding source – Financial year 2019 - $80,000 – CPMS 43676 Delivery Package Play and Recreation Development. - $22,000 – CPMS 43660 – Community Parks Development. $15,500 Urban Renewal Budget.

Legal Implications
6.41 There are no negative legal implications to the naming of the Council land. The land has already been entered into the maintenance contract under a proposed name and the naming of the park complies with the Council Register: Naming of Reserves and Facilities.

6.42 The land is classified for Recreation Reserve pursuant of Section 16 (2)(A)(a) of the Reserves Act 1977.

6.43 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit

Risks and Mitigations
6.44 There is a risk of increase in costs of play equipment caused through time delay from estimates at the concept plan stage until gaining approval and placing orders.

6.44.1 Planned treatment include: Confirming the estimate and obtaining a final quote. If the cost is higher than expected, other suppliers will be researched for better pricing.

6.44.2 Residual risk rating: the rating of risk is low.

Implementation
6.45 Implementation dependencies – Gaining Council approval of the proposed name. Gaining Community Board approval to proceed with construction of the landscape plan.

6.46 Name implementation timeframe:
- Approximately one month after the names have been approved by Council.

6.47 Landscape implementation timeframe:
- Community Board approval of landscape plan – February 2019.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
6.48 The advantages of this option include:
- Improvement to the habitat, biodiversity and amenity values of the new park.
- Encourages community ownership of the new park.
- Implementing the outcome of the public consultation.

6.49 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Closure of the park during the construction period of the implementation of the landscape plan is approved.

7. Option 2 - Do not recommend the proposed name to Council and; do not approve the landscape plan

Option Description
7.1 This option does not recommend to the Council to approve the proposed name or approve the landscape plan. Further, the Community Board requests staff to consider alternative name and landscape options and to re-consult with the community.
Significance

7.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.

7.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are low, consistent with section 2 in this report.

7.4 Engagement requirements for this level of significance have been exceeded because of a decision made at the outset of this project for staff to work closely with the surrounding community to develop a landscape plan for the neighbourhood park.

Impact on Mana Whenua

7.5 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water. However, the park is in the vicinity of the pā site of the Ngāi Tahu chief Tautahi, by the Ōtākaro/Avon River on what is now Kilmore Street.

7.6 The park is in the vicinity of the pā site of the Ngāi Tahu chief Tautahi, by the Ōtākaro/Avon River on what is now Kilmore Street.

7.7 Mana Whenua were consulted and Ngāi Tahu have gifted the name Te Ara a Rongo for the new park. The link with Ngāi Tahi is also acknowledged in the proposed planting of native trees.

Community Views and Preferences

7.8 Two of the 20 submitters (10%) did not support the proposed landscape plan.

7.9 Two submitters did not support either of the names Te Ara a Rongo or Gloucester/Worcester Park.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

7.10 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications

7.11 Cost of Implementation – Further funding would be required to cover the cost of a Landscape Architect to draft a new landscape plan and for an Engagement leader for further community consultation.

7.12 Funding source – Financial year 2019 - $80,000 – CPMS 43676 Delivery Package Play and Recreation Development. - $22,000 – CPMS 43660 – Community Parks Development. $15,500 Urban Renewal Budget. This option would have an impact on the total budget available for the development of the park.

Legal Implications

7.13 There are no negative legal implications to the naming of the Council land. The land has already been entered into the maintenance contract under a proposed name and the naming of the park complies with the Council Register: Naming of Reserves and Facilities.

7.14 The land is classified for Recreation Reserve pursuant of Section 16 (2)(A)(a) of the Reserves Act 1977.

7.15 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit

Risks and Mitigations

7.16 There is a risk of increase in costs of play equipment caused through time delay from estimates at the concept plan stage until gaining approval and placing orders.

7.16.1 Planned treatment include: Confirming the estimate and obtaining a final quote. If the cost is higher than expected, other suppliers will be researched for better pricing.

7.17 Residual risk rating: the rating of risk is low.
Implementation
7.18 Implementation dependencies – gaining Community Board support to consult on the name of the park, draft a new landscape plan and approval of the revised landscape plan.

7.19 Implementation timeframe:
- Redesign of landscape plan and investigate alternative names – March/April 2019.
- Community Board Seminar – May 2019.
- Community Board Support for name and Approval of Landscape Plan – August 2019.
- Detailed design, tendering, placing orders for equipment – September 2019

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.20 The advantages of this option include:
- The community has the option to consider alternative landscape designs.

7.21 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Additional funding for design, consultation and implementation which may result in less budget being available for play equipment/furniture/landscaping (or alternatively more budget may be required to complete the project).
- Delay in completing the project.
- Consultation feedback did not support this option.
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Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).
(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.
## Signatories

| Authors          | Sarah Blows - Parks Planner  
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| Approved By      | Andrew Rutledge - Head of Parks  
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## Gloucester/Worcester Park landscape plan - submissions and responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Support landscape plan?</th>
<th>Submitters’ comments</th>
<th>Project team responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20204</td>
<td>Peter &amp; Lynda Quaid</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>The overall plan looks great - a real practical enhancement. A couple of feedback though: We are unsure of the relevance of the Bug Hotels, in this urban setting. We are also unsure about the benefit/usage of the chess pieces, versus the potential cost and risk of theft (therefore replacement). We propose draught pieces instead - maybe just simple timber rounds painted white &amp; black. If the school kids want to play chess, then they could supply their own pieces. Maybe the draught pieces could be 'labelled' as the chess pieces.</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. Bug Hotels: A key aspect of the play elements in this park is to give young visitors a taste of nature. Bug hotels will attract insects and give children an experience of looking for bugs and seeing them in this environment. Chess Pieces: As this idea was put forward during pre-engagement with the school we would like to take this opportunity to trial it. Thank you for your suggestion about the draught pieces, we think this is a good idea. Labelled draught pieces will mean that people can play both draughts and chess; they will be less appealing to steal and they require less storage space. In addition, we're proposing that the game pieces are kept in a storage seat that can be accessed via a combination lock that will be shared with the local community. If they go missing despite these measures then people will be able to bring their own pieces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20231</td>
<td>David Burwick</td>
<td>Christchurch Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>The avenue of Hoheria lyalli is not a good choice for the reserve! This subalpine species needs cool humid conditions in summer and rainfall above 1500 mm per annum along with good soil drainage. In lowland conditions this Hoheria quickly succumbs to heat stress and various root rots and would not be a good use of limited resources. I suggest an alternative species, Hoheria angustifolia, a heat and drought resistant tree which is native to the lowland/coastal plains ecosystem and much admired in late summer for its beautiful starry white blossom. <em>H. angustifolia</em> is widely planted around the city in bush plantings, but it also makes a great park/avenue planting as its tiny leaves don't smother the lawn and the fibrous branches resist vandalism and winds. Instead of Acer 'Bloodgood', (very sensitive to wind and drought) plant some Quinces or Apricots as they are more drought and wind tolerant when established (as well as edible)!</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. We had previously considered the <em>Hoheria angustifolia</em> (Narrow-leaved Lacebark) but were keen to trial the <em>H. lyalli</em> (Mountain Lacebark) because it's a smaller variety. However, we have reassessed this following your comments and have changed back to the <em>Hoheria angustifolia</em> (Narrow-leaved Lacebark). We are comfortable with our choice of the Acer platanum 'Bloodgood', however we have changed one of these to a Fagus sylvatica (Copper Beech) based on a suggestion from another submitter. We are already proposing some fruit trees and there are other fruit trees already existing on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20240</td>
<td>Lisa James</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20261</td>
<td>Richard Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20265</td>
<td>Trish Lowe</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>No lighting? Are you serious? At least some lighting in the central part to light existing &amp; established trees. It would minimise the temptation for rough sleepers and general night loitering. Please include a water drinking fountain and shade over the picnic table. Otherwise it is okay albeit cupping on mediocre and low budget</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lighting:**

A safety review has confirmed that lighting should not be used in the park. At night, there are safer alternative routes available. Lighting can give people a false sense of security.

**Furniture:**

We generally don't include drinking fountains in small neighbourhood parks as people are close to home and are able to bring water with them. The Acer platanum 'Bloodgood' trees have been included in the park specifically to provide shade to the picnic table. But taking your comment into consideration we've...
<p>| 20300 | Mike O’Grady | CDHB | yes | replaced one of these with a larger Fagus sylvatica (Copper Beech) tree. Trees have the benefit of being deciduous so will allow sun through to the table in winter and shade it during the summer. |
| 20304 | Matthew Reid | yes |
| 20327 | Ronny Groenteman | yes | As an owner of a property on Gloucester St, I thank the Council for proposing this reserve. Love the bug hotels, chess board, use of existing fruit trees, addition of more fruit trees, planting native trees... All wonderful! |
| | | | I would like to propose widening of the footpath to enable separating cyclists and pedestrians. |
| | | | I would also like to propose replacing the exotic deciduous trees with the native deciduous kowhai, which will add bright yellow colour when in flower and will attract birdlife to the reserve. |
| | | | Lastly, I would like to propose adding outdoor exercise/fitness facilities to encourage adult users of the reserve to engage in free healthy activity. |
| | | | I agree that no lighting is required in the reserve. |
| | | | Thank you for your feedback. |
| | | | Cycle Path: |
| | | | The width of the path is 2m which is the minimum required for a shared pedestrian and cycle path. The cost of the footpath is a significant portion of the budget for this park. We are therefore proposing the minimum width to allow for both cyclists and pedestrians while keeping the cost down. The path is bordered by grass which allows room for users to move off the path if necessary. |
| | | | Trees: |
| | | | There are a number of native trees proposed in the park as well as two existing Sophora microphylla (Kowhai) trees. The purpose of the two deciduous trees is to provide shade to the picnic table. The size and deciduous nature of the trees will provide shade in summer and allow sun through to the table in winter. Kowhai are a smaller tree, only semi-deciduous and are unlikely to perform this function so well. |
| | | | Fitness equipment: |
| | | | The addition of outdoor fitness equipment is outside the scope and budget for this park. However, the development of this park is intended to make it easier for people to walk and cycle through the neighbourhood and we hope this will encourage people to do this. |
| 20353 | Lindsay Campbell | yes | I whole heartedly support the plan - the provision of a &quot;path of peace&quot; which encourages residents, birds &amp; children in the centre of a busy city is to be encouraged. I particularly like the provision of a path / cycle way, as the land does get very wet in the winter, with seating, BBQ area &amp; chess. It is a lovely, sunny neighbourhood asset which will be much improved when the proposal is completed. A rubbish bin, designed to accept small items only, should be provided. |
| | | | Thank you for your feedback. We generally don’t include bins in small neighbourhood parks as people are close to home and are able to take their rubbish home with them. |
| 20382 | Maggie Rankin | I’d love to come to the park this week re: landscaping plan but am away with work. One concern (which may already have been addressed, - sorry if I might be repeating it) is that of adequate lighting, ideally solar-powered. |
| | | | Thank you for your feedback. A safety review has confirmed that lighting should not be used in the park. At night, there are safer alternative routes available. Lighting can give people a false sense of security. |
| 20383 | Peter Kent | yes | One concern (which may already have been addressed, - sorry if I might be repeating it) is that of adequate lighting, ideally solar-powered. |
| | | | Thank you for your feedback. A safety review has confirmed that lighting should not be used in the park. At night, there are safer alternative routes available. Lighting can give people a false sense of security. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20390</td>
<td>Laura Gartner</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Really like the nature play. Would like to see more native trees like kowhai to attract native birds. How about some space for small communal vegetable gardens given the many new housing complexes in the area that have no garden space. This would give local apartment/multi-unit residents an opportunity to grow some food. Also a small perennial flower garden with flowers attractive to bees to help the ailing bee populations. Thank you for your feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20393</td>
<td>Bernie &amp; Diane Williams</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>We think that this park is a great idea! The kids will love it! Also a nice place for people to relax in. Thank you for your feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20404</td>
<td>Ray &amp; Judy Minchin</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>It sounds so amazing Thank you for your feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20406</td>
<td>Sheldon McIntyre</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Green spaces close to town great given the excess apartment living coming. Thank you for your feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20442</td>
<td>Warren Robertson</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Good plan. A bit sorry to see existing trees removed. Bit worried about chess pieces going missing. Though good idea. A ban on alcohol as been a problem A ban on alcohol has been a problem several times in the past. Another seat Thank you for your feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trees:**
- We have proposed a number of native trees for the park which produce flowers and fruit that are attractive to birds and bees. There are two existing Sophora microphylla (Kowhai) in the park but we are not proposing to add any more.

**Communal garden:**
- This is currently outside the scope of the project, however space has been retained next to the barbecue area where they could be added in future. This will require a lease due to the recreation reserve status of the land and will need to follow the Community Gardens Guidelines.

