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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 maurua tāukiuki
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
Collaboration
Prudent Financial Management
Stewardship
Wellbeing and resilience
Trust

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 are 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
Areas of Focus
The focus of the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee is the governance of roading and transport, three waters, waste management, and natural hazards protection.

The Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:
- Encourages opportunities for citizenship, community participation and community partnerships
- Works in partnerships with key agencies, groups and organisations
- Considers the impact of climate change in its decisions

The Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee considers and reports to Council on issues and activities relating to:
- Water supply, conservation and quality
- Stormwater drainage including the Land Drainage Recovery Programme
- Natural environment, including the waterways, aquifers, ecology and conservation of resources
- Natural hazards protection, including flood protection and river control
- Solid waste minimisation and disposals
- Sewage collection, treatment and disposal
- Roads, footpaths and streetscapes
- Transport including road operations, parking, public transport, cycle ways, harbours and marine structures consistent with Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee Terms of Reference

Delegations
The Committee delegates to the following working group the responsibility to consider and report back to the Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Councillor Cotter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Councillor Davidson (Deputy Chair), Councillor Buck, Councillor Clearwater, Councillor Galloway, Councillor Keown, Councillor Scandrett and Councillor Templeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum</td>
<td>Half of the members if the number of members (including vacancies) is even, or a majority of members if the number of members (including vacancies) is odd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Cycle</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports To</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Land Drainage Working Group matters relating to the Land Drainage Recovery Programme, including opportunities for betterment.

**Major Cycleway Route (MCR) Programme**

At the Council meeting of 9 March 2017:

It was **resolved** that the Council:

1. Delegates to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee the authority to make all decisions in connection with the Major Cycleway Routes (MCR) programme, including final route selections and anything precedent to the exercise by the Council of its power to acquire any property, subject to:
   
a. The Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee and affected Community Boards being briefed prior to any public consultation commencing on any Major Cycleway Route project.
   
b. The relevant Community Board Chair(s) will be invited by the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee to participate in the relevant Major Cycleway Route item discussion and give their Board’s feedback or recommendations.

2. Notes and reconﬁrms Council’s previous decision to designate the MCR programme a metropolitan project, as set out in the Council’s resolutions on 29 January 2015.

13.4 **Agree** to the Major Cycleway Route programme being declared a Metropolitan Programme and delegate to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee all decision making powers.

**Christchurch Biodiversity Fund**

At the Council meeting of 20 June 2017:

It was **resolved** that the Council:

5. Delegate authority to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee to consider and approve applications to the Christchurch Biodiversity Fund.
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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 Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting held on [Wednesday, 13 March 2019](#) be confirmed (refer page 7).

4. **Public Forum**
   A period of up to 30 minutes may 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**
   5.1 **Aotearoa Bike Challenge**
   Local winners of the Aotearoa Bike Challenge will be presented with their certificates.

   5.2 **Christchurch Civic Trust**
   Ross Gray will speak on behalf of the Christchurch Civic Trust regarding Item 7, 9 Cathedral Square – Structures on Road Permit.

   5.3 **Historic Places Canterbury**
   Mark Gerard will speak on behalf of Historic Places Canterbury regarding item 7, 9 Cathedral Square – Structures on Road Permit.

6. **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**
   - **Committee Decision**
   
   There were no apologies.

2. **Declarations of Interest**
   - **Part B**
   
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. **Confirmation of Previous Minutes**
   - **Part C**
   - **Committee Resolved ITEC/2019/00009**

   **Committee Decision**

   That the minutes of the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 13 February 2019 and the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting held on Monday, 25 February 2019 be confirmed.

   Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Davidson  **Carried**

4. **Public Forum**
   - **Part B**
   
   Andrew Charlesworth and Cleve Cameron from Big Street Bikers addressed the Committee regarding their proposed electric mobility network.

   Michael Bate addressed the Committee regarding the state of the Styx River.

5. **Deputations by Appointment**
   - **Part B**
   
   5.1 **Don Babe - Spokes**
   
   Don Babe addressed the Committee regarding Item 10, Tuam Street at Justice Precinct Entrance.
6. Presentation of Petitions

Part B
There was no presentation of petitions.

7. Cathedral Square Improvement Works

Committee Decided ITEC/2019/00010

Part A

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee recommends that the Council:

1. Approve Option 1 – Proceed with the design proposals for the Cathedral Square public realm improvement project (phases 1-3). Refer to attachments A and B.
2. Note further updates will be provided at key stages of the design progression; namely at developed and detailed design stages.
3. Delegates to the Chief Executive authority to enter into a contract/s for phases 1-3 of the Cathedral Square public realm improvements.
4. Notes that Phase 4 works (which seek to prioritise pedestrian activity and safety in Cathedral Square) will follow a separate piece of work that will consider the transport network in the north of the CBD as well as key facilities in the immediate area. This phase will have the appropriate engagement process associated with any changes that might be proposed.

Councillor Clearwater/Councillor Galloway Carried

8. Cabbage Trees outside 222 High Street

Committee Decided ITEC/2019/00011

Part A

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee recommends that the Council:

1. Approves the preferred option set out in the officers’ report, which is to remove the existing cabbage trees outside 222 High Street and plant temporary low plantings or grasses such as tussocks until a permanent landscape design is developed and further consultation carried out as part of the High Street (Cashel – St Asaph) project scheduled to be delivered in Financial Year 2020.

Councillor Keown/Councillor Buck Carried
Councillor Galloway requested that her vote against the above decision be recorded.
9. **Transport Unit Bi-Monthly Report**

   Committee Resolved ITEC/2019/00012

   **Part C**

   That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:
   
   1. Receive the information in the attached report.

   Councillor Templeton/Councillor Galloway

   Carried

10. **Tuam Street at Justice Precinct Entrance**

   **Committee Comment**

   The staff recommendations were moved by Councillor Keown and seconded by Councillor Galloway. On being put to the meeting the motion was declared a tie, four votes each.

   The Committee decided to refer the matter to the Council without making a recommendation and requested staff to table further information at the Council meeting.

   **Committee Motion**

   **Part A**

   That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee recommends that the Council:

   1. Approves that the Give Way control placed against the Tuam Street west approach, left turn movement located at a point 115 metres east of Durham Street South, be revoked.

   2. Approves that a Give Way control be placed against the west approach of the Tuam Street special vehicle lane which is for the use of eastbound cycles only, and that this Give Way control be located at a point 115 metres east of Durham Street South as detailed in Attachment A.

   Councillor Keown/Councillor Galloway

   Tied

   **Committee Decided ITEC/2019/00013**

   **Part A**

   That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

   1. Refers this matter to the Council and requests staff to table additional information on:

      a. The removal of the left turning lane to improve sight lines outside the Justice Precinct using bollards.

      b. The cost of signalising the access way or other technological solutions.

      c. The cost of installing a stop sign or mirror, or other options.

   Councillor Templeton/Councillor Cotter

   Carried

   Councillor Keown and Councillor Galloway requested that their vote against the above decision be recorded.

   Councillor Buck left the meeting at 4:09 p.m.
11. Manchester Street - Operational Functionality

Committee Resolved ITEC/2019/00014

Part C

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

1. Note the changes that Council and Christchurch Transport Operations Centre staff have made to the operation of Manchester Street.

2. Agree on the need for continued monitoring of performance and the implementation of minor changes by the Christchurch Transport Operations Centre.

3. Agree on staff continuing their work on the addition proposals currently underway.

Councillor Cotter/Councillor Keown Carried

12 Resolution to Exclude the Public

Committee Resolved ITEC/2019/00015

Part C

That at 4:16 pm. the resolution to exclude the public set out on pages 82 to 83 of the agenda be adopted.

Councillor Cotter/Councillor Davidson Carried

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 4.23 pm. at which time the meeting concluded.

CONFIRMED THIS 10TH DAY OF APRIL 2019

COUNCILLOR PAULINE COTTER
CHAIRPERSON
1. **Purpose and Origin of Report**

   **Purpose of Report**
   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee to review and recommend to the Council an application received for a Structures on Roads Deed of Licence in respect of the proposed development at 9 Cathedral Square.

   **Origin of Report**
   1.2 This report is staff generated in respect of the application for a Structures on Roads Deed of Licence to occupy the legal road at 9 Cathedral Square. The application has three elements (see Appendix A & Figure 1):
   1.2.1 Northern canopy facing Cathedral Square includes supporting poles and foundations, therefore occupation of legal road subsoil, surface and airspace (Attachment A pp.1 & 3).
   1.2.2 Western façade verandah along Strand Lane (Council owned land) airspace encroachment (Attachment A p.2)
   1.2.3 Hereford Street frontage verandah; airspace encroachment (Attachment A p.2).
   1.3 This report relates only to the proposed Cathedral Square canopy. The Hereford Street and Strand Lane proposals are included for information only as they comply with the Policy for Structures on Roads 2010 and are being dealt with under staff delegation.

2. **Significance**

   2.1 The decision in this report is Medium significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
   2.1.1 The level of significance was determined by assessment and discussion.
   2.1.2 The community engagement and consultation outlined in this report reflects the assessment.

3. **Staff Recommendations**

   That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee recommends that the Council:

   1. Notes that the proposal is inconsistent with the Policy for Structures on Roads 2010.
      a. The inconsistency is detailed as follows:
         i. Paragraph 2.2 of the Policy requires that the horizontal projection not be more than one metre.
         ii. Paragraph 3.3 of the Policy requires that all foundations be built within the private lot.
         iii. Paragraph 3.5 (i) requires that there be no other practicable option available.
      b. The reason for the inconsistency is that the proposal has a canopy that projects more than one metre, the supporting columns and their foundations project into legal road and there is no other practical options available.
c. Due to the ‘one-off’ nature of the application, there is no intention to amend the Policy to accommodate the decision.

2. Approve the application to encroach on the legal road at 9 Cathedral Square and as land owners to authorise the construction of the canopy, poles and column foundations on the area shown in Attachment A.

3. Approve the granting of a Deed of Licence to allow the encroachment of the legal road at 9 Cathedral Square for a term of up to a maximum of 35 years and at a market licence fee determined by a registered valuer appointed by the Council. In addition to the annual licence fee the licensee would be required to pay the extra tree maintenance costs arising from the proposal.

4. Require as part of the Deed of Licence the preparation of a Tree Protection and Management Plan by the owners of 9 Cathedral Square in respect of the three street trees on the Square, and the licensee’s compliance with that plan.

4. Key Points

4.1 This report does not support the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028).

4.2 The following feasible options have been considered:
   - Option 1 – Approve the Deed of Licence Application (preferred option)
   - Option 2 – Refuse the Deed of Licence Application

4.3 Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages (Preferred Option)

4.3.1 The advantages of this option include:
   - Facilitates an important new structure on Cathedral Square
   - Provides an architecturally significant building in the post-earthquake central City
   - Maintains mobility access, and access for persons with buggies, etc.
   - Does not create a significant barrier on the legal road
   - The site remains legal road
   - Creates an area for outdoor refreshments
   - Minimal cost option for the Council

4.3.2 The disadvantages of this option include:
   - Creates a partial obstruction on the footpath (legal road) with seven supporting columns.
   - Requires the relocation of underground services to accommodate the proposed foundations on Cathedral Square. This will be at the applicant’s cost.
   - Requires minimal pruning of the three street trees opposite the site to accommodate the canopy and also during construction at the applicant’s cost.

5. Context/Background

Recent History

5.1 The 9 Cathedral Square site is located on the south-western corner of the Square bordered by the Square (north), Strand Lane, (west), Hereford Street (south) and Colombo Street (east) (Figure 1). Cathedral Square is a significant Heritage Item and the proposed building also sits within the Square’s Heritage Setting.
5.2 The site formerly contained the ANZ bank building which was demolished in 2013. The site is now vacant and cordoned off.

Resource Consent (RMA/2018/1116)

5.3 This site is owned by Redson Corporation Holdings Ltd who submitted a resource consent application for redevelopment in May. The resource consent was approved in June 2018 on a non-notified basis. A copy of the decision forms Attachment B.

5.4 The applicant proposes to construct a new building on the site to house retail, a café, and restaurant(s). The architect is Shigeru Ban (Cardboard Cathedral) and provisionally the proposed building is named “Braided Rivers”. This title is based on the architect’s concept to reflect Canterbury’s braided rivers and trees through the unique supporting pillars and glazed structure.

5.5 Storage space and plant will be accommodated in the upper levels of the building. The building will be largely glass fronted with a number of 10 metre high timber columns internally and on part of the legal road to support the roof. The columns will be shaped to resemble tree trunks and branches (see Figure 2). The proposal also includes several encroachments, over, on and under the legal road known as Cathedral Square, Hereford Street and the Council owned Strand Lane (not legal road).

Structures on Road Application

5.6 The Redson structures on roads’ application proposes:

5.6.1 Northern façade canopy extending 6.9 metres over the legal road along the entire length of the site. The canopy will be 10 metres high and supported by seven timber columns which will be fitted to support the canopy similar to those supporting the roof and first floor inside the building. The columns require foundations encroaching into the road’s subsoil (see Figure 1 & Attachment A).

5.6.2 The glazed verandah along the Hereford Street frontage encroaching over the legal road.
5.6.3 A glass verandah extending 1.7 metres over Strand Lane. This is not legal road, but fee simple land owned by the Council. Strand Lane functions as a footpath between Cathedral Square and Hereford Street and is currently closed.

5.7 The proposed Hereford Street and Strand Lane verandahs conform to the Structures on Roads Policy and the District Plan as they are cantilevered from the building’s façade.

Legal Road Issues

5.8 Initially the applicant enquired about road stopping the section of Cathedral Square to be encroached by the canopy and its supporting structures. This was considered by staff to be unrealistic for several reasons including:

- The road stopping process is complex, time consuming and expensive. Hence, it may slow a decision on the proposal for a significant period of time (up to two years).
- Given the high profile location a road stopping request would likely generate a high level of public interest, controversy and objections.
- Under these circumstances staff could not support the applicant in pursuing this path.

5.9 The structures on roads process was suggested as a more realistic alternative to allow the approval of the encroachments with a deed of licence to allow the proposed occupation of legal road. Staff have delegated authority to approve the canopies over Hereford Street and Strand Lane as they meet the Policy’s criteria.

5.10 However, the proposed northern canopy does not comply with Structures on Roads Policy (Attachment C) due to the supporting columns and the subsoil foundations, horizontal projection. As the Council is the only decision maker that can authorise a departure from Policy the matter must be reported to the Council.
5.11 The Council has the power to lease the airspace and subsoil of legal road land, but not the surface. Generally speaking, the Council utilises a deed of licence to authorise the occupation of the road’s surface, mainly for garages in the hill suburbs. The deed of licence would be limited to the Cathedral Square encroachments.

5.12 Although the 9 Cathedral Square building is designed for a 50 year life, the Council is unlikely to issue a lease or licence for this period (this is not recommended). The law allows a lease/licence for 35 years without the need to subdivide the land. If the lease/licence for 50 years was required, the encroached road land would need to be stopped and subdivided at the applicant’s cost.

5.13 Staff intend to use a Deed of Licence to authorise the occupation of the legal road at 9 Cathedral Square limited to 35 years for the northern canopy (including the foundations and supporting columns).

5.14 The applicant has stated that the café tenant may require a separate licence to allow table and chairs under the proposed canopy on Cathedral Square. This would be dealt with separately under staff delegations.

5.15 Another issue is the need to provide sufficient space for the passage of emergency vehicles, especially Fire Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) trucks. The FENZ Guidelines states their vehicles require a minimum width of four metres and a minimum of four metres height clearance.

5.16 Staff are also concerned about the impact of the Braided Rivers canopy of the adjacent street trees.

5.17 The proposed encroachment of the northern façade’s canopy is 6.9 metres from the property’s boundary (Attachment A). Additionally, the seven proposed columns will be placed approximately three metres in the road from the property boundary. The columns’ foundations will encroach up to four metres into the road reserve’s subsoil from the property boundary.

5.18 The resource consent approval includes a condition for Redson to ensure the existing Cathedral Square paving treatment under the canopy it reinstated before the building is occupied. This will safeguard the consistent treatment for this significant heritage setting and the integration of the edges of this important public space.

LGA 2002 s.80 Inconsistent decisions

5.19 The proposal is inconsistent with the Structures on Roads Policy for the following reasons:

- The horizontal projection of the canopy exceeds one metre;
- The proposed canopy supporting columns foundations under the legal road reserve (the policy only permits seismic movement trenches in the subsoil); and
- There is no other practical option available.

5.20 Section 80 allows the Council to make decisions that are significantly inconsistent with any policy, which is the case for the proposed Cathedral Square canopy.

5.21 The rationale behind this proposed inconsistency is to enable the proposed landmark building at 9 Cathedral Square which is intended to be a critical component of the central City rebuild.

5.22 In making an inconsistent decision the following must be identified:

5.22.1 The inconsistency – which are identified above.

5.22.2 The reasons for the inconsistency – the Structures on Roads policy does not permit a canopy (architectural feature category) to exceed one metre in horizontal projection. Also the policy does not normally permit foundations to encroach under the legal road. Normally the Council would expect the developer to seek an option that does not conflict with our policies, but this is considered a special case.
5.23 Due to the one-off nature of the application there is no intention to amend the Policy to accommodate the decision. The report seeks the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee to recommend to the Council to approve the inconsistent proposal for the encroachment into legal road at 9 Cathedral Square.

**Strand Lane Land Purchase**

5.24 Strand Lane is a public footpath between Cathedral Square and Hereford Street forming the western boundary of 9 Cathedral Square. However, Strand Lane is not legal road, but Council owned fee simple land.

5.25 The Council has proposed to widen Strand Lane to ease pedestrian movement between Hereford Street and Cathedral Square. It is proposing to buy strips of land (1.7 metre wide) on both sides of the laneway. The eastern strip would be acquired from Redson. Strand Lane will not be transferred from fee simple to legal road, but it will remain open for pedestrians.

5.26 The Property Unit drafted a report to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee for 12th December 2018 meeting which recommended to the Council that it acquires two 1.7 metre strips to widen Strand Lane. The Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee referred the report and a decision to the Council’s meeting on 19th December 2018.

5.27 Although the Council approved the staff recommendation to acquire the strips to widen Strand Lane, they requested that the Chief Executive investigate if there is an alternative mechanism under the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act (GCRA) 2016 to achieve the benefits more quickly. If the Chief Executive is satisfied the GCRA would not deliver the benefits more quickly the process outlined by staff would be utilised.

**Utilities relocation**

5.28 Staff have made initial enquires to the utility companies and its own records to determine the likely need to relocate any cables and pipes to accommodate the proposed encroaching foundations. Our inquiries indicate that both Orion and Chorus cables would need to be relocated away from the encroachment area, as well as two Spark phone boxes on the Square (see Figure 3).
N.B. the current fenced off area includes a 3 metre strip of legal road

5.29 In addition, the Council’s Three Waters Team is responsible for freshwater, stormwater and wastewater mains which traverse the proposed subsoil encroachment area. These will also need to be relocated away from the proposed foundations.

5.30 The applicant is aware of this issue and will need to confirm the extent of relocation works and they will also be responsible for liaising with the service providers and paying the costs of the works.

Urban Design

5.31 The initial proposal for 9 Cathedral Square has been considered by the Council’s Urban Design Panel in April (Attachment D). The panel generally welcomes the proposal particularly the boldness of the brief and its narrative for a landmark project.

5.32 Addressing the Panel’s comments in respect of the proposed encroachments they:

5.32.1 Support the proposed northern canopy encroachment over Cathedral Square, including the “colonnade” provide the encroached area remains in the public realm and public access is unimpeded.

5.32.2 Consider the project should help to retain the cruciform of the Square by emphasising its’ edges. The Panel notes that the use of paving patterns and threshold treatments could contribute to this objective.

5.32.3 The need to provide some pedestrian shelter along Hereford Street, e.g. canopies.

5.32.4 The panel recommends further design development for this project in light of “the profile and significance of the site and the landmark potential of the design,...”

5.33 The Panel also raises some secondary recommendations relevant to this report, including:

5.33.1 There should be clear signage provided for the building.

5.33.2 Advocates a mixed use design (servicing and pedestrian activity) for Strand Lane.

5.33.3 Advices the use of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles particularly for Strand Lane.

Street Trees

5.34 There are three street trees (Common Lime *Tilia x europaea*) in planters on the southern boundary of 99 Cathedral Square opposite the proposed canopy for 9 Cathedral Square, see Figures 1 & 2.
5.35 A site meeting with the applicant and Council staff was held on 25 March 2019 to clarify the building requirements and proposed construction methodology and understand the likely effects on the trees. The Arborist’s report is attached to this report (Attachment E). At the meeting the following points were clarified.

5.35.1 The extent and expected situation of the building frontage, pillars and edge of the building canopy in relation to the trees.

5.35.2 The anticipated construction methodologies.

5.35.3 The alteration of services in the pavement between the building and the trees.

5.35.4 The construction of building foundations and any potential changes to the pavement levels.

5.36 The Arborists report states the following:

5.36.1 It is expected that the proposed building development can proceed with minor potential effects on the trees.

5.36.2 The tree canopies are not expected to be significantly modified, as a relatively small percentage of the tree canopies will require pruning due to the change in site use, and encroachment of the building canopy and possibly the pillars.

5.36.3 It is expected that the relocation of utility services, the construction of building foundations and changes to the pavement levels can be carried out without resulting in significant adverse effects on the health of the trees.

5.37 The Arborists report also makes the following suggestions:

5.37.1 A suitably experienced and qualified arborist should be engaged by the applicant to provide tree protection advice and supervision to ensure that tree protection occurs during the building development works.

5.37.2 The applicant should produce a tree protection plan that is to be approved by the Council’s Arborist before the commencement of any site works within the vicinity of the
subject trees. The tree protection plan should be comprehensive and address all aspects of the works, including any associated utilities and infrastructure.

5.37.3 Further arboriculture assessments should be carried out prior to and during construction to confirm that the final design and construction methodologies are appropriate, and to ensure that the protection of trees is achieved.

