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## Developing Resilience in the 21st Century

Strategic Framework

Whiria ngā wheno o ngā papa, honoa ki te mauara tāuiiki
Bind together the strands of each mat and join together with the seams of respect and reciprocity

### Ōtautahi–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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Community Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being open, transparent and democratically accountable</td>
<td>Resilient communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting equity, valuing diversity and fostering inclusion</td>
<td>Strong sense of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking an inter-generational approach to sustainable development</td>
<td>Active participation in civic life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prioritising the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities and the quality of the environment, now and into the future</td>
<td>Safe and healthy communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on the relationship with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and the Te Hononga-Council Papatipu Rūnanga partnership, reflecting mutual understanding and respect</td>
<td>Celebration of our identity through arts, culture, heritage, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively collaborating and co-operating with other local, regional and national organisations</td>
<td>Valuing the voices of all cultures and ages (including children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the diversity and interests of our communities across the city and the district are reflected in decision-making</td>
<td>Liveable city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vibrant and thriving city centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable suburban and rural centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A well connected and accessible city promoting active and public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient supply of, and access to, a range of housing 21st century garden city we are proud to live in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy water bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High quality drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unique landscapes and indigenous biodiversity are valued and stewardship exercised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable use of resources and minimising waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosperous economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great place for people, business and investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An inclusive, equitable economy with broad-based prosperity for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A productive, adaptive and resilient economic base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern and robust city infrastructure and community facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Priorities

- Enabling active and connected communities to own their future
- Meeting the challenge of climate change through every means available
- Ensuring a high quality drinking water supply that is safe and sustainable
- Accelerating the momentum the city needs
- Ensuring rates are affordable and sustainable

### Ensuring we get core business done while delivering on our Strategic Priorities and achieving our Community Outcomes

- Engagement with the community and partners
- Strategies, Plans and Partnerships
- Long Term Plan and Annual Plan
- Our service delivery approach
- Monitoring and reporting on our progress
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Karakia Timatanga .................................................................................................................. 4

C  1. Apologies / Ngā Whakapāha .......................................................................................... 4

B  2. Declarations of Interest / Ngā Whakapuaki Aronga ......................................................... 4

C  3. Confirmation of Previous Minutes / Te Whakaāe o te hui o mua .................................. 4

B  4. Public Forum / Te Huinga Whānui ............................................................................... 4

B  5. Deputations by Appointment / Ngā Huinga Whakaritenga ........................................... 4

B  6. Presentation of Petitions / Ngā Pākikitanga ................................................................ 4

C  7. Correspondence ........................................................................................................... 11

### STAFF REPORTS

C  8. Proposed Bus Passenger Shelter Installation Beside 23 Ensors Road ..................... 25

C  9. Provision of School Bus Stop with time of day parking restrictions at redundant Metro bus stops on Linwood Avenue ......................................................... 33

C 10. Removal of redundant Metro bus stops on Gloucester Street between Linwood Avenue and Woodham Road ................................................................................. 39

C 11. Proposed No Stopping, Maryville Courts entrances on Salisbury Street and Colombo Street ................................................................................................................ 45

C 12. Proposed No Stopping Restrictions, Salisbury Street ................................................. 55

C 13. Port Hills Grazing Deed of Licence ............................................................................. 61

C 14. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Area Report - August 2020 ......................................................................................................................... 71

B 15. Elected Members’ Information Exchange / Te Whakahwhiti Whakaaro o Te Kāhui Amorangi ...................................................................................................................... 82

C 16. Resolution to Exclude the Public ............................................................................... 83

Karakia Whakamutunga
Karakia Timatanga

1. Apologies / Ngā Whakapāha
   At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2. Declarations of Interest / Ngā Whakapuaki Aronga
   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 / Te Whakaāe o te hui o mua
   That the minutes of the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board meeting held on Wednesday, 8 July 2020 be confirmed (refer page 5).

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

5. Deputations by Appointment / Ngā Huinga Whakaritenga
   Deputations may be heard on a matter or matters covered by a report on this agenda and approved by the Chairperson.

   There were no deputations by appointment at the time the agenda was prepared.

6. Presentation of Petitions / Ngā Pākikitanga
   There were no petitions received at the time the agenda was prepared.
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Karakia Timatanga:
The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

1. *Apologies / Ngā Whakapāha*

   Part C
   Community Board Resolved LCHB/2020/00051

   That an apology for absence from Jackie Simons be accepted.
   Michelle Lomax/Jake McLellan  
   Carried

2. *Declarations of Interest / Ngā Whakapuaki Aronga*

   Part B
   There were no declarations of interest recorded.

3. *Confirmation of Previous Minutes / Te Whakaāe o te hui o mua*

   Part C
   Community Board Resolved LCHB/2020/00052

   That the minutes of the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board meeting held on Monday, 29 June 2020 be confirmed.
   Tim Lindley/Darrell Latham  
   Carried

4. *Public Forum / Te Huinga Whānui*

   Part B

   4.1 *Menlo Terrace, St Andrews Hill*

   Mr Graeme Nottage, on behalf of the residents of Menlo Terrace, addressed the Board on the ongoing maintenance issues of Menlo Terrace. Menlo Terrace is a privately owned shared road. The residents have noted an increase of foot traffic to access a private walkway from Menlo Terrace to St Andrews Hill Road since another private walkway has been blocked off by the installation of a retaining wall post 2011/12 Canterbury Earthquakes. Mr Nottage advised that the residents are looking for assistance for the maintenance of Menlo Terrace or for residents to “gift” the Terrace to the Council as legal road.