**Chess Pieces:**
- As this idea was put forward during pre-engagement with the school we would like to take this opportunity to trial it. Following feedback from the submissions, we have decided to provide draught pieces that are labelled as the chess pieces. Labelled draught pieces will mean that people can play both draughts and chess; they will be less appealing to steal and they require less storage space. In addition, we’re proposing that the game pieces are kept in a storage seat that can be accessed via a combination lock that will be shared with the local community. If they go missing despite these measures then people will be able to bring their own pieces.

**Signage:**
- The Christchurch City Council Alcohol Restrictions in Public Places Bylaw 2018 identifies the central city as a permanent alcohol ban area. Signage is proposed for the park and will include wording regarding the alcohol ban.

**Seating:**
- We are proposing an extra bench seat next to the chess board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20443   | Michael & Sascha Corcoran | yes      | HI. I live close by. I have a degree in 'Recreation and Sport' also Diploma from the Hillary Commission: My comments are as follows: <br>The FENCING right through - on either side, is an eyesore, needs to be renewed or tidied up; <br>"Alcohol Ban" sign, needs to be placed both entry place; <br>(Last Summer) full of people drinking. Keep in mind new blocks of state housing across the road for single men; <br>CARS always obstructing the entrance way. WORCESTER END, needs levelling off to pavement area! <br>A rubbish "Council Bin" - re bar-b-que (etc.) <br>Scrap the idea of chess pieces (they will be gone in one week. (London/New York have seen people bring their own sets. <br>Provide two tables, close to each other CREATES a better participation | Thank you for your feedback.  
Fencing:  
Replacing boundary fencing is outside the scope of this project. Staff will investigate working with neighbours through the Fencing Act 1978 to replace the boundary fencing.  
Signage:  
The Christchurch City Council Alcohol Restrictions in Public Places Bylaw 2018 identifies the central city as a permanent alcohol ban area. Signage is proposed for the park and will include wording regarding the alcohol ban.  
Cars:  
Fencing and a seating area is proposed at the Worcester Street entrance which will prevent vehicles being able to park in the park.  
Rubbish:  
We generally don't include bins in small neighbourhood parks as people are close to home and are able to take their rubbish home with them.  
Chess Pieces:  
As this idea was put forward during pre-engagement with the school we would like to take this opportunity to trial it. Following feedback from the submissions, we have decided to provide draught pieces that are labelled as the chess pieces. Labelled draught pieces will mean that people can play both draughts and chess; they will be less appealing to steal; and they require less storage space. In addition, we're proposing that the game pieces are kept in a storage seat that can be accessed via a combination lock that will be shared with the local community. If they go missing despite these measures then people will be able to bring their own pieces. |
| 20444   | S Rowse       | yes      | Great idea, I hope the storage benches are made of metal.  
I'm sure the chess pieces will disappear! Sounds a bit simplistic | Thank you for your feedback.  
Chess Pieces:  
As this idea was put forward during pre-engagement with the school we would like to take this opportunity to trial it. Following feedback from the submissions, we have decided to provide draught pieces that are labelled as the chess pieces. Labelled draught pieces will mean that people can play both draughts and chess; they will be less appealing to steal; and they require less storage space. In addition, we're proposing that the game pieces are kept in a storage seat that can be accessed via a combination lock that will be shared with the local community. If they go missing despite these measures then people will be able to bring their own pieces. |
| 20445   | Marette Wells | yes      | I really like the flow | Thank you for your feedback. |
| 20548   | S. Peddie     | yes      | Fantastic idea! Great plan, good flow  
*Lacebarks are relatively short lived - how about an exotic tree that would provide more shade + autumn colour (this is in the avenue area) & have a group of lacebarks elsewhere?  
* Kauri is slow growing - would just keep this to one. But this is the only tree with some height. Would be great to see stronger tree selection. Some large exotic park trees e.g.: Exotic Beech (NZ Beech) * More seating / or another table & seats combo.  
* Some oaks  
A couple of low mounds could be good - 700mm high max, but nice to sit on, roll down etc. | Thank you for your feedback.  
Avenue Trees:  
The feedback we've had so far is a preference for native trees rather than exotics. We also need to be mindful of shading to neighbours properties which is why we've selected a smaller tree.  
Trees:  
Thank you for your suggestion of some larger trees within the park. We have proposed to replace one of the Acer platanatum "Bloodgood" trees with a Fagus sylvatica (Copper Beech). |
Seating:
We're proposing an extra bench seat next to the chess board.

Mounds:
There is a mound proposed in the nature play area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions made at consultation drop-in session on 29 November 2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate whether a donated rimu can be planted out from the corner (adjacent to rear Gloucester St unit (310))</td>
<td>Seat in that corner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This has been proposed next to the nature play area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowhai and flax planted on other side of the path?</td>
<td>There are two existing Sophora microphylla (Kowhai) in the park and we are not proposing to add any more at this stage. Other proposed native trees produce flowers and fruit that attract birds and bees. Flax can get very large resulting in visibility concerns so any flax considered for this site would need to be small varieties. This will be considered at the detailed design stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underplanting/kowhai/azaleas along fence adjacent to 259 Worcester St.</td>
<td>No additional planting is proposed along here at this stage due to the costs involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gloucester/Worcester Park - Feedback on name and suggested artwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Support G/W Park name?</th>
<th>Name. Do you have any other suggestions?</th>
<th>What artwork would you like to see in the park?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20204</td>
<td>Peter &amp; Lynda Quaid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>We think the Te Reo name of the &quot;Te Ara a Rongo&quot; is a great gift and should be adopted as the official name. An additional translation on any signage to (like) &quot;Path between the streets&quot; might be good.</td>
<td>We would like to see simple (geometric) shapes and colours representing the homes, villas units and landscapes of the surrounding urban area. Something that 'blends' in, but still provides interest (and discourages tagging). See below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20231</td>
<td>David Barwick</td>
<td>Christchurch Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20240</td>
<td>Lisa James</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20261</td>
<td>Richard Bell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20265</td>
<td>Trish Lowe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20300</td>
<td>Mike O'Grady</td>
<td>CDHB</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20304</td>
<td>Matthew Reid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Just use the Ngai Tahu name.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mural of a weta or another insect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20327</td>
<td>Ronny Groenteman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>A sculpture by a NZ artist would be great. I would like to suggest Anna Korver <a href="http://www.annakorver.co.nz/gallery.html">http://www.annakorver.co.nz/gallery.html</a> Being next to a school, the sculpture could focus on the theme of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20353</td>
<td>Lindsay Campbell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perhaps an artwork that celebrates the owners of the earthquake, damaged homes upon which the park now exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20382</td>
<td>Maggie Rankin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20388</td>
<td>Peter Kent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Thank you for your message. I am very happy with the proposed park and both Maori and English names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20390</td>
<td>Laura Gartner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Please accept Te Ara a Rongo as the sole park name....Gloucester/Worcester Park is boring, dull, unimaginative and too long. Just keep the name gifted by Ngai Taha please. It has much more relevant meaning.</td>
<td>Something natural... wood or stone carving? Something to celebrate nature and appreciate in peaceful contemplation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20393</td>
<td>Bernie &amp; Diane Williams</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed plan looks really good</td>
<td>Would leave that to you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20404</td>
<td>Ray &amp; Judy Minchin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe some sculptures!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20406</td>
<td>Sheldon murtha</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maori name excellent,</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20442</td>
<td>Warren Robertson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20443</td>
<td>Michael &amp; Sascha Corcoran</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;Boring&quot; &quot;Two Links&quot; - Park ([Re-the connection Gloucester/Worcester] OR &quot;Counties - Park ([Re-Counties of Gloucester/Worcester)</td>
<td>Something simple / maybe to climb on. Example: Maori Mosaic on the stop. See below. What artwork would you like to see in the park?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20444</td>
<td>S Rowse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some kinetic pieces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20445</td>
<td>Marette Wells</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Te Ara a Rongo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20548</td>
<td>S. Peddie</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Just have Te Ara Rongo</td>
<td>Sculpture work by local artists that can be used for play - e.g. rotating sculpture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Cambridge Green Pou Artwork Future Treatment Options Report

Reference: 18/951434
Presenter(s): Jo Grigg, Project Manager, Parks Project Management Team

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

   Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to recommend to Council an option for the future treatment of the Cambridge Green Pouwhenua artwork.

   Origin of Report
   1.2 This report is staff generated to Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board as a result of the earthquake damage to the artwork.

2. Significance

   2.1 The decision in this report is of medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the cost, city wide significance and number of people affected by the decision.

   2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflect the assessment.

3. Staff Recommendations

   It is recommended that the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board recommend that the Council:

   1. Decommission the Cambridge Green Pouwhenua artwork and carefully remove the remaining carved wooden pou from site and return all three pieces to the carver’s family
   2. Commission a new artwork for the plinths on this site in the future.

4. Key Points

   4.1 This report supports the Council's Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

   4.1.1 Activity: Parks & Foreshore
   • Level of Service: 6.9.1.4 To manage and maintain Public Monuments, Sculptures, Artworks and Parks Heritage Buildings of significance - Public Monuments, Sculptures, Artworks & Parks Heritage Buildings Asset of above average condition: 80%

   4.2 This report supports the Artworks in Public Places Policy 2002.

   4.2.1 That the Council approves the Procedures for Moving, and Altering Artworks as described in Appendix 10

   4.3 An Artworks Commissioning Agreement was not executed for this artwork.

   4.4 The following options have been considered:
• Option 1 – Decommission the artwork and return the wooden pou to the carver’s family, and commission a new artwork at a later date (preferred option)
• Option 2 – Repair existing and carve new central pou
• Option 3 – Do nothing

4.5 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Option 1 - Preferred Option)
4.5.1 The advantages of this option include:
• The original artwork is no longer damaged and deteriorating.
• The risk of the remaining two pou falling in a seismic event is eliminated.
• The concrete plinths remain, therefore no requirement for consents, archaeological authority. Impact on ecological system is significantly reduced.
• There are funds available to undertake the removal.
• Supported by the carver’s family representative.
• Supported by Matapopore representatives.
• Supports Maori tikanga practices.
• Commissioning a new artwork allows Ngāi Tahu / Ngāi Tūāhuriri history to continue to be interpreted on the site.
• The site continues to be enhanced with artwork.

4.5.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
• The context of the original artwork as a whole including the plinth is lost permanently.
• The carved pou are no longer on display and the plinths largely hidden by the surrounding foliage until such time as a new artwork is commissioned.
• There is a risk that the community perceive the artwork could have been repaired or replaced like for like. However this can be mitigated through effective communication and education on the cultural sensitivities surrounding this artwork.

5. Context/Background

Artwork Commissioning and Interpretation
5.1 An Artwork Commissioning Agreement was not executed for this artwork.

5.2 The Pouwhenua in Cambridge Village Green Reserve were erected in 2004 to signify the importance of the site to Māori. This area was a part of Tautahi’s Pā site.

The macrocarpa pouwhenua were carved by Tohunga Whakairo George Edwards, and bought by the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board for the site via a third party.

A small working party oversaw the artwork plan. The working party comprised representatives from Tuahiwi, Ōtautahi Runaka, Council staff, the Council Community Board and local residents associations. The artworks were given a judges citation from Creative New Zealand for the works and the consultation process that was undertaken.

The concrete plinths were designed by Council’s former Maori Community Arts Advisor under the guidance of Reverend Maurice Gray. The designs on the plinth are moko kauae (traditional Maori chin tattoo worn by Maori women).

Pou A: Hine-titama (Goddess of life)
Pou B: Hine-nui-te-pō (Goddess of death & wisdom)
Pou C: Hine-ahu-one (Goddess of mortal beings)

The poles figuratively represents ‘te ara’ – ‘the pathway’ to the star constellation of Tautoru (Orion’s Belt). The three stars of Orion’s Belt are at the top of each pole. The feminine spiritual pathways which connect to the masculine cosmic stars are captured in the structures. The first pole is Tautahi, the middle pole is Taurua and the third Tautoru which completes the trinity of stars. The rope cords are symbolic as they bind the masculine and feminine energies together as one united force.

The Pou were erected and unveiled at a dawn ceremony carried out by Reverend Maurice Gray. One half of a pounamu mauri stone is installed in the plinth of the central pouwhenua. The other half is located beneath the Tribute to Firefighters artwork upstream.

In the handover report following installation, it notes that the wooden pouwhenua were installed in a degraded state. The lifespan of the wooden pou was estimated at 5-10 years and the rope five years. The concrete plinths have a lifespan of 50 years.

Condition Assessment

5.3 In the 22 February 2011 Canterbury earthquake, the central pou (B) failed and fell into St Mary’s stream. The two other pou (A and C) moved out of alignment by approximately 5-6°. Lateral spreading is visible in the surrounding area. Refer Attached – CCC Structural Inspection Report dated 3 October 2011.

The fallen pou was recovered in April 2011 and transported to CCC storage. A condition assessment was undertaken by Emily Fryer Conservation in April and June 2011. Refer attached Condition Assessment Report dated June 2011. The pou was reported to have substantial decay and was in a very poor condition.