5.37.4 The applicant’s arborist should be on site to assist within tree related investigations, provide tree protection advice and supervise any activities within the vicinity of the trees that have the potential to cause damage to the trees.

5.37.5 All tree pruning should be managed by the Council, carried out by the Council’s tree maintenance contractor, and be limited to the extent of pruning that is specified by the Council’s Arborist.

5.37.6 Any debris produced by the trees that affect the building and associated structures should be managed by the building owner.
Heritage Issues

5.38 Heritage issues have been dealt with by the Resource Consent which has been granted. A copy of the heritage report for the resource consent forms Attachment F.

Consultation

5.39 In accordance with the legal advice the proposed encroachments were subject to a community and stakeholder process to comply with the decision-making requirements of the Local Government Act (LGA) 2002. This exercise took place between Monday 18th February and Monday 11th March; the results’ analysis is found below.

Summary

5.40 Staff consider that the proposed canopy is acceptable to encroach under, on and above the legal road in front of 9 Cathedral Square, providing the deed of licence is approved by both parties. The main conditions are:

5.40.1 The Licence will be issued for a maximum period of 35 years, to avoid the need to subdivide the site.

5.40.2 The three street trees will remain in place in their raised planters although they will be subject to regular pruning to prevent undue damage either to themselves or the canopy.

5.40.3 The applicant/landowner will be required to pay a sufficient annual charge through the deed of licence to cover the cost of the accelerated tree maintenance programme.

5.40.4 The application will be required to develop and comply with a Tree Protection and Management Plan in accordance with staff guidance and the Construction Standard Specifications.

5.40.5 The applicant/landowner will be responsible for the maintenance and repair of the encroaching structures.

5.40.6 Sufficient width and height should be maintained to allow for the free flow of pedestrians and the passage of emergency vehicles.
6. Option 1 - Approve the Deed of Licence Application (preferred)

Option Description
6.1 The proposed road encroachments recommended for a Deed of Licence is:

6.1.1 Northern façade canopy extending seven metres over the legal road along the entire length of the site. The canopy will be 10 metres high and supported by seven timber columns which will be fitted to support the canopy similar to those supporting the roof inside the building. The columns require foundations encroaching into the road’s subsoil.

Significance
6.2 The level of significance of this option is medium consistent with section 2 of this report.

6.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance includes a community/stakeholder consultation exercise, see section 6.5.

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. Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd, on behalf of Ngāi Tahu, has received information about the proposal but have not responded.

Community Views and Preferences
6.5 Consultation on the proposed occupation of legal road in Cathedral Square in front of the ‘Braided Rivers’ building on 9 Cathedral Square was undertaken from 18 February to 11 March 2019.

6.6 Consultation leaflets were posted to 25 property owners in the vicinity of 9 Cathedral Square. Emails were sent to other key stakeholders including nearby businesses, and the disability and heritage communities. Attachment G contains the details of each submission and staff comments.

6.7 The project was also discussed with St John, New Zealand Fire and Emergency and New Zealand Police. No concerns were raised by the emergency services.

6.8 Thirty six responses were received during the consultation period. Submitters were asked to provide comments. Twenty eight (78%) indicated that they supported the proposed encroachment of the building onto legal road within Cathedral Square. Two others (5.5%) gave qualified support and six (16.5%) submitters did not support the proposal.

6.9 Many of those who provided comments in support referred to the architecturally significant design of the ‘Braided Rivers’ building proposed on 9 Cathedral Square and how it would be an asset to the centre of the city and to Christchurch. Specific comments included: “The proposed structure is very beautiful and would make a stunning contribution to the urban fabric.” Another said: “I support it, it looks fantastic.”

6.10 Most of the submitters who specifically referred to the encroachment of the canopy on legal road said the iconic glass and timber building designed by Shigeru Ban would encourage people back into the centre of Christchurch and have a positive impact on Cathedral Square.

6.11 The Chief Executive of Christchurch Airport Malcolm Johns added that Shigeru Ban had delivered a concept that is unique and special and inextricably linked to Canterbury. The vast open canopy would provide public access, shelter and shade, and provide a welcoming and hospitable view from Cathedral Square.

6.12 Six submitters did not support the canopy. The Christchurch Civic Trust and Historic Places Canterbury said the canopy should be either scaled back or reconsidered to reduce its impact on the unique cruciform shape of Cathedral Square - scheduled in the District Plan as a ‘Highly
Significant’ heritage item and setting – and the three lime trees which were part of that setting. They said the proposal could set a precedent in the Square.

6.13 In the earlier resource consent process for 9 Cathedral Square, both the heritage consultant for the applicant and the Council’s heritage advisor considered that the impact of the proposed building and its northern canopy on the heritage setting in the Square would be minor.

6.14 One of the conditions of resource consent is that the existing paving treatment in Cathedral Square will be reinstated under the northern canopy of the proposed building to maintain a consistent treatment and integration with adjacent edges of the public space. The only area of public space that would not be accessible to the public once the canopy is built would be the area occupied by the lower section of the seven supporting columns.

6.15 Seven submitters, including the Civic Trust and Historic Places Canterbury, referred to the need to protect the trees and/or manage their ongoing maintenance. One respondent commented: “Under no circumstances must the proposed canopy effect the growth and shape of the three lime trees.”

6.16 The arborist has now assessed the three trees in relation to the proposed northern canopy and pillars. The arborist has concluded that construction of the canopy and its dimensions would have a minor impact on the trees. The arborists memo forms Attachment E of this report.

6.17 All submitters have been advised of the outcome of the consultation and also details of this Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee meeting. They were also asked to indicate whether they wished to request speaking rights.

Alignment with Council Plans and Policies

6.18 This option is inconsistent with the Council’s Plans and with the Structures on Roads Policy.

6.18.1 Inconsistency – there is no specific operational plan objective for this proposal
6.18.2 Reason for inconsistency – as above
6.18.3 Amendment necessary – not applicable

Financial Implications

6.19 Cost of Implementation – Not applicable the landowner of 9 Cathedral Square pays all costs
6.20 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs – landowner of 9 Cathedral Square pays re the street trees
6.21 Funding source – not applicable

Legal Implications

6.22 There is a legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision. The Council has complied with the legal advice to consult on the proposal and the proposed Deed of Licence will be prepared by the Legal Services Unit.

6.23 This report has been reviewed by the Legal Services Unit.

Structures on Roads Policy

6.24 See paragraphs 5.19-5.23.

Risks and Mitigations

6.25 There is a risk that the building may not be constructed. This may result in the deed of licence not being needed, or that the building will remain empty for an extended period. These are risks for the landowner and developer and not directly for the Council.

Implementation

6.26 Implementation dependencies - none
6.27 Implementation timeframe - none

**Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages**

6.28 The advantages of this option include:
- Facilitates an important new structure on Cathedral Square
- Provides an architecturally significant building in the post-earthquake central City
- Maintains mobility access, and access for persons with buggies, etc.
- Does not create a significant barrier on the legal road
- The site remains legal road
- Creates an area for outdoor refreshments
- Minimal cost option for the Council

6.29 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Creates a partial obstruction on the footpath (legal road) with seven supporting columns.
- Requires the relocation of underground services to accommodate the proposed foundations on Cathedral Square. This will be at the applicant’s cost.
- Requires minimal pruning of the three street trees opposite the site to accommodate the canopy and also during construction at the applicant’s cost.

7. **Option 2 - Refuse the Deed of Licence**

**Option Description**
7.1 Decline the application to licence proposed legal road encroachments.

**Significance**
7.2 The level of significance of this option is medium consistent with section 2 of this report.
7.3 Engagement requirements for this level of significance are discussed in section 6.

**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. However, Ngai Tahu has been sent a copy of the road encroachment proposal, see above section 6.4.

**Community Views and Preferences**
7.5 See sections 6.5 to 6.17.

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

**Financial Implications**
7.7 Cost of Implementation – no cost to the Council
7.8 Maintenance / Ongoing Costs - none
7.9 Funding source – not applicable

**Legal Implications**
7.10 See paragraphs 6.22 to 6.23.
Risks and Mitigations
7.11 There is a risk to the Council’s reputation and the redevelopment of the central city if the deed of licence application is refused.

7.11.1 Residual risk rating: The residual rating of the risk is high.

7.11.2 There are no planned treatments

Implementation
7.12 Implementation dependencies - None
7.13 Implementation timeframe - None

Option Summary - Advantages and Disadvantages
7.14 The advantages of this option include:
- No encroachment above, on or under the legal road
- No obstruction on the legal road
- No need to relocate the underground services or the pay phones
- No need for a special maintenance regime for the three street trees

7.15 The disadvantages of this option include:
- Could lead to the failure of the proposed redevelopment at 9 Cathedral Square leaving the site vacant for a longer period.
- Reputational risk for the Council if seen to refuse an important component of the 9 Cathedral Square development.
- Potential for the Council to be perceived as not supporting the renewal of the central city.
- Failure to facilitate what could be an important resource and an architecturally significant structure in Cathedral Square.
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Report / Decision on a Non-notified Resource Consent Application
(Sections 95A / 95B and 104 / 104C)

Application Number: RMA/2018/1116
Applicant: Redson Corporation Holdings Ltd.
Site Address: 9 Cathedral Square, Central City
Legal Description: Lot 1 DP 61143, 1371m²
Zoning: Christchurch District Plan: Commercial Central City Business
Overlays and map notations: Central City Active Frontage & Veranda
Central City Building Height 28m Overlay
Central City Core Overlay
Central City Inner zone
Category 2: Lower Noise Level Entertainment & Hospitality Precincts
Liquefaction Management Area
Activity Status: NES: Restricted Discretionary
Christchurch District Plan: Restricted Discretionary
Description of Application: Redevelopment of the site to construct a two-storey commercial building together with soil disturbance and removal associated with the redevelopment of the site on land subject to the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health (NESC5)

Introduction

The subject site is located on the south-western corner of Cathedral Square and is bordered by Colombo Street, Hereford Street and Strand Lane, with Cathedral Square located to the direct north. The site formerly contained the ANZ bank building and is currently vacant since the building was demolished in 2013. The site as outlined in Figure 1 is in the ownership of the applicant.
Section 3.1 of the submitted AEE contains a comprehensive description of both the site and the existing environment. This description is accepted and adopted here. Section 4.0 sets out a description of the proposal. This description is also accepted.

In brief, the applicant seeks consent for the following activities under the District Plan & NES provisions:

- Construction of a new building within the Central City Core which is visible from a publicly owned and accessible space, that has been certified by a qualified expert on the Council approved list as meeting each of the urban design provisions and outcomes in Rule 15.13.2.7;
- New buildings on sites in the area identified as the Core on the planning maps are required to be built up to all road boundaries of the allotment, and across 100% of the width of the allotment where it abuts all road boundaries;
- Reduction/absence of veranda or other means of weather protection for proposed building which is located within ‘Central City Active Frontage and Veranda’ overlay.
- Removal of requirement to provide the minimum number of cycle parking spaces for the development - 7 for visitor and 10 for staff spaces required;
- Part of the building’s canopy will extend into Cathedral Square, which is a Heritage Item (ID 98) and is also the Heritage setting (ID 553) for a range of other heritage items. The proposed canopy also requires earthworks within the area of a heritage item;
The proposal requires a volume of soil disturbance and removal that require consent under the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health.

Figure 1. Application site (© 2016, GeoMedia Ltd)

### Planning Framework

The operative Christchurch district plans are under review. The Independent Hearings Panel has made all decisions on the Proposed Replacement District Plan. With the exception of specific provisions in the Commercial Chapter, all rules are now fully operative or treated as operative pursuant to section 86F of the Act. The rules applicable to this proposal have been assessed and the breaches are identified below. Relevant objectives and policies are discussed in a later section of this report.

### Christchurch Replacement District Plan

The site is zoned Commercial Central City Business in the Replacement District Plan, is covered by active frontage and veranda overlays, and is also identified as part of the Core. This zone provides for a wide range and scale of activities including comparison shopping, dining and night life, entertainment activities, guest accommodation, events, cultural activities and tourism activities.

The proposal does not comply with or is captured by the following rules in the Christchurch Replacement District Plan:

### Chapter 15 - Commercial

- Pursuant to Rule 15.10.1.2 (C1), the erection of new buildings and/or use of any part of a site not undertaken in a building which is visible from a public space requires consent as a controlled activity under rule 15.10.1.2 C1 of the District Plan, where it is certified by a qualified expert on a Council approved list as meeting each of the urban design provisions/outcomes in Rule 15.13.2.7 Commercial Central City Business Zone Urban Design.

The applicant has provided an urban design certification by qualified expert Mr Tim Church of Boffa Miskell in order for the new building to be treated as a controlled activity under this rule.
The matters over which Council reserves its control specify that the activity shall be undertaken in accordance with the urban design certification.

- Built form standard 15.10.2.1(a) – Building setback and continuity, states that on sites in the area identified as the Core on the planning map titled ‘Central City Core, Frame, Large Format Retail, and Health, Innovation, Retail and South Frame Pedestrian Precincts planning map’, buildings (excluding fences for the purposes of this standard) shall be built up to the road boundary, except that where the allotment fronts more than one road boundary, buildings shall be built up to all road boundaries of the allotment.

The proposed building is not built up to the western site boundary shared with Strand Lane – 1.7m setback proposed.

Pursuant to Rule 15.10.1.3 (RD5), consent is required for a restricted discretionary activity. Council’s discretion is restricted to the matters specified in Rule 15.13.3.15 - Commercial Central City Business Zone - Building setbacks and continuity.

- Built form standard 15.10.2.2 – Verandas, states that in the areas shown on the ‘Central City Active Frontages and Verandas and Building Setback planning map’ as Central City Active Frontage and Veranda, every building shall provide a veranda or other means of weather protection with continuous cover for pedestrians.

The proposed building does not provide a continuous veranda/cover along Hereford Street, and provides no veranda/cover along the Colombo Street frontage.

Pursuant to Rule 15.10.1.3 (RD5), consent is required for a restricted discretionary activity. Council’s discretion is restricted to the matters specified in Rule 15.13.3.16 - Commercial Central City Business Zone - Verandas.

Chapter 7 - Transport

- Standard 7.4.3.2 – Minimum number of cycle parking facilities required, states that at least the minimum amount of cycle parking facilities in accordance with Appendix 7.5.2 shall be provided on the same site as the activity. The proposal requires a total of 7 visitor and 10 staff cycle spaces and does not provide any cycle parking.

Pursuant to Rule 7.4.2.3 (RD1), any activity that does not meet any one or more of the standards in Rule 7.4.3 is restricted discretionary.

Council’s discretion is restricted to the matters specified in Rule 7.4.4.4 - Minimum number of cycle parking facilities.

Chapter 8 - Earthworks

- P1 of rule 8.9.2.1 – Permitted activities – earthworks, states that earthworks shall not occur within 5 metres of a heritage item. The proposed columns supporting the canopy result in earthworks within Cathedral Square and adjacent road reserve, which is a Group 1 Heritage Item (Item 98).

Pursuant to Rule 8.9.2.3 (RD1), any activity listed in Rule 8.9.2.1 P1 that does not meet any one or more of the activity standards is a restricted discretionary activity. Council’s discretion is restricted to the matters specified in Rule 8.9.4.

Chapter 9 – Natural and cultural heritage

- Pursuant to Rule 9.3.4.1.3 (RD2), new buildings in a heritage setting require consent as restricted discretionary activity. The proposal includes a canopy measuring 301m² which extends 6.9m into Cathedral Square and adjacent road reserve which is a Heritage Setting (Item 553).

Council’s discretion is restricted to the matters specified in Rule 9.3.6.1 - Alterations, new buildings, relocations, temporary event structures, signage and replacement of buildings.

- Pursuant to Rule 9.3.4.1.3 (RD3), new buildings, structures or features located within an open space which is a heritage item requires consent for a restricted discretionary activity.

The proposal includes a canopy measuring 301m² which extends 6.9m into Cathedral Square and adjacent road reserve which is a Group 1 Heritage Item (ID98).

Council’s discretion is restricted to the matters specified within Rule 9.3.6.1 - Alterations, new buildings, relocations, temporary event structures, signage and replacement of buildings.

The proposal is considered as a restricted discretionary activity under this plan.
National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health (NES)

These standards became operative on 1 January 2012 and seek to ensure that land affected by contaminants in soil is appropriately identified and assessed before it is developed and if necessary the land is remediated or contaminants contained to make the land safe for human use. The NES controls soil disturbance on land where an activity on the Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL) is being carried out, has been carried out, or is more likely than not to have been carried out.

The application site has been identified as HAIL land and LLUR records indicate that the site was used for E1 – Asbestos products manufacturing or disposal, and requires consent for a breach of the following NES provisions:

- Regulation 8(3)(c) – the volume of soil disturbance will exceed 25m³ per 500m² (soil disturbance estimated to exceed permitted volume of 68m³).
- Regulation 8(3)(d)(ii) - the volume of soil to be removed from the site will exceed 5m³ per 500m² (soil removal estimated to exceed permitted volume of 13m³).

The disturbance and removal of soil that is not a permitted activity under regulation 8(3) of the NES is a controlled activity under regulation 9(1) of the NES provided the following requirements are met:

(a) a detailed site investigation of the piece of land must exist:

(b) the report on the detailed site investigation must state that the soil contamination does not exceed the applicable standard in Regulation 7:

(c) the consent authority must have the report:

(d) conditions arising from the application of subclauses (2), if there are any, must be complied with.

With reference to Regulation 9(1)(b), the report on the DSI states that the soil contamination exceeds the applicable standard in Regulation 7, and the report has been provided to the Council.

Pursuant to Regulation 10(1) & (2), the proposal requires consent for a restricted discretionary activity under the NESCS.

The overall status of the application is restricted discretionary.

The existing environment

The application site and surrounding environment are described in Section 3.1 of the submitted AEE. I adopt the applicant’s description.

Written approvals [Sections 95D, 95E(3)(a) and 104(3)(a)(iii)]

The application does not include written approvals.

In respect of Section 95A – 95C, the relevant rules within chapter 15 include non-notification clauses. However, there is no such clause associated with Rule 7.4.2.3 RD1. This rule relates to cycle parking, specifically the absence of such. This is a result of the proposed building (i.e. were the buildings designed differently then such parking could be provided). It follows that as not all rules have an associated non-notification clause, the overall application loses the benefit of such clauses associated with any individual rules - in this case 15.10.1.2 C1 and 15.10.1.3 RD2. I am therefore required to consider notification as appropriate within the context of the relevant statutory framework.
Comparison with adverse effects of permitted activities (Section 104(2))

I do not consider there to be a relevant permitted baseline against which to compare the level of adverse effects of the proposed building given that the Plan requires new buildings located within the Central City Retail Core overlay which are visible from a publicly owned and accessible space to be assessed as Controlled Activities at the very least.

With that said, it can be reasonably argued that based on the CCCB built form standards there is an anticipated maximal building envelope covering bulk and location on any site. The proposed building is largely compliant with this anticipated envelope less the proposed canopy to the northern elevation.

Notwithstanding the above, it is salient that the activities proposed to be undertaken within the buildings are permitted by the district plan (i.e. retail activities permitted by P1 of Rule 15.10.1.1, subject to compliance with the relevant built form and activity specific standards).

Adverse effects assessment

The proposed building is to be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity against the relevant matters specified within the CCCB, Heritage & Transport chapters. These matters can be grouped into an assessment of the following effects on the environment:

- Urban design impact
- Visual amenity effects
- Heritage effects
- Effects on cycle parking

Note: NES matters will be covered separately.

Specialist advice has been sought from the following Council specialists:

- Senior Urban Designer Mr John Lonink
- Senior Heritage Advisor Ms Fiona Wykes
- Senior Environmental Health Officer Hannah Mirabueno

Urban Design

In terms of the general urban design focused matters, as confirmed by the applicant, the erection of new buildings and/or use of a site not undertaken in a building which is visible from a public space requires consent as a controlled activity under Rule 15.10.1.2 (C1), whereby it is certified by a qualified Urban Design expert on a Council approved list as meeting each of the urban design provisions / outcomes in Rule 15.13.2.7.

The applicant has subsequently provided urban design certification by Mr Tim Church of Boffa Miskell within Appendix 9 of the submitted application. Firstly, Mr Church holds a Master of Urban Design and is a member of the Urban Design Forum. Coupled with significant experience it is considered that Mr Church is suitably qualified as an expert. Second, while Council does not yet have a formal list, Council have agreed delegations to enable an interim process pending establishment of a full list of approved urban design experts. Mr Church has been approved via this process by John Higgins (Head of Resource Consents) and Carolyn Ingles (Head of Urban Regeneration, Urban Design and Heritage). Consequently I consider the application merits consideration under Rule 15.10.2.1 C1.

The matters for control within this rule require the activity to be undertaken in accordance with the urban design certification. As my control is limited I have not considered effects any further in respect of these matters, though I do note that Rule 15.13.2.7 does include Maori cultural matters, which have been addressed by Mr Church, and which are reflected in consent conditions as volunteered by the applicant. Additional conditions have been volunteered around CPTED, paving treatments and servicing of the building, which are also adopted as part of this consent.

Visual amenity effects

The proposal seeks consent for a breach of the building continuity and setback rule, together with the continuous veranda rule. With reference to the proposed 1.7m building setback from the western boundary shared with Strand Lane, I have received advice from Council Senior Urban Designer Mr John Lonink who has referred to Mr
Church’s urban design assessment of the setback breach commenting “I agree with this viewpoint that the setback will enhance the Laneway by providing more opportunity for edge activation and a clearer movement corridor and would support this from an Urban Design perspective”. I concur with Mr Lonink’s assessment and must note that there is some crossover between the urban design certification and proposed building setback breach, although these activities are discrete from one another within the Plan provisions. Nonetheless, the applicant has provided a separate assessment of this rule breach within the AEE which I adopt for the purpose of this report.
In conclusion, I consider the effects of the reduced building setback from Strand Lane to be less than minor.