   After questions from the Board members, the Chairperson thanked Mr Nottage for his presentation.

*Attachments*

A  Documents for Menlo Terrace Public Forum
4.2 Ferry Road, Rutherford Street and Palinurus Road Intersection

Mr Matthew Houston and Ms Joanna Houston, local residents, addressed the Board on the Ferry Road/Rutherford Street/Palinurus Road signalised intersection. Their main concern is the phasing of the lights when trying to turn from Ferry Road (travelling from the city) into Rutherford Street. They consider that the timing for the right turning arrow display is not long enough to allow more than one car to turn during a sequence.

The Board agreed to seek staff advice on how to improve the safety of turning traffic from Ferry Road (travelling from the city) into Rutherford Street at the signalised intersection of Ferry Road/Rutherford Street/Palinurus Road as a matter of urgency particularly in light of the upcoming Woolston Village upgrade works.

5. Deputations by Appointment / Ngā Huinga Whakaritenga

Part B
There were no deputations by appointment.

6. Presentation of Petitions / Ngā Pākikitanga

Part B
There was no presentation of petitions.

7. 30 Garlands Road - Relocation of an existing bus stop

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2020/00053 (Original staff recommendations accepted without change)

Part C

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

1. Pursuant to Clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017:
   a. That all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the north side of Garlands Road commencing at a point approximately 46 metres west of its intersection with Tanner Street (measured from the prolongation of the western kerb line of Tanner Street), and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of approximately 63 metres, be revoked.
   b. That the stopping of vehicles is prohibited at all times on the north side of Garlands Road commencing at a point approximately 46 metres west of its intersection with Tanner Street (measured from the prolongation of the western kerb line of Tanner Street), and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of approximately five metres.
   c. That a marked bus stop be installed on the north side of Garlands Road commencing at a point approximately 51 metres west of its intersection with Tanner Street (measured from the prolongation of the western kerb line of Tanner Street), and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of approximately 15 metres.
   d. That the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the north side of Garlands Road commencing at a point approximately 66 metres west of its intersection with
Tanner Street (measured from the prolongation of the western kerb line of Tanner Street), and extending in a westerly direction for a distance of approximately 12 metres.

2. That these resolutions take effect when the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions described in the staff report are in place (or removed, in the case of revocations).

Sara Templeton/Darrell Latham

Carried

Michelle Lomax left the meeting at 04:08 p.m.
Michelle Lomax returned to the meeting at 04:10 p.m.
Jake McLellan left the meeting at 04:11 p.m.
Jake McLellan returned to the meeting at 04:12 p.m.

8. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Area Report - July 2020

Officer Recommendations / Ngā Tūtohu

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

2. Receive and note the information provided to the Board on:
   b. Redcliffs Archaeological Centre and Interpretation.
3. Consider items for inclusion in an upcoming Board’s Newsletter.

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2020/00054

Part C

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

2. Receive and note the information provided to the Board on:
   b. Redcliffs Archaeological Centre and Interpretation.

Part B

3. Request staff advice on the post fire remediation for replanting Tunnel Road and Heathcote River True Right reserves.

Sara Templeton/Michelle Lomax

Carried
9. **Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Submissions Committee Minutes - 11 June 2020**

Community Board Resolved LCHB/2020/00055 (Original staff recommendation accepted without change)

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

1. Receives the minutes from the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Submissions Committee meeting held 11 June 2020.

Darrell Latham/Tim Lindley

Carried

10. **Elected Members’ Information Exchange**

Part B

Board members exchanged information on the following:

- The Board discussed the Council’s position and current work on Climate Change. It was noted that a report is due to the Council’s Sustainability & Community Resilience Committee in October 2020.

- The Board acknowledged the work of the Coastal Pathway Group (especially the Group’s Treasurer Tim Lindley) and Council in submitting a successful $15.8 million funding application to the Governments “Shovel-ready” projects for the Coastal pathway to be completed. The funding application is to complete the pathway section between Redcliffs and Rapanui.

10.1 **Ōpāwaho/Heathcote River - Comparison of Pre and Post Land Drainage Programme**

The Board noted that the land drainage work on the Ōpāwaho/Heathcote River appears to have been successful. In particular it was noted that there was minimal flooding following the recent heavy rainfall and king tide.

The Board agreed to request staff advice on the cost comparisons of the flooding pre and post the Land Drainage Dredging Programme.

10.2 **Linwood Avenue School – Slip lane**

The Board agreed to request staff to work with the Linwood Avenue School Acting Principal on the safety of the Linwood Avenue School slip lane on Linwood Avenue and report to the Board on the outcome of the discussions.

10.3 **Redcliffs School – Resource Consent Non Compliance**

- The Board noted that there had been a hearing on Friday 3 July 2020 regarding the Redcliffs School building compliance. The Board discussed the Council’s media response dated 1 July 2020 in relation to the Redcliffs School resource consent non-compliance.
The Board agreed to request staff advice as to why the Community Board was not informed of the Redcliffs School resource consent non-compliance issue.