Treetech were engaged in June 2016 to undertake a condition assessment of the two remaining pou, as there were concerns over the level of decay. Refer attached Treetech Revised Report5 July 2017. Their investigations involved using a sounding hammer to detect audible changes in tone to the wood which would indicate areas of potentially poor wood structure. Visual observations of deterioration in the wood surface was also recorded. The consultant arborist took two 350mm (L) core samples from each pou in the lower and upper third respectively.

The following was recorded:

- Pou A (note reported as Pou 1 in Treetech Report)
  - The smaller of the two remaining pouwhenua
  - external degradation and splintering
  - Core Sample A – Lower third showed localised degradation of outer weathered surface but good wood from approximately 15mm and deeper to the centre.
  - Core sample B – Upper third showed overall sound wood. Good exterior surface with soft wood only 0.10mm depth.

- Pou C (note reported as Pou 2 in Treetech Report)
  - The larger of the two remaining. Close proximity fall distance to pathways.
  - H&S concern falling. Reduced quality of wood. Greater target area for falling.
  - Core Sample C – Lower third showed substantial soft, deteriorating wood. Sound wood estimated at 250mm depth. The width of the pou is 520mm. Weaker wood structure with a softer interior and potentially reduced tensile strength.
- Core Sample D – Upper third substantial soft, deteriorating wood. Sound wood estimated at 210mm plus depth. The diameter of the pou is 450mm. Weaker wood structure with a softer interior and potentially reduced tensile strength.

**Recommendations:** Pou A contains enough sound wood to remain on site however will require treatment and monitoring. Analysis of the core samples indicate that the strength of Pou C has been compromised and should be removed.

**Consultation**

5.4 Council staff held a series of meetings during 2016 and 2017 with George Edwards’ family, Paula Rigby and Matapopore representatives to discuss the future treatment of the artwork. Due to George Edwards’ ill health at the time, his daughter Mrs Kirsten Aumua represented the Edwards family. The following was discussed:

5.4.1 The Edwards family gave consent to decommission the artwork and expressed a strong desire to see the three pieces returned home to family.

5.4.2 Matapopore and Paula Rigby supported in principle the decommissioning of the artwork due to its earthquake damage.

5.4.3 An artwork or carving and its pieces would not normally be separated. The pieces should remain together, therefore the fallen pou should be displayed or returned to the site. The pieces should be given the treatment and honour they deserve and be preserved together.

5.4.4 It would be acceptable to reduce the height of the pou by cutting out the decayed wood, however in later discussions and upon inspection of the fallen pou it was agreed that the decay extended to nearly 90% of the length of the pou. It was agreed that the pou could not be re-erected safely at its full height and too much of the original material would be lost if the decayed wood was cut out.

5.4.5 A pouwhenua would not normally be laid down. They cannot be retained on site without a transitional layer between them and the ground.

5.4.6 The original carver is not able to undertake repairs or carve a new pou. It is not customary to have another carver carry out the work.

5.4.7 Agreed if the carved pou were to be removed, then it would be acceptable to leave the concrete plinths and tidy the top rope sections of the artwork. This would minimise the impact on St Mary’s stream and the ecosystem of the site. There would be no requirement for consents, an archaeological authority etc.
6. Option 1 - Decommission Artwork and Gift Carved Pou to the Artist’s Family and Commit to Commissioning a New Artwork (preferred option)

Option Description
6.1 This option would see the artwork decommissioned and the remaining two pou carefully removed from the plinths. The concrete plinths would remain. The foundations extend approximately 6m into the ground below. The rope would be tidied to the top of the plinths or removed.

6.2 The fallen pou that is currently in storage would be transported to Cambridge Green and all three pou returned to the carver’s family. The careful removal would ensure that as much of the original carving is kept together.

6.3 Maori tikanga practices undertaken.

6.4 The Council would follow the Artworks in Public Places Policy, for the commissioning of new artwork.

6.5 The timeframe to commission a new artwork would be in excess of 12 months.

6.6 Mana Whenua and the Artist of the plinth would be involved in the project from its commencement, to participate in the early stages of the consultation and provide comment on the new artwork and to ensure the correct interpretation.

Significance
6.7 The level of significance of this option is medium consistent with section 2 of this report. Engagement requirements for this level of significance are medium. Engagement with the carver’s family and Matapopore has been undertaken for the removal of the existing pou.

6.8 Engagement with mana whenua and the wider community will be required for any new artwork on this site.

Impact on Mana Whenua
6.9 This option does involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

6.10 Matapopore representatives were consulted with in 2016 & 2017 and were supportive in principle of the decommissioning of the original artwork.

6.11 Consultation with Matapopore will be required for any new artwork.

Community Views and Preferences
6.12 The artists are specifically affected by this option due to the loss of the original artwork. The artists and/or their representatives are in support of the decommissioning of the artwork.

6.13 The community are affected by this option when commissioning a new artwork, due to “having a true account of the area’s history from the original occupants of the region, e.g. Ngāi Tahu”. This will allow for open and transparent conversations with communities and citizens within the region.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.14 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies.

Financial Implications
6.15 Cost of Implementation - $4500 approximately for the removal. Funding source – Delivery Package Artworks Project (CPMS25506)
6.16 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs until the new artwork is installed - $500 per annum (wash down of the plinths, structural assessment)

6.17 Cost of Implementation for the new artwork is unknown and can only be determined once the new artwork has been designed and commissioned.

6.18 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs for the new artwork - Unknown

**Legal Implications**

6.19 There is a legal implication relevant to this decision. A commissioning agreement would need to be executed with the new artist for their artwork.

6.20 This report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit.

**Risks and Mitigations**

6.21 There is a risk that in the event of another seismic event the remaining pou will fall. This may result in injury to members of the public, destruction of the remaining pou. This risk is eliminated by removing the carved pou.

**Implementation**

6.22 Implementation dependencies are as follows:

6.22.1 The removal of the remaining carved pou is approved by the Community Board.

6.22.2 Commissioning of a new artwork is approved by the Community Board.

6.22.3 Funds are sourced to allow the project to proceed.

6.22.4 The artist who designed the plinth is engaged early on in the consultation process and approves of the new artwork.

6.22.5 Mana whenua approve the new artwork.

6.23 Implementation timeframe – it is estimated that to commission a new artwork the process could take in excess of 12 months from consultation to installation.

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

6.23.1 The advantages of this option include:

- The original artwork is no longer damaged.
- The risk of the remaining two pou falling in a seismic event is eliminated.
- The concrete plinths remain, therefore no requirement for consents, archaeological authority. Impact on ecological system is significantly reduced.
- There are funds available to undertake the removal.
- Supported by the carver’s family representative.
- Supported by Matapopore representatives.
- Supports Maori tikanga practices.
- Commissioning a new artwork allows Ngai Tahu / Ngai Tuahuriri history to continue to be interpreted on the site.
- The site continues to be enhanced with artwork.

6.23.2 The disadvantages of this option include:

- The context of the original artwork as a whole including the plinth is lost permanently.
The carved pou are no longer on display and the plinths largely hidden by the surrounding foliage until such time as a new artwork is commissioned.

There is a risk that the community perceive the artwork could have been repaired or replaced like for like. However this can be mitigated through effective communication and education on the cultural sensitivities surrounding this artwork.

7. Option 2 - Repair the Carved Wooden Pou

Option Description
7.1 This option would see the decayed wood removed and new wood spliced in. The fallen pou cannot be reinstated, therefore a new central pou would be carved.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with section 2 of this report.
7.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are low. Consultation will be required with mana whenua, and the artist of the plinth.

Impact on Mana Whenua
7.4 This option does involve a decision in relation elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.
7.5 Consultation with the carver’s family and Matapopore highlighted that it is culturally insensitive to engage another artist/carver to repair and replicate an original carver’s work.
7.6 Further engagement with mana whenua and the artists family will be required if this option was selected.

Community Views and Preferences
7.7 The community and members of the public are not affected by this option.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
7.8 This option is inconsistent with Council’s Plans and Policies
7.8.2 Reason for inconsistency – The carver’s family provided consent to decommission the artwork and advised another carver would not normally work on the repair or replication of an original carvers work. With the passing of George Edwards, the pou are unable to be repaired. This would not meet the policy conditions as approval has not been granted for repair.

Financial Implications
7.9 Cost of Implementation – estimated > $15,000
7.10 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – estimated at $2000 pa
7.11 Funding source – There are currently no funds identified sufficient to cover the cost of this option.

Legal Implications
7.12 There is no legal implication relevant to this decision

Risks and Mitigations
7.13 There is a risk of that if the pou are to be repaired, the carver may not fully understand Ngai Tahu / Ngai Tuahuriri history and therefore may not be mandated to integrate adequate
interpretations to the current depictions. This may result in offence to both iwi and the artist’s whanau.

7.13.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk after the below treatment(s) is implemented will be low.

7.13.2 Engagement would be required with both mana whenua and the carver’s family to gain approval to a) undertake the work and ensure the correct interpretation and b) approval of the carver.

Implementation
7.14 Implementation dependencies - Agreement required from the original artists and/or their representatives and mana whenua.

7.15 Implementation timeframe – in excess of 6 months.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.16 The advantages of this option include:
- The artwork is repaired like for like.

7.17 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Not supported by the artists family
- In principle does not comply with Artworks in Public Places Policy, Appendix 10.

8. Option 3 - Do Nothing

Option Description
8.1 This option would see the two remaining pou left on site with no further treatment.

8.2 The remaining pou are exhibiting areas of decay and will continue to decay to the point where they fail and fall.

8.3 This option is not in keeping with the intent of the original artwork.

8.4 This option is not supported by the carver’s family.

Significance
8.5 The level of significance of this option is Low consistent with section 2 of this report.

8.6 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are low.

Impact on Mana Whenua
8.7 This option does involve a decision in relation elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

8.8 Following consultation with the carver’s family and Matapopore, it was advised that an artwork or carving and its parts would not normally be separated. The carvings should remain together, therefore the fallen pou should be displayed or returned to the site. The carvings should be given the treatment and honour they deserve and be preserved together. By doing nothing, this option does not support mana whenua culture and tradition.

Community Views and Preferences
8.9 There is currently no community interest.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
8.10 This option is inconsistent with Council’s Plans and Policies
8.10.1 Allowing the artwork to degrade and be incomplete is not aligned with LTP Activity: Parks & Foreshore

- Level of Service: 6.9.1.4 To manage and maintain Public Monuments, Sculptures, Artworks and Parks Heritage Buildings of significance - Public Monuments, Sculptures, Artworks & Parks Heritage Buildings Asset of above average condition: 80%

Financial Implications
8.11 Cost of Implementation - $0
8.12 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – Unknown. However it is anticipated that there will be future costs for removal once the two pou have degraded to a point they fail and fall.
8.13 Funding source – No funding source has been identified in the LTP for future works.

Legal Implications
8.14 There is a potential for legal implication relevant to this decision, if one of the pou fails in an earthquake or due to degradation and injures a member of the public.

Risks and Mitigations
8.15 There is a risk that in a seismic event the remaining pou could fall and injure members of the public walking by.

Implementation
8.16 This option has no implementation dependencies or timeframe.

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
8.17 The advantages of this option are NIL.
8.18 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Ongoing maintenance costs
- Risk of injury to members of the public, legal action and associated costs.
- The remaining pieces of the artwork will continue to degrade
- The artwork remains incomplete.
- Not supported by the carver’s family.
- This option does not meet the Councils’ Level of Service.
- Does not meet the Councils Art in Public Places policy.
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| STRUCTURE: Cambridge Green Poupou |
| ADDRESS: Corner of Cambridge Tce and Barbados St/Salisbury St. |
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1. INTRODUCTION

A Structural inspection was carried out on the Cambridge Green Maori Pillar (Poupou) at the Cambridge Village Green Reserve on the 27 January 2012. The objective of this report is to determine the condition of the structure following the 4 September 2010 and 22 February 2011 earthquakes and following sequence of aftershocks. Options for repair are given at the end of this report.

2. STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION

Situated at the Barbadoes/Salisbury Streets intersection on the Cambridge Village Green Reserve the three Cambridge Green Pous highlight an area of cultural and historical significance and were a collaborative effort to provide a community art work best suited to the area. (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Pillar location denoted on circle A, B and C
The three timber pillars referenced A, B and C from Figure 1 are 4.9m, 5.8m and 6.8m in height respectively (including the concrete plinth) and are mounted on concrete plinths (figure 2). Pillar B is situated within a pond and both pillars A and C at the river bank. All three artworks are connected to the concrete plinths by steel ring plates as shown on the drawing in the Appendix A. The plinths are supported by 6.2m long by 219mm diameter steel screw piles filled with 30MPa concrete. It is understood there were installed to resist lateral movement due to liquefaction.

![Figure 2: Pillar elevation and foundations](image)

3. INSPECTION

The structural inspection identified extensive damage due to liquefaction and lateral spreading of the ground where the timber pillars were located (figure 3). As a result,
pillars A and C have tilted 5% and 6% respectively (Figures 4 and 5). Pillar B had completely failed at the base of the timber base section causing the pillar to break off (Figure 6).