The site is located within the Central City Active Frontage and Veranda overlay which requires all sites to provide a veranda or other means of weather protection with continuous cover for pedestrians. This requirements fails to be met along the Colombo and Hereford Street elevations as shown in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2. Proposed site plan

I have sought specialist advice as to the effects of the veranda breach from Mr Lonink who has commented as follows:

“In regard to the non-compliance relating to a continuous veranda along Hereford Street and Colombo Street I couldn’t find clear reasoning as to why this level of pedestrian amenity is not provided.

The matters of discretion15.13.3.16 refer to:

1. the present and anticipated volume of pedestrian movement in the vicinity of the building concerned and any adverse effect on pedestrians.
2. the effect of not providing a veranda or other weather protection upon the use design and appearance of the building and adjoining buildings, the continuity of veranda provision along the street and the continuity of the street façade.”
The most important argument for providing a veranda relates to point 1, the expected amount of pedestrians and the level of amenity this provides for pedestrians. As mentioned in Tim Church's certification there is expected to be a high level of footfall in this area and providing a continuous veranda will provide the level of amenity expected within this area.

The proposed verandas along Hereford Street will provide an indication of where there will be an entrance to tenancies, however it will not provide the level of amenity a continuous veranda would provide for pedestrians. Although there might be an argument made for the design rationale of the building and the appearance of the building there has in my opinion not been a balanced assessment made why this would be of more importance than providing the level of pedestrian amenity as sought by the district plan.

Adding to that the Urban Design Panel mentioned there are ‘Design Cues’ to be found in the horizontal lines created by the first floor and the pattern of the curtain-wall façade that could provide a well-integrated veranda design.

For Colombo Street the argument is used that there are no adjacent buildings and as such no veranda would be required. If this was the only reason for providing a veranda this part of Colombo Street should not need a veranda requirement. The argument should be about balancing out pedestrian amenity versus design rationale / integrity of the building.

However by providing a veranda / roof cover over Cathedral Square the design of the building is actually making a compelling argument to provide a continuous veranda along Hereford Street and Colombo Street.

From an Urban Design perspective I would consider the current design does not achieve the level of weather protection the plan requires in this zone and in my view I can only see a strong compelling reason to actually provide a good level of continuous weather protection around the building to connect with the roof that is covering part of Cathedral Square.

There might be an architectural design rationale for not providing the veranda however I could not find this in the Assessment of effects."

I fully concur with Mr Lonink’s assessment of this breach and entered discussions with the applicant as to how these concerns are able to be addressed in order to avoid adverse effects on the environment.

The applicant provided a response on 30th May 2018. The response is able to be separated into ‘Effects on Colombo Street’ & ‘Effects on Hereford Street’.

Effects on Colombo Street

In terms of the effects of lack of veranda provision upon pedestrians travelling north/south along Colombo Street, the applicant has stated that the proposed canopy to the northern elevation provides weather protection to pedestrians within the Square which is currently fully exposed to the elements. The applicant also considers that the veranda along Strand Lane provides an alternative covered pedestrian route linking the Square with the BNZ centre. Additionally, the applicant notes that the internal building layout allows for the flow of pedestrians through the building during business hours as an alternative to Colombo Street. Architectural reasons for the breach are outlined, with the applicant stating that external structures that interfere with the simplicity of the building form and strong ‘landmark’ statement of the building have been purposely minimised.

I have taken this rationale into consideration and agree with Mr Lonink’s view that the proposed canopy to the Square provides a compelling argument to provide continuous cover. I therefore afford little weight to the architectural argument, particularly as the proposal is a new build with greater scope to include such structures.

With that said, I consider that on balance the combination of veranda/canopy provision to the north and western building elevations provides for sufficient weather protection which mitigates the adverse effects of the lack of cover to the Colombo Street elevation.

Effects on Hereford Street

Further to the above, the applicant has provided three verandas above the tenancies fronting Hereford Street. These measure 4.1m in width and cover approximately 29% of the Hereford Street frontage. While not continuous, the applicant considers that this provides a sufficient degree of weather protection, particularly when balanced against building design and appearance considerations.

It is clear from the response that the applicant considers that veranda provision is a concern for the overall architectural integrity of the building. Having visited the site, I acknowledge that the building will be highly visible from a number of vantage points, particularly from the Colombo / High Street intersection, but note that failure to provide pedestrian cover along road frontage is non-existent within the surrounding environment. I consider providing continuity of veranda provision along Hereford Street particularly important to ensure consistency with adjoining buildings and the general character of the street scene. From a practical point of view, I consider that pedestrians standing at the corner of Hereford & Colombo Street would expect shelter to be provided while waiting to cross this intersection. For the reasons listed above, I have recommended a condition specifying that a continuous or near-continuous veranda be provided along the Hereford Street elevation which I consider to be
the minimum level of provision that should be provided to offset the overall lack of verandas to active pedestrian frontages. The applicant has reviewed this condition and has agreed to providing cover to 68% of the Hereford Street frontage, specifically to the edge of the mezzanine level which occupies 30m of the 44m building length. The Urban Design Panel held on 19th April 2018 recommended the following in relation to continuous veranda provision:

‘The need to provide further pedestrian shelter particularly along Hereford Street - While this needn’t necessarily be continuous, the Panel believes more than the currently proposed doorway ‘lids’ would be desirable. Integration / expression of the edge of Level 1 floor plate might provide design cues for this, without compromising the legibility of the vertical structure / higher soffit.’

I rely on the above recommendation in respect of the reduction in continuous veranda provision along Hereford Street and note that the applicant has addressed the Panel’s recommendation. While not continuous, I consider this condition to provide enough consistency with the Plan provisions to ensure the adverse effects on pedestrians, adjoining buildings and the street scene will be less than minor.

In conclusion, I assess that although a better outcome would be achieved by providing continuous veranda cover to the south and eastern building elevations, the adverse effects of the veranda breach will be less than minor.

Effects on historic heritage

The proposal seeks to occupy 310m² of the Cathedral Square heritage item with a canopy and 7 columns. The canopy extends 6.9m into the Square along the full length of the site boundary and measures 9.8m in height. This activity requires consent for both buildings and earthworks within a heritage item and setting as outlined within the Planning Framework section of this report. In order to provide the necessary input into the level of effects of this activity on the heritage values of Cathedral Square, the applicant has submitted a Heritage Assessment by Ms Jenny May of Heritage Management Services. Ms May has provided an assessment of the activity against the relevant matters contained within Clause 9.3.6.1 of the Plan and has concluded that the effect of the activity on the heritage values, form and fabric of Cathedral Square would be no more than minor. In addition, Ms May has recommended the following measures to mitigate effects on the Square:

- Marking of ground treatment along boundary to visually retain south west end of the quadrant of the Maltese Cross

Council Senior Heritage Advisor Ms Fiona Wykes has reviewed the proposal, together with the Heritage Assessment provided by Ms May. Ms Wykes has backed the matter raised by Ms May in relation to the edge definition of the building with Cathedral Square, together with an additional comment regarding the large amount of solid plant located on the roof of the building, which has the potential to affect the views looking into the Square from High Street. In relation to the second point, I have taken into account the permitted baseline which permits a building of up to 28m within this zone, excluding plant rooms which are able to extend above the 28m limit. In addition, the proposed plant is not situated within the heritage item/setting and for these reasons I give weight to the effects that are able to be generated by a permitted building and associated roof plant.

In relation to the building edge definition, I have discussed Ms Wykes’ concerns with the applicant who has agreed to the following recommended condition:

“*The consent holder shall provide details of the Cathedral Square paving treatment along the boundary with the building prior to its installation. The details shall demonstrate how the proposed boundary treatment achieves effective definition of the edge of Cathedral Square.*”

Ms Wykes has accepted the wording of this condition and has concluded in her memo that the proposed works are acceptable with regards to heritage matters in the District Plan, subject to additional conditions requiring certification of the proposed paving treatment prior to the commencement of works, together with a photographic record pre and post-works, to ensure maintenance of Cathedral Square and the Former Chief Post Office Building. The applicant has agreed to the recommended conditions.

I concur with and adopt Ms Wykes’ assessment of the effects of the proposed canopy, columns and earthworks on the highly significant heritage item. Based on the advice received from both internal and external specialists, I consider the effects of the proposal on the adjacent heritage item to be less than minor.

Effects of lack of cycle parking provision

The applicant has confirmed that the proposal will not include the provision of cycle parking. The District Plan requires a total of 7 visitor and 10 staff spaces. The applicant has provided an assessment of this non-compliance
within Section 6.4 of the AEE which I adopt for the purposes of this report. In short, I concur that the 158 Hereford Street & 33 Lichfield Street parking buildings, which contain covered, secure cycle parking facilities within 130m & 230m of the subject site, are within walking distance for staff and visitors of the site. While undertaking a site visit, I counted 32 available cycle spaces within 158 Hereford Street, and 96 spaces within 33 Lichfield Street, which are able to offset the 10-space staff shortfall. An advice note recommending that the consent holder advises staff of available staff parking within walking distance of the site is recommended. With specific reference to staff parking, I note that advice note 1.b.ii. of Appendix 7.5.2 of the Plan, which states that staff cycle parking may be provided on a site within 200 metres of the site on which the activity is undertaken provided these are covered and in a secure area. I consider that for the reasons listed above, the staff cycle parking shortfall is able to be catered for. In terms of visitor cycle parking, it is also useful to mention that both sides of Colombo Street contain cycle racks within easy walking distance of the subject site. In conclusion, I consider the effects of the cycle parking shortfall to be less than minor.

NES

The application is a restricted discretionary activity under the NES due to the anticipated volume of soil to be disturbed/removed from the site. Regulation 10(3) of the NES lists the matters over which discretion is restricted. In relation to the E1 HAIL activity located on the site, the applicant has submitted a DSI and Contaminated Materials Management Plan. In order to determine the effects of the proposed earthworks on human health, I have relied upon specialist input form Council Senior Environmental Health Officer Ms Hannah Mirabueno. In terms of the proposed soil disturbance, Ms Mirabueno confirmed the asbestos, heavy metals and PAH contaminants with the soil and stated that the DSI has raised the potential of workers being affected if the soil were found to be corrosive. The applicant has stated that the contaminated soils are to be covered by the building and that no soil disturbance will be undertaken while the building remains on site, which is likely to be long term. Ms Mirabueno has assessed this aspect of the application and recommends a long term site management plan condition should any future activity expose the capping layer and pose a risk to human health, to which the applicant has agreed. In relation to the proposed soil removal, Ms Mirabueno assessed that the arsenic levels included within the DSI report exceeded the human health standards for commercial/industrial use, and that other metals and PAH’s at background levels cannot be taken to a cleanfill facility. As a result, Ms Mirabueno confirmed that additional testing would be required before disposal to such a facility i.e. Burwood landfill. Disposal of contaminated soils to a facility that is equipped to accept such material is therefore to be protected by way of condition, to which the applicant has agreed. A number of additional standard conditions have been recommended by Ms Mirabueno i.e. Site Validation Report/Contamination discovery, to which the applicant has agreed. In conclusion, I concur with and adopt Ms Mirabeuno’s assessment of the proposal for the purposes of this report and am satisfied that subject to the mitigation measures proposed within the application, together with recommended conditions, the works on site will be able to be appropriately managed so as to avoid adverse effects on human health.

Conclusion and recommendations

In conclusion, I consider that on balance, the proposal is acceptable in the context of the matters for discretion relative to each rule breach, resulting in less than minor adverse effects on heritage values, the street scene and the wider surrounding environment. Further to this, the activity shall be undertaken in accordance with the submitted urban design certification, ensuring compliance with Rule 15.13.2.7 – Commercial Central City Business zone urban design. Based on specialist input from Council Environmental Health Specialist’s, the proposed earthworks are able to be managed to avoid adverse effects on human health under the provisions of the NESCS. For the reasons listed above, I do not consider any persons to be adversely affected.

Recovery Plans and Regeneration Plans

Section 60(2) of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 requires that decisions and recommendations on resource consent applications are not inconsistent with Recovery Plans and Regeneration Plans. For restricted discretionary activities, Section 60(5) states that such plans are a matter over which discretion is restricted.

The application is considered to be consistent with the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan in that it adds to the aim of providing a compact commercial core, respects the surrounding views and vistas and does not affect the formation of the proposed Retail Precinct outlined in the Plan. The applicant has included an assessment of how
the proposal is consistent with the vision of the Central Recovery Plan, which I also adopt for the purpose of this report (See Section 7.1 of AEE).

Relevant provisions of a National Environmental Standard, National Policy Statement, Regional Plan, Regional Policy Statement or Coastal Policy Statement [Section 104(1)(b)]

The National Environmental Standard for managing contaminants in soil to protect human health has been discussed within the Planning Framework section of the report above. The District Plan gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and for the aforementioned reasons is considered to be consistent with this.

Other Section 104 matters

- In respect of section 104(1)(b) matters, the District Plan is considered to give effect to the relevant statutory documents, and accordingly my assessment is focused on the District Plan objectives and policies, which I consider as follows:

Chapter 4 – Hazardous substances and contaminated land

- The relevant objectives and policies are set out in Chapter 4 of the District Plan and are listed as follows:
  - Objective 4.2.2.1 Contaminated land – managing effects;
  - Policy 4.2.2.1 Best practice approach;
  - Policy 4.2.2.2 Remediation;
  - Policy 4.2.2.1.3 Future use

In giving effect to this objective and the supporting policies the District Plan defers to the provisions of the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health, which has been discussed and recommended upon in this report. I conclude that the application gives effect to these objectives and policies.

Chapter 15 – Commercial

- Objective 15.2.1 – Recovery of commercial activity. The proposal is considered to be consistent with this over-arching objective in that it provides commercial activities in the form of general retail and restaurant use that will support the recovery of the Commercial Central City Business zone.

- Objective 15.2.2 – Centres-based framework for commercial activities. The proposal is consistent with this objective in that commercial activity supports intensification within centres, whilst the vitality and amenity of the Central City Core will be enhanced through the range of retail and tourism-related activities that are to be provided.

- Objective 15.2.4 – Urban form, scale and design outcomes. The proposal is consistent with this objective in that the scale, form and design of the development provides a visually attractive, safe development that is easy to orientate and accessible to the general public. This wording of this objective relates strongly to Rule 15.13.2.7 of the Plan and the subsequent urban design certification that was submitted to achieve the matters listed within this rule. Subject to the certification, the application achieves this objective to the extent sought by the Plan.

- Policy 15.2.4.1 – Scale and form of development. The proposal is consistent with the policy in that the scale and form of the building reflects the context and character anticipated for the CCCB zone, as discussed within the urban design certification submitted on behalf of the applicant by Mr Tim Church.

- Policy 15.2.4.2 – Design of new development. The proposal was found to be complimentary to the scale, form and design of the existing built form and meets the general intent of this policy. However, the proposal is inconsistent with part (a)(i) of this policy which requires the encouragement of pedestrian activity and amenity along streets and in adjoining spaces. Specifically, the proposal fails to provide a veranda or other form of weather protection to the Colombo Street frontage and in this respect does not provide a sufficient level of amenity along the street.

- Policy 15.2.6.3 – Amenity. The proposal is consistent with this policy in that a full urban design certification was undertaken together with consultation with the relevant bodies (Matapopore Charitable Trust), to ensure that the proposal recognises the values of Ngāi Tūhuriri/ Ngāi Tahu in the built form, and the expression of their narrative.
Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee
10 April 2019
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Chapter 9 – Heritage

- I adopt the applicant’s assessment of the proposal against the following objectives and policies of Chapter 9:
  - Objective 9.3.2.1.1 – Historic Heritage
  - Policy 9.3.2.2.3 – Management of scheduled historic heritage
  - Policy 9.3.2.2.5 – Ongoing use of heritage items and heritage settings

The proposal is further consistent with Policy 9.3.2.2.4 – Archaeological sites, in that the applicant has been made aware of the process to be undertaken with HNZRTA should an archaeological site be discovered during construction-phase works.

Chapter 7 - Transport

- Policy 7.2.1.6 – Promote public transport and active transport. The proposal is not fully consistent with this policy in that it does not promote public and active transport due to the failure to provide for cycle parking. With that said, cycle parking is available for both staff and visitors within easy walking distance of the subject site. Specifically, 2 car parking buildings are located within close proximity of the site and provide safe and secure bike parking for future staff of the mixed use tenancies, whereas uncovered cycle racks along Colombo Street are within a short walking distance of the site for visitors. The effects of the failure to meet this policy are therefore able to be mitigated.

  In my opinion the application is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies in the Plan, as the proposal will aid with recovery of the central city area, and assist in revitalising the central city as a focal point for the people of Christchurch.

- I consider the proposal is consistent with the strategic directions objectives in Chapter 3 of the Christchurch District Plan.
- There are no other matters that are relevant and reasonably necessary to determine the application pursuant to section 104(1)(c).

**Recommendations**

That, for the above reasons:

A. **The application be processed on a non-notified basis** in accordance with Sections 95A - 95F of the Resource Management Act 1991.

B. **The application be granted** pursuant to Sections 104, 104C, 108 and 108AA of the Resource Management Act 1991, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall, except where directed by additional conditions below, proceed in accordance with the information and plans submitted with the application together with the urban design certification entitled ‘urban design review certificate’, submitted on behalf of the applicant by approved urban design expert Tim Church of Boffa Miskell and dated 8th May 2018. The Approved Consent Documentation has been entered into Council records as RMA/2018/1116 (214 pages).

2. The consent holder shall submit plans and information, to the Council’s Head of Resource Consents for certification prior to the occupation of the building, which demonstrates that:

   a. An interpretive panel, artwork, or similar display acknowledging the relationship of Ngai Tūhuriri/Ngai Tahu with the site or surrounding area is included within the development.

   b. Locally and/or sustainably sourced materials are included within the development.
c. Consideration has been given to design features that have regard to the relationship of Ngai Tūhuriri/ Ngai Tahu with Ōtautahi as a cultural element.

d. Consultation with Matapopore has informed the particulars proposed in respect of matters (a) – (c) in this condition.

Note: Condition 2 does not provide the ability to amend the plans beyond the scope of the resource consent as defined by condition 1. Any changes that are materially different from the application approved may require consideration via section 127 of the RMA.

3. The consent holder shall ensure a plan for external lighting and protective treatments to external column structures shall be reviewed by a suitably qualified professional experienced in applying Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles. The consent holder shall provide information in writing to the Council (attention: Manager – Resource Consents) confirming how these matters have been addressed in the finalised design of the building, prior to occupation of the building.

4. The consent holder shall ensure that the servicing requirements of the building, where vehicle access to Strand Lane is required, is time managed to occur between 11pm and 5am to minimise potential conflict between essential service functions, pedestrian movement and pedestrian-based activities. This condition does not include access required for emergency services, and to access utility infrastructure.

5. The consent holder shall ensure that the existing paving treatment in Cathedral Square under the northern canopy of the proposed building is reinstated prior to the occupation of the building to maintain a consistent treatment and integration with adjacent edges of the public space.

6. The consent holder shall ensure that the paving treatment within Cathedral Square and Strand Lane provides an even surface that complies with accessibility standards, and level café outdoor seating is provided at the north-west corner of the development.

7. A veranda or other method of weather protection shall be provided in order to provide continuous/near-continuous cover for pedestrians along that part of the Hereford Street frontage (southern elevation) of the building that has a mezzanine floor (level 1).

Please be advised that this condition does not prevent the erection of a veranda of the same design along Colombo Street should the consent holder wish to provide a veranda along this frontage for design reasons.

8. At least 10 working days prior to the commencement of works associated with this resource consent, the consent holder shall notify by email the Heritage Team Leader, Christchurch City Council (or nominee) of the intention to commence.

9. Photographic record: A photographic record of the listed façade and its treatment, together with the remainder of the site at 31 Cathedral Square (Item 609 & Setting 611) and 99 Cathedral Square (Item 98 & Setting 553), shall be undertaken prior to commencement of any work, during the work, and following the completion of the works. This record shall be provided to the Council, Attention of the Heritage Team Leader (or nominee), by way of email to romon@ccc.govt.nz and provided within three months of the completion of the work.

10. The consent holder shall provide details of the Cathedral Square paving treatment to be located along the northern site boundary of the building to Council’s Heritage & Regeneration teams prior to its installation (Contact Ms Fiona Wykes – fiona.wykes@ccc.govt.nz). The details shall demonstrate how the proposed boundary treatment achieves effective definition of the edge of Cathedral Square.

**NES Contaminated Soils**

11. The consent holder shall notify the Council five days before the start of any earthworks. The notification shall be by email to environcementmonitoring@ccc.govt.nz.

12. The works on the site shall occur in accordance with the information submitted with the application, including the procedures and measures outlined in the Contaminated Materials Management Plan (CMMPP), prepared by WSP OPUS, dated 12 April 2018.
13. The works shall be undertaken in accordance with the directions of an appointed contaminated land specialist / suitably qualified environmental practitioner.

14. All contaminated soils removed from the site must be disposed of at a facility whose waste acceptance criteria permit the disposal.

15. Evidence of any soil disposal such as weighbridge receipt or waste manifest should be submitted to the Christchurch City Council's Environmental Health Team within two months of completion of works. This should be emailed to envresourcemonitoring@ccc.govt.nz.

16. Any fill material imported to the site shall be cleanfill as defined in the Christchurch District Plan.

17. In the event of any unexpected hazardous materials or contaminated soils being found during the works e.g. visible staining, odours and/or other conditions that indicate soil contamination, then work must cease until a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Practitioner (SQEP) has assessed the matter and advised of the appropriate remediation and/or disposal options for these soils. Any remedial measures from the discovered contamination must be approved by the Christchurch City Council.

18. Within three (3) months of the completion of the works, a site validation report shall be prepared by the project's contaminated land specialist/ suitably qualified environmental practitioner (SQEP), and outlining the works undertaken. The site validation report shall include at least the following:

   a. Statement of the volumes of any soil disposed offsite and confirmation of disposal facility location;
   b. Confirmation of cleanfill materials imported to site including source of this material including any supporting analytical data where appropriate;
   c. Any additional soil testing results;
   d. Investigation of discovered contamination (if any).