Sara Templeton left the meeting at 04:44 p.m.
Sara Templeton returned to the meeting at 04:54 p.m.

11 Resolution to Exclude the Public
Community Board Resolved LCHB/2020/00056

Part C
That at 5:02pm the resolution to exclude the public set out on pages 69 to 70 of the agenda be adopted.

Darrell Latham/Tim Lindley Carried

Michelle Lomax left the meeting at 05:06 p.m.
Michelle Lomax returned to the meeting at 05:08 p.m.

The public were re-admitted to the meeting at 5:21pm.

Karakia Whakamutunga:

Meeting concluded at 5:22pm.

CONFIRMED THIS 3rd DAY OF AUGUST 2020

ALEXANDRA DAVIDS
CHAIRPERSON
7. Correspondence

Reference / Te Tohutoro: 20/803811

Report of / Te Pou Matua: Liz Beaven, Community Board Advisor, Liz.Beaven@ccc.govt.nz

General Manager / Pouwhakarae: Arohanui Grace, Manager Community Governance Linwood-Central-Heathcote, Arohanui.Grace@ccc.govt.nz

1. Purpose of Report / Te Pūtake Pūrongo

Correspondence has been received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader City Planning, Strategy and Transformation Group</td>
<td>Update on home-share accommodation – Feedback now online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Gould</td>
<td>Richmond Community Wellbeing/Remember Richmond Residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Officer Recommendations / Ngā Tūtohu

That the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board:

1. Receive the information in the Correspondence Report dated 03 August 2020.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Update on home-share accommodation - Feedback now online</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>J Gould - Richmond Community Wellbeing/Remember Richmond Residents</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 June 2020

Sally Buck / Alexandra Davis
Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board
PO Box 73052
Christchurch 8154

Hi,

Re: Update on home-share accommodation – Feedback now online

Thanks again for your interest in the current review of the District Plan rules for home-share accommodation (e.g. Airbnb, HomeAway/Bookabach). We received a large number of responses (almost 570) during consultation on the different District Plan options and it’s apparent from the level of thought and effort that went in to these responses that this is an issue of significant interest to the community.

Staff have analysed this feedback and the next step will be to present a report with a recommendation to the Council on whether or not to notify a District Plan change. If the decision is to notify a plan change, there will be an opportunity for people to make formal submissions on the proposed change and to speak to those submissions at a hearing.

We are aiming to present that report in August. We’ll send out an update to everyone on our contact list for this review as soon as the final date is confirmed.

In the meantime, we’ve published all of the feedback received (with contact details redacted) on our website here if people are interested in reviewing it: https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/consultations-and-submissions/haveyoursay/show/283

If you put in feedback but don’t see it at that link you can contact PlanChange@ccc.govt.nz for further advice.

We’ll continue to publish updates on this page as well as the review progresses.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Stevenson
Team Leader City Planning
Strategy and Transformation Group
Hi

Could you please forward this email & .pdf to all the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote & Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board members?

1. Remember Richmond Residents
In 2016 our family moved from Shirley (where we had been living for 8 years) to Richmond. Since then I have had growing concerns for Richmond residents & the Richmond Community Wellbeing. The attached .pdf outlines my research/ideas to “Rise Up Richmond”.
The Richmond residents/community has had many changes since the earthquakes: adjacent suburbs ‘red zoned’, homes fixed/rebuilt/on sold, more transient residents/less intergenerational, community facilities demolished/not rebuilt, local schools closed/moved, increased social housing developments, increased medium density property developments etc.
So many changes has unsettled & divided residents with differing opinions on the developments in Richmond, which has affected our community wellbeing & social connections.

I support the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board’s request “that the Council’s Development Contributions Policy be reviewed to allow contributions that are collected from new residential developments to be tagged and used to improve amenities within the area that these developments are constructed.”
With the increase to Richmond’s population of vulnerable people/social housing & through medium density property developments, Richmond residents/community needs the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote & Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board members to advocate for the CCC to invest in the Richmond Village Revitalisation & CCC owned/managed community facilities, to improve the Richmond Community Wellbeing for all Richmond residents.

2. Richmond Residents and Business Association Community Project/"Community Capacity Builder"
Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board 2019-20 Discretionary Response Fund Application - Richmond Residents and Business Association

2.1 Richmond Residents and Business Association: Volunteering
Last week was National Volunteer Week in NZ. It was inspiring to see the posts/videos on social media, promoting the positive impact that volunteering has on the volunteer & organization/community group they volunteer for.
Residents/Business Associations are usually volunteer roles (unless paid membership) filled by people in the community that want to be actively involved.
There are many locals who regularly make posts on the RADS (Richmond Avonside Dallington Shirley)
Facebook page to promote local events/activities/businesses & to engage with the community over local issues.
There are few opportunities to volunteer in Richmond. Not everyone in the community is physically able (like me). Since 2017, I’ve had chronic pain in my ribs & have been unable to work. I spend most of my time at home while I physically recover.
I ‘volunteer’ through my research/creativity & design/small business/mental health/disability/wellbeing skills, to make submissions & create my websites/Facebook pages/groups. This improves my mental health & wellbeing, connects me online with like minded people & leaves me feeling less socially isolated.
The RRBA Community Project Discretionary Response Fund application – “Outcomes that will be achieved through this project:
- Increase the membership and participation in the Association.
- Grow the website content using storytelling, videos and blogs promoting local people, organisations, amenities and history including the Maori cultural significance.
- Compile reports and data that have been produced over the past 10 years into a workable document.
- Develop at least two amazing spaces that will encourage increased community connectedness, inclusion, participation and engagement.”
The RRBA “Community Capacity Builder” role could have been advertised as a volunteer role/s shared by many people in our community, instead it is a paid position for one person.