Figure 3: Evidence of lateral spreading observed around the site

Figure 4: Tilt of pillar A. Pillar B broken off.
The brittle failure of pillar B at the timber base to steel housing connection appears to be related to rotten timber at this section in combination with the excessive seismic forces of the 22 February 2011 earthquake.

At the early construction stage, the structural engineer identified the timber used for the poles was rotten in some parts. Repair work was undertaken prior installation of the poles at pillar C (Figure 5 darker brown colour). Figure 7, shows the repair methodology for the pillar. The broken section of pillar is being stored at a CCC depot.
4. DESKTOP INVESTIGATIONS

A desktop investigation determined the Cambridge Green Pou bases were designed using the NZS 4203:1992 seismic design standard, which was a predecessor of the current NZS 1170.5:2004 standard for earthquake actions.
The ultimate seismic load coefficient was originally calculated as 54% of the seismic mass at ultimate limit state with a ductility factor of 1.0 (elastic design). This equates that the Pou bases were designed for a moment of 9.62 kNm.

An analysis of the seismic loading using NZS 1170.5, for an importance level 2 and 50 year design working life and ductility 1.0, the seismic coefficient will be 63% and 21% of the seismic mass at ultimate and serviceability limit states respectively. Note that the seismic load coefficient for Christchurch was increased by 36% following the 22 February Earthquake and this would account for some of the difference in seismic demand effects from NZS 1170.5.

However, the derivation of a lower seismic design load used from the earlier standard is not likely to have affected the outcome following the 22 February 2011 earthquake. This is because the failure of the timber pillar B was due to rotten timber (and hence lower timber strength), and the tilt of the other pillars was due to significant ground movement and subsidence far exceeding design expectations.

The structural calculations show in detail the design of the steel screw piles designed for lateral earthquake pressure, the timber pillar stresses generated due to bending and shear and the steel ring connector plate capacities.

The author believes pillars A and C have moved and rotated as a rigid body from the base of the screw piles to the top of the Pou (elastic rotation and no inelastic deformation of the foundation or piles has occurred). However, an invasive site investigation of the pile and plinth connection would be required to confirm this assumption and that the rotation has not been caused by bending failure of the screw pile (although this is unlikely).

Due to the tall, slender nature of the artwork and the way it is connected to the foundations, small movements of the ground will have a more pronounced effect upon the top of the pillars and hence the visual appearance. For example, the 6° tilt of pillar C could be generated by 700mm lateral ground movement and would translate to a 1400mm horizontal displacement at the top of the pillar. Generally for a building column, the acceptable out of plumb is 1:500, which for the tallest pillar would be 14mm horizontal displacement at the top. Small adjustments of the pillar verticality could be made at the steel plate to pillar connection by unbolting and inserting steel shims. The acceptable tilt of the pillars to preserve their artistic effect would need to be considered and accounted for in the design of any ground remediation measures.

4.1 Geotechnical Review

Interrogation of the recently released CERA geotechnical information from this area (Area 8 Central North) revealed the extent of ground movement around the pillars. These reports include mapping of ground cracking, liquefaction and lateral spreading observations, LiDAR ground elevation and vertical ground movements.

Generally, the proximity of the site close to the Avon River has subjected the ground to significant vertical and horizontal movement due to lateral spreading and the effects of liquefaction.
Since the site is not residential it has not been given a specific technical categorization, however it is adjacent to, and between zones marked TC3 which states that “Moderate to significant land damage from liquefaction is possible in future large earthquakes. Foundation solutions should be based on site-specific geotechnical investigation and specific engineering foundation design”.

Observed ground cracking in this area has been recorded as ranging from 50-200mm directly on the site and greater than 200mm along the adjacent Cambridge Terrace.

Minor ground cracking but no liquefaction was recorded at the site following the 4 September 2010 earthquake, however large quantities of ejected material was recorded following the 22 February 2011 earthquake.

Major damage to the below ground services in the area was recorded with the network directly adjacent to the site requiring complete rebuild.

The recorded change in elevation of the site between July 2003 and February 2012 measured using LiDAR, was in the order of 500mm subsided.

5. REMEDIAL WORK OPTIONS

Due to the high liquefaction and lateral spreading potential of the site in future earthquakes, methods to mitigate the impact of ground movement on the pillars are likely to be expensive. Further specialist geotechnical assessment of ground improvement methods would be required, and should be considered with regard to the long-term remediation of the surrounding area.

Re-levelling of the pillars is likely to be an expensive undertaking with some uncertainty of success. Re-levelling the structures without ground remediation or verification of the integrity of the existing piles would risk similar failures occurring again in potential future earthquakes.

It should be recognised that in the ultimate limit state (ULS) seismic event where most ground movement will occur, the design codes allow for significant damage to the structure so long as life safety is maintained. It could therefore be appropriate for the client to accept the risk of liquefaction induced damage in the event of a large earthquake. A comparison between the cost of remedial work to the pillars after each event and the cost of extensive ground improvement to mitigate the earthquakes effects (if actually possible) should be considered.

The seismic strength of the pillars can be assessed against current design levels and strengthening undertaken as required. This is not likely to involve significant work, other that the repair and reinstatement of the damaged pillar B.

5.1 Option 1: Re-align the structure

The tilt of the pillars could be corrected by pulling back the artwork’s concrete plinth close to ground level. This methodology requires the unbolting of the timber pillar section from the concrete plinth to make it easier to attach a sheet pile vibrator. A
steel frame connected to the concrete plinth and a sheet pile vibrator would pull the section back into place while the ground was vibrated. Careful monitoring would be needed during this operation to ensure both the plinth and screw pile moved as a rigid structure. This procedure would have to be undertaken under the guidance of a specialist geotechnical contractor as the vibrating depth will depend upon the soil strata and properties. Some filling and compaction of the ground surrounding the pile may be required to maintain its verticality.

Due to the extent of the rotten timber of Pillar B, it is likely a new timber section will need to be spliced to the base of the pillar. Consultation with the original artist will be necessary to achieve the same look of the original is maintained.

A cost estimate for this solution with no ground improvement is $30,000.

5.2 Option 2: Re-align the structure with moderate improvement to performance under lateral spreading

Several methods can be implemented to guard against the risk of liquefaction and lateral spreading damage on the structure. However, these methods are fairly expensive particularly due to the proximity of the Avon River and nature of the ground.

A method to prevent ground movement due to from lateral spreading under a large earthquake would be the construction of a new retaining wall structure along side the adjacent Avon River. This structure would be able to withstand the lateral earth pressure during an earthquake and hence would likely be a substantial structure with piled foundations.

Detailed geotechnical analysis and design of this structure would be required and should be incorporated within any future remedial ground work in this area and along the Avon River.

Repairs to the damaged pillar and re-levelling of the tilted structures would still be required as outlined in Option 1.

A cost estimate for this solution is $300,000.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be drawn:

- The 22 February 2011 earthquake subjected the artwork to strong ground shaking, probably well in excess of its design loading and the moderate earthquake definition in the Building Act regulations.

- Site investigations identified moderate to significant liquefaction and lateral spreading around the site. Two of the pillars had tilted towards the Avon River, with the third pillar collapsing due to failure through its timber base.
• Due to the tall, slender construction of the artwork and its connection to the foundation, small lateral ground movements will be amplified to much larger displacements at the top of the pillars, impacting upon the visual appearance.

• Methods to re-level the pillars consist of pulling the pillar as the ground is mechanically vibrated. A replacement section of the collapsed pillar will be required.

• The cost and feasibility of ground improvement of the surrounding area to prevent movement damage compared to having to re-level the structures after potential future earthquakes should be considered and evaluated.

Please Note: This report has been prepared by Capital Delivery Unit, Christchurch City Council solely for the benefit of our client. No liability is accepted by the author, in respect of its use by any other person. Any other person who relies upon any matter contained in this report does so entirely at their own risk.
Appendix A: Original Construction Drawings
Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board
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1 Executive Summary

This report describes the current condition of one of three pou pou from the Cambridge Green Reserve, and makes recommendations for short term treatment of the object and longer term maintenance.

The following short term recommendations are made:

- Unwrap large fragment detached from statue to allow to dry
- Isolate large fragment (mold growth) as much as possible
- Cover the statue and associated fragments in Tyvek to protect from dripping condensation
- Investigate improvement of air flow in container
- Consult the artist / a cultural advisor. Use this dialogue to inform decisions relating to any future treatment, storage or exhibition, etc., of the artwork.

2 Introduction

2.1 Object Summary

Object       One of three pou pou from Cambridge Green Reserve (2005)
Artist       George Edwards
Dimensions   3.7m long with a 0.54m diameter
Location     Moved to storage at Beckenham Service Centre
Report Date  14th June 2011
Owner        Christchurch City Council
Contact      Maria Adamski

2.2 Background

A brief site inspection was made in the morning of 26th April 2011 in the container. The weather conditions for the inspection were fair, but the sky was overcast. A follow-up inspection was made on 7th June 2011. The morning was cool and sunny.

The sculpture is in bad condition, having been damaged in the earthquake. It also exhibits a significant degree of deterioration inherent to rotting wood (see Section 5 of this report).
2.3 Description

Part of a large carved wooden statue with rope detail on base. The piece has a protective rubber covering on its head (likely to protect from water ingress). There is a bituminous substance around the base and large metal nails (possibly for attaching the rope to the statue). Several carved elements near the top of the statue are highlighted in reddish-brown paint. The statue was originally mounted on to a painted concrete plinth.

View of proper left side of pou pou
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2.4 Materials

Wood - possibly Macrocarpa
Varnish / Coating - unknown
Bitumen / Tar
Rope
Nails
Rubber
Paint – unknown

2.5 Fabrication and assembling (including base)

The section of the statue in storage is 3.7 m long. At its widest, the statue has a diameter of 54 cm.

The wood appears to be carved from a single tree.

There is a bituminous substance around the bottom edge of the statue.

Several 78mm long (approximately) nails with 4mm heads are driven in to the bottom edge of the statue.

A 1.15m length of double-stranded rope (80mm circumference) is attached to the bottom of the statue. Photos viewed as part of the on-line article “On the Edge of a Stream” (October 28, 2009 / http://maorilifestyles.blogspot.com/2009/10/on-edge-of-stream.html) show that the rope was originally wrapped around the bottom of the wooden portion of the statue, just above the cement plinth. The rope fragments attached to the pou pou, and those accompanying the statue, are likely part of this decorative element.

The cap of the statue is cut to shape from a thin (approximately 1mm thick) sheet of textured black rubber. The rubber appears to be secured to the top of the statue using an unknown adhesive. Nails, staples or other fasteners are not visible.

The exact colour and type of paint used on the statue is currently unknown. However, the painted decorative elements on the concrete plinths has been recorded, and they are all Resene Uracyl 403 paints (white: Alabaster 8.5GR12; black: Habitats Black; red: Flash Point 1BR39).
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Detail of nails in bottom of pou pou

Length of rope attached to bottom of pou pou
2.6 Surface finish

There are multiple holes (around 15mm diameter) over the body of the pou pou. Most of these holes appear to be between 90 and 120mm deep. Despite the lack of visible tool marks in relation to the hole, the relatively uniform depth of the holes suggests that their presence is intentional. Tool marks, likely from carving, are visible on sections of the surface of the statue.

Four linear grooves are cut into the wood about halfway down the length of the statue. The grooves are all approximately 8mm wide, but range in length from 120mm to 225mm.

The statue had an unknown coating / varnish applied in the past. There are also remnants of a reddish colour in the recesses of the carving, particularly in the top portion of the carving.
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Painted surface of topmost section of pou pou

Holes and parallel gouges in side of pou pou

2.7 Inscriptions

There are no inscriptions visible on the pou pou.
3 Condition

3.1 Structural Condition

The statue appears to be structurally unstable. Documentation (“Handover of artworks, plaques, memorials” for Cambridge Green Pou) ascribes an approximate overall height of 8m (0.8m diameter) for each of the three pou pou. Given that the section currently in storage is only 3.7m tall, it is possible that just over 4m of the statue is either missing or remains on-site at the Reserve.

Additionally, there is a large loss to both sides of the statue near the base. One void is filled with rubbish, dirt and wood fragments. A sizable fragment from this void (1.37m in length) was collected, but is still quite wet and has significantly deteriorated.

The wood in the interior of the statue is very soft (almost “spongy”), crumbly, fibrous and still wet to the touch in many places. Wood fragments collected in baggies exhibit similar characteristics. There are also several smaller fragments collected from the river that are drying on ethafoam padding. These were accompanied by a 50 cm section of dirty, fraying and degraded rope.