19. Within three months of completion of earthworks, the applicant shall supply to the Council an ongoing, long term site management plan that informs the site owners on how any subsequent work on the property that may involve the handling or disturbing of soils, paving or the barrier may be carried out safely. This should be sent by email to envresourcemonitoring@ccc.govt.nz. The long term site management plan shall be approved and accepted by the Council.

Advice Notes

- The Council will require payment of its administrative charges in relation to monitoring, as authorised by the provisions of section 36 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The current monitoring charges are:
  
  (i) One inspection: A monitoring fee of $272 to cover the cost of setting up a monitoring programme and carrying out a site inspection to ensure compliance with the conditions of this consent; and
  
  (ii) Time charged at an hourly rate of $118.50 incl. GST if additional monitoring is required, including non-compliance with conditions.

- For the purposes of satisfying the heritage-related conditions of consent, the nominees for the Heritage Team Leader are Fiona Wykes, Senior Heritage Advisor, phone: 9418052 or email: fiona.wykes@ccc.govt.nz, or Brendan Smyth, Team Leader Heritage, phone: 9418934 or email: brendan.smyth@ccc.govt.nz.

- Information required to meet the conditions of this consent can be emailed to Council’s Monitoring Team at rcmont@ccc.govt.nz.

- With reference to the photographic record (Condition 9), it is preferable that the same poses are used for all photo sets i.e. before, during, and after the relevant works to enable comparison. Photographs should be labelled with the location, date and photographer’s name, and submitted with a plan of the building showing photo positions/locations. Photos can be submitted to the Council’s nominated Heritage team contact electronically by email, noting that Council’s email data transfer limit is 20MB per email, or via a file transfer website such as: wetransfer.com or dropbox.com to rcmont@ccc.govt.nz.
- This site may be an archaeological site as defined and protected under the provisions of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Archaeological sites are defined in the HNZPTA as any place in New Zealand where there is physical evidence of pre-1900 occupation, regardless whether the site is known or not, recorded in the NZAA Site Recording Scheme or not, or listed with Heritage New Zealand or the local council. Authority from Heritage New Zealand is required for any work that affects or may affect an archaeological site. Please contact the Heritage New Zealand regional archaeologist on 03 363 1880 or archaeologist@heritage.org.nz before commencing work on the land.

- The consent holder is advised to inform staff of the available cycle parking facilities located within both the 158 Hereford Street & 33 Lichtfield Street car parking buildings. These buildings contain safe and secure cycle parking at ground and first floor levels and are within walking distance of the subject site.

**Reported and recommended by:** Luke Wignall, Planner  
**Date:** 19.06.2018

**Decision**

That the above recommendations be adopted for the reasons outlined in the report.

[Signature]

Ward, Sean M  
25/06/2018 4:45 PM  
Principal Advisor - Resource Consents
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POLICY ON STRUCTURES ON ROADS

1. INTRODUCTION

Roads are first and foremost for vehicular and pedestrian use by the community at large, and only by exception will the Council consider applications for structures on or over roads, as set out in this policy.

Permitting structures on or over roads can contribute to a more flexible approach to building design that adds to the character of the city and its outlying areas. This policy presents a pragmatic approach to address the functional and service requirements generated by the public or individuals.

Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to enable Council to reasonably control the use of:

- Public road airspace and to protect the public from nuisance and inconvenience that may arise from these commercial activities (structures encroaching on airspace of roads).
- Public roads for private and commercial activities to occur without creating undue inconvenience to the public (structures encroaching on and under roads).

Scope
The policy applies to non-habitable structures:

(a) Over roads, including:

- Verandahs in business areas
- Overbuildings which make use of the airspace of a road for architectural features including balcony, oriel windows, egress facilities and building service plants
- Overbuildings which make use of the airspace of a road for increasing floor area
- Overbuildings which make use of the airspace of road for a pedestrian and/or vehicular air bridge

(b) Encroaching onto or under roads, including:

- Retaining structures, carports, garages, parking platforms, access ramps, cable-car stations and sub-surface vaults.
- Exoskeletal structures (also over roads)
- Infrastructural structures.
- Other defined structures.

General Approach

In applying this policy the Council will ensure that traffic flow and personal safety is enhanced.

The costs of maintenance and removal of (1) structures for which permits or other authorisations are required, and (2) private letter boxes rests solely with the owner.

An approval given under this policy only allows the use of airspace over or use of a road controlled by the Council. The applicant will also need to obtain any other consents, permits or authorisations that are required.

A written Council permit/consent/deed of licence/building consent will be issued for any authorisation granted under this policy.
Principles of this Policy

The following principles apply when considering applications under this policy:

- The effects on existing roads and the impact on any future road works are minimal.
- The structure over the road or encroaching on the road should not cause inconvenience or any safety issues to other road users.
- The road space is surplus to roading requirements generally.
- The public’s rights of access to the road are not unreasonably affected.
- The potential impact of proposals on heritage sites and other significant historical and cultural sites.
- The potential impact of any proposals on views and sight lines along roads, including but not limited to views towards significant buildings and structures, and towards significant natural features such as the Port Hills.

Definitions

For the purpose of this policy:

‘Air bridge’ means a structure providing a pedestrian and/or vehicle link.

‘Airspace’ means any part of the airspace above the surface of the road.

"Anchors" mean devices that fasten a retaining wall into adjacent, subsoil and/or rock for greater stability and strength.


‘Cable-car station’ means a station serving a cable car for goods and people.

‘Carport, garage/ parking platform’ means a structure that is used for parking a motor vehicle.

"Electric Vehicle Charging Structure (EVCS)" means a utility structure primarily used for recharging light electric road user charges vehicles (gross laden weight 3.5 tonnes or less) whose motive power is derived wholly or partly from an external source of electricity.

"Exoskeletal structure” means a retro-fitted external skeletal structure for earthquake strengthening an existing building which is anchored into the subsoil.

‘Non habitable structures’ means structures not authorised for living purposes

‘Information Bollards’ means bollards installed by Council to provide information to visitors to the city.

‘Overbuildings’ means any structure which extends into the airspace over a road and include enclosed balconies.

‘Permit’ means a permit or approval issued by the Council under the Public Places Bylaw 2008 and in accordance with this policy

‘Poster Bollard’ means a bollard installed by private company which has a contract with Council to promote events in the city.

‘Road’ means the whole of any land vested in Council for the purpose of a road and includes access ways and service lanes as defined in the Section 315 Local Government Act 1974. (A road includes the whole width of the road reserve, including areas set aside for use by vehicles, as well as areas set aside for pedestrians such as footpaths).

‘Retaining structures’ means structural walls supporting land, driveways, walking tracks or steps.

Seismic Movement Trench
Means any in-ground structure (self supporting) for the purpose of creating seismic isolation void to enable movement of a building or its framing to move within during a seismic event. The structure would be provided with a permanent and safe access cover complying with the Council’s roading and planning policies and standards.

‘Subsoil Space’ means any part of the subsoil under the surface of the road.

‘Verandahs’ means structures suspended or cantilevered from buildings generally built on boundaries and include canopies, sun blinds and awnings.

Alignment
The policy gives effect to the Public Places Bylaw 2008.

The policy also allows the Council’s decision making to be consistent with:

- Local Government Act 1974:
  - Section 319 General Powers of Council in respect of roads
  - Section 341 Leases of Airspace or subsoil of roads
  - Section 357 (2) Penalties for damage to roads
  - Section 334 Erection of monuments etc.
  - Section 339 Transport shelters
  - Section 344 Gates and cattle stops across roads.
- The Christchurch City Plan
- The Banks Peninsula District Plan
- The Stock Control Bylaw 2008

2. STRUCTURES ENCROACHING ON AIRSPACE OF ROAD

2.1. Verandahs in business areas
(Building consent required)

Scope
Verandahs (which includes canopies, awnings and sunblinds) are usually provided by building owners to provide protection and comfort to pedestrians in adverse weather conditions and in shopping precincts. In the central city it is a requirement for building owners to provide such facilities in defined locations (shown on planning map 39E of the City Plan).

Verandahs are also present in strip shopping precincts in many suburban locations and this policy will continue to permit their replacement, and the construction of new verandas in new developments where appropriate.

Policy Details
It is vital that the presence of verandahs does not affect road users, particularly drivers of motor vehicles. It is also equally important that these structures be permitted in locations where accidental damage by motor vehicles is unlikely, and for these reasons the following will apply:

(a) A verandah will only be permitted where there is a physical barrier between the verandah and the carriageway, e.g. a kerb and channel between building and the carriageway, and where there is a footpath.

(b) A verandah would normally be erected at a height of not less than 2.9 metres above the level of the footpath, creating a sufficient and comfortable environment for pedestrians, and taking into consideration the maintenance of significant streetscapes. It must extend from the supporting building to a distance of 500 millimetres inside a vertical line drawn from the face of the kerb to minimise the risk of the structure being damaged by larger motor vehicles travelling close to the kerb.

For consistency of verandah design it is vital that existing design requirements be preserved. The design requirements are:

(i) The fascia must not be less than 300 millimetres nor more than 450 millimetres in depth.

(ii) The roof covering of the verandah must be of weather resistant material and be provided with gutters and down pipes.

(iii) Ceilings of verandahs must be lined with material compatible with adjacent buildings - also in colouring.

(iv) A minimum lighting level of 5 lux under the verandah will be required to provide a level of safety to pedestrians during the hours of darkness.

(v) Canopies, sun blinds and awnings are restricted to an area of less than 5 m² where there is no appropriate stormwater disposal system.

2.2. Use of the airspace over roads for architectural features on buildings including balconies, oriel windows, egress facilities and building service plants. (Building consent required)

Scope
Previous bylaws and building standards permitted the use of airspace over roads for the above architectural features. This has led to some interesting building facades that form the road scenes.

A minor intrusion into the airspace of roads for these features will have insignificant implications for road users, but any intrusions will require the input of the Council’s Urban Design Panel, or other formally recognised advisory design panels or committees.

This policy will permit minor intrusions to the airspace of roads to create some flexibility for building owners in their building designs, the placements of building plants and services attached to buildings, for structural strengthening of buildings, re-cladding of buildings and any other minor modifications of buildings.

Policy Details
Airspace over roads is generally available for adjacent properties for the above mentioned features. For new buildings the features must not be less than

(a) 2.6m above existing footpath level;
(b) 6.0m above existing road level; and
(c) the horizontal projection shall generally not exceed 1.0m.
The following design parameters have been used to control the minor intrusions in the past:

(i) Architectural features at a height of not less than 2.60m above the footpath level or 4.50m where no footway has been formed and constructed.

(ii) The horizontal projection shall generally not exceed 1m.

2.3. Use of the airspace over roads for increasing the floor area of a building (Resource consent, Building consent, and Deed of Licence required)

Scope
The Council will not generally grant rights to airspace above roads for the sole purpose of creating additional floor space (for an overbuilding) unless there are exceptional circumstances, such as where there is a clearly demonstrated need for increased floor space that cannot be met in any other way (i.e. by expansion upwards, sideways or backwards, or by moving to another site). When considering a request to grant rights to use airspace over a road for this purpose, the Council must be satisfied that the policy details below are met.

Policy Details
1. The proposed overbuilding must:
   (a) Act as a landmark.
   (b) Provide an additional viewing point.
   (c) Provide an opportunity for an architectural statement.

2. An application under this section of the policy will be considered in the following circumstances:
   a) Where the design and location of the structure will not cause excessive shading at road level, or block light and views from adjoining buildings.
   b) If there are already over-buildings close by, building further structures will not have an adverse cumulative effect.
   c) Potential building movement caused from base isolation foundations during a significant seismic event leading to damage to road infrastructure above the ground, such as light columns, traffic signal poles, wires, street trees, bus stops, etc., from permitted overbuilding above the road.

3. The terms and conditions for using airspace over roads for increasing floor area will be negotiated by the Council's Corporate Services Unit. The terms and conditions may include (without limitation):
   (a) The use to which the structure can be put; and/or
   (b) Design requirements which must be to the Council’s satisfaction through the Urban Design Team’s approval process.

2.4. Use of the airspace over roads for a pedestrian and/or vehicular air bridge. (Resource consent, Building consent, and Deed of Licence required)

Scope
The Council will not generally grant rights to airspace above roads for the sole purpose of creating air bridges. When considering a request to grant rights to use airspace over a road for this purpose, the Council must be satisfied that the policy details have been met.
Policy Details
1. Any proposal will need to meet a significant number of the following conditions or results:
   (a) There are high levels of pedestrian traffic in the vicinity, some of which would be usefully diverted to an elevated walkway, without reducing the amount of pedestrian activity on the road to a level which detrimentally affects the vitality of existing activities on the road.
   (b) A more direct link or a choice of routes between public buildings or places of interests (including car parking buildings) will be created.
   (c) The new structure will act as a landmark.
   (d) The new structure will provide an additional viewing point.
   (e) The new structure will provide an opportunity for an architectural statement.
2. An application under this section of the policy will be considered in the following circumstances:
   (a) Where the design and location of the structure will not cause excessive shading at road level, obstruction of footpaths or block light and views from adjoining buildings.
   (b) Where joining buildings across the road will not result in excessively bulky built form.
   (c) Where the structure can be joined to the host building/s in an architecturally sympathetic way.
   (d) If there are already other air bridges or overbuilding close by, building further structures will not have an adverse cumulative effect.
   (e) Where the alignment and location of the structure will not detract from views nor compromise the basic grid layout and urban form of the City Centre and the general openness of the road system.
3. The terms and conditions for a licence to occupy airspace will be negotiated by the Council's Corporate Support Unit. The terms and conditions may include (without limitation):
   (a) The use to which the structure can be put; and/or,
   (b) Design requirements which must be to the Council's satisfaction.

3. STRUCTURES ENCROACHING ON ROADS

3.1 Retaining structures, carports, garages, parking platforms, access ramps, and cable-car stations. (Resource consent, Building consent, and Deed of Licence required)

Scope
The request to build such non-habitable structures often arise from owners in the hill areas where the terrain is steep and difficult. A majority of these properties were created prior to 1974 when vehicle access to properties was not required for subdivisions.
There are also requests from owners to build retaining structures on roads to support their properties following landslips or potential landslips that have been identified.

Property owners have a legal right of access onto a road and for this reason driveways in the older hill suburbs are often supported by retaining structures built on a legal road.

Likewise, there are a number of properties having exclusive use of parcels of legal roads for carports, garages, parking platforms, access ramps and cable-car stations. These have significant advantages to occupiers and at the same time help to ease on-road parking pressures on roadways. The garage sites have also been used as one of the tools to enable residential developments in difficult terrain.

Boat sheds are excluded from this policy.

Policy Details
1. Any proposal will need to meet the following criteria:
   (a) The structures do not cause any safety issues to any road users including pedestrians, cyclists and other commuters.
   (b) Legal right of access is maintained for individual property owners.
   (c) There is no conflict with the likelihood of future roadway widening or alterations.
   (d) The applicant is unable to construct the structure on his or her land because of the nature of the terrain.
   (e) The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the Christchurch City Plan Vol. 3, Part 13 Transport, or the Banks Peninsula District Plan Part VI, Chapter 35 Access, Parking and Loading.
   (f) The road environment, and any council or other utility services, are not unduly compromised with the presence of the structure.
   (g) The visual intrusion to the roadscape will have minimal effect on road users, and landscape mitigation measures must be provided when required.
   (h) Detached garaging is principally provided for storage of motor vehicles and other modes of transport.
   (i) Only one single garage site per residential allotment will be considered when that site does not front the occupier’s property and a licence to occupy under such circumstances shall be terminated when alternative garagable space facilities complying with the rules of the City Plan or District Plan have been achieved on the occupier’s property.

2. If the Council is satisfied with the above criteria, the owner is required to:
   (a) Enter into a Deed of Licence to occupy legal road with the Council. Such licence will be transferable to future owners with the Council’s consent.
   (b) Obtain resource and building consents as appropriate

For Existing Structures:
(a) An occupier of a structure on a road normally has a licence granted by the Council. The licence is transferable to future owners of the property with the Council’s consent.

(b) The licence to occupy for a carport or garage shall be terminated when alternative garage facilities complying with the rules of the City Plan have been achieved on the occupier’s property.

3.2 EXOSKELETAL STRUCTURES

Exoskeletal Structures are retrofitted externally to a building occupying airspace, the surface and subsoil of road land (Building Consent and Deed of Licence required)

Scope
In the post-earthquake environment developers and landowners are utilising retro-fitted exoskeletal structures to meet the new requirements of the earthquake code. Exoskeletal structures provide an external steel cage to wrap an existing building that avoids more expensive solutions such base isolated foundations or internal steel bracing. External bracing also ensures that the loss of leasable floor space is minimised.

Depending on the construction methodology and the District Plan rules exoskeletal structures can extend into the public road airspace, surface and subsoil to accommodate the pillars and the ground anchors.

Policy Details
The provision of bracing pillars and ground anchors in the public road should not impede road users, particularly pedestrians, or other street infrastructure. In order to accommodate this engineering innovation, minimise disruption to road users and facilitate the post-earthquake rebuild the following will apply:

(a) Except for the Central City Zone All external exoskeletal structures would not normally be permitted to occupy road land, airspace and subsoil outside the Central City Zone. This relates to the narrower footpath standards in the suburban centres.

(b) All underground services would be protected from the structure, no structures on the road being interfered with or obstructed (including verandahs), and allows full public use of the road. Occupation of the footpath should be minimised and the ground anchors should be covered to eliminate trip hazards. The maximum allowable obstruction of a central City footpath (minimum width 3 metres excluding the kerb) would be 200 mm. If the footpath is less than 3 metres the maximum allowable encroachment will be 100 mm. The circumstances may include but are not limited to the older suburban centres (e.g. Lyttelton, Merivale, Riccarton, etc.), heritage, historical and cultural sites, aesthetics and natural and pre-existing features. These applications would be considered on a case by case basis only. The relocation of underground and above ground services (e.g. gas, electricity, water, sewage, telecoms cables, etc.) must be carried out at the developer’s expense and must meet the standards applicable to the utility provider. The structure must comply with the Council's Urban Design Guidance and Crime Prevention through Environmental Design principles.

(c) For the whole of Christchurch. Exoskeletal structures to earthquake strengthen new buildings will not be permitted to occupy road land in any manner (airspace, surface and subsoil).

3.3 STRUCTURES ENCROACHING ON THE SUBSOIL OF ROADS
Seismic Movement Trenchs to accommodate the movement zone of adjoining base isolated structures (Building Consent and Deed of Licence required)

Scope
In the post earthquake environment developers and landowners are utilising base isolation foundations to meet the new requirements of the earthquake code. This method is being used particularly in the Central City. Base isolation foundations allow a building to move in accordance with the waves created by an earthquake, but uses technology that dampens and decelerates the actual tremors and therefore are more likely to reduce the risks of injury, damage and building failure.

Depending on the construction methodology and the District Plan rules base isolation foundations can extend into the public road subsoil to accommodate the zone of movement, and occasionally the elements of the foundations themselves.

Policy Details
The provision of vaults in the public road subsoil should not impede road users, particularly pedestrians. In order to accommodate this engineering innovation, minimise disruption to road users and facilitate the post earthquake rebuild the following will apply:

(a) Except for the Central City Zone All base isolation foundations should be constructed within the property boundary to include the movement zone (+/- 400 – 750 mm) whenever feasible. This would include a sacrificial zone horizontal cover at the access to the building from the street that may move or deform in a significant seismic event. All building movement should be contained within the private lot.

(b) For the Central City and exceptionally elsewhere Build to the boundary of the road (within the private lot) all the foundations including base isolation installations. This entails allowing a sacrificial zone horizontal cover at the building’s access that may move or deform across the adjacent road typically between +/- 400 and 750 mm in a significant seismic event. All underground services would be protected from potential movement, no structures on the road being interfered with or obstructed, and allows full public use of the road outside significant seismic events. Damage to the footpath should be minimised and the underground vaults should be covered to eliminate trip hazards. The exceptional circumstances may include but are not limited to the older suburban centres (e.g. Lyttelton, Merivale, Riccarton, etc.), heritage, historical and cultural sites, aesthetics and natural and pre-existing features. These applications would be considered on a case by case basis only and is likely to apply mainly to the central City. The relocation of underground services (e.g. gas, electricity, water, sewage, telecoms cables, etc.) must be carried out at the developer’s expense and must meet the standards applicable to the utility provider.

3.4 Essential Service Structures
(Council authorisation required)

Scope
These structures include:

(a) waste or water pump plants
(b) waste container compounds
(c) Council information bollards
(d) stock under passes
(e) public bike stands
(f) bus shelters
(g) traffic mirrors
(h) other utility structures.

Policy Details
The locations of existing structures resulted from past actions of the Council and were placed for their practical function and convenience.

In determining the location of any new such structures, the following assessment matters must be satisfied:

(a) Safety of all road users including pedestrians, cyclists and other commuters is not comprised.
(b) Legal right of access is maintained for individual property owners and users.
(c) There is no conflict with likely future roadway widening or alterations.
(d) The proposal is consistent with the Council’s Activity Management Plans and LTCCP.

In the event of concerns arising from existing structures, the structure will be Assessed in terms of (a), (b) and (c) above.

Note: There are existing public utility infrastructures on roads, including telecommunication, electricity, gas and postal services. The placing and maintenance of such infrastructure is determined by statutory powers, exercised in consultation with local authorities.