2.2 Richmond Residents and Business Association: Fundraising
"How does fundraising work? A fundraiser is any event or campaign developed with the sole purpose of raising money for a specific purpose. Fund raisers are held by schools, churches, organizations, charities, and many other groups who need to raise money for their financial goals."
Fundraising isn’t just about collecting money. It is also about promoting your group & engaging/connecting with your local community, to improve/increase buy in/ownership/belonging/membership within a group & their local community.
If a community group wants to be financially sustainable, it needs to look at other sources of funding like fundraising, so that isn’t reliant on CCC/Community Board funding & other funding providers.

2.3 Richmond Residents and Business Association: Engagement
- Avebury House/Richmond Community Garden/We Are Richmond/Bingsland Blogger
The same people are involved & connected with the above. If you have a difference of opinion or personality clash, you might be less likely to engage with the RRBA.
- RRBA Meetings: Location/Parking & Time
Avebury House is ‘hidden’ in our suburb. There is limited off street parking available. The location is not near local bus stops. Not everyone is available to attend meetings at night time.
The Avebury House driveway could be widen to create a new car parking bay on one side, beside a new shared footpath with lighting, connecting the entrance to the front of Avebury House (similar to the entrance/driveway at Riccarton House & Bush).
Otherwise why not activate an under utilised CCC community facility: Richmond Neighbourhood Cottage? Central location in our community, easy to locate, bus stops on Stanmore Road, plenty of parking as part of the Richmond Village Green on London Street.
RRBA could also alternate having a night time then a day time monthly meeting.
- Richmond Residents/Business Owners: Interest & Availability
Not everyone in the community is interested in being involved in an association. Others have family/work/time constraints that affect their ability to be actively involved to attend meetings, but sign up to be included on the mailing list for meetings agenda/minutes & newsletters.

3. Richmond Community Facilities
There are many residents in our communities who don’t have a ’second place (work)’: stay at home parents,
caregivers, retirees, unemployed, people working from home etc. Some due to their circumstances don't feel like they have a safe and relaxing 'first place (home)'.
This is why it is so important that our 'third places (social)' are welcoming and inclusive for everyone in our communities.
“Urban planners seeking to stabilize neighborhoods are focusing on the critical role that “third places” can play in strengthening our sense of community. Third places have a number of important community-building attributes.
Depending on their location, social classes and backgrounds can be “leveled-out” in ways that are unfortunately rare these days, with people feeling they are treated as social equals. Informal conversation is the main activity and most important linking function. One commentator refers to third places as the “living room” of society.
Many city planning efforts to reinvigorate metropolitan neighborhoods now include specific steps to create third places, especially public spaces, to try and break down social silos.”
https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2016/09/14/third-places-as-community-builders/

The Richmond Neighbourhood Cottage (former Bingsland School Caretakers Cottage, see attached .pdf 12. Richmond Neighbourhood Cottage) is the only CCC owned/managed community facility in Richmond.
Can the Boards/CCC look at significantly reducing the hire costs for a local resident to create/run a small group from this well located (car parking on London Street/Richmond Village Green/bus stops on Stanmore Road) under utilised CCC community facility?
One of the reasons I have been advocating since 2018 for the rebuild of a CCC owned/managed community facility at 10 Shirley Road/Shirley Centre, is the lack of options/facilities available, to arrange a meeting/start a community group with local like minded residents.
My idea is to move the Shirley Library to a more visible/accessible/destination space & add Learning Spaces, so that anyone in the community has the ability to get out of their 'first place (home)' & be part of a bumping space that can improve their wellbeing & help them/others to avoid social isolation.

4. Richmond Village Revitalisation
See attached .pdf: 16. Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas: 16.1 Richmond Village, 16.2 Street Art, 16.3 Kai Town, 16.4 Avebury House & Richmond Community Garden, 16.5 Dudley Creek, 16.6 Sutton’s Place, 16.7 River Road Park.
Last week I contacted the business that created the Bishopdale Village Mall Directory sign, after seeing a Facebook post. “The cost will be around $2450+gst for similar to the Bishopdale directory sign including: Design/Setup, fabrication for the frame, Paint, earthwork with concrete and installation on site.”
Then I did some research (see attached .pdf 15. Bishopdale Village Mall Revitalisation) to see how they were able to revitalise the Bishopdale Village Mall (see attached .pdf 17. CCC Business Improvement District Grant Plan & 18. CCC Business Improvement District Policy).
Can the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote & Waipapa/Papanui-Innes Community Board’s work together with a CCC Urban Regeneration Planner & interested local residents/business owners to create a "Richmond Village Revitalisation Programme”?