The statue is drying out, but shows little sign of new large cracks. There are a large number of existing cracks running vertically down the length of the statue. Most of these cracks are no larger than 1-2mm, with the exception of a crack at the bottom of the statue. At its widest, this particular crack is 10mm. These cracks do not appear to have been previously filled.
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Detail of gouge in side of pou pou

Leaf litter and rubbish in void near broken bottom edge of pou pou
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Detail of decaying wood in void near broken bottom edge of pou pou

1.37m fragment wrapped in ethafoam (left) and unwrapped (right)
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Fragments of wood and rope collected from river

Baggies of wood fragments collected from river
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Detail of degraded rope collected from river

3.2 Surface Condition

The sculpture is covered with a layer of surface dirt.

The varnish has flaked off in most places and on the head has become whitened from water damage. The wood has coloured to a grey-silver where weathered. Newly exposed areas are pinky-yellow.

The statue is dirty overall. Dirt and leaves / grass hang of the back of the statue. Its cracks and voids in the wood are filled with a variety of materials, including insect casings, spider webs, snails / snail trails, leaf litter and rubbish. Many of the small holes found over the surface of the pou pou are also filled with dirt, debris and tiny wood fragments. The piece has a fairly strong smell which may mean it is contaminated by sewage from the water.

The rubber cap is coated in dirt.

No active mold was seen on 26th April 2011. However, by 7th June 2011 large patches of active mold were growing on the large fragment of wood from the bottom of the statue. Patches of mould and mould spores were also found in various spots on the side of the pou.
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Dirt, leaves / grass hanging off bottom of top portion of the pou pou

Water droplets (left) and snail (right) on surface of pou pou
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Remnants of varnish and exposed greying surface

Dirt on wooden fragment collected from the river (note degraded condition)
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Dirt on rubber cap of pou pou
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Mould actively growing on side of 1.37m fragment
4 Environment

The piece has been removed to a container (unlined) at Christchurch City Council’s Beckenham Service Centre. The statue itself is on its side lying on several blocks of wood padded with black plastazote on top. Fragments of wood and rope sit uncovered on plastazote. The baggies of wood fragments were unsealed so as to allow the wet wood to dry. Only the larger fragment from the bottom of the statue was still wrapped up in ethafoam.

Droplets of condensation were noticeable on the ceiling of the container, suggesting a storage environment that lacks airflow and suffers from high humidity.
5 History and Previous Treatments

The statue was one of a set of three pou pou installed on the Cambridge Green Reserve grounds on 11th August 2005 by Niveau Construction. Each pou pou was set on to a cement plinth designed by City Solutions and decorated with Maori cultural designs.

The following documents were consulted and provide a background to the development of the Cambridge Green Reserve, as well as the commissioning and creation of the statues to be installed therein.

- Correspondence: D. Sissons to A. Kamo, 8 August 2006
- Correspondence: A. Kamo to D. Sissons, 17 July 2006
- “Meeting Notes of a Meeting to Consider Artwork Development for Cambridge Green”, 16 April 2003
- Map of Cambridge Green Reserve / Tautahi’s Pa, City Solutions / Christchurch City Council
- Correspondence: Christchurch City Council Parks and Waterways Unit to M. Parsons, 23 August 2002
- Correspondence: P. B. Dickson to Rev. M. Gray, 6 May 2002
- Meeting Minutes: Cambridge Management Group, 13 November 2001
- Report: “Pointing to the Matters of Resource Management Significance to Takata Whenua in Regard to the Concept Plan for St. Mary’s Stream Cambridge Green Reserve”, prepared for the Water Services Unit of...
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the Christchurch City Council by ORA Environmental Services, December 2000

There are no records of any on-site treatment of the statue, but a document relating to the Cambridge Green statues entitled “Handover of artworks, plaques, memorials” does briefly outline ideas for a possible maintenance schedule. This includes a plan to have City Solutions monitor the condition of the wood, as “the timber was installed in a degraded state”. It appears that the coating on the timber was to be allowed “to weather off” / “not recommended to repair”. The concrete plinths were to be cleaned “as required”.

The document also suggests an expectation of a limited lifespan for the statues. The timber, which was rotting, was thought to last 5-10 years. It was anticipated that the rope would have a life span of about 5 years (“or until vandalized”), while the concrete plinths would last considerably longer (50 years).

The statue was removed from the lower banks of the Avon River after the 22nd February 2011 earthquake. Wood fragments of various sizes were also removed from the river, along with a second piece of rope. These were extremely wet, and have been drying out in the container at Beckenham.

6 Short-term Treatment Recommendations

The following short term treatment recommendations will facilitate the need to stabilize the condition of the artefact without the need to partake in any interventive treatment:

- Unwrap large fragment detached from the statue to allow it to dry.
- Isolate mould growth on large fragment and the rest of the statue as much as possible. It is not advisable to store other organic materials in the storage container with this item in its present condition.
- Cover the statue and associated fragments in Tyvek. This will protect the wood from dripping condensation and allow it to breathe.
- Improve RH conditions investigating and implementing means by which air flow can be improved within the container (e.g. creating a vent hole of a suitable size and location).

7 Long-term Options

Developing and implementing a full treatment proposal / long-term care plan for the Cambridge Green Reserve statue should not be undertaken without first consulting the artist and / or a cultural advisor. It will be necessary to fully
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discuss the implications of possible treatment options, as they may affect the artist’s intent of the statue. The following treatment / maintenance options are presented for consideration, and can be more fully developed using the information gathered as part of the “artist’s interview” process.

7.1 Option 1– Exhibition Outdoors

Fairly extreme measures will need to be taken if the statue is to be re-installed outdoors (either on its original plinth in the Cambridge Green Reserve, or elsewhere).

- Clean dirt, debris and rubbish from voids, holes and cracks
- Remove lichen and moss from surface
- Treat mould growth
- Treat possible sewage contamination
- Assess need for treating possible insect infestation
- Stabilize and/or remove deteriorating wood
- Fill voids in wood and/or remove highly degraded material
- Replace rope
- Re-touch painted surfaces and fill cracks if deemed appropriate
- Protect surface by re-coating statue
- Attach securely to new or existing plinth. If using the existing plinth, a decision will need to be made about treating / making use of portion of statue still attached to existing plinth. Making use of any remaining wood will require that the degraded wood be treated and be able to structurally support the rest of the statue.
- Develop a monitoring and maintenance program – dirt, lichen, moss, vandalism, expansion / development of new or old cracks, deterioration of coating, degradation of wood, etc. Regular on-going maintenance after treatment is essential to the longevity of the statue should it be decided to re-exhibit the artwork outdoors.

7.2 Option 2 – Exhibition Indoors

A great deal of treatment will also need to be undertaken in order to stabilize the statue for exhibition indoors.

- Clean dirt, debris and rubbish from voids, holes and cracks
- Treat mould growth
- Treat possible sewage contamination
- Assess need for treating possible insect infestation
- Stabilize deteriorating wood
- Fill voids in wood and/or remove highly degraded material.
- Re-touch painted surface / fill cracks if deemed appropriate
- Replace rope
- Retouch paint / fill cracks if deemed appropriate
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- Attach to a new plinth and attach a central support structure in stainless steel.
- Provide and monitor safe, secure and environmentally controlled (as much as possible) conditions for exhibition of the statue

7.3 Option 3 – Storage Indoors

The statue could take on new life as a research piece to be retained in suitable indoor storage conditions

- Clean dirt, debris and rubbish from voids, holes and cracks
- Remove lichen and moss from surface
- Treat mould growth
- Treat possible sewage contamination
- Assess need for treating possible insect infestation
- Stabilize deteriorating wood
- Treat remaining rope fragments
- Provide and monitor safe, secure and environmentally controlled conditions for the long-term storage of the statue
- Case piece
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Estimates

Please note that the estimate provided is not a quotation. The complex nature of the work involved means that additional problems may be discovered during treatment. If this indicates a cost increase we will notify the client and await further instructions before proceeding. You will be entitled to withdraw the object or objects upon payment for the work already done. For the same reason, any time estimates or guidelines can only be given as an indication. We cannot guarantee completion by a given date, as the well-being of the object or objects must be given prime concern. Notwithstanding that all treatments are carried out to the highest standards, no warranty in respect of the quality or durability of the final result will be implied or expressly given. Information gathered through technical examination may have a bearing on the date or source of an object, but we cannot and do not give opinions or issue statements on questions of style, authorship or monetary value of an object.

Estimates are valid for a period of 90 days from the date of the estimate after which we reserve the right to revise the estimate.

Conditions of Acceptance

In agreeing to the treatment or examination of an object, you accept the following terms and conditions:

- You agree to indemnify Emily Fryer Conservation Ltd from any and all liability in the event of any claim by any other person based in any way upon records, reports or opinions arising from the treatment or examination of an object. Further to this you agree that any transcripts, reports or opinions arising from the treatment or examination of an object may be used for scientific and educational purposes at our discretion.
- In the event of serious damage to the object while in our care, whether due to act of God, riot or other violence, or to other similar or dissimilar causes, we will be free to determine the course to be followed in protecting or removing such objects and storing them and any such determination shall be final and shall not subject us to any liability. Any reasonable cost of such protection, removal or storage shall be reimbursed to us by you.
- A storage fee equal to one hour’s labour ($100) may be charged for any object left one month past notification of completion. A similar fee may be added each succeeding month, and after six months the object may be considered abandoned property and sold in lieu of payment.
- These provisions shall be binding upon the client or other owner and on their respective heirs, legal representatives and assigns.

Insurance

We do not provide insurance for the object or the treatment. Objects under examination or treatment are at your sole risk at all times. In agreeing to the treatment or examination of the object, you waive and release any and all claims which may arise for damage to or loss of or related to such objects, however occasioned, and whether or not due to our negligence or default.

Copyright

Emily Fryer Conservation Ltd will retain the copyright in any report that we prepare and of any photographs we take of the object.

Ongoing Care by the Client

The client is advised to follow any written guidelines we may issue for the care and treatment of an object after we have worked on it. If these guidelines are not followed then the condition of the object may be adversely affected.

Company Details

Emily Fryer Conservation Limited
2/378 Gilmours Road, Tai Tapu RD2 7672
03 981 2598 or 021 144 6096
emily@emilyfryer.co.nz
www.emilyfryerconservation.co.nz

Registered in New Zealand, number 2025954
Pouwhenua Assessment – Core Sampling
Cambridge Green, Cambridge Terrace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client:</th>
<th>Christchurch City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Jo Grigg (Project Manager – Consultant), Facilities Infrastructure Rebuild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Cambridge Green, Cambridge Terrace, CBD, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Ed Sard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>05/07/16 Final (Revised)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Treetech Specialist Treecare Ltd was contacted by Jo Grigg (Project Manager – Consultant) for Facilities Infrastructure Rebuild on behalf of Christchurch City Council and engaged to attend the site of Cambridge Green, Cambridge Terrace to carry out an assessment of two Pouwhenua. The Pouwhenua are artistic wooden poles positioned on concrete plinths and an assessment of the structural integrity of the two Pouwhenua was required to inform interested parties as to the safety and future management of the Pouwhenua within the context of the site.

1.2 The two Pouwhenua were specifically assessed for the structural integrity of their wood structure following the failure of a third Pouwhenua during the Canterbury Earthquakes. Observations of the failed Pouwhenua identified wood decay within its structure. As part of the assessment, two core samples were obtained using an increment borer from each Pouwhenua. In addition to the core samples, observations as to the general condition of the two Pouwhenua and the surrounding targets were recorded.

1.3 The following details were recorded following a site visit on Monday 13th June 2016.

1.4 The two Pouwhenua were inspected from ground level and aerially by a qualified arborist experienced in assessing the structural integrity and composition of trees.

1.5 Whilst core samples were obtained for on-site analysis, no additional advanced decay testing was carried out. The following report provides observations as to the likely composition and structural integrity of the two Pouwhenua. The structural integrity of the concrete plinths and their attachment points was not assessed and falls outside the remits of this report.

1.6 An assessment of the base of each Pouwhenua pole and their attachment onto the concrete plinths was limited by the presence of decorative rope.
2.0 Site Observations:

2.1 The two Pouwhenua are located within the open recreational area of Cambridge Green, Cambridge Terrace. The Pouwhenua are positioned within native planting on the northern boundary of Cambridge Green and are located adjacent to a small pond. The two Pouwhenua are positioned on concrete plinths, with a third Pouwhenua having been removed post-earthquake. Its concrete plinth still remains in-situ within the pond (see Appendix A).

**Pouwhenua - 1**

2.2 This is the smaller of the two assessed Pouwhenua. The height from the top of the concrete plinth to the top of the Pouwhenua was measured at 3.3 metres (see photo 1a).

2.3 An initial assessment of the Pouwhenua observed a slight lean to the north/north east but this is possibly attributed to historic ground movement and/or displacement of the concrete plinth as a result of the Canterbury Earthquakes (see photo 1b).

**Photo 1a & 1b:**

| Photo 1a: Pouwhenua 1 viewed from west | Photo 1b: Pouwhenua 1 viewed from east |

2.4 A sounding hammer was used as an initial method of identifying whether the Pouwhenua had areas of weak or decaying wood structure. Audible changes in tone
would indicate areas of potentially poor wood structure in addition to visual observations of deteriorating wood on the exposed surface.