3.5 Other Structures
Scope
These structures include

- Installations such as artwork, support structures for verandahs (which includes sunblinds, awnings and canopies), or buildings, outdoor advertising, commercial bike stands, and fences. (Permit required).
- Other structures for which Council has contracts or agreements for e.g. poster bollards, information stations, private bus shelters (Adshels). (Permit required).
- The provisions for gates and cattle stops encroaching onto the road reserve, (providing access to a property or placed across a road), are determined by the provisions of Sections 344 and 357 of the Local Government Act 1974. (Permit required).
- Fences within a road corridor are generally not authorised. However in exceptional circumstances written applications may be considered under Section 357 of the Local Government Act 1974. (Permit required).
- Private letter boxes in rural areas or where they are not adjacent to formed footpaths. No written permit is required unless its replacement is in conflict with Policy Details (a) – (e) below
- Anchors for private retaining walls that may need to encroach into the road land subsoil. A permit will be given providing the anchors are at least 2.5 metres below the road surface and are not in conflict with Policy Details (a, b, c, f & i) below.

- Electric Vehicle Charging Structures for the recharging of electrically powered vehicles. A site licence will be given providing the recharging structure is not in conflict with Policy Details (a) to (i) below.

Policy Details
In determining the location of such structures, the following assessment matters must be satisfied:

(a) Traffic safety is not compromised.

(b) Pedestrian movements and access to private properties are not unduly compromised.

(c) There is no conflict with utility services.

(d) There is no affect on business entranceways.

[Note: The shifting of an existing letter box necessitated by a new entrance is the responsibility of the owner].

(e) Consultation has been carried out with building and business owners.

(f) Issues arising in sensitive cultural and natural environments must be addressed e.g. adjacent to waterways, historical sites, indigenous sites, and heritage buildings.

(g) Outdoor advertising must comply with the requirements of the City Plan Vol. 3 Part 10 Heritage and Amenities or the Banks Peninsula District Plan Part VI Chapter 34 Signs.

(h) Fences within the road corridor will be considered on a case by case basis, and only where no other practical alternatives exist, or where public safety benefits are enhanced.

(i) There is no other practicable option available

4. Obtaining a Permit/Authorisation

Application forms can be obtained through Customer Services phone 941 8999 or downloaded from the Christchurch City Council website www.ccc.govt.nz/policies/

The application form sets out the information needed to accompany each permit (as appropriate) and where to send the completed application.

5. Fees

Fees and charges are set out in the Council’s Schedule of Fees and Charges, which is available on request and can be found on the Council’s website. The fees and charges are revised on an annual basis.

Permit fees may include the costs of permitting, monitoring and enforcement.
The Council reserves the right to charge rental fees for all commercial activities on a public road. The rent will be set at a level that reflects the location to ensure that businesses solely on private property are not unfairly disadvantaged.

The permit applicant must pay the full permit fee and supply all the required documentation before the permit will be issued.

6. Delegations

Decision making authority for the policy is to be exercised as follows:

- Clauses 2.1, 2.2 (when the structure does not extend more than 2 metres) and 2.3 (when the overbuilding extends no further than 2.5 metres): The Chief Executive, or a nominated manager.

- Clauses 2.2 and 2.3 (for both in all other cases) and 2.4: The Council, advised by the relevant Community Board.

- Clauses 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.5: The Chief Executive, or a nominated manager.

- Clause 3.4: The Chief Executive, or a nominated manager, as advised by the relevant Community Board.

The delegations will be reviewed by the Council from time to time.
19 APRIL 2018

By Email: peter.marshall@warrenandmahoney.com; richardh@aoteanz.com

Dear Richard and Peter

Urban Design Panel – 9 Cathedral Square – 11 April 2018

The above Panel considered your application on 11 April 2018. Please find below the confirmed comments from that meeting.

In response to the material circulated and the review meeting, the Panel thanks the applicant for their attendance and commends the applicant on the brief and on the:

- Boldness of their project brief and the clarity of their design proposal. The Panel supports the poetic design approach taken, and the commitment to high quality architecture with the intent to create a landmark project on this important site.
- Narrative-driven intent of the design.
- Collaborative approach of the design process and the engagement with key stakeholders.
- Civic nature of the design, in particular its address towards Cathedral Square.
- Intent to carry through the quality of design to developed and detail design, including the pursuit of high quality lighting and glazing systems.

A. KEY DESIGN AND CONSENT RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Recommendations on matters to be addressed for Panel support of the application"

The Panel:

1. Recognises that a robust narrative that aligns with and is differentiated from surrounding cultural narratives is critical to this ‘legacy landmark’ project and recommends further development of the narrative specific to the immediate context through continued dialogue with Matapopore. This could include:

   - Acknowledgement of noble trees common to the natural landscape of the city to reveal pre-existing ecologies (Refer to: http://lucas-associates.co.nz/ecosystems/wet-plains.html, ‘Kahikatea Ecosystem’. e.g. tī kouka; kaikomako; mahoehoe etc);

   - Inclusion of te reo Māori within design development to support the developed narrative;

   - Intended collaborative development of design and artworks with Matapopore is commendable and will further enhance the depth and clarity of story told.

2. Supports the encroachment of the roof and colonnade onto Cathedral Square in the manner indicated on the basis that the area it encroaches on remains part of the public realm of the Square (the public members are not prevented from accessing the space in perpetuity).

3. Considers that the building should retain the Maltese Cross form of the Square through emphasising the edge of the Square. While the currently proposed glazing line defines this edge, the Panel notes other design mechanisms, such as the paving patterns and threshold treatments.
4. Considers that while important to maintain the clarity of the design there are several aspects that need to be better addressed in the development of the design. These include:

- The need to further emphasise the South East corner to address the building’s relationship with High Street and the traditional connections to the Port Hills/Banks Peninsula. An option could be to recess the glass façade to externalise column number 1. This (or similar design moves) would enable a degree of differentiation of the corner, more legible expression of the sculptured column/soffit to this important diagonal approach and provide some shelter on the corner (potentially in combination with tenancy entries.)

- The need to provide further pedestrian shelter particularly along Hereford Street. While this needn’t necessarily be continuous, the Panel believes more than the currently proposed doorway ‘lids’ would be desirable. Integration / expression of the edge of Level 1 floor plate might provide design cues for this, without compromising the legibility of the vertical structure / higher soffit.

- Given the profile and significance of the site, and the landmark potential of the design, the Panel strongly recommends further design development is tested and demonstrated within the 3D model of the broader urban context, using key viewpoints such as from across the square and approach along High Street.

B. SECONDARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Further improvements and value added recommendations"

The Panel:

5. Notes that given the height and location of the building, and delicate design of the roof, the design of the roof top elements is very important. Hence restricting the plant area and height and ensuring they’re located well clear of roof edges and long approach views (Across the Square / Along High Street) will be important.

6. Considers, given the importance of expressed structure, and transparency of façade, the building will need a clear and balanced signage strategy.

7. Considers that environmental systems, including solar mitigation, ventilation, building services systems will need to be carefully integrated in the design of the building.

8. Advocates Strand Lane’s design for mixed use - including servicing / loading and unloading (for this site and the adjoining) as well as for pedestrian use day and night.

9. Advises that CPTED considerations and activity in Strand Lane are important and encourages the applicant to continue conversations with the neighbours to create a successful mix-use Lane.

10. Notes that the level changes across the site need to be integrated in a structured manner. This may provide cues as to how the building thresholds work to Hereford Street, along with the tenancy doors and shelter aspect noted above.

PLEASE NOTE:

The Urban Design Panel is an advisory body only. The Panel has no statutory decision making powers. The Panel’s recommendations are to assist you in the refinement of your development proposal and the reporting Council officer will take its advice into account when processing any resource consent applications. The decision on any application rests with the Council.
The Christchurch City Council understands that you may wish to refer to the Urban Design Panel recommendations in the promotion of your development proposal. Please note the comments are not intended for publication.

To further discuss the Panel's recommendations please contact Josie Schroder (Council Urban Design Panel facilitator) at josie.schroder@ccc.govt.nz.

Please feel free to contact me in regards to any administrative matters (as the Council Urban Design Panel administrator) at mark.saunders@ccc.govt.nz.

Yours sincerely

Mark Saunders
Hearings Advisor
Community Support, Governance & Partnerships Unit
Customer & Community Group
9 Cathedral Square - Tree Assessment

This tree report was commissioned by Lynette Ellis, Manager Planning and Delivery - Transport, Christchurch City Council. The report provides an assessment of potential effects and tree related recommendations for the proposed development of 9 Cathedral Square.

The proposal includes the construction of building foundations and a canopy supported by pillars, the relocation of underground utility services and changes to levels within the vicinity of three Common Lime (*Tilia x europaea*) trees in raised planters on the southern side of Cathedral Square.

Cathedral Square, including the road corridor where the trees are located is listed in the District Plan as a Heritage Item, and the trees are part of the heritage fabric of the site. Two of the raised planters contain commemorate plaques, including a tree presented by Operation Deepfreeze (USN) in 1973 (32586) and a tree planted by Her Majesty the Queen in 1977 (32587).

A memorandum was provided to Richard Holland, Team leader Asset Planning Transport on 24 August 2018 regarding the potential for the proposed building encroachment into Cathedral Square to have a significant adverse effect on the trees due to excessive pruning and construction related damage. At that time the applicant’s drawings (A03.003, dated 28 May 2018) showed the trees at less than half their actual size, and the construction requirements and methodologies within the vicinity of the trees had not been outlined by the applicant.

The trees will require clearance pruning for the proposed veranda during construction and for the ongoing maintenance and use of the site, and at that stage it was not possible to quantify the extent of pruning required. To assess the potential effects especially in relation to the pruning required it was necessary to establish the proximity of the trees to the proposed building foundations, canopy and pillars, and confirm the access requirements (e.g. scaffolding, crane access, etc.) and all other construction requirements that may affect the trees.

Since the 24 August 2018 memorandum was produced, further site investigations have been carried out. This included measuring the trees in relation to the proposed structures and the use of ground penetrating radar to estimate the extent of tree roots that extend beyond the planters.

A site meeting with the applicant and Council staff was held on 25 March 2019 to clarify the building construction requirements and the likely effects on the trees. At the meeting the following points were clarified.

- The extent and expected situation of the building frontage, pillars and edge of the building canopy in relation to the trees.
- The anticipated construction methodologies.
- The alteration of services in the pavement between the building and the trees.
- The construction of building foundations and changes to the pavement levels.

The information provided by the applicant at the site meeting has addressed the main concerns that were outlined in the 24 August 2018 memorandum. This tree assessment is based upon the information provided by the applicant at the site meeting and the site measurements provided in the resource consent application.

It is expected that the proposed building development can proceed with minor potential effects on the trees.

- The tree canopies are not expected to be significantly modified, as a relatively small percentage of the tree canopies will require pruning due to the change in site use, and encroachment of the building canopy and possibly the pillars.
- It is expected that the relocation of utility services, the construction of building foundations and changes to the pavement levels can be carried out without resulting in significant adverse effects on the health of the trees.
9 Cathedral Square - Tree Assessment

Effects on tree canopies

The proposed building canopy will encroach into the tree canopies (as shown in Figure 1 below).

![Figure 1: Proximity of the proposed building canopy to the trees.](image)

The building canopy will be approximately 10.0 metres high and will extend to the outer edges of the upper tree canopies, as shown in Figure 2.

At the site meeting the applicant confirmed that the building canopy and pillars can be installed with only minor tree pruning being required, as those features are modular and can be craned into place and attached without affecting the trees.

The applicant also confirmed that additional pruning for construction access and scaffolding will not be required. This will negate the potential risk of additional pruning being required during construction.

Minor pruning within the upper tree canopies will be required for construction and initial tree clearance from the northern edge of the building canopy.

It is expected that the majority of the tree canopies can be retained under the building canopy, and minor pruning may be required for construction and initial clearance of the pillars.

The existing standard is to provide at least 1.0m clearance from buildings/structures, and this extent of pruning is not expected to result in a significant change to the shape of the trees.

![Figure 2: Proximity of proposed building canopy to the largest tree (32585).](image)
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Raising the height of the tree canopies will assist with construction and site use. The lower canopies of the trees are currently approximately 2.7 to 3.0 metres above ground, and the tree canopies could be raised to achieve 3.5 to 4.0 metres ground clearance without resulting in a significant change to the shape of the trees.

The proposed building canopy will result in a reduction in sunlight to the southern sides of the tree canopies during mid-summer. It is expected that the potential adverse effects of the shading created by the building canopy will not be significant. A relatively small percentage of the tree canopies will be shaded during mid-summer only, and the majority of the tree canopies will not be shaded by the building canopy at any time.

The subject trees are not yet fully grown. The largest Cathedral Square tree of the same species and within a raised planter is approximately 25 percent larger than the subject trees. The natural canopy shape of the tree species is broadly columnar (more upright than broadly spreading). It is expected that the canopies of the subject trees will continue to grow and develop around the edge of the proposed building canopy without having a significant effect on the long term development of the trees.

Following construction, periodic pruning of the trees will be required to maintain clearance from the building canopy and pillars. Any initial and future pruning of the trees is expected be managed by Council and carried out by Council’s tree maintenance contractor.

Clearance of debris produced by the trees is expected to be managed by the building owner.

Effects at ground level and below ground

The subject trees are located centrally within raised planters, with the tree bases approximately 3.0 metres from the southern sides of the planters. Previous ground penetrating radar investigations along the southern edge of the planters identified only one isolated area where tree roots have grown beyond the edge of a planter (tree 32586).

The proposed building foundations will be constructed approximately 4.5 to 5.0 metres from the southern edges of the tree planters, and beyond the canopy spread of the trees. The clearance distance between the trees and the building foundations is appropriate, and is not expected to result in a significant reduction in root mass, soil volumes, water or drainage available to the trees. It is expected that the construction of the building foundations will not result in adverse effects on the tree root systems or canopies.

The relocation of underground services will occur within the road corridor area between the raised planters and the proposed building foundations. This will require trenches to be excavated within the paved area on the southern side of the trees. The utility service works can be carried out using methodologies that identify, retain and protect tree roots, and it is expected that this can occur without resulting in an adverse effect on the tree root systems or canopies.

Changes in paving levels are required within Cathedral Square to match the proposed building floor levels. This will result in an increase in the height of the paving by approximately 0.5 metre at the eastern end of the site. Due to the majority of the tree roots systems being confined to the planters, the proposed changes in paving levels are not expected to result in an adverse effect on the trees.

Further design work is required regarding the changes in paving and any modifications to the raised planters. The raised planters may be providing structural support to the tree root systems. Also, there may be opportunities to increase the amount of soil available to the trees, which could benefit the trees in the long term.
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Recommendations for any conditions of approval

1. A suitably experienced and qualified arborist should be engaged by the applicant to provide tree protection advice and supervision to ensure that tree protection occurs during the building development works.

2. The applicant should produce a tree protection plan that is to be approved by the Council’s Arborist before the commencement of any site works within the vicinity of the subject trees. The tree protection plan should be comprehensive and address all aspects of the works, including any associated utilities and infrastructure.

3. Further arboricultural assessments should be carried out prior to and during construction to confirm that the final design and construction methodologies are appropriate, and to ensure that the protection of trees is achieved.

4. The applicants arborist should be on site to assist within tree related investigations, provide tree protection advice and supervise any activities within the vicinity of the trees that have the potential to cause damage to the trees.

5. All tree pruning should be managed by Council, carried out by Council’s tree maintenance contractor, and be limited to the extent of pruning that is specified by the Council’s Arborist.

6. Any debris produced by the trees that affect the building and associated structures should be managed by the building owner.

Laurie Gordon
Arborist
1. Introduction:

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide an assessment of effects, in accordance with Christchurch City Council’s District Plan (CDP), with regard to the heritage values of Cathedral Square in relation to a proposal to erect a commercial building at 9 Cathedral Square.

1.2. Cathedral Square (and its setting including the adjacent road reserve), is a highly significant (Group 1) scheduled heritage item in the CDP, Appendix 9.3.7.2 Schedule of Significant Historic Heritage; list number 98.

1.3. While Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) lists some buildings on the perimeter of the Square, the Christchurch Cathedral and monuments in Cathedral Square, Cathedral Square itself is not listed by HNZPT in its list of Historic Places. However, the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 defines an archaeological site as a place associated with pre-1900 human activity and as such any work at 9 Cathedral Square or on the Cathedral Square site may be subject to an Archaeological Authority. It should be noted that Cathedral Square contains a recorded archaeological site (M35/489) relating to a burial site uncovered in 1995. I note that the applicant is aware of the HNZPT Act archaeological requirements.

1.4. The CDP notes in its assessment of the heritage values associated with Cathedral Square that Cathedral Square was laid out in the 1849 and 1850 within plans prepared for the Canterbury Association by surveyor Edward Jollie. The Square’s design was in a Maltese Cross form and was originally known as Ridley Square but changed to Cathedral Square in 1851. Over the 19th century buildings were built around the boundary of the Square in a manner that retained and respected this form. Over time the land of the Square became a transport hub and network of roads and tram tracks. Cathedral Square has been redesigned over the years to reflect a shift from a transport centre to a largely people and activity focused central city public space. Following the closure of the road in front of the Cathedral in 1965 the Square became steadily pedestrianised but always in a manner that retained and respected the essential elements of the historical layout and Maltese Cross form.

1.5. Of particular note to this application is the discussion within the Cathedral Square Assessment of Significance CDP, Appendix 9.3.7.2, Schedule of Significant Historic Heritage, under Contextual Significance. The CDP notes that contextual significance are those values or that “...demonstrate or are associated with: a relationship to the environment (constructed and natural), a landscape, setting, group, precinct or streetscape; a degree of consistency in terms of type, scale, form, materials, texture, colour, style and/or detail; recognised landmarks and landscape which are recognised and contribute to the unique identity of the environment.” Cathedral Square is scheduled and assessed as having high contextual significance within central Christchurch noting that the intersection of Worcester and Colombo Streets forms the axis for the four quadrants of ...
the Maltese Cross form. The CDP heritage assessment notes that the wider contextual significance links the Square with the other central city squares, Cranmer, Latimer and Victoria, and "...terminates one end of the city’s main ceremonial boulevard (Worcester) which links it with the educational quarter and Hagley Park, bisects the city’s ‘main’ street (Colombo) and provides an axial centre from which the city radiates." Cathedral Square which includes its specific form, is a significant landmark in Christchurch and contains within it and on its perimeter a number of scheduled heritage items.

2. Proposal Overview

2.1. The proposed new building will be sited in the south west quadrant of Cathedral Square at the Hereford and Colombo Street intersection. The north façade of the building abuts the Cathedral Square boundary. To the immediate west within the south west quadrant is the former central city Chief Post Office, also a highly significant scheduled heritage item in Appendix 9.3.7.2 of the CDP and listed as a Category 1 Historic Place under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.

2.2. The proposed new building is 14,500mm in height at the recessed third level. It has a verandah canopy which is a seamless extension of the roof at the second level at 10,450mm. This canopy and its associated timber columns, which flow from internal to external, protrude into both the air and physical space of the Square for some 770mm. In considering the proposal to extend the design elements into the Square I am of the opinion that they do not present a negative effect in relation to the view shafts of the former central city Chief Post Office.

2.3. The building design features columns of an organic nature inspired by the Canterbury landscape – its flora and rivers. These move through the exterior to the interior of the building and reflect much about the history of place, the braided nature of Canterbury rivers and the original forestation of the area.

2.4. The columns also complement in part the design intent of Regenerate Christchurch’s current proposals for the Square which seek to reference history and a sense of place and as such this provides a continuity of design form within the Square.

2.5. Canopied verandahs have traditionally been on the buildings in this quadrant and in particular on the site subject of this consent application. The site at 9 Cathedral Square originally housed the former United Service Hotel (image 1) which had a canopied verandah and poles that extended into the Square space; the ANZ bank building (image 2) previously on this site after the demolition of the United Service Building also had a canopied verandah – this was cantilevered. The latter building was demolished as a result of seismic damage following the 2011 Canterbury earthquake. However, I note that unlike the proposed building the ANZ building did not address the Maltese Cross form. (see image 2) The proposed new building form, roofline and canopy will achieve this and will clearly retain the important boundary line that holds the Maltese Cross form.

2.6. In my opinion an historic precedent exists with regard to canopied verandahs and columns as part of the earlier built form of the perimeter of the Square and that the proposed building, its verandah canopy and columns, serve to emphasise the historical form of the south west quadrant.
3. Assessment of Effects

3.1. The assessment of effects with regard to heritage values is discussed below in accordance with appropriate and relevant matters of the CDP Section 9.3.6.1 Alterations, new buildings, relocations, temporary event structures, signage and replacement of buildings.

3.2. Matter (d) Whether the proposal, including the form, materials and methodologies are consistent with maintaining the heritage values of heritage items and heritage settings, and whether the proposal will enhance heritage values, particularly in the case of Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items and heritage settings and in particular have regard to:

v. the impact on public places; and
vi. within a heritage setting, the relationship between elements, such as layout and orientation, form and materials.

I am of the opinion that the building, which abuts rather than sits on the scheduled area of the Square, will be consistent in form and bulk in relation to maintaining the heritage values of the Square. The significant point to consider is whether or not it takes regard of maintaining the Maltese Cross form of the Square within the south west quadrant. The building will sit on the boundary which will respect and retain this form at this point. However, the canopy will extend into the airspace and the columns to support this will be placed within the Square itself thus impacting on the public space and definition of the boundary line at this point of the south west end of this quadrant of the Maltese Cross. In order to mitigate any perceived negative impacts of the proposed design it is important that the ground treatment marks the boundary in some way that visually retains the boundary line at this point. This could be achieved through the pattern on the paving at the boundary edge and such a detail may well be undertaken in conjunction with the plans for the Square proposed by Regenerate Christchurch.

3.3. As noted in section 2 of this report, the building design features columns of an organic nature inspired by the Canterbury landscape – its flora and rivers. These move through the exterior to the interior of the building and reflect much about the history of place, the braided nature of Canterbury rivers and the original forestation of the area. Cathedral Square itself was once part of the forested swamp of this area with kahikatea and braided streams running through it and the building design considers that historical sense of place thus respecting and marking the past history of this space.