Thank you for your time. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Joanna Gould
joanna@10shirleyroad.org.nz | www.10shirleyroad.org.nz |
joanna@riseuprichmond.nz | www.riseuprichmond.nz | www.facebook.com/RiseUpRichmond/|
www.facebook.com/groups/2070060349907745/|
joanna@getcreativechristchurch.nz | www.getcreativechristchurch.nz |
www.facebook.com/GetCreativeChristchurch/ | www.facebook.com/groups/299724980619778/
Richmond Community Wellbeing | Remember Richmond Residents

1. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board: Submission to CCC Updated Draft Annual Plan 2020/21
2. Submission to CCC Updated Draft Annual Plan 2020/2021 by Joanna Gould
3. Submission to Papamui-Innes Draft Community Board Plan “Have Your Say” 2020 by Joanna Gould
4. Submission to CCC Draft Strategy for Arts and Creativity 2019–2024 by Joanna Gould
5. Submission to CCC Draft Annual Plan for 2019/2020 by Joanna Gould
7. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Meeting, 14 November 2018
8. Richmond Community Needs Analysis Survey
9. CCC Community Facilities Network Plan
10. CCC Richmond Neighbourhood Improvement Area Report 1987
11. Richmond Village Green History
12. Richmond Neighbourhood Cottage
13. Richmond Commercial Centre Factsheet 2017
15. Bishopdale Village Mall Revitalisation
16. Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas
16.1 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Richmond Village
16.2 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Street Art
16.3 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Kai Town
16.4 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Avebury House & Richmond Community Garden
16.5 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Dudley Creek
16.6 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Sutton’s Place
16.7 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | River Road Park
17. CCC Business Improvement District Grant Plan
18. CCC Business Improvement District Policy

1. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board: Submission to CCC Updated Draft Annual Plan 2020/21
https://christchurch.infocouncil.nz/Open/2020/06/LCBSC_20200611_MAT_4850_WEB.htm
“...the Board have identified:
- Community Wellbeing is Supported and Improved
- Progress Suburban Centres Masterplans Projects
5.2. Development Contributions Policy – Post 2010/11 Canterbury Earthquakes the community within the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board area has witnessed a large amount of high housing intensification which has led to the decrease to the established communities’ amenities.
Board request: The Board requests that the Council’s Development Contributions Policy be reviewed to allow contributions that are collected from new residential developments to be tagged and used to improve amenities within the area that these developments are constructed.”

2. Submission to CCC Updated Draft Annual Plan 2020/2021 by Joanna Gould
Includes: my research/ideas/suggestions for the Christchurch City Council, especially at this time while in COVID-19 lockdown, to help support individual/social well-being & civic infrastructure in Christchurch going forward.
Page 3-5 of the .pdf highlights parts of the Canterbury Wellbeing Index & how I see the Government/Council/NGOs could share resources & use civic infrastructure to address well-being & social issues in our communities.
Page 6 of the .pdf highlights the different well-being models, our 1st place (home)/2nd place (work)/3rd place (social), opportunities in our social places for connections & networks, opportunities for the Government/Council/ NGOs to work together in our civic facilities to provide community education for all.
I see the following gaps in the Christchurch Community Facilities Network Plan: Page 9-12 of the .pdf, that could provide opportunities for community education to all Christchurch residents: Shirley Centre, Sutton’s Place, Māori Heritage Park, River Bank Centre. These centres are based on the link between creativity and well-being, and could address: occupational health, social health, mental health, emotional health, environmental health, in collaboration with the Govt Ministry’s (Health, Education, Social Development, Tourism etc.)./Christchurch City Council/NGOs.
Just as we have seen the exponential growth of one person infected with the COVID-19 virus, I can see the positive ripple affect one person can have in their home/work/social places if the Government/Council/NGOs work together to provide community education in our civic facilities throughout NZ.
3. Submission to Papanui-Innes Draft Community Board Plan “Have Your Say” 2020 by Joanna Gould


“Improve community facilities in the Papanui-Innes Wards:

- Engage with the community over future developments of 10 Shirley Road
- Vulnerable Communities are supported:
  - Advocate for targeted funding to support youth, elderly, and social isolation issues
  - Advocate for the Long Term Plan to include increased services and funding for social isolation issues
- Build strong relationships and well-connected networks with external agencies
- Encourage civic participation in local decision making:
  - Increase community engagement opportunities (which can include public meetings and targeted opportunities with organisation leaders)
  - Encourage community networks
  - Increase volunteerism within the community.”

In my opinion, the top priority for the Papanui-Innes Community Board should be the planning/building of a new Shirley Centre on 10 Shirley Road. New Inclusive Civic Centre with: Shirley Library | Learning Spaces | Service Centre. Supporting our communities: Identity | Well-being | Learning.

Since 1915 this location has been important part of our identity, first as the original Shirley Primary School, then as the Shirley Community Centre, until the building was demolished in 2012 due to earthquake damage.

- citizen hub for community education & learning, ‘DIY How To’ civic engagement & education sessions, civil defence education, citizenship education.
- connecting NGOs with residents through ‘Hello my name is...’ intro sessions based in the learning spaces, ‘you are here’, ‘go where the people are’.
- community directory to inform & direct residents out from the hub, connecting residents into activities/groups/other community centres.
- park setting location, with significant trees, Dudley Creek and playground/half basketball court, with off street & on street parking.
- centrally located between our four remaining schools: Mairehau High School, Shirley Primary School, Shirley Intermediate & new Banks Avenue School.
- bus stops for the Orange Line/Orbiter/100 routes, are located outside 10 Shirley Road, and across the road, by Shirley Primary School.