2.5 Pouwhenua 1 has an area of deteriorating wood on the northwest side at approximately 1 metre height above the top of the concrete plinth. The outer surface has splintered exposing the internal wood. This in turn has exposed the wood structure to the elements, ie moisture and frost. The exterior wood was brittle and there were audible changes on tone when struck with the sounding hammer. Both Pouwhenua have been treated in what appears to be a type of varnish to protect the outer surface, but with time this has weathered.

2.6 Two core samples were obtained from Pouwhenua 1;

Sample A: Core taken at 0.9 metres height from top of plinth (west side) to a depth of 300mm. Diameter of wooden pole at sampling location 580mm (see photo 2a).

Sample B: Core taken at 2.4 metres height from top of plinth (south side) to a depth of 200mm. Diameter of wooden pole at sampling location 430mm (see photo 2b).

Photo 2a & 2b:
Findings:

2.7 **Sample A**: This sample was obtained within the lower third of the Pouwhenua. Taken from an area identified as having a poor exterior surface with visible degradation, the actual core sample was found to contain good wood structure with sound heartwood. This indicates that the degradation of the wood has at the time of the inspection been confined to the outer weathered surface of the Pouwhenua in a localised area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core sample A:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height taken at: 0.9m (west side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter of wooden pole at sampling location: 580mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bore depth: 300mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft wood (outer wood): 15mm depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound wood: 15mm to 300mm depth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8 Sample B: This sample was obtained within the upper third of the Pouwhenua. Taken from an area identified as having good exterior surface with no visible degradation, the actual core sample was found to contain good wood structure with sound heartwood. There was no discolouration indicating a change in wood structure or presence of decay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core sample B:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height taken at: 2.4m (south side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter of wooden pole at sampling location: 430mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bore depth: 200mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft wood (outer wood): 0.10mm depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound wood: 0.10mm to 200mm depth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pouwhenua - 2

2.9 This is the larger of the two assessed Pouwhenua. The height from the top of the concrete plinth to the top of the Pouwhenua was measured at 5.8 metres (see photo 3a).

2.10 An initial assessment of the Pouwhenua observed a minor lean to the southeast but this is possibly attributed to historic ground movement and/or displacement of the concrete plinth as a result of the Canterbury Earthquakes (see photo 3b).

Photo 3a & 3b:

| Photo 3a: Pouwhenua 2 viewed from west | Photo 3b: Pouwhenua 2 viewed from east |

2.11 As with Pouwhenua 1, a sounding hammer was used as an initial method of identifying whether the Pouwhenua had areas of weak or decaying wood structure. Audible changes in tone would indicate areas of potentially poor wood structure in addition to visual observations of deteriorating wood from exposed surfaces.

2.12 Pouwhenua 2 – The wooden structure appears to have been repaired in previous years with circular wooden discs and strips of different wood embedded into the wooden structure. These were identified due to their different colour and texture when compared with the surrounding wood. Audible changes were noted with the sounding hammer when localised areas were struck. This was not confined to one particular area and differing resonance was noted in a number of locations around the circumference of the pole. Some areas had a weakened and deteriorating exterior surface with soft wood and cracked varnish. As with Pouwhenua 1, the surface of the wooden pole has been treated with a protective varnish.
2.13 Two core samples were obtained from Pouwhenua 2;

Sample C: Core taken at 0.9 metres height from top of plinth (east side) to a depth of 350mm. Diameter of wooden pole at sampling location 520mm (see photo 4a).

Sample D: Core taken at 2.3 metres height from top of plinth (north side) to a depth of 350mm. Diameter of wooden pole at sampling location 450mm (see photo 4b).

Photo 4a & 4b:
Findings:

2.14 **Sample C**: This sample was obtained within the lower third of the Pouwhenua. Taken from an area identified as having a poor exterior surface with visible degradation and changing resonance when sounded with a hammer, the core sample was found to contain poor wood structure. The extracted core was very small, pale in colour with a lighter density and softer texture when compared to the other core samples obtained from Pouwhenua 1. The increment borer was easily inserted into the sampling site with minimal effort required to obtain the sample. This indicates weakened wood structure, with a softer interior and potentially reduced tensile strength.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core sample C:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height taken at: 0.9m (east side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter of wooden pole at sampling location: 520mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bore depth: 350mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft wood (outer wood): 0 – 170mm plus depth. Note approx. 70mm plus of sample deteriorated on site when being removed from borer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound wood: Estimated at 250mm plus depth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.15 **Sample D:** This sample was obtained within the upper third of the Pouwhenua. Taken from an area identified as having good exterior surface with no visible degradation, the actual core sample was found to contain wood varying from average to poor structure. The extracted core was pale in colour with darkened patches randomly spaced along the sample. The texture of the wood was softer and the density lighter when compared to the other core samples obtained from Pouwhenua 1. As with sample C, this indicated that the wood within the vicinity of the sample is weaker in structure, with potentially reduced tensile strength.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core sample D:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height taken at: 2.3m (north side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter of wooden pole at sampling location: 450mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bore depth: 350mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft wood (outer wood): 0 - 180mm plus depth. Note approx, 30mm plus of sample deteriorated on site when being removed from borer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound wood: Estimated at 210mm plus depth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Conclusion:

3.1 The core sampling was commissioned to determine the structural integrity of the two remaining Pouwhenua at Cambridge Green. There were originally three Pouwhenua located on site, but one Pouwhenua was found to contain decaying wood following the Canterbury Earthquakes. With the remaining two Pouwhenua located in an area accessible to members of the public, the safety aspect of these artistic structures needs to be considered.

3.2 Pouwhenua 1 is located within native planting adjacent to an open area of managed grass. An entry point for pedestrians into Cambridge Gardens from Barbadoes Street is located to the east but there are no roads or formed pedestrian footpaths immediately adjacent to the Pouwhenua. Therefore the targets within one length of its total height are reduced. Occupancy rates for Cambridge Green and the access point from Barbadoes Street are relatively low and seasonally driven.

3.3 It is exhibiting signs of exposure to the weathering effects of the sun, rain and frost. A protective layer of varnish does cover the main structure but this has degraded with time and moisture has entered the exterior surface of wood. The outer edges of the wood structure is exposed in a defined area on the west side, and the condition of the exterior wood was found to be brittle and degrading in selected places. However, the core samples indicate that whilst there continues to be a level of wood degradation to the outer surface, this is confined to a small area. More importantly, the internal heartwood appears to be sound, with no cavities or seated decay found.

3.4 Pouwhenua 2 is also located within native planting, but it is located in a more exposed position adjacent to Cambridge Terrace road, with its associated footpath (south side of Cambridge Terrace) and a linked access footpath from Cambridge Terrace into Cambridge Green. All these targets are within one length of its total height and at the time of inspection, the access footpath was being used by members of the public as a cut through from Cambridge Terrace to Barbadoes Street and the central city.

3.5 As with Pouwhenua 1, Pouwhenua 2 is exhibiting signs of exposure to the elements, with varying levels of deterioration of the exterior wood. The exterior wood surface is brittle and despite the protective varnish layer, continues to be exposed to the effects of weathering. The core sampling indicated that the density and texture of the internal wood within the whole structure is of reduced quality. Whilst no cavities or seated decay were observed externally or within the samples obtained, it is highly likely that the tensile strength of the wood structure within Pouwhenua 2 is weaker when compared to Pouwhenua 1. The density and texture of the sampled cores indicates softer wood which continues to be impacted by the presence of moisture, frost and desiccation. This was particularly evident on the east side within the lower third of Pouwhenua 2 where sampling took place. Pouwhenua 2 is the larger of the two at 5.8 metres height and has the greater target area.

3.6 The limitations of obtaining core samples at greater depths than those recorded were governed by the length of the increment borer (400mm) and the density of the wood structure. Further investigation utilizing other more advanced decay detection techniques could be carried out. However, by collecting samples from defined areas of both Pouwhenua and comparing their density and texture to sound wood structure observed within trees, we have been able to surmise as to the likely condition of the Pouwhenua at the time of the assessment.
3.7 Limitations of the decorative rope covering the attachment point between the Pouwhenua and concrete plinths prevented a detailed assessment of these particular areas. This is a potential area of failure as it is likely to be the weakest point of the structures. Further investigation of the attachment point by engineering professionals is therefore recommended, to include the stability and structural integrity of the concrete plinths themselves.

4.0 Recommendations:

4.1 Pouwhenua 1 – Analysis of core samples at the time of the inspection indicate that it still contains enough sound wood of adequate tensile strength to be retained and monitored.

4.2 Pouwhenua 2 – Analysis of core samples at the time of the inspection indicate that the tensile strength of the structural wood has been compromised and as a result the amount of sound wood has been reduced to such an extent that it should be removed with options as detailed in paragraph 4.4 considered.

4.3 The location of Pouwhenua 2 with the more exposed targets of greater occupancy rate within one length of its total height is a considered factor. The overall wood structure within Pouwhenua 2 was found to have less tensile strength than Pouwhenua 1. The degradation of the exterior surface continues and it appears to have been actively repaired with new pieces of wood added over time. This further indicates that the wood has degraded in the past and may well be deteriorating both externally and internally at a faster rate than the wood in Pouwhenua 1.

4.4 Considered options for Pouwhenua 2 are;

- Relocate to another location within the native planting to remove the target area, eg use the existing spare plinth as new base. The relocation could be incorporated into a re-modelling of Pouwhenua 2 so as to retain its existing form and cultural significance, whilst making it smaller in stature.

- Reduce the risks of failure by strengthening the attachment point and reinforcing the main structure with engineering solutions, whilst maintaining the aesthetic and cultural importance of the Pouwhenua.

- Remove the Pouwhenua and replace with new Pouwhenua or similar structure in another area of Cambridge Green away from identified targets.

4.5 Pouwhenua 1 is exhibiting the effects of weathering to exposed surfaces, but the structural integrity of the internal wood appears to be stronger. Its position away from identified targets and less occupancy rate negates the need for moving or strengthening, but it should continue to be monitored every two years. The blistered exterior wood (west side) could be repaired for aesthetics and an additional protective layer of varnish reapplied over the whole Pouwhenua.

Ed Sard
Consultant Arborist
Treetech Specialist Treecare Ltd
STRUCTURAL REVIEW REPORT

CAPITAL PROGRAMME GROUP

| STRUCTURE: | Cambridge Green Poupou |
| ADDRESS: | Corner of Cambridge Terrace and Barbados St/Salisbury Street |
| SIZE: | Two pillars of 4.9m and 6.8m height by 0.6m diameter |
| YEAR BUILT: | 2004 |
| INSPECTION BY: | Natasa Alekscic | DATE: 10/01/2019 |
| PREPARED BY: | Natasa Alekscic | DATE: 24/01/2019 |

INTRODUCTION

Structural review of the two pou structures at corner of Cambridge Terrace and Barbados Street has been requested due to concerns about structural stability. The two pillars tilted 5° (H=4.9m) and 6° (H=6.8m) following the 2010-2011 Canterbury earthquakes. Structural inspection report dated October 2012 identified extensive damage due to liquefaction and lateral spreading of the ground. This caused the pillars to move and rotate as rigid body from the base of the screw piles. Third pillar collapsed. Failure of the third pillar at the timber base to steel housing connection was due to rotten timber.

INSPECTION

Structural inspection was carried out on 10th January 2019. Pillars were surrounded by dense shrubs which made access to the structures difficult. The following observations were made regarding condition of the two structures:

6.8m high pillar:
- Angle of inclination, measured relative to the vertical street posts, is approximately 7°
- There is no visible damage of timber at the timber base to steel housing connection/ critical section.
- There is no visible damage at the connection of the steel housing to concrete plinth.
- Structure is located next to the footpath, therefore, failure could endanger human life.

4.9m high pillar:
- Angle of inclination, measured relative to the vertical street posts, is approximately 5°
- There is no visible damage of timber at the timber base to steel housing connection/ critical section.
- There is no visible damage at the connection of the steel housing to concrete plinth.
- Structure is surrounded by native planting. It is not likely that failure of the structure would endanger human life.

STRUCTURAL REVIEW

Timber section capacity at the critical location was calculated assuming the pillars are made of totara heartwood with the following characteristic strength properties (Totara ingrade test results, Scion CRI):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bending Strength</td>
<td>20MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension Strength</td>
<td>10MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear Strength</td>
<td>4MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compression Strength</td>
<td>30MPa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of structural integrity of the wood was carried out in July 2016 by Treetch Specialist Treecare Ltd. Results of the core sampling for 6.8m high pou showed weakened wood structure with a softer interior and potentially reduced tensile strength. Sample obtained within the lower third of the pou had deteriorated exterior surface of approximately 70mm thickness.

Timber section capacity at the critical location was calculated using reduced section size (D = 490mm - 2*70mm) because of deteriorated surface. Accurate reduction factor due to weakened wood structure is unknown. However, for calculation purpose 40% reduction of characteristic strength was assumed.