3.4. With regard to matter 9.3.6.1. (e) - the extent to which the works are in accordance with the principles in Policy 9.3.2.2.3(b), the latter refers to any work undertaken on scheduled heritage
items and heritage settings in the DP and notes that work must take consideration of the following principles:

i. focus any changes to those parts of the heritage items or heritage settings, which have more potential to accommodate change (other than where works are undertaken as a result of damage), recognising that heritage settings and Significant (Group 2) heritage items are potentially capable of accommodating a greater degree of change than Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items;

ii. conserve, and wherever possible enhance, the authenticity and integrity of heritage items and heritage settings, particularly in the case of Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items and heritage settings;

iii. identify, minimise and manage risks or threats to the structural integrity of the heritage item and the heritage values of the heritage item, including from natural hazards;

iv. document the material changes to the heritage item and heritage setting;

v. be reversible wherever practicable (other than where works are undertaken as a result of damage); and

vi. distinguish between new work and existing heritage fabric in a manner that is sensitive to the heritage values.

3.5. The value of Cathedral Square as a heritage item in the CDP focuses on its cultural spiritual and historical social significance with the principal tangible historical element being its form. The fabric of the Square has been altered many times since its inception and will continue to be the subject of change as is often the nature with a highly used hard edged urban space. The planned new building does, in my opinion, conserve and enhance, the authenticity and integrity of the heritage item and its setting by respecting the form of the Square. The activity as proposed would be reversible and the work is clearly distinguishable as new but the nature of it as previously noted respects and reflects past history associated with the site and wider surrounds.

3.6. It is noted that in Policy 9.3.2.2.3(b) iv there is a need to document change. Photographic and plan documentation will be provided and the applicant would be willing to accept a condition of consent relating to this matter as defined in 9.3.6.1. (k). The extent of photographic recording which is necessary to document changes, including prior to, during the course of the works and on completion, particularly in the case of Highly Significant (Group 1) heritage items, the need for a high level of photographic recording throughout the process of the works, including prior to the works commencing.

3.7. With regard to matter 9.3.6.1. (f) Whether the proposed work will have a temporary or permanent adverse effect on heritage fabric, layout, form or heritage values and the scale of that effect, and any positive effects on heritage fabric, fabric, form or values, I am of the opinion that the work proposed will not have either a temporary or permanent adverse effect on heritage fabric, form or values but will enhance the form and nature of the Square through the retention of form, respect of cultural and historical values and the continuance of the built urban form. The nature of the design will enable and encourage public use of the space in this area.

3.5 With regard to matter 9.3.6.1. (h) Whether Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga has been consulted and the outcome of that consultation as noted in 1.5. The applicant is aware that the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 defines the Square as an archaeological site as a place associated with pre-1900 human activity and that the work may be subject to an Archaeological Authority and a requirement to consult with Heritage New Zealand.
3.6. Matter 9.3.6.1. (I) is an assessment matter that relates to new buildings, structures and/or features in heritage items which are open spaces and asks whether the building, structure or feature will:

i. be compatible with the heritage fabric, values and significance of the heritage item including design, detailing and location of heritage item(s) within the open space;

ii. impact on views to or from the heritage item(s), and reduce the visibility of heritage item(s) from public places; and

iii. the relationship between elements, such as the layout and orientation, form, and materials within the open space.

The bulk of the building as discussed will sit on the perimeter boundary of the south west quadrant of the Square. The elements that actually extend into the scheduled space are as noted the canopy and associated support columns. The columns and canopy will have some impact on the Square but not in my opinion in a detrimental way. The Square, as a central city urban space, was designed to house buildings on its perimeter in order to retain its form and historically this has been undertaken. By the early 20th century the Square had buildings in each quadrant to the boundary lines with verandahs on most buildings piercing the airspace of the Square and with columns into the Square’s space to support these.

3.7. The current proposal as noted essentially does not present an element that has not historically been part of the urban design and form of the Square for more than 150 years. It does in fact bring back the sharp-edged boundary driven design line that retains and contains the Maltese Cross form of the Square. Equally the proposed verandah canopy and its associated timber columns, while protruding into both the air and physical space of the Square, will not, in my opinion, present a negative effect to the view shafts to the former central city Chief Post Office, a highly significant scheduled heritage item in the CDP and listed as a Category 1 Historic Place under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. The proposed building (and the associated verandah canopy) have been designed in a manner that respects other existing heritage buildings in the immediate vicinity in terms of form and scale notably the ChristChurch Cathedral and the former Government Buildings to the east.

4. Conclusion

4.1. In conclusion, and given the discussion above, I am of the opinion that measured against the appropriate rules in Section 9 of the CDP that the proposed new building for 9 Cathedral Square, its verandah canopy and columns, will not have an effect that can be assessed as more than minor on the heritage values, form and fabric of Cathedral Square.

Jenny May
Director
Heritage Management Services

9 Cathedral Square Heritage Assessment of Effects
Heritage Management Services April 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub ID</th>
<th>Any comments?</th>
<th>Project Team responses</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21149</td>
<td>This road needs to be here for the shape of the cross and city heritage. Covering the street will make it dark thru 6 months of the year with no sun and sky. The trees are growing well and should not have to be covered. This will affect their growth. The building itself is unattractive and not going to attract people back to the city. Open spaces, in a concrete maze like Melbourne, is needed. Trust Ecan to, or braided rivers to, need a huge eye sore for an office or display.</td>
<td>Opposition noted. The impact of the proposed canopy on heritage values was assessed as minor in the earlier resource consent process. A recent assessment of the trees by an arborist has found that construction of the proposed canopy and its dimensions would have a minor impact on the trees.</td>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21161</td>
<td>Love the building design, and would be great to have more hospitality in a sunny area of Cathedral Square. Would compliment any hospitality at the Old Post Office building. Few/none adverse effects of this veranda.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Vannoort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21162</td>
<td>A bit misleading of Council to say that the canopy will extend over a public road when it's actually over the pedestrian boulevard in the Square, as far as I can tell from the photos, which are not clear. I think the design is fantastic. One complaint you often hear is the lack architectural interest in our new buildings and Shigeru Ban's design is a breath of fresh air in that respect and fully deserves a prominent spot in our sadly neglected Cathedral Square. The petty disadvantages outlined are typical of the Council Officer mindset. This building will add some much needed excitement to the Square. Shigeru Ban can do no wrong as far as I'm concerned!</td>
<td>Support noted. This part of Cathedral Square is legal road.</td>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Augor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21164</td>
<td>I fully support the building of the Shigeru Ban building in the square.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td>Di</td>
<td>Trower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21166</td>
<td>Looks great!!</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>McCauley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21167</td>
<td>A well thought out and designed asset for Christchurch. It will looking stunning.</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td>Geraldine</td>
<td>Sloane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21168</td>
<td>My submission is in support of the proposed canopy.</td>
<td>Support indicated.</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21169</td>
<td>I object strongly to this building. Why has the architect not designed a building that fits within the existing rules made to protect and enhance the environment of Cathedral Square. This is also taking over by stealth of public land by a private enterprise - partially obstructing the carriageway is wrong. Three slow-growing half-grown trees will be sacrificed unnecessarily. And the aesthetic effect on the Cathedral un conceivable. As for the above statement that a benefit will be an architecturally significant building... Surely one that does not have these negative effects would be more architecturally significant. The disadvantages heavily outweigh any advantages. Get the architect to design a building with no disadvantages!</td>
<td>Opposition noted. The impact of the proposed canopy on heritage values was assessed as minor in the earlier resource consent process. A recent assessment of the trees by an arborist has found that construction of the proposed canopy and its dimensions would have a minor impact on the trees.</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lovell-Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21170</td>
<td>I think the proposed building is absolutely beautiful and love the &quot;braided river&quot; concept. I think it will be an asset to Chch (my home city) and to the square. Will be great to have something different and interesting and bold, designed by a renowned international architect too. Support noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21171</td>
<td>I support the application Support noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21206</td>
<td>Looks stunning, just get on and do it !! Support noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21246</td>
<td>I wish to support the Council's approving this application by the owners of the 'Braided Rivers' building to include a canopy and support columns into the legal road space of Cathedral Square. My reasons are as follows. The intended building will be a beautiful piece of architecture that can only enhance its site and the surrounding area. Cathedral Square is currently in great need of such enhancements. The encroachment does not take the form of a significant mass. Such a form would be a disadvantage. But instead this building and canopy have the merit of lightness, openness and virtual insubstantiality. The encroachment does little to infringe the notion and functioning of the space as a 'road'. The space has not served as what would commonly be regarded as functioning as space for vehicle passage for many years. More importantly the future of Cathedral Square should be as a space for people primarily - a pedestrian precinct. There is no need for the Square to serve as a vehicle thoroughfare, and not doing so would greatly enhance its environmental wellbeing. The building's proposed encroachment does not seem likely to impede people's access and rather offer Square users advantages of shelter, visual enjoyment, and as well possibly, the services of outdoor dining. Blurring of the base shape of the Square is minimal and of no particular significance anyway to users. The shape is already blurred in many other ways by the various contents of the whole space, and the varying mass of the structures on its boundaries. It is only truly apparent from above - a view not easily achieved by people in the Square. There is no great cost to the council. That the lime trees will need some pruning and continuing maintenance does not seem a sufficient barrier to prevent the enhancements the building will provide. Therefore I see this building with its canopy and supports as an admirable addition to the renewed and improved centre of our city. Support noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21268</td>
<td>I think this building is a good idea and will enhance Cathedral Square. Support noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Marie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Duff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Support Statement</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21330</td>
<td>Full support. Need more development around the square and this will look great.</td>
<td>Gemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21346</td>
<td>Thank you for issuing this proposal for comments. Nexus Point, as the land owner at 2 Cathedral Square, have the following comments suggesting: 1. That the Council approve any necessary license or lease that will allow the project to proceed. 2. That any pruning or maintenance of the nearby trees required to enable building of the canopy should be approved by CCC. Thank you</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21348</td>
<td>I fully support the development of this building as proposed including 'encroachment' into the square. Whilst this may be legal road, the whole area is pedestrianised and will not hinder access. It is a fantastic addition to the area which should be encouraged not logged down in procedure which adds nothing to the process. Any tree pruning or maintenance required due to the location of the canopy should be undertaken at the building owners expense both during construction and as long as the trees and/or building remain in place.</td>
<td>Matt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21401</td>
<td>I support this building it looks beautiful and in keeping with the heritage of the area. currently, the area is just a wasted space when it could be an amazing event space or even just a beautiful year-round dining space.</td>
<td>Adele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21411</td>
<td>I support this application with reservations. In principle, I do not like granting the right to put a private structure in a public 'road' (paper or otherwise. However, I believe that this disadvantage is warranted it the structure is part of a building of architectural merit, the structure over pubic land provides public amenity, the licence to maintain these features is enforceable over the life of the structure.</td>
<td>Alister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21492</td>
<td>Further to our meeting today I would like to support the use of the road reserve to enable this architecturally significant building to be built as the architect conceived it. As a neighbour we consider ourselves fortunate that Redstone Corporation has chosen to design an iconic building rather than a more modest structure which would have cost much less and therefore would have provided the company with a much better return on capital. We look forward to the Council's early approval of this proposal.</td>
<td>J C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21507</td>
<td>I believe the roof extension over the square should be approved as it is part of the beauty of the building and will soften the harsh environment of the square. That corner of the square has been a dead zone for many years prior to the earthquakes, and a cafe will help enliven it.</td>
<td>Sally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21539</td>
<td>I support the use if 1/ there is unhindered public access to the area at all times 2/ the licence to use is limited to 35 years 3/ the area is never sold to a commercial interest 4/ an annual rental of $60,000 is paid to Christchurch City Council. This is entirely achievable given the nature of the proposed business.</td>
<td>Judith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified support noted. Points 1-3 are part of this proposal. The licence fee has not been fixed at this stage but staff are recommended that part of this fee should cover the cost of maintaining the three trees in front of the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21558</td>
<td>I think that new developments for Cathedral Square should be welcomed. The proposed structure is very beautiful and would make a stunning contribution to the urban fabric.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21560</td>
<td>Under no circumstances must the proposed canopy effect the growth and shape of the 3 lime trees. The extent of the canopy must be reduced if necessary, so that is the case. The trees are a significant part of the design fabric of Cathedral Square and are only now starting to reach maturity. The new building must be designed to fit in with the trees and not the other way round.</td>
<td>Opposition noted. The arborist has now assessed the three trees in relation to the proposed northern canopy. He has concluded that construction of the canopy and its dimensions would have a minor impact on the trees. The building owner would pay the cost of any extra pruning and ongoing maintenance work which would be undertaken by Council contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21561</td>
<td>No thanks. They have a whole block to accommodate their building and canopy. If they want a canopy they should scale back their design so that it is accommodated on their privately owned land. The seating could be approved subject to current CCC requirements for removable private seating on public land. The current cruciform shape of The Square should be retained and this area should remain in the public realm with public access not impeded.</td>
<td>Opposition noted. The impact of the proposed canopy on heritage values was assessed as minor in the earlier resource consent process. The only area of public space that would not be accessible to the public once the canopy is built would be the area occupied by the lower section of the seven supporting columns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21564</td>
<td>The Sigarau Ban designed building will be magnificent. It will contrast with much of the rebuild so far as well as the future restored Anglican Cathedral. Just get on with it.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21599</td>
<td>I fully support the application for an encroachment into the public space of Cathedral Square. I consider that the artistic merit of the design in this key space more than justifies the loss of public space and the required trimming of the Lime trees.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21611</td>
<td>I support the application. I would like to see the impact on the trees minimised.</td>
<td>Support noted. A recent assessment of the trees by an arborist has found that construction of the proposed canopy and its dimensions would have a minor impact on the trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21671</td>
<td>I support the construction of the canopy, it will give the square some much needed covered shelter. the building is an outstanding piece of architecture and will be a great addition to the city.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21673</td>
<td>I support the canopy encroaching on public land.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21787</td>
<td>I support the application for the canopy and foundations of this building to encroach into the legal road. I feel this is a spectacular building design that will enhance the public amenity of Cathedral Square. Given that public access and ownership is maintained and that the cost for pruning the affected trees is being covered by the applicant, I feel there is minimal negative impact.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21931</td>
<td>I support the design of the development and believe that the Council should grant approval for the canopy and supporting columns of this structure. It is an iconic building, with an eye catching design which will encourage people back into the centre of Christchurch.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21809</td>
<td>I support it, it looks fantastic.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21866</td>
<td>Love it</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21941</td>
<td>Historic Places Canterbury is concerned at the impact of the proposed canopy on the heritage values of the square and the effective privatisation of a public space represented by the 6.9 metre encroachment in to the square as well as the impact of the proposal on the lime trees, which form part of the heritage fabric of the square. Although both the heritage consultant for the applicant and the Council’s heritage advisor for the Council consider that the impact of the canopy on the heritage of the square is minor. Historic Places Canterbury disagrees. Although having a building returned to this site is important for re-delineating the form of the maltese cross, which is an essential aspect of the heritage of the square, by projecting 6.9 meters beyond the building line, this design effectively muddles the form. The Spark building proposed for the opposite side of Colombo Street adheres to the building line, so the canopy will create a visual anomaly. It has been argued that there is precedent for verandahs projecting into the space of the square and this is certainly true. However, the height and scale of this design makes it quite different in its impact. The United Services hotel had a verandah projecting immediately above the ground floor. Viewing the building from the Square, the several stories above were what defined the the edge of the cross form. The supporting columns for verandahs were also typically fine with limited impact upon the pavement, whereas these, to judge from the plan, are bulky and quite intrusive. Traditional verandahs were clearly an add-on to the building and were not read as something which extended the building into the realm of public space, whereas this integrated canopy impinges on public space and by implication privatises it. This effect is emphasised by the presence of the columns occupying space in the legal road. It will be the perception of members of the public that the space below the canopy is effectively that of the adjacent building. Historic Places Canterbury is concerned, that not only does this proposal impinge upon the heritage of the Square, but that it will set a precedent for further intrusion into the public space of the Square. While we recognise the desirability of activity around the edges of the Square, this proposal, by creating a permanent structure which is an integral part of the building design, goes well beyond a license to put out tables and chairs. In fact, Historic Places Canterbury is surprised that a design which intrudes to such an extent into the premier heritage space of the city, was treated as a non-notified resource consent, with the opportunity to comment only arising from the technicality that it intrudes onto a legal road. The proposed canopy extends right up to the existing tree line of the 3 lime trees adjacent to the building. The Council arborist has indicated that these have not yet reached maturity and could double in size. It is accepted that these will require clearance pruning for construction of the verandah and ongoing maintenance pruning. The beauty of the lime trees lies in its symmetrical form. This will be severely compromised if constant pruning is required on the building side of the tree. Indeed it is not difficult to foresee that the ongoing cost of this work and the problem of leaf litter caused by the trees will before long result in pressure for their removal. Were this to happen it would be a significant loss of public amenity. If consent were to be granted, Historic Places Canterbury believes that the Council should be responsible for the pruning to ensure that the best possible job is done, with the cost to be borne by the building owner. However, we believe that the impact of this design on the trees is such that at the very least, the canopy needs to be scaled back.</td>
<td>Opposition noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although we consider that building is an attractive addition to the city, we believe that the overhanging canopy element of the design needs to be reconsidered for the reasons outlined above.

| Item No.: 7 | The Christchurch Civic Trust is fully aware that the proposed building at 9 Cathedral has been consented. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed north-facing canopy of the building.

We believe that the concept of the Aotea Gift Centre building's integrated 6.9m x 4.4m long canopy, supported by seven large structures at a height of 10.0m, which extends into the scheduled Highly Significant heritage public space of Cathedral Square, has been generated by applicant and architects on the basis that the canopy will be approved. Put another way, the interior form of the building appears to us to be predicated on the assumption that the exterior structures occupying a public, scheduled Highly Significant space will be permitted. Clearly the canopy and supports are conceived of as an extension of the inside of the building.

What may be seen as a telling turn of phrase in Jenny May's heritage report for the applicant, 3 Assessment of Effects, 3.3. reads "...the building design features columns of an organic nature inspired by the Canterbury landscape – its flora and rivers. Those move through the exterior to the interior of the building..." (our emphasis).

We question the fairness and equity of an architect or architects with high reputation being given, in effect, anticipatory carte blanche to encroach on and into the Highly Significant space of Cathedral Square, thus offering a significant 'advantage' to the very nature of the design which is produced. Why, in the future, should all designers of new buildings not be permitted to exceed the stated area of the building envelope and intrude extensively into Cathedral Square, right from concept formulation stage through to developed working drawings? What might the accumulated result of this be on Cathedral Square over time?

Heritage consultant for the applicant, Jenny May, refers to the historic precedent of buildings with verandas and supporting columns in The Square. Unfortunately she has neglected to mention the extreme difference of scale between historical forerunners and the proposed building: the United Services Hotel's continuous eastern and northern bull-nosed veranda was 3m - 4m in height, with a span to posts of approximately 4m, as opposed to the 10.0m h. x 6.9m dimensions (rather than 770mm as stated in Ms May’s report) of the proposed canopy. In Ms May's assessment there is no mention of the 3D bulk of the columns and upper forms. There are no measurements indicated in plan or elevation drawings which members of the public can use to gauge the scale of the supports. Most definitely, there is a highly significant difference in the scale of the seven proposed north canopy support structures compared with any historical precedent. Fiona Wykes, Senior Heritage Advisor at CCC, shares our view on this matter. However, her conclusion that any deleterious effects of canopy and support structure on the integrity of the space of Cathedral Square will be no more than minor (which echoes that of Jenny May's), we find to be questionable.

We draw your attention to a largely neglected aspect of this application, the row of three lime trees contiguous with the proposed canopy edge. Not only have applicant and architects failed to give due consideration to the relationship of built canopy to tree canopies, in point of fact they themselves have created a significant problem where none currently exists. In application and CCC plans the edge of the proposed 10.0m high canopy is shown to confront the outer form of the tree canopies. Therein lies an irony: a significant part of a building which it is claimed references nature in braided river and tree

| 21872 | Opposition noted.
The impact of the proposed canopy on heritage values was assessed as minor in the earlier resource consent process.
One of the conditions of resource consent is that the existing paving treatment in Cathedral Square will be reinstated under the northern canopy of the proposed building to maintain a consistent treatment and integration with adjacent edges of the public space.
The only area of public space that would not be accessible to the public once the canopy is built would be the area occupied by the lower section of the seven supporting columns.
A recent assessment of the trees by an arborist has found that construction of the proposed canopy and its dimensions would have a minor impact on the trees.
The building owner would pay the cost of any extra pruning and ongoing maintenance work, which would be undertaken by Council contractors.

| Ross | Gray | ChCh Civic Trust, Deputy Chair |

---

*Note: The document includes a table and additional text that is not fully visible in the image.*
form, itself confronts, and has the potential to have a highly negative effect on nature, in the form of the lime trees. An unidentified Christchurch City Council arborist states that the trees would require construction pruning, could double in size and would thus require extensive trimming and shaping into the future if the canopy were built as proposed. The arborist also mentions the unavoidable phenomenon of autumn leaf litter and possible fall of other tree debris onto the building canopy or patrons of the café; any of these aspects may be very unwelcome to outside diners, proprietors et al.

We note that the plans provided showing the relationship of canopy to trees are somewhat misleading: the distance from building boundary to edge of tree canopy is approximately 5.5m at the moment. Even given that there may have been deferment of pruning, this clearly indicates that the proposed 6.9m reach of the built canopy will have a serious impact on the lime trees, particularly the largest one.

We consider that it reflects very poorly on all involved in the planning of the building and canopy – and those parties supporting the application – that the arborist is the only contributor to the discussion of the canopy to have made mention of this crucial environmental aspect. We note that comments from the arborist appear only in the public consultation document: “The potential adverse effects on the development of the trees (and potential loss of contribution to the amenity of the site) and the potential increase in costs of tree maintenance have not been quantified, but should be assessed as part of the application.” (our emphasis)

In fact, there is no mention of the canopy’s relationship to these scheduled heritage trees in any of the following: documentation from the applicant; from CCC approved expert planner for the applicant; from heritage consultant for the applicant; from heritage advisor for CCC. And even the author of the CCC Report / Decision on a Non-Notified Resource Consent Application fails to raise this issue. We find this almost universal lack of recognition of such a pertinent and important issue most disappointing and alarming.