The current Shirley Library is situated inside the Coastal-Burwood ward, although it is seen as a Shirley/Richmond facility. Currently the Innes ward has no ‘suburban’ library. Approx 25,000 people live in the Innes ward, with our population increasing due to in fill housing & social housing developments.

‘Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update’ identifies Shirley as a ‘Key Activity Centre’ for new residential/commercial opportunities, meeting the demands arising from the growing population.

‘Resilient Greater Christchurch Plan’ identifies Shirley as ‘Under performing Commercial Centre, Mall dominated centres with higher levels of vacancy, crime, reducing retail turnover’. Unfortunately due to the location of the library in the car park of The Palms mall, the library continues to attract anti-social behaviour, requiring a security guard to be present.

The Shirley Library & Service Centre is soon to refurbished to include NZ Post services, in an already congested building with Shirley Library, Service Centre & Coastal-Burwood Governance unit.

This library is smaller than most ‘suburban’ libraries in Christchurch & yet is consistently one of the top providers of events/activities, even with no dedicated learning spaces.

We need a new community facility to serve the wider communities of Shirley, Richmond, Mairehau, Edgewater and St Albans east of Cranford Street, https://www.10shirleyroad.org.nz/where-is-our-community-centre-petition/.

Citizen hubs become landmarks in a community. They are a safe place to go to. Their familiarity brings comfort in stressful times. They are the only third place that offers education & entertainment in the one place, & transforms to fulfill the communities needs during a local emergency.

https://www.10shirleyroad.org.nz/this-is-what-a-librarian-looks-like/

4. Submission to CCC Draft Strategy for Arts and Creativity 2019–2024 by Joanna Gould

https://www.riseuprichmond.nz/toi-otautahi-christchurch-arts-strategy/


“International research now shows the importance and impact creativity has on a individual and their well-being, with engagement in arts/crafts being increasingly seen as an effective way to help manage the stresses and strains of this modern digital world. Studies show that for those with mental health issues, from anxiety and depression to neuro-degenerative diseases like dementia, art therapy can profoundly improve lives.”

Includes: Our People (Identity, Well-being, Learning, Business, Community, Economy) “Tangata ako ana i te kāenga, te tūranga ki te marae, tau ana. A person nurtured in the community contributes strongly to society.” Our Places (Creative Books, Learning Spaces, Street Art, Sutton’s Place, Māori Heritage Park, River Bank Centre) “He muka harakeke, he whita tangata. The harakeke is woven with the human strand – binding people and places together.”
5. Submission to CCC Draft Annual Plan for 2019/2020 by Joanna Gould
Includes: Q. Is the 10 Shirley Road site the best place for a community centre?, Q. Why do we need another community centre?, Q. Why are you suggesting we move the Shirley Library to the 10 Shirley Road site?, Q. Why do we need Learning Spaces in a library?, Q. Why not just leave the 10 Shirley Road site as a park?, Q. What is one word to describe your idea, that represents your “why” this centre is needed?

https://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2020/06/
LCHB_20200629_AG4462_AT.htm#PDF3_Attachment_27689_1
“Community wellbeing is supported and improved
Why this matters:
- Well-connected neighbourhoods and communities improve wellbeing.
- Bumping places, both formal and informal, increase wellbeing.
What the board will do:
- Listen and respond to local concerns about community wellbeing.
- Directly sponsor collaborative local projects that improve the wellbeing of specific locations or groups in the board area.
- Support funding applications that maximise outcomes and reduce duplication.
- Provide strengthening communities funding to local groups whose work achieves wellbeing outcomes.
- Support capacity building within communities wishing to grow community wellbeing.”

7. Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Meeting, 14 November 2018
“5. Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area
5.1 Richmond Residents and Business Association
The Richmond Residents and Business Association (RR & BA) was established in May 2018 to give voice to the concerns of the residents of Richmond. The association’s area is defined as the area bound by Fitzgerald Ave, Whitmore Street, Hills Road, Shirley Road, North Parade, Banks Ave and River Road. The area is half in the precinct of the Papanui-Innes Community Board and half in the precinct of the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board with North Avon Road as the boundary. The setting up of the association, its initial concerns and progress were reported to the Board in June 2018.
5.2 Richmond Village Revitalisation
The revitalisation of the Richmond Village area is seen by the association as a significant project that is likely to take a number of years to complete. The Richmond Village area is defined as Stanmore Road from Avonside Drive to North Avon Road and a block or so either side. The Council has produced a Richmond Commercial Centre Fact Sheet (https://www.ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Culture-Community/Stats-and-facts-on-Christchurch/Community-Ward-Profiles/Commercial-Centre-Factsheets/Richmond.pdf) as part of its Commercial Centre Fact Sheet series. The fact sheet notes that the centre is linear in nature, lacks identity and focus, has a limited range of retail offerings and has a fragmented pattern of ownership. The rebuilding of Richmond Club, roughly in the middle of the centre, is likely to re-establish some focus to the area while the village green is a widely appreciated and widely used green space. The association sees the proximity of the Richmond Village to the Avon Ōtākaro River corridor as a huge source of potential development that it would like to see better utilised.
5.3 Enliven Places Programme
The council’s enliven places programme aims to create interesting, fun and welcoming communities for both residents and visitors by assisting communities to identify issues and generate solutions in identified urban regeneration priority areas. Suburban Centre project. Funding is available to activate vacant spaces in identified suburban centres, including Richmond Village. Initial discussions have been held between Council staff and the association to identify possible sites and activities or projects. The association will also survey members to get their ideas for potential sites and activities. Initial activities have focused on placing some planter boxes in strategic positions in the village and placing a community notice board in the village green opposite the supermarket. The planter boxes will be supplied by the council and maintained by the community.
5.4 Richmond Community Needs Analysis Survey
A contract has been let to independent social researcher, Sarah Wylie, to undertake a Community Needs Analysis for Richmond.”
“"The Papanui-Innes Community Board and Governance Team see Richmond as a priority area, researcher Sarah Wylie will look at the strengths, needs and gaps of the area.”
(Email from Papanui-Innes Community Board, October 2018)
8. Richmond Community Needs Analysis Survey