6.8m pou structure was analysed for the following ultimate limit state loads:
- Gravity load (self-weight)
- Wind load (design wind speed = 37.4m/s, Terrain category 3)
- Seismic load (Response spectrum modal analysis; ductility factor = 1.0, soil class D)

Calculations show that wind (along-wind and crosswind combination) is the governing load. However, more accurate seismic load calculation would be required, where the timber structure is analysed as a part. In accordance with NZS 1170.5:2004 this requires a special study to determine dynamic characteristics of the part. However, given the unknown accurate timber properties a special dynamic study seems unreasonable at this stage.

Calculation results for 6.8m high pou are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical timber section check</th>
<th>diameter (mm)</th>
<th>bending strength (Mpa)</th>
<th>capacity (kNm)</th>
<th>demand (Wind load) (kNm)</th>
<th>demand/capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intact section</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduced diameter due to deterioration (70mm)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduced diameter and reduced strength due to weakened wood*</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* assumed reduction factor = 0.6

CONCLUSIONS

- There is no visible damage or increase of the inclination angle of the pillars which means that the structures have been structurally stable since the post-earthquake inspection in 2012.
- Structural strength and stability depend on material/ timber properties which are unknown. Timber section capacity was calculated using assumed material properties. Therefore, capacity calculation results are only an estimate.
- Calculation results show it is likely that the critical timber section still has some reserve capacity despite weakened wood structure.
- Special study would be required to determine the maximum seismic load. With the available information it is reasonable to conclude that failure of the structure at the critical timber section is possible in the event of a strong earthquake.

Inspection and structural analysis results of the pou structures show that there is likely no reason for immediate alarm. However, given the unpredictability of earthquake events and the unknown current condition of weakened timber we suggest that the pillars be removed as soon as possible.
12. Curries Road/Tanner Street - Intersection Improvements

Reference: 18/383943
Presenter(s): Sandra Novais – Project Manager
           Barry Hayes - Traffic Engineer - CCC Operations

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

   Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board of a change in circumstances at the Curries Road level rail crossing and request that the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve the ‘do nothing option’ for this project and recommend to Council that the project be cancelled. This is as a result of changes in Kiwirail Operations.

   Origin of Report
   1.2 This report is staff generated following detailed project investigations.

2. Significance

   2.1 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

       2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by using the engagement significance matrix. The engagement assessment performed by staff shows that the matter is of low significance due to the fact that no changes are proposed to the current layout of the intersection.

3. Staff Recommendations

   That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board approve and recommend to the Council:

   1. The ‘do nothing option’ for the Intersection Improvements: Curries Road/Tanner Street project.
   2. Cancel the project and remove from the Long Term Plan.

4. Key Points

   4.1 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2015 - 2025):

       4.1.1 Activity: Roads & Footpaths

           - Level of Service: 16.0.3.0 Maintain resident satisfaction with road condition - =38%

   4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:

           - Option 1 – Do nothing (preferred option)
           - Option 2 – Continue with a project despite need not being there.

   4.3 Option Summary – ‘Do nothing’ Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

       4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:

           - It reflects the current situation at the intersection and rail crossing.
           - No road works disturbance to residents.

       4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
5. Context/Background

Location
- The roads and their classifications within this project are:
  - Tanner St – Collector
  - Curries Rd – Collector
  - Maunsell St – Collector (East of the intersection - towards Cumnor)
  - Maunsell St – Local (West of the intersection - towards Garland)

- These roads do not form part of the freight network, walking network, core public transport network or local cycleway network, as outlined in the CTSP.
- The Heathcote Major Cycleway Route is currently being constructed along Cumnor Terrace to the east of this intersection.
- The location of the project is shown in Figure 1 below.

![Figure 1 – Location of the Tanner/Curries/Maunsell intersection.](image)

5.2 The project brief identified a traffic efficiency problem at the intersection during the shunting operation at the railway crossing on Curries Road. Shunting operations were causing the line to be closed to road traffic, hence resulted in delays to traffic with cars waiting for long time to be able to cross the railway line.

5.3 In the analysis of the 10 year CAS data 2007 – 2017 there were three crashes at this intersection. Two of these were non injury crashes and one resulted in a minor injury.

5.4 Attachment 1 of this report contains information about crashes, traffic volumes, rail activity and operations works in the intersection.

Project Objectives
5.5 The original project objectives are outlined below.
5.5.1 Improve capacity and minimise traffic delays at the intersection especially during shunting operation.

5.5.2 Allow efficient movements for heavy traffic through the intersection;

5.5.3 Free up Tanner St Corridor and encourage Tanner Street traffic to use the Cumnor Terrace and Chapman Road route especially during shunting operation;

5.5.4 Align the intersection design with the Heathcote Expressway Major Cycleway proposal

5.5.5 Maintain safety for all road-users; and

5.5.6 Develop a cost-effective solution.

Evaluation of objectives

5.6 The primary objective of the scheme was to reduce the delay experienced at this intersection due to shunting at the railway line.

5.7 Based on the investigation undertaken and outlined in the scheme report, it is considered that the rail crossing no longer has a significant detrimental impact on the capacity of the road network in this location. The average delay is less than 2 minutes when the crossing is in operation and the average queue length is 4 vehicles. Shunting on average occurs 5 times/day.

5.8 Since the project was initiated, railway operations have changed. Lyttelton Port Company’s (LPC) ‘Inland’ facility at Rolleston is now the major freight hub (where previously it was in the CityDepot/Woolston area) and the majority of shunting operations are now carried out at Rolleston. Major freight roading networks have been developed to support this change (e.g. extension of Halswell Junction road and extension of rail tracks by Hornby).

5.9 The LPC Inland Port at Rolleston, named ‘MidlandPort’ is considered critical by the Port Company for increasing container movement by rail and with the aim of removing trucks from Christchurch roads and allowing customers to avoid road congestion and delays.

5.10 Mindful of the above, and given that the primary objective for the project is no longer required as there is little delay to the traffic and no benefit from the proposed works, the project should be cancelled.

Conclusions

5.11 Based on the above the project team recommends the ‘do nothing option’ for this project as it is considered any improvements are not necessary at this intersection due to the change in the railway operations since the project was initiated.

6. Option 1 – Do nothing – remove project from LTP (preferred option)

Option Description

6.1 For this ‘Do nothing’ option no changes to the intersection layout are required. Normal maintenance activity would continue.

Significance

6.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with Section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua

6.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences

6.4 This project has not reached the consultation phase and no options were presented to the community.
Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
6.5 This option is inconsistent with Council’s Plans and Policies, especially the Long Term Plan 2015-25, which includes improvements for this intersection. Council approval is required for this project to be cancelled.

Financial Implications
6.6 Cost of Implementation - nil
6.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – there will be no additional maintenance costs if the intersection stays the way it is.
6.8 Funding source – n/a

Legal Implications
6.9 There is not a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.

Risks and Mitigations
6.10 There is no significant risk associated to the implementation of this option for the intersection.
6.11 No barriers arms are present at the intersection currently.

Implementation
6.12 Implementation dependencies - n/a
6.13 Implementation timeframe – n/a

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
6.14 The advantages of this option include:
   - It reflects current situation at the intersection and rail crossing.
   - No road works disturbance to residents.
6.15 The disadvantages of this option include:
   - Enhancement opportunity at the intersection is lost.

7. Option 2 - Continue with the intersection upgrade project

Option Description
7.1 This option involves progressing with the scheme design, consultation, design works and construction works for the project and allow for potential changes to the physical layout of the intersection.

Significance
7.2 The level of significance of this option is low consistent with Section 2 of this report.

Impact on Mana Whenua
7.3 This option does not involve a significant decision in relation to ancestral land or a body of water or other elements of intrinsic value, therefore this decision does not specifically impact Ngāi Tahu, their culture and traditions.

Community Views and Preferences
7.4 This project has not reached the consultation phase.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies
7.5 This option is consistent with Council’s Plans and Policies, especially the Long Term Plan 2015-25, which includes improvements for this intersection, but, it does not address the issues that trigged the project and as the issues are now considered minor the option is not recommended.
Financial Implications
7.6 Cost of Implementation - $75,000 - $300,000
7.7 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - there may be additional maintenance costs that are yet to be determined.
7.8 Funding source – previous LTP (2015-2025)

Legal Implications
7.9 Nil

Risks and Mitigations
7.10 There is a risk of public perception that Council is utilising funds for projects that have no benefit.

Implementation
7.11 Implementation dependencies - n/a
7.12 Implementation timeframe – n/a

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.13 The advantages of this option include:
   - Potential enhancement of street environment due to new landscaping.
7.14 The disadvantages of this option include:
   - Funding is expended for no benefit.
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INVESTIGATION DATA - SUMMARY

Crashes

Table 1: Crash type and number per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash Type</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bend - lost control/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing/ turning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic volumes

When the project was initiated it was considered that traffic flow has increased in the area due to development of the tannery, industry and port traffic. Although a traffic count has been completed as part of this scheme, there is no historic data at the same location to compare this to. There is however traffic counts on Curries Road at the rail crossing. The combined flows are shown below for 2012, 2009 and 2006, for the AM and PM peak are shown in table.

The intersection count undertaken for this scheme (2015) shows the AM and PM peak flows and can be used to find the traffic flows south of the intersection, where the previous surveys were undertaken at the rail crossing.

Table 2: comparison of traffic flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07:00 – 08:00</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00 – 09:00</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 17:00</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 – 18:00</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison shows that there has not been substantial growth in traffic flow. The traffic flows were growing prior to 2009 however they dropped significantly between 2009 and 2011, presumably due to the effects of the earthquake. The most recent counts for 2015 are broadly comparable with 2009.
Rail Activity
The primary objective of the scheme was to reduce the delay experienced at this intersection due to shunting at the railway line. This was based on the fact that the Tanner Street/Curries Road/Maunsell Street Intersection is a priority intersection and the Curries Road- Tanner Street have priority over Maunsell Street. The intersection experiences some delays during the shunting operation at railway line (i.e. located at around 60 meter south of the intersection), which result in longer queues along Curries Road and Tanner Street. Moreover, the current road layout does not offer any alternative to the traffic on Curries Road and, depending on the time of shunting, the traffic especially along Tanner Street and Curries Road approaches get blocked, congested and create frustration to all road users.

A survey of the railway crossing was undertaken between Monday 12th and Friday 16th October 2015, between 7am and 7pm each day, recording operation of the crossing in respect to stoppages due to activity on the tracks, and operation of the intersection. From the survey, the average frequency of the crossing operation during the AM and PM peak periods is shown in a graph in Figure 1.

![Frequency of Crossing Operation](image1.png)

**Figure 1: Frequency of Crossing Operation**

Traffic disruption due to the rail crossing being in operation varies from less than a minute to several minutes and sometimes up to 5 minutes. From the seven day survey, it was found that the crossing in operation time varied between an approximate minimum of 10 seconds up to a maximum of 7 minutes, with an average of 1 minute 46 seconds. Figure 2 identifies how often the crossing was used for the various crossing times.

![Time Crossing in Operation](image2.png)

**Figure 2: Distribution of Time which Crossing is in Operation**
The longer crossing operation times resulted in traffic queuing that backed up over the Tanner Street / Curries Road / Maunsell Street intersection. In addition there were periods where the shunting operation was not physically blocking the crossing but the crossing lights and bells are operating. This in turns leads to some interesting traffic behaviour including:

People doing u turns and finding alternatives routes, in particular Cunnor Tce / Chapmans Road

Often the road is not physically blocked by engines or wagons whilst the crossing is in operation, so people will overtake the queue and crossing the railway lines while the crossing lights and bells are operating

From the survey of this crossing, it was found that there was a maximum of 9 vehicles queued at any one time when the crossing was in operation. Average queue length was approximately 3 vehicles.

Kiwirail has advised that it does not intend to install barrier arms or modify the rail yards to limit the effect of shunting on the road crossing. It also advises that it does not have a formal shunting schedule and does not have records of shunting times / delays on road uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Operations works in the intersection**

‘No stopping’ lines have recently been installed at the intersection to increase the visibility and manoeuvring space for vehicles using the intersection.

Vehicles turning out of Maunsell Street west now have visibility splays in either direction meeting the requirements set out in Austroads. The visibility for vehicles turning out of Maunsell Street east however still does not meet current standards. Visibility to the north, near side traffic, is below the requirements for both the left and right turners measuring 60 metres and 40 metres respectively. The requirements for a 50 km/h road is 90 metres. Visibility to the south meets the requirements in for both movements.

The shunting at this location is not an issue anymore as Kiwirail has changed the operations of this line to Rolleston.
1. **Purpose of Report**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval for members of the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board (the Board) to attend the 2019 Community Boards’ Conference in New Plymouth from 11-13 April 2019.

2. **Staff Recommendations**

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the report.
2. Approve the attendance of interested Board members at the 2019 Community Boards Conference at the Devon Hotel in New Plymouth, subject to available budget.