It is our view that the integration of the canopy with the building itself and projection into Cathedral Square is problematic – in terms of rationale, function and in physical form. In order for a canopy to provide shelter from excessive sunshine and particularly rain for pedestrians and table diners below – not to mention a desirable sense of ‘enclosure / security’, a well-considered height and reach/span ratio must be arrived at. Of course the designers have been faced with a dilemma (of their own making): a canopy which shows no break from a high roofline, at 10m above ground level must extend a considerable distance from the building to be effective in dealing with the aspects just mentioned. This has resulted in the extreme width of the canopy and indeed the magnitude of the supports (which it is to be assumed are structural, but no detail on this matter is provided in the documentation). Our query is: what evidence is there that even at this extreme reach into the Highly Significant heritage space of Cathedral Square, the canopy will offer meaningful shelter from the elements, particularly rain? Given the less than continuous veranda cover on Hereford St, the nil coverage on Colombo St, much rests, as has been noted in the documentation, on the continuous cover in Cathedral Square – but will the proposed canopy at that height deliver? Clearly it will have no ‘enclosure’ effect – in fact, for the ‘occupant’ it will remove a 6.9m x 44m slice of Christchurch sky space from the ‘square experience’. It is possible, in fact, that wind speeds / rain force may increase as airflow is siphoned or trapped under the canopy: no details on weather matters have been provided by the applicant.

There is also, we think, a problem with the aesthetic dimension of the supports themselves. We agree that the referencing of braided rivers and trees within the building will have a lively and perhaps inspiring visual effect. However, the same aesthetic applied to the exterior supports in such close proximity to large
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| lime tree specimens, particularly in autumn and winter, is likely to create an overstated, perhaps even conflicting visual dynamic which has the potential to detract from the trees themselves and from the visual experience intended by the applicant and architects. We believe that this matter needs more careful consideration by all concerned. Further, as raised in the public consultation document, the presence of the canopy and supports, in conjunction with the glazed north façade of the building, could potentially blur the claimed re-definition of the Maltese Cross / cruciform which Ms May asserts had been lost with the previous building on this site, the ANZ Bank, following the demolition of the United Services Hotel building. On several occasions since 2014 the Christchurch Civic Trust has publicly suggested that a system of cloisters or arcades could be placed by the Christchurch City Council on council-owned heritage scheduled land in Cathedral Square at a height and of a scale and in design terms which would help to unify Cathedral Square and personalise the Square experience for residents and visitors alike. (See Attachment 1 below.) What the proposed canopy might offer the Square-goer bears little resemblance to the potential experience offered by the cloisters / arcades concept, as outlined. We urge the Christchurch City Council to reject the application for the canopy at its present dimensions and that the applicant be requested to re-design the required provision of shelter along the north face of the new building. Thank you. Additional comments 1. Error: it has been brought to our attention that the three lime trees referred to in our submission, although situated in the scheduled Highly Significant Cathedral Square space, are not themselves specifically designated as scheduled trees under the City Plan. However, there is every reason to think that they could be at some point. The application of a designation would depend on the trees being in good biological and aesthetic condition, which we maintain could be severely jeopardised if the canopy were built as planned. 2. Error: we should have referred to the building with veranda formerly on the site as the United Service Hotel. 3. Clarification: our reference to the form of Cathedral Square as 'Maltese Cross / cruciform' in relation to a comment by Jenny May acknowledged her description (Maltese Cross), but indicated that it is also described by some as a cruciform shape. There is considerable variance in choice of descriptor; we believe that the term 'cruciform' better represents the typology of the space. 4. Additional observation: we question whether any consideration had been given to the problem of birds, mainly seagulls, using the upper branches of the supports as very convenient perches, nicely placed above table-based food sources. Equally, the well-known propensity for dogs to be attracted to pillars and posts could provide a problem for the maintenance of the lower support structures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 April 2019</td>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johns</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ChCh Airport Chief Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item No.: 7**

I write in support of the proposed construction in Cathedral Square of the new Aotea Gifts "Braided Rivers" building designed by Shigeru Ban. This is a magnificent and bold concept developed by a very experienced and successful tourism industry operator who is committed to providing an asset of lasting value for the people of Christchurch and the many visitors to our region and country. Shigeru Ban has an exceptional international reputation that extends to famous tourism meccas like the Aspen Art Museum, Colorado USA, and the La Seine Musical, Île Seguin France, not to mention his many accomplishments across in home country of Japan. His work previously in Christchurch following 2011 in producing the city's Cardboard Cathedral has brought our city tremendous international interest not to mention city pride. With his work on this building "Braided Rivers" he has not only delivered a concept that is unique and special but inextricably linked to Canterbury. To have this building at the centre of our city serving our many international visitors while also offering facilities that will appeal to the local market is a wonderful concept. More importantly, however, this building will also become a new beacon for Our City, Our Island and Our Country as it will develop to be an attractor of note. I would like to specifically address an aspect of the design, and that is the building canopy and its extension over the public space of Cathedral Square. As I have referenced earlier this is a magnificent amenity of great appeal to both visitors and residents alike and part of that appeal is the vast open canopy that provides a welcoming and hospitable view from Cathedral Square. This covered area open to the square allows public access and will provide both shelter and shade to those passing by or pausing to admire. It is the ultimate extension of the building that will allow all those that come in contact with the building to feel connected to it.

Support noted.

(See next page for Attachment 1)

**Attachment 1 - System of cloisters or arcades proposed in Cathedral Square by the Christchurch Civic Trust**
8. Biodiversity Fund Project Applications

Reference: 19/324772
Presenter(s): Laura Molles, Advisor – Natural Environment

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to recommend the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee approve Biodiversity Fund support for two projects.

2. Staff Recommendations

That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:

1. Receive the information in the report.
2. Approve funding for the two recommended projects as listed below:
   a. $16,226 for Tirowaikare, Little River
   b. $40,000 for Big Hill, Little Akaloa

3. Key Points

3.1 The Christchurch Biodiversity Fund supports custodians of biodiversity working on ecologically significant sites. Council provides up to 50% of funding for eligible projects aimed at protecting and enhancing biodiversity on private land. Up to $200,000 may be allocated each year, with a maximum of $40,000 per individual project/property per year.

3.2 Authority to consider and approve applications to the Christchurch Biodiversity Fund has been delegated to the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee.

3.3 The two projects recommended for allocation of funding would require a combined total of $56,226 in funding, bringing the total allocated in 2018-2019 to $79,300. Staff expect to recommend allocation of the remainder of the annual funding to further projects in June 2019.

3.4 The projects recommended for allocation of funding are listed below. More information on the individual projects is provided in the attachment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tirowaikare, Little River</td>
<td>$16,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Hill, Little Akaloa</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56,226</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Context/Background

Issue or Opportunity

4.1 The Biodiversity Fund is an opportunity to support private landowners who are taking voluntary action, and investing their own time and money, to protect and enhance biodiversity on their properties. The projects provide real protection for biodiversity in the Christchurch District through direct action.
Strategic Alignment

4.2 The Christchurch Biodiversity Fund is provided for in the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan, and is aligned with the Council’s strategic framework.

4.3 The programme aligns with the strategic framework’s supporting principles of collaboration and stewardship, by supporting individual landowners to protect and enhance biodiversity on private land.

4.4 The programme aligns with the Healthy Environment Community Outcome. Specifically, the Biodiversity Fund supports the “unique landscapes and indigenous biodiversity are valued” outcome, by contributing to the protection of indigenous species and ecosystems, and by supporting landowners who are working to look after biodiversity on their own properties.

4.5 The programme aligns with District Plan policies regarding the protection of ecologically significant sites, and the provision of advice and incentives for landowners who wish to do this on private property.

4.6 The programme supports the goals of the Council’s Biodiversity Strategy.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>Christchurch Biodiversity Fund 2018-2019 - April Funding Round - Project Descriptions</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Laura Molles - Advisor Natural Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Emma Davis - Head of Strategic Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brendan Anstiss - General Manager Strategy and Transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christchurch Biodiversity Fund 2018/2019 – April Funding Round – Project Descriptions

The Natural Environment Team recommends allocating 2018/2019 Biodiversity Funding to the following projects in the April round. Fully funding both projects will allocate $56,226 of the total $200,000 available in the 2018/19 financial year. The Biodiversity Fund allocated $23,074 to two projects in December, so these further projects would bring the annual allocation to $79,300. We expect to recommend allocation of the remainder of the annual funding in June 2019. We are working with ECan and covenanting organisations to make the most efficient use of our combined resources.

Both of the projects recommended for funding are on private property sites listed as Sites of Ecological Significance on Schedule B (Information Only) of the District Plan. This means they have already been assessed by ecologists as meeting one or more significance criteria. The actions proposed by the landowners are well-aligned with management recommendations included in the Site Significance Statements prepared by Council.

- **Big Hill, Little Akaloa ($40,000):** This project involves two separate fencing and planting sites at the bottom and top of Big Hill paddock, totalling about 9ha (approximately 1.3km of fencing, in conjunction with existing boundary and paddock fences). In addition to encompassing several hectares previously assessed as ecologically significant, the landowners are proposing to include adjacent vegetation within the fenced area. Council staff support this inclusion; the additional area also meets significance criteria and will provide a meaningful boost to the ecological health of the site. Fencing the area will facilitate natural regeneration and reduce browsing pressure in areas that already support indigenous vegetation, and will support successful establishment of infill planting.

Currently around 2ha within the project area does not host indigenous vegetation. Previous attempts by Banks Peninsula landowners on similar sites to fence off areas and allow natural indigenous regeneration have often proved unsuccessful due to the competitive nature of the pasture in this climate. Because of this, infill planting with eco-sourced indigenous plants will be beneficial. Council staff will provide practical support to help choose and source the right plants for the site.

The landowners are seeking additional support for the project from ECan and the Billion Trees Fund, in addition to their in-kind contributions, as the total cost of the project will exceed $80,000. If they are unable to secure sufficient additional funding, Council staff will work with them to adjust the project as necessary. The amount the landowners ultimately request from Council may be less than $40,000 if this is the case, to maintain the required 50:50 funding ratio.
Tirowaikare, Little River ($16,226): This project will protect 7ha of forest through construction of approximately 600m of fencing and removal of stock grazing. The landowners have decided to provide a high level of protection for the site by putting in deer fencing rather than standard stock fencing; they have noted that wild deer are having a substantial impact on their site. The landowners are in the process of establishing a QEII covenant over the area to be fenced, and also intend to carry out pest plant control within the area to further support biodiversity values within the recovering bush. Infill planting is not needed at this site.

The landowners’ work to fence and covenant this site will mean that virtually all of the vegetation assessed as ecologically significant on their property will be both practically and legally protected, which is a fantastic result.
9. Three Waters and Waste report - February/March

Reference: 19/263419
Presenter(s): John Moore

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee of the activities undertaken by the Three Waters and Waste Unit, who are responsible for the planning, asset management, operations, maintenance and capital project delivery for all three waters and waste infrastructure. This includes drinking water, wastewater, stormwater, land drainage and solid waste services within the city.

2. Staff Recommendations
   That the Infrastructure, Transport and Environment Committee:
   1. Receive the information in the Three Waters and Waste December/January report attached.

3. Key Points
   3.1 Overview of Three Waters and Waste Operations.
   3.2 Progress update on temporary chlorination of Christchurch drinking water.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ITE Report Three Waters and Waste - February March 2019</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
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<td>Approved By</td>
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</tr>
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Richardson Terrace stormwater pump station and stormfilter treatment device

Three Waters and Waste
FEBRUARY - MARCH 2019 REPORT

Christchurch City Council | March 2019
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Overview
This report is intended to inform the Committee of the current progress against the planned activities in the Three Waters and Waste unit for the period ended 28 February 2019.

Consents and Compliance
- There are currently no outstanding enforcement actions and no significant non-compliance grades.
- No new consents have been obtained from Environment Canterbury in 2019.

Health and Safety
There were 111,937 hours worked in February (including Transport) with three medical treatments but no lost time injuries.
- Contractor was stung by a wasp. They taped off the area and visited a doctor.
- A contractor got caught in the eye by flattened cardboard.
- A staff member slipped on ply, lost his footing and landed on right foot, pulling his achilles tendon.
Please see appendix 1 for the detailed statistics and the measures of LTIFR (lost time injury frequency rate) and TRIFR (total recordable injury frequency rate).

In January a lost time injury occurred where a staff member of a sub-contractor was off for nine days. The details are:
- While lifting a water pump and riser column from a water well a non-return valve fell from a suspended load and impacted a subcontractor’s staff.
- The staff member had not identified the risk of the suspended load and suffered lost time injuries.
- The staff member has been managed back to work under their back to work policy and the main contractor have completed an incident cause analysis method (ICAM).
Finance

MANAGE TO BUDGET

Operating costs – The February forecast to completion is currently indicating a favourable position $1,996M at year end and includes a forecast carry forward of $4.1m of dredging costs in the Heathcote River and $0.5m for the Multi Hazard Analysis. If the carry forwards are not approved, it will result in an unfavourable variance of $2.6m for the year. Maintenance cost included in the current forecast have been set at a level in order to maintain current levels of service, however there is a risk that the costs could increase further due to increased chlorination costs and higher costs in maintaining wastewater networks and treatment operations. The contracted maintenance costs are being closely managed to minimise the financial impact on the unit.

Trade waste revenue is down $1.37m YTD due to lower volumes and chargeable solids. This is offset by revenue from the Burwood landfill which is $580k higher than plan YTD. Revenue from trade waste is forecast to be $1m below plan for the year, offset by revenue from the BRRP forecast to be $1m above plan for the year and will be reviewed for the next quarter reporting during March.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date $000's</th>
<th>Activity Summary</th>
<th>Year End $000's</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forecast</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>9,118</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>9,118</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>3,509</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>(243)</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>3,381</td>
<td>6,214</td>
<td>(281)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(268)</td>
<td>(341)</td>
<td>(96)</td>
<td>(719)</td>
<td>-102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,043)</td>
<td>(346)</td>
<td>805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,546</td>
<td>4,864</td>
<td>12,427</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>8,547</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>3,947</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,477</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>12,496</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,476</td>
<td>15,684</td>
<td>21,851</td>
<td>6,167</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,476</td>
<td>15,684</td>
<td>21,851</td>
<td>6,167</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,788</td>
<td>3,117</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,384</td>
<td>13,087</td>
<td>18,805</td>
<td>5,718</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>5,429</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,384</td>
<td>13,087</td>
<td>18,805</td>
<td>5,718</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,384</td>
<td>13,087</td>
<td>18,805</td>
<td>5,718</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,788</td>
<td>3,117</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,384</td>
<td>13,087</td>
<td>18,805</td>
<td>5,718</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,384</td>
<td>13,087</td>
<td>18,805</td>
<td>5,718</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,788</td>
<td>3,117</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconciliation to Controllable Net Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Provided to other Units</th>
<th>CO - Infrastructure Rebuild Client Team</th>
<th>Internal Cost Inputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(3,108)</td>
<td>(5,275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(3,108)</td>
<td>(5,275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>7712</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98,120</td>
<td>98,116</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Delivery – At the end of February, Three Waters and Waste has delivered $77.79m, or 50.6% of its capital programme budget of $153.7m. The forecast to year end is currently under budget at $447.35m which has come back from $558.4 at last report. The main drivers for this are:

- Drop in the forecast spend on wastewater renewals due to longer than planned time in engineering design for a number of key projects. This is reflective of the volume of new projects commenced in FY19 to fulfil the LTP expectations.
- Drop in the forecast spend in renewals in the wastewater treatment plant on Pages Road. This is due to longer than planned time in engineering design and tendering for a number of projects.
- Drop in the forecast spend on renewals relating to water supply pumping stations and water supply wells. These delays are due to the on-going wellhead security program to remove chlorination from the Christchurch network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchasing Department</th>
<th>Purchasing Team</th>
<th>Budget Current FY</th>
<th>Forecast Current FY</th>
<th>Forecast Variance FY</th>
<th>Actual YTD</th>
<th>Forecast Months Remaining</th>
<th>Monthly Spend To Meet Forecast</th>
<th>Carry Forward / Bring Back</th>
<th>Carry Forward</th>
<th>Budget Over/Under</th>
<th>Indicated Savings / Over/Spends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Services</td>
<td>Three Waters &amp; Wast</td>
<td>$153,689,399</td>
<td>$147,351,853</td>
<td>$6,337,547</td>
<td>$77,796,274</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,391,395</td>
<td>$701,047</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$7,838,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Services Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$153,689,399</td>
<td>$147,351,853</td>
<td>$6,337,547</td>
<td>$77,796,274</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$17,391,395</td>
<td>$701,047</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$7,838,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$153,689,399</td>
<td>$147,351,853</td>
<td>$6,337,547</td>
<td>$77,796,274</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$17,391,395</td>
<td>$701,047</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$7,838,594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Last Updated: 2019-03-22 09:20:22*
Water Supply Improvement Programme

The city has 53 pump stations and 140 operating wells. Four relatively new pump stations (11 wells signed off following minor remedial works) are continuing to operate without chlorination – Keyes, Estuary, Prestons and Gardiners.

Chlorine has been turned off at a further 10 pump stations as works have been completed and/or any remaining unsecure wells have been isolated from the network. Together these pump stations provide approximately one quarter of the city’s water supply.

WELL HEAD REMEDIATION

At the beginning of this programme just seven wells had been signed off as secure. As at 12 March 2019, 39 wells at 19 pump stations have been signed off as secure.

The table below lists the wells that have been signed off as secure and notes the total number of wells at each of the pump stations.
The design work is complete, contractors appointed and construction is timetabled or underway for a further 53 wells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pump Station &amp; Supply Zone</th>
<th>Well heads Secure / Total</th>
<th>Remedial Works Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kainga Brooklands</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>Raise below ground well head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blighs Central</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Central</td>
<td>3 / 3</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well heads secure and raise below ground well head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham Central</td>
<td>2 / 4</td>
<td>Complete headworks on new wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafalgar Central</td>
<td>1 / 3</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns Central/Ferrymead</td>
<td>1 / 3</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolston Central/Ferrymead</td>
<td>1 / 3</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Rocky</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuary Central/Rawhiti</td>
<td>2 / 2</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyes Central/Rawhiti</td>
<td>3 / 3</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Terrace Central/Rawhiti</td>
<td>2 / 3</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well heads secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnside North West</td>
<td>6 / 6</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well heads secure and raise below ground well head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosbie North West</td>
<td>1 / 3</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrington North West</td>
<td>5 / 5</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well heads secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiners North West</td>
<td>2 / 2</td>
<td>New pump station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampian North West</td>
<td>3 / 3</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure and raise below ground well heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffreys North West</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompkins North West</td>
<td>1 / 2</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestons Parklands</td>
<td>2 / 4</td>
<td>Minor works to make above ground well head secure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVE DISINFECTION**

The construction tender for ultraviolet light disinfection has been awarded for main pumps, which supplies approximately 5% of the city’s water, in the Central supply zone. Construction is proposed for early 2019 with commissioning to be completed by June 2019.
REDUCING THE CHLORINE DOSE

A reduction in the chlorine dose, from 1 part per million (ppm) to at least 0.5 ppm, has been agreed with the Drinking Water Assessor where we have at least two minutes’ contact time before the first consumer on the network.

The chlorine dose has been lowered at 22 pump stations across the city:

- Auburn, Avonhead and Crosbie in the North West supply zone
- Hillmorton, Kerrs, Main Pumps, Mays, Montreal, Sydenham and Worcester in Central
- St Johns and Woolston in Central/Ferrymead
- Picton and Tara in Riccarton
- Tanner in Rocky Point
- Aston in Rawhiti
- Mairehau, Marshlands and Parklands in Parklands
- Denton, Dunbars, Sockburn and Wilmers in West
- And in Wainui.
DRINKING WATER QUALITY MONITORING

Overview

This report is intended to inform the ITE Committee of drinking water quality monitoring related activities for the 2-monthly period ended 28 February 2019.

It summarises the number of samples taken in each Council owned water supply and provides information about transgressions that occurred.

Council Owned Water Supplies

Council owns and operates the following drinking water supplies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplies &amp; Zones</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Community Code</th>
<th>Water Source</th>
<th>Water Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTCHURCH CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Central</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>CHR001</td>
<td>Non-secure groundwater</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Point</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklands</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riccarton</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Christchurch</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>NOR012</td>
<td>Non-secure groundwater</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands/Kainga</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>BRO012</td>
<td>Non-secure groundwater</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANKS PENINSULA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyttelton Harbour Basin</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>LYT001</td>
<td>Non-secure groundwater</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyttelton</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Harbour</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Bay</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akaroa</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>AKA001</td>
<td>Surface and groundwater</td>
<td>Membrane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdlings Flat</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>BIR001</td>
<td>Non-secure groundwater</td>
<td>UV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvauchelle</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>DUV001</td>
<td>Surface water</td>
<td>UV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little River</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>LIT001</td>
<td>Surface and groundwater</td>
<td>UV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takamatua</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>TAK002</td>
<td>Surface and groundwater</td>
<td>Membrane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainui</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>WAI138</td>
<td>Secure groundwater</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeon Bay</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>PIG001</td>
<td>Surface water</td>
<td>UV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. coli water quality monitoring November and December 2018

570 E. coli samples were collected in January and 311 samples in February. The following charts provide a further breakdown by water supply zone.
E. Coli transgressions

No E. coli transgressions occurred in January and February 2019.
Temporary Chlorination and Chlorine Monitoring

In April Council started to measure the Free Available Chlorine (FAC) in all compliance monitoring samples collected from the distribution system in Christchurch City and the Lyttelton Harbour Basin. These random network samples are useful for monitoring the potential for customer complaints, whereas Citycare’s FAC samples – which are taken at points in the immediate vicinity of the dosing sites approximately 1 minute and / or 2 minutes downstream from the dosing points – assist to confirm that the chlorine dosing meets the chlorination target.