When we know who we are (identity), what we need to be healthy (well-being), and the importance of a growth mindset (learning), this causes a positive ripple effect in our businesses, economy and community.
Includes: Observations & Opportunities: Shirley Library, 10 Shirley Road, Dudley Creek, Richmond Village, Kai Town, Street Art, Sutton’s Place, Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor, Avon-Ōtākaro Cycle Route, Richmond Community Garden, Avebury House, River Road Park, River Bank Centre, Māori Heritage Centre.

9. CCC Community Facilities Network Plan
https://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2019/07/SOC_20190731_AGN_3438_AT.PDF
Figure 9. Community Facilities | Linwood-Central-Heathcote | July 2019, Page 65
Avebury House is not included in any of the maps in the Global Leisure Group Ltd report nor in the “Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Area & Number of Facilities” or the “Papanui-Innes Community Board Area & Number of Facilities” tables.


10. CCC Richmond Neighbourhood Improvement Area Report 1987
“This report was prepared by the Christchurch City Council and published in 1987. The document consists of nine sections and includes descriptions of the Richmond area as it was in the late 1980s, as well as suggestions for improving the appearance, function and traffic flows in and around the area. So, it is an interesting snapshot of Richmond as it was thirty years ago as well as an insight into the thinking at the time, of people seeking to improve the area.”
“Richmond Playground has a very important central location. It justifies development as the focal open space for Richmond. It could be re-named to reflect this focal role in the community, eg Richmond Village Green.”
“Proposed developments include additional shrub borders on the north and western sides, children’s play equipment and areas near the south eastern entry to the park. A community notice board would be incorporated in the seating area.” (Richmond ‘Village Green’ Landscape Design Plan, Page 22 of pdf)

11. Richmond Village Green History
https://www.aveburyhouse.co.nz/richmond-history-group/a-snapshot-of-bingsland-1879
https://christchurchcitylibraries.com/Heritage/Maps/120813.asp, Plan of Christchurch and suburbs 1879
“In 1879, George Alfred Buck published a Christchurch and Suburban Directory. The 379-page directory offers a snapshot of Christchurch only 29 years after its founding. At this time there was no suburb of Richmond; this area was known as Bingsland, after Morice Bing (1830–1877) who had owned land in the area. By 1879, Bingsland was becoming more closely settled; the area’s growing population meant Bingsland was included in the directory as one of Christchurch’s suburbs, outside the city area bounded by the four town belts (now the four avenues). In 1868, a Methodist Church had been established on Stanmore Road, on land donated by Mr Bing.
The Bingsland School had opened on its Stanmore Road site [Richmond Village Green] in 1875. These developments reflected an increasing local population and were beginning to set the area apart from much of the rest of the largely rural surrounding area.” (Richmond History Group, David Holland)


12. Richmond Neighbourhood Cottage
“Richmond Caretakers Cottage. In 1873 the Bingsland School was built on land that is now known as the ‘Village Green’. Behind the school headmasters house - built in 1876, was the caretakers cottage, located on the corner of London and Cumberland (now Pavitt) Street. The headmasters house was demolished in 1912, but the caretakers’ house still remains today. After the school was moved to a different site, the old grounds became public recreation ground with the swimming baths still on this site on the southwest corner. In 1978 renovations to save the historic cottage began and in 1982 it was officially opened as the Richmond Neighbourhood Cottage.”
(Richmond Community News, Jennifer Pope)
13. Richmond Commercial Centre Factsheet 2017

"Overall the centre currently lacks identity/focus"

"The environment of the centre is dominated by Stanmore Road and off street parking areas, although the village green and maturing landscaping around the supermarket offer attractive streetscape elements."

"Stanmore Road has a higher road safety risk score which may influence perceptions of cyclists."

"Strengths: Supermarket and Village Green are good anchor presences. Accessible to its immediate catchment and the Central City."

"Opportunities: Richmond Club redevelopment. Nearby Avon/Otakaro corridor regeneration."

"Weaknesses: Lack of identity and limited range of retail offer."

"Economic Wellbeing: 76% Food Retail, 24% Non Food Retail."

"Social Amenity: Sit Down/Eating/Dining, Community Run Facilities."

"Catchment Depreciation Profile: B-10 Most Deprieved Households."

"Network Safety: Safety (accident data) High Risk Corridor = Stanmore Road."

"Transport Overview: Pedestrian/Cycling/Public Transport, higher than average across Neighbourhood Centres."

https://www.riseuprichmond.nz/richmond-business-directory/

During Covid-19 lockdown, I created a Richmond Business Directory, to promote the local businesses in Richmond.

Features: Google My Maps (legend with categories, each business icon is clickable & provides business info, zoom in/out street view) & Richmond Business Directory Listing (filtered by category, sorted alphabetically, same info included in the Google My Maps: Name, Address, Phone No., Google (listing/directions), Facebook & Website)

I also create "Spotlight on Richmond" posts on the Facebook Rise Up Richmond Community Group:
https://www.facebook.com/groups/2070060349907745/, to highlight a different local business & regularly share Richmond business Facebook posts to the group.

15. Bishopdale Village Mall Revitalisation

"A selfie-friendly mural with an "interactive" kea aims to draw people to the new-look Bishopdale Village Green. Created by local street artist Jake Clark, Mr Clark believes that areas like The Village Green are essential to the regeneration of Christchurch and the local community. The new work – on a local business wall – contributes to a regeneration programme for the central area, including the development of the former library and community centre site. Supported by the Waimārero/Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board and local business and community groups including the Bishopdale Community Trust and Enliven Bishopdale Group, several improvements are under way, including the Village Green. The open space will include seating, picnic tables, cherry trees and a drinking fountain. Waimārero/Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board Co-chairman David Cartwright says the mural and panels – along with other improvements – "will bring a vibrant scene to life in the heart of Bishopdale."

https://www.alliedconcrete.co.nz/about/sustainability/our-community/

"Bishopdale Village Mall: A group of locals joined forces to form the Bishopdale Beautification Project group. Lindsay Dell, of the Enliven Bishopdale Group, is one of the members of the BBP, and he hoped the way the community has been involved could be a good model for other groups in the city. The project is led by the city council, but run by the community, with multiple organisations being involved and local businesses offering resources for the project. A path, water fountain and planting on the new village green are complete. The path is orange and yellow – the colours of Bishopdale Village Mall, it curves through the village green and is lined by flowering cherry trees. Mr Greenwood said workers from Allied Concrete played a big role in the path, the two members that poured the concrete, Dave Barker and Mike Smith gave their time freely and spent an extra two hours applying a non-slip coating to the path."

https://christchurch.info/council Biz/Open/2019/07/FWHB_20190729_AGN_3499_AT.htm

"10. Waimārero/Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board Area Report - August 2019
5.2 Other partnerships with the community and organisations
5.2.1 Bishopdale Village Mall Beautification Project - Update
The core project group (Chris Coles – Bishopdale Community Trust, Bill Greenwood and Lindsay Dell – Enliven Bishopdale Group, Clare Whiteman – Bishopdale Centre Association and the Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood, City Council Community Development Advisor) are progressing the Bishopdale Beautification projects.

Richmond Community Wellbeing | Remember Richmond Residents | Joanna Gould | June 2020 | Page 5 of 9
The mural project for the wall that faces onto the grassed area (formerly the site of the Bishopdale Library at the Bishopdale Village Mall) known as the ‘village green’ is progressing nicely. In consultation with the School of Business, who own the wall, the project group are in the process of developing a draft artist brief for a central piece of art on the wall. Schools are also part of the project and it is envisaged that their art panels will go around this central art piece. Five schools have shown an interest in participating in the project to date, Iselworth, Bree’s, Emmanuel, Casebrook, and Papanui High. They will look at completing their panels as part of term three or four projects.

The Christchurch City Council’s Graffiti Projects Co-ordinator is working with the project group taking it on as one of their first projects for the new financial year, providing support and resources for the project. Resene have also pitched in and will provide some paint for this community project as well. The broad theme for the mural is “Windows over Bishopdale”.


—B. Bishopdale Village Mall Revitalisation Programme Update, Joshua Neville, Planner – Urban Regeneration

4.1 Over the past few years there has been increasing community concern about the ongoing viability of Bishopdale Village Mall, and its capacity to fulfil its role as a Neighbourhood Centre. This latest interest follows a range of previous investigations and calls for action.

4.4 Any financial commitment to capital spending by the Council would need to follow the usual Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes, as well as aligning with the Council’s key strategic policies and priorities. To date no requests for financial commitment have been supported through the Annual Plan process.

4.6 Investigations by the Council and OCL staff since 2017 have concluded that, without intervention, Bishopdale Village Mall will likely continue to decline with a range of complex and largely negative implications for multiple stakeholders. These stakeholders include the Council, which is both an asset owner and an agency with responsibilities and functions under the Local Government Act.

4.7 Community Governance staff have also been working with local community groups and members on temporary activation and beautification projects."

https://christchurch.infocouncil.nz/Open/2019/08/SDC_20190826_AGN_3421_AT.html#PDF3_Attachment_24545_1

Innovation and Sustainable Development Committee Meeting, 26 August 2019

Staff Reports: 7. Bishopdale