3. **Key Points**

3.1 The conference is being held at the Devon Hotel, New Plymouth from 11-13 April 2019.

3.2 The theme for the conference is ‘Community Boards in a Time of Change’. There will be a diverse range of guest speakers as well as interactive workshops, aimed at providing delegates to participate fully and take away ideas that they can implement within their own environment.

3.3 The New Zealand Community Boards Executive Committee will also offer the Best Practice Awards which recognise significant contributions made by community boards to the process of achieving excellence in local governance. The awards scheme was developed as a learning tool for quality improvement in the functioning of community boards and allows boards to showcase projects and initiatives that have made a difference in the community.

3.4 The conference registration fee for each attendee is $855 for registration. This cost covers attendance at all conference business sessions and workshops and catering as indicated in the programme. Accommodation ranges between $179 and $183 per room per night. Travel from Christchurch to and from New Plymouth, is approximately up to $400.

3.5 Attendance for the conference will be subject to available budget.

4. **Outcomes**

While attending the conference, delegates can expect to:

4.1 Network, exchange ideas and build strong relationships with other Community Board Members and councils.

4.2 Learn from an extensive range of keynote speakers covering topics relevant to current issues faced by the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board.
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## Programme

### Thursday 11 April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>Optional tours depart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.45pm</td>
<td>Coaches depart The Devon to Len Lye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6pm</td>
<td><strong>Welcome function</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30pm</td>
<td>Coaches return from Len Lye to The Devon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Free evening

### Friday 12 April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8am</td>
<td>Registration open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>Mihi Whakatau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9am</td>
<td>Conference Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neil Holdom (New Plymouth Mayor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15am</td>
<td>Plenary: Looking forward, encouraging youth and talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darren Pratley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10am</td>
<td>Plenary: Engaging with the Maori community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puna Wano-Bryant, Wharehoka Wano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45am</td>
<td><strong>Morning tea</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>Plenary: Taranaki Mounga Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Zeiltjes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>Plenary: The important role of Youth Voice Groups locally and regionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Colcord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45pm</td>
<td>Plenary: Local Government update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minister for Local Government, Nanaia Mahuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm</td>
<td>Award participants presentations 3 – 4 minutes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15pm</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45pm</td>
<td>Concurrent workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Building strong Te Ao Maori relationships Puna Wano-Bryant, Wharehoka Wano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Towards Predator-Free Taranaki Toby Shanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Age friendly communities Diane Turner, Julia Tinga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Community Emergency Planning Ben Ingram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15pm</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00pm</td>
<td>Conference dinner and Best Practice Awards. Venue: Grand Auditorium, The Devon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saturday 13 April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.00am</td>
<td>Registration open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>NZCBC Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of NZ Community Boards, Mick Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45am</td>
<td>LGNZ Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of LGNZ, Dave Cull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15am</td>
<td>LGNZ Localism Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEO of LGNZ, Malcolm Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45am</td>
<td>Plenary: Setting the foundations for community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shay Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td><strong>Morning tea</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00am</td>
<td>Concurrent workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Title tbc Shay Wright, Sarah Colcord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rural Connectivity Group – RB12 and Mobile Black Spots Programme Caitlin Metz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Are we People Friendly enough? Lance Girling Butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30pm</td>
<td>Plenary: Active aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natalie Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15pm</td>
<td>Plenary: Thinking about Education to Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warwick Foy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Conference wind up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30pm</td>
<td><strong>Post conference BBQ</strong>. Venue: Sculpture Garden, The Devon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Applications to Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board's Youth Development Fund - Various

Reference: 19/114585
Presenter(s): Diana Saxton, Community Recreation Advisor

1. Purpose and Origin of Report

Purpose of Report
1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to consider four applications received for funding from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund.

1.2 There is currently a balance of $1,850 remaining in this fund.

Origin of Report
1.3 This report is to assist the Board to consider applications of funding from Brad Joel Christiansen, Amelia Elise Sykes, Henry Te Raukura Chiefy Tangiwai-Scott, and Eden Anthony Gray Skipper.

2. Significance

2.1 The decision(s) in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by the number of people affected and/or with an interest.

2.1.2 Due to the assessment of low significance, no further community engagement and consultation is required.

3. Staff Recommendations

That the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board resolve to:

1. Approve a grant of $150 from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Brad Joel Christiansen towards competing at the 2019 NZSS Volleyball Tournament in Palmerston North from Sunday 24 March - Saturday 30 March.

2. Approve a grant of $250 from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Amelia Elise Sykes towards representing Canterbury U17 girls to race for national titles at 2019 Vantage Age Group Track National Championships in Cambridge from 7 to 10 March.

3. Approve a grant of $250 from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Henry Te Raukura Chiefy Tangiwai-Scott towards competing in the NZ Deaf Rugby Football Union team against the Deaf Argentina Rugby Team from 25 May to 1 June 2019.

4. Approve a grant of $500 from its 2018/19 Youth Development Fund to Eden Anthony Gray Skipper to attend the Rotary Young Leaders Award North America – Washington DC (Community and Diversity Conference) from 1 to 8 July 2019.

4. Applicant 1 – Brad Joel Christiansen

4.1 Brad, a 16 year old resident of Waltham, is one of ten players selected for the Middleton Grange School (MGS) Volleyball team to compete at the 2019 NZSS Volleyball Tournament in Palmerston North from Sunday 24 - Saturday 30 March.

4.2 Brad has been playing volleyball for four years including the MGS junior volleyball team. The senior team trains three times a week plus holiday sessions. Brad is part of the senior leadership
team within the squad and takes an active role in helping to develop the younger players in the school.

4.3 Brad is a Year 12 student at Middleton Grange School. He enjoys physical education, playing volleyball, basketball, MMA, boxing, reading and spending time with friends. On leaving school Brad is planning on joining the army.

4.4 Being in the team helps Brad develop his volleyball skills, physical and mental clarity and becoming a team player.

4.5 The team is relying on personal fundraising by each player to compete in this event.

4.6 The following table provides a breakdown of the costs for Brad to compete at the 2019 NZSS Volleyball Tournament in Palmerston North from Sunday 24 - Saturday 30 March:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return flights to Wellington, accommodation, meals and van hire for travel to Palmerston North from Wellington</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 This is the first time the applicant has applied for funding.

5. Applicant 2 – Amelia Elise Sykes

5.1 Amelia, a 14 year old resident of Sumner, has been selected to represent Canterbury U17 girls to race for national titles at 2019 Vantage Age Group Track National Championships in Cambridge from 7 to 10 March 2019.

5.2 Amelia has been track cycling for three years and trains on the road two to three hours per day, six days a week. She also does track training and racing at Denton Park twice a week. Amelia has completed two seasons of track racing on Denton Park. She won an U15 regional title and was selected to compete at the NZ track cycling championships on the indoor velodrome in Southland where she was placed 4th in the U15 girls scratch race plus strong performances in other events.

5.3 Amelia is a talented, dedicated and passionate road and track cycling athlete and a member of the Canterbury track cycling team. Last year she had outstanding results in the NZU15 age category. This was also her first year of competition at a national level with NZ. In 2019 she stepped up to the very competitive U17 age category and has already proved her ability with a 2nd in the flying 200m and a 5th in the 2000m pursuit during the 2018/19 Southland track championships. By competing in this competition she is aiming to gain experience and recognition with the aim of cycling for NZ globally, including the Olympics. She is a positive and happy person who is a role model for others her age and younger.

5.4 Amelia is a Year 10 student at Avonside Girls High School where she studies art, maths, science, physical education, social science, hard materials and Maori.

5.5 Amelia is supported by her parents to fund her participation in her chosen sport plus is aiming to sell coffee beans to businesses pending approval from a coffee supplier.

5.6 The following table provides a breakdown of the costs for Amelia to represent Canterbury U17 girls at the Vantage Age Group Track National Championships in Cambridge from 7 to 10 March 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return airfare including two bikes to Hamilton</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7 This is the first time the applicant has applied for funding.

6. Applicant - Henry Te Raukura Chiefy Tangiwai-Scott

6.1 Henry is a 17 year old resident of Sumner. Henry has been selected to play for the NZ Deaf Rugby Football Union team against the Deaf Argentina Rugby team from 25 May to 1 June 2019.

6.2 Henry started playing for the Southern Zone Deaf Rugby Team in 2017 when he was 15 years old. In 2018, Henry was selected in the starting 15 and helped the NZ Deaf Blacks when they had a training match against Belfast Rugby and was later contacted to be in the Deaf Blacks Team. Henry has been part of the Hillmorton High School Basketball team and attended Nationals in 2018. He has also been a member of the Southern Zone Deaf Rugby for two years – a team that have won the national championships for seven years in a row.

6.3 This is Henry's first selection into a National team and he is very motivated to prove himself and NZ Deaf Rugby that he will be a player to continue to develop confidence and skills. He is keen to show the wider community that Deaf people can participate in sports at a national level and represent their country, proudly wearing the silver fern.

6.4 Henry is in the transition class of Van Asch Deaf Education Centre based at Hagley Community College and will be doing a life skills programme at ARA and is enrolled at ARA trades. He hopes to get his driver’s licence and is also intending to attend Deaf youth leadership camps and mentor younger Deaf students.

6.5 Henry enjoys basketball, rugby, touch and likes being active and supporting younger students.

6.6 Henry has received a $500 grant from the Sir Richard Hadlee Trust. The Southern Deaf Blacks players are holding regular BBQs, organising a raffle, asking for donations from pub patrons, and a fundraiser dinner. The team have raised $240 to date from a Give a Little page.

6.7 The following table provides a breakdown of the costs for Henry to play for the NZ Deaf Rugby Football Union team against the Deaf Argentina Rugby team from 25 May to 1 June 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airfares</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport – bus hire</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social dinner ticket</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour to Rotorua with the Argentina team</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own spending money</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,630</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.8 This is the first time the applicant has applied for funding.
7. Applicant - Eden Anthony Gray Skipper

7.1 Eden is a 20 year old resident of Waltham. He has been selected to attend the Rotary Young Leaders Award North America (RYLA NA) Community and Diversity Conference in Washington DC from 1 to 8 July 2018.

7.2 The conference focuses on youth development, specifically for service to the community which Eden is keen to attend for personal development and international collaboration opportunities with other young adults on a project he started in Christchurch. Committed to helping students and young professionals gain careers and lower the youth unemployment rate Eden initiated Rotary Young Leaders from District 9970. It is an initiative that ‘marries volunteering and young professionalism’ for career development and volunteering. Event ideas to date are community career days in areas with high youth unemployment, spray paint cleaning, networking nights, 50/50 raffles, and a school entrepreneurship award.

7.3 At RYLA NA Eden will be an ambassador for his iwi and represent the Canterbury region. The conference will be an opportunity to exchange ideas, cultural values, approaches to benefit community and much more with over 40 countries participating. There will be opportunities to explore new approaches to marketing, solving social problems, fundraising and much more.

7.4 Eden is a third year student at University of Canterbury completing a five year double degree in Civil Engineering and Statistics. He is also an enthusiastic athlete completing a marathon and winning a half marathon. He is also planning on cycling from Wellington to Napier.

7.5 Eden has also applied to Ngai Tahu and Papanui Rotary for some funding support.

7.6 The following table provides a breakdown of the costs for Eden to attend the Rotary Young Leaders Award North America (RYLA NA) Community and Diversity Conference in Washington DC from 1 to 8 July 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airfares</td>
<td>2,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference fee includes accommodation</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel insurance</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,967</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.7 This is the first time the applicant has applied for funding.

Attachments

There are no attachments to this report.

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance

Compliance with Statutory Decision-making Requirements (ss 76 - 81 Local Government Act 2002).

(a) This report contains:
   (i) sufficient information about all reasonably practicable options identified and assessed in terms of their advantages and disadvantages; and
   (ii) adequate consideration of the views and preferences of affected and interested persons bearing in mind any proposed or previous community engagement.
(b) The information reflects the level of significance of the matters covered by the report, as determined in accordance with the Council’s significance and engagement policy.
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15. Elected Members’ Information Exchange

This item provides an opportunity for Board Members to update each other on recent events and/or issues of relevance and interest to the Board.
16. Resolution to Exclude the Public


I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely items listed overleaf.

Reason for passing this resolution: good reason to withhold exists under section 7.
Specific grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution: Section 48(1)(a)

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

(a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
(b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority.”

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>SUBCLAUSE AND REASON UNDER THE ACT</th>
<th>PLAIN ENGLISH REASON</th>
<th>WHEN REPORTS CAN BE RELEASED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>COMMUNITY BOARD ALCOHOL LICENSING DELEGATIONS</td>
<td>S7(2)(G)</td>
<td>MAINTAIN LEGAL PROFESSIONAL PRIVILEGE</td>
<td>THIS REPORT CONTAINS LEGAL ADVICE.</td>
<td>WHEN THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE DETERMINES THAT THERE IS NO REASON TO WITHHOLD THE INFORMATION.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>