THE PROCESS OF RE-CONFIRMING GROUNDWATER SECURITY UNDER DWSNZ 2005 (REVISED 2008)

DWSNZ section 4.4 state that bore water is considered secure when it can be demonstrated that contamination by pathogenic organisms is unlikely because the bore water is:

- Not directly affected by surface or climate influences, as demonstrated by compliance with bore water security criteria 1 (bore water must not be directly affected by surface or climatic influences) and 3 (E. coli must be absent from bore water).
- Abstracted from a bore head that provides satisfactory protection, bore water security criterion 2 (bore head must provide satisfactory protection).
Bore water security criterion 1: bore water must not be directly affected by surface or climatic influences

Council will demonstrate the absence of surface influences by groundwater age determinations and hydrogeological modelling.

- 17 groundwater samples from various aquifers were collected in July and September 2017 as part of a joint agency project (ECan, CCC and GNS) and analysed by GNS. A GNS report on groundwater age was issued in June 2018.
- A further 7 groundwater samples were collected in late October and submitted to GNS for analysis. The analytical work associated with groundwater age determinations will take approximately 6 months.
- CCC is in negotiations with Aqualinc to provide groundwater modelling services. Once the contract has been signed groundwater modelling will commence which will take approximately 10-12 months. Groundwater age data determined by sampling will be incorporated in the modelling.
- A peer review panel will provide technical input at critical stages of the modelling. Panel members will be staff from ECan and ESR. This peer review is supported by the DWA.
- Upon successful completion of the modelling a report will be issued to the DWA.

Bore water security criterion 2: bore head must provide satisfactory protection

Council’s Well Head Security Improvement Programme (WHSIP) is the programme of works to upgrade the Christchurch water supply to meet the existing Drinking Water Standards and to provide future proofing for likely more stringent DWSNZ requirements. The programme includes:

- Conversion of wellheads to above ground well heads to further improve their security and to make them easier and safer to access for maintenance.
- Drilling of new / replacement wells.
- UV treatment at some sites. UV treatment provides protection against contamination but does not have the same effect on taste and smell as chlorination.
- Other work to provide protection from contamination.
- Wellhead security assessments will be carried out by a qualified expert to confirm that the newly converted wellheads meet DWSNZ bore water security criterion 2.

Bore water security criterion 3: Escherichia coli must be absent from bore water

This criterion is satisfied by Council’s ongoing drinking water monitoring programme.
Water safety plans (WSP)

The Drinking Water Assessor (DWA) carried out an implementation audit of the Christchurch City and Lyttelton Harbour Basin WSP and issued a formal report which includes findings and recommendations. Work is underway to improve processes relating to the reporting of regular reservoir and wellhead inspections.

The DWA also undertook an implementation audit of the WSP for Akaroa, Pigeon Bay, Takamatua and Wainui and issued an audit report in January which includes findings and recommendations. Work is underway to improve processes relating to the reporting of regular reservoir and wellhead inspections.

Details of the findings, recommendations and resulting plan of action are presented on the following pages.

In December 2018 the Ministry of Health released the ‘New Zealand Water Safety Plan Framework’. While the Framework outlines the Ministry of Health’s expectations for the content of a water supplier’s WSP, it provides no guidance on how these expectations can be met. Guidance will be provided in the ‘Handbook for Preparing a Water Safety Plan’ which is due to be released in March or April 2019.

It is the Ministry of Health and DWA’s expectation that all CCC water safety plans be updated in 2019 to align them with the new framework. CCC staff met with the DWA and Ministry of Health representatives on 18 January to discuss a plan of action. The aim is to have all water safety plans updated by the end of July 2019. This is a very tight timeframe and only achievable if adequate support and information is provided by key staff and the maintenance contractor.

Water Safety Plan Register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Current WSP Status</th>
<th>DWA WSP Approval Date</th>
<th>Number of Non-Conformances</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Christchurch / Lyttelton Harbour Basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Central</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>9/03/2018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Christchurch</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>9/03/2018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands/Kainga</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>9/03/2018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyttelton Harbour Basin</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>9/03/2018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akaroa</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>27/09/2017</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdlings Flat</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>9/03/2017</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvauchelle</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>14/05/2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little River</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>10/04/2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takamatua</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>1/07/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainui</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>26/06/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeon Bay</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>1/08/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Riccarton Road stage 3 & 4 between Harakeke and Matipo – Construction of the replacement water main, crossovers and submains between Matipo and Harakeke streets began in February 2019 and is progressing well. Day shifts and night shifts are being utilised in conjunction with local business preferences.

Construction of the replacement wastewater main and laterals over the same section is due to begin in April 2019. This work will begin at three sites on the Matipo to Harakeke stretch of Riccarton Road, all working from east to west. By implementing three crews we aim to execute the work as fast as possible and minimise disruption.

Tuam Street WW – The contract for these works has been let for $9.3m, slightly less than the quantity surveyor estimate, indicating that the Christchurch construction market remains competitive.

Physical works, comprising of the installation of a replacement 1.2m diameter main, along Tuam Street will commence at the end of April and last 12 months.

Colombo Street WW – Works north of the Heathcote River on Colombo Street continue to advance on program.

The project is now preparing for the crossing through the Heathcote River with start work notice updates having been issued to local residents. The crossing works will commence in April and are expected to be completed by June.

Lyttelton Harbour Wastewater Pipeline Scheme – The last of the water supply connection works at both ends of the Lyttelton road tunnel are being completed with reinstatement of the tunnel tank site underway and due to be finished in May. This will complete the first package of the project which delivers an upgraded water supply main to Lyttelton.

Practical completion has been granted for the two submarine pipelines linking Lyttelton to Governors Bay and Diamond Harbour. These pipes will allow us to direct wastewater from Diamond Harbour and Governors Bay to Lyttelton and allow us to stop treated wastewater discharges to the harbour.

Works to convert the Governors Bay and Diamond harbour wastewater plants are now advancing having resolved on site geotechnical problems. The Governors Bay and Diamond Harbour works are expected to be completed in 2020. Geotechnical works have included rock stabilisation at the Diamond Harbour site to protect the people and assets during operation of the plant and this is underway prior to continuing construction activities on site.

The Heathcote Valley pipeline contract has been awarded to Fulton Hogan and completion of contract documents and establishment on site is underway. The construction programme for the 4.5km pipe line is planned to be completed this year.
with up to four crews operating along the alignment. Coordination is being undertaken with both CCC Transport and Orion.

Works are commencing on the terminal pump station at Simeon Quay. This will be the last of the visible parts of the project in Lyttelton. Once the Simeon Quay and Heathcote pipeline are complete all wastewater flows can be directed to Bromley.

**WS Pump Stations and Wells Program**

**Wrights New Wells** – Construction of two new wells are in progress and is planned to be completed by end September. This will replace the existing pump station which is currently offline.

**Ben Rarere New Pump Station** – The drilling of the second well is in progress as well as the design of the pump station and suction tank with plans to advertise the construction contract by July 2019. The construction period will be 12 months.

**Jeffreys Suction Tank Replacement** – Well 06 above ground conversion is planned to be completed by end May 2019. The design of the suction tank is in progress and we plan to advertise the construction contract in June 2019.

**Sydenham Suction Tank Replacement** – A new suction tank of 500 cubic meter capacity is to be constructed. A preliminary design selecting the proposed location of the new tank and future wells is now being considered and we are reviewing the suitability of this site and space available; in doing so we are considering access issues (during construction and for maintenance), network connectivity, existing infrastructure and future location of the pump station.

**Hillmorton and Redwood Replacements** – Feasibility studies are underway for replacement and new wells at Hillmorton and Redwood Pump Stations.

**Metro Sports Water Supply Station** – A concept design is being prepared for a new pump station in the Central Zone to provide security of water supply and maintain the levels of service.

**WATER AND WASTEWATER PLANNING**

**Rawhiti water supply zone pressure management trial** – the zone is currently operated at an average pressure of 650 kPA (down from initial pressure in zone of 720 kPA). The period for implementing the pressure reduction to a target level of 500 kPA has been extended to allow fine-tuning of the pressure reducing valves and pump station settings to support ease of operation. The next five metre pressure drop is targeted for end March 2019.

Customer complaints are actively monitored. No complaints have been received that can be related directly to the drop in pressure.

The pressure reduction trial will run for a year, and then we will report back to Council on the costs and benefits, with a recommendation about whether pressure reduction should be implemented for the rest of the city.
Duvauchelle water treatment plant – analysis of trial and treatment plant performance data, together with raw water sample analysis and stream turbidity monitoring results has proceeded. The pilot treatment plant has not yet been decommissioned, awaiting the outcome of the data analysis.

Source water from Piper Valley Stream has very high turbidity during rain events, which the treatment plant cannot cope with, and water needs to be tankered to Duvauchelle when this happens. In addition, the raw water characteristic during dry weather is unsuitable for the current treatment process, resulting in average performance. The pilot plant is part of the process of exploring options for upgrading the treatment plant.

Duvauchelle wastewater treatment and disposal upgrade – public consultation for the future reuse of the recycled water to irrigate the golf course will start in April.

Aranui and Shirley vacuum sewer systems – The automatic air admittance devices have been installed in both Aranui and Shirley. There were delays in securing the retuning of the systems, however, Council has approached an alternative supplier to avoid further delays.

The roll-out of the vacuum sewer monitoring devices will proceed next month, starting at the Aranui vacuum system.

Both the Aranui and Shirley vacuum sewer systems have major capacity issues, and require pumping out with sucker trucks during storms. It is hoped that the automatic air admittance devices and the monitoring system on collection chambers will help address these capacity issues. In the meantime, no new connections to these vacuum sewer systems are being allowed.

Wastewater flow monitoring – a request for scope is being finalized to secure hydraulic modelling experts to upgrade and calibrate the wastewater network model, using the flow monitoring data that has been gathered in late 2018.

Akaroa wastewater scheme - additional public consultation on a short list of options for the reuse of the recycled water will commence in April.

**ASSET MANAGEMENT TEAM**

Work continues to document the asset handover processes and to build the workflow processes.

Work has commenced on development of all three waters 2021–32 asset management plans (AMP’s) with the first chapter of the AMP’s, Introduction due before the end of March.

The Gap Analysis between NZ Metadata standards and current CCC standards for Wastewater, Stormwater and Water Supply assets has now been completed. Next steps will be to identify the changes required to our core Asset management Information Systems and the Council As-built Templates, CAT. These will then inform the requirements of future capital works and pave the way for the objects required under BIM projects.
The new Three Waters & Waste controlled document register system is undergoing testing in readiness for a wider roll out across the unit.

**LAND DRAINAGE PLANNING**

**Comprehensive Stormwater Network Discharge Consent (CSNDC) application** – At the request of the Hearing Panel, CCC provided supplementary evidence on 15 March. Submitters have an opportunity to provide responses by 25 March. CCC then has a right of reply by 28 March. The Hearing Panel is then expected to make its decision within a month.

**Sutherlands Basin (Welsh), Hoon Hay Valley and Eastmans Stormwater Facilities** – Civil works are underway with the primary focus being the completion of the first-flush basin by this winter.

**Bullers Stream Naturalisation and Wetland** – The project is complete and open to the public. The multi-use facility includes walkways, a viewing platform, boardwalks and a wetland which will provide stormwater contaminant reduction. The project offers ecological, amenity and stormwater quality and drainage benefits.
Reticulation and Maintenance Team

SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF WATER JOBS (INCREASING TREND)

We were seeing total water jobs flattering out however over the last couple of weeks we have seen an increase once again. For February there were around 2100 leak jobs, this time last year the monthly total was closer to 1200.

Citycare are prioritising all jobs coming in and are meeting the KPI’s for Urgent jobs through to 3 day jobs. The problem area is the large number of “minor” leaks where Citycare currently have around 1300 jobs outstanding. On average they are receiving 50 jobs per day and completing only 40.

We are continuing to work with Citycare to come up with a solution to this problem. They currently have 23 crews working through the week and another 7 over the weekend. Other contractors are currently being contacted to see what support they can provide. Note that when we get an urgent job crews are pulled off the lower priority jobs to complete the urgent works, this is also having an impact on getting through the large number of outstanding jobs.

![chart showing water jobs completed]

The graph represents all jobs with a Category of Water Reticulation Maintenance where a Completed status was applied during the month. Data includes Earthquake jobs.
Solid Waste Team

WMMP (WASTE MANAGEMENT MINIMISATION PLAN) PROGRESS

Waste audits are the first step and were completed in 2018. The second step is the waste assessment report which uses the waste audits to review where we are, review all CCC’s waste related services and also those provided by commercial providers. This is a lengthy document and is being reviewed at present by all members working on solid waste and should be ready by first week of April.

The third step is writing the draft WMMP. The progress schedule for this to go to ITE and Council by June, and then go out for the Special Consultative Process in July/August. The local body election then creates a suspension of formal council processes, so the actual hearing of submissions could take place either before Christmas or in late January 2020, depending on when Council appoints hearings panels/committees. The hearings panel will report directly to Council and it is anticipated that can happen in March 2020. Thereby the incoming council takes ownership of the WMMP going forward.

LANDFILL AFTERCARE

Burwood gas treatment plant computer is 12 years old and is near the end of its useful life. CCC SCADA specialists are investigating costs to upgrade to current hardware and software platforms to maintain reliability of LFG delivery to users. Gas treatment plant annual shutdown and maintenance went smoothly with no major unscheduled maintenance required.

ORGANICS PROCESSING PLANT (OPP)

ECAn staff presented the findings of the Bromley odour survey to the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board seminar on March 18th. They also briefed the board on a new project to proactively engage with businesses in the Bromley Industrial area to help mitigate odour issues. ECan have been requested to present to the Infrastructures Transport Environment Committee and have confirmed they will in April.

OPP open day scheduled for 16th March was cancelled due to events on the 15th March.

ECOSORT (MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY)

With the suspension of the national soft plastics collection scheme until April 2019 there has been an increase in soft plastics being incorrectly disposed of in the yellow bin. EcoCentral have employed additional resources to extract this material to reduce the contamination of the accepted recyclable product which is sold into market both locally and internationally. Council are working on an education campaign to address this with the public.

TRANSFER STATIONS

City Care investigating into repair work on the stormwater first flush system at Parkhouse site.
KERBSIDE COLLECTION
As of 15 March 423,749 wheelie bins have been fitted with RFID tags representing a completion rate of 89.3% and on target for the three year project completion. 6,719 additional bins have been removed from circulation as of this date.

WASTE DIVERSION INITIATIVES
Staff attended the National Resource Recovery Workshop held in Wellington on 6 March, in response to the China National Sword policy effects. The Associate Minister Eugenie Sage and Ministry for Environment Directors were in attendance.

The Associate Minister is looking for some 'quick wins' and a Container Deposit Scheme (CDS) was identified as a potential option, although currently not in the MfE work programme. Medium term work streams include feasibility of domestic fibre mill increased capacity and transition into high value packaging (ie no 3-7’s plastics). Long term work streams include: examine the role of product stewardship, investigate feasibility of packaging content and recyclability regulations, work with MBIE to progress a positive procurement policy – local/central/business.

Over the week of 11-15 March, four of the six planned Waste Free Workshops were held. Three of the workshops were sold out and the feedback by attendee’s was that they found the workshops both informative and enjoyable and were keen to use the items provided in the pack to assist with waste reduction in everyday life. The remaining two workshops are being rescheduled to 17th April.

Stormwater and Land Drainage Teams

LEVELS OF SERVICE
Levels of Service targets for stormwater have been met to date in FY19. We continue to deliver the Land Drainage Recovery Programme of works and improve operational maintenance.

LAND DRAINAGE WORKING GROUP SUMMARY
A Working Group meeting was held on Friday 8 February 2019, covering the following topics:

- A review of the Auditor General’s report on stormwater. The report used three other councils as examples from across New Zealand, but the findings are applicable to our council. These included how we identify our flood risk, how we provide this information to our elected members and our community, our knowledge of our stormwater assets, and collaboration with other councils.

- The current land drainage website. Although it is comparable to other New Zealand councils, it is still difficult if the user does not already know basic information, like their catchment. Therefore, staff still field a lot of questions on flood risk to individual properties. An upgrade to a map-based webpage would empower residents with information, and reduce staff time. This is currently being worked on. In the longer term further information could be
provided, such as flood maps for a variety of events, or scheduled maintenance activities.

- The Bells Creek project has been completed in February 2019. This $89M Land Drainage Recovery Programme project was combined with a $2.4M stormwater treatment project. It reduces floor level flooding in a 50 year event from 33 houses to just one, which is an improvement on pre-earthquake conditions. Below-floor flood levels are reduced for an additional 88 properties. The scheme included pipe upgrades in Mackworth Street, conversion of Edmonds Park to a stormwater basin, conversion of Lower Linwood Fields to Te Oranga Waikura Urban Forest, an access manhole and screen in Woolston Park, and construction of a pumpstation and stormwater filter on Richardson Terrace.

- An update on the dredging of the Heathcote River. Stage 1 is largely completed, Stage 2 is currently suspended for the spawning season and design is still underway on Stage 3.

- An update on the status of the section of St Albans Creek between Slater Street and Hills Road. A report to ITE is currently being drafted on the works proposal and recommended programme.

**LAND DRAINAGE RECOVERY PROGRAMME (LDRP)**

Other important updates for LDRP projects, not mentioned above:

- Eastman Wetlands – There was an environmental incident on site in early March in Milns Drain. ECAN and DoC were immediately notified and we are working closely with them to identify the next steps and prevent a re-occurrence.

- Heathcote Dredging - For Stage 2, given the smaller than anticipated footprint of the landscaping works, it is proposed to engage rather than consult with the community.

- Cashmere-Worsley Flood Storage – The contractor installing the control gates in the lower valley adjacent to the current Adventure Park entrance are now on site.

- Matuku Waterway – A contract is in the process of being awarded for the Stage 3 flood mitigation works, which is the widening of a section of open waterway upstream of Bridle Path Road.

- No. 1 Drain – The floating treatment wetland tender has closed and a successful tenderer will shortly be appointed. This is to treat stormwater prior to discharge into Horseshoe Lake.

- Wigram Flood Storage Basin – Final shaping, inlets and connections in the new basins are being completed, and the wetlands are being planted. Stage 2 works, to install the pipes and remove sediment in the old Wigram Basin, are progressing.

- Southshore Emergency Bund – A tender for the stabilisation works will be issued to the market in the coming weeks.
- Curllets Flood Storage – Stream diversion works are currently underway, and
  the first flush basin for stormwater treatment is now partially operational.
  Construction is programmed to be complete before end of April 2019, with
  planting in winter.
- Upper Heathcote Storage Optimisation – This project is to draw together the
  four basins in the Upper Heathcote Storage Scheme and optimise their
  performance during flood events. It is in its preliminary stages to align with the
  forecast completion of the storage basins.

Wastewater Treatment Plant

Union negotiations continue to be at the forefront of all activities. With negotiations
still ongoing into April 2019 (started in May 2018).

In February, the operation of the CWTP’s larger co-generation engine was restored.
Unfortunately the amount of down-time means that the LTP KPI target of 75% of
electricity self-generated by the CWTP for the financial year will not be met. In future
years, it is anticipated that the installation of the gas storage facility should assist with
meeting this target, (due 2020). The rest of the CWTP process performed well, with
new power monitoring and reporting coming online. It is anticipated that this should
allow the CWTP staff to better monitor electricity usage with a view of improving the
efficiency of the CWTP.

The midges control program for the 2018/19 season is continuing well, with the early
teething issues fully resolved. The mechanical disturbance (dragging chains through
the sediment at the bottom of the ponds to disrupt the early aquatic stage of the
midges lifecycle), was carried out consistently over the height of the midge (summer)
season. Early results are positive, with the objective midge number monitoring
indicating a 30.7% reduction in midge numbers this season compared to last season.
This data will be fully evaluated at the end of the season. The majority of the native
plantings have been planted. This natural vegetation barrier will look to be expanded
in coming seasons as the annual funding becomes available.

Arrangements for the ISO:4001 audit have been confirmed for Monday 25th to
Wednesday 27th March. This is where external auditors will audit the CWTP’s
Environmental Management System against the ISO:4001 International Standard. As
this is a first audit, it is anticipated that there will be a number of corrective actions
required.

Reasonable restoration in performance of the Akaroa, Lyttelton & Duvauchelle’s
Wastewater Treatment Plants have been seen, particularly in relation to meeting their
bacteria compliance level. Citycare, who operate the plants under contract, have been
working more closely with Council. Addition input from Council’s CWTP Process
Engineer appears to have been beneficial.
### Appendix 1 – Health and Safety Statistics

#### Health and Safety Statistics

3 Waters Waste and Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and Safety Statistics - Month of February 2018</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Land Drainage</th>
<th>Water Waste</th>
<th>Solid Waste</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Intern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near Misses</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid injuries (FAI)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Treatment Injuries (MTI)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Time Injuries (LTI)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of days lost to LTIs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of hours worked</td>
<td>111,937</td>
<td>19,829</td>
<td>28,873</td>
<td>18,962</td>
<td>23,129</td>
<td>21,144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and Safety Statistics - Year to Date July 2018 - February 2019</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Land Drainage</th>
<th>Water Waste</th>
<th>Solid Waste</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Intern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near Misses</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid injuries (FAI)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Treatment Injuries (MTI)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Time Injuries (LTI)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of days lost to LTIs</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of hours worked</td>
<td>820,581</td>
<td>133,424</td>
<td>197,383</td>
<td>105,537</td>
<td>226,850</td>
<td>157,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIFR</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTIFR</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIFR (LTI + MTI)</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year to Date July 2018 - June 2019
(as at 19-03-2019)
10. 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>11</td>
<td>PUBLIC EXCLUDED INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES - 13 MARCH 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REFER TO THE PREVIOUS PUBLIC EXCLUDED REASON IN THE AGENDAS FOR THESE MEETINGS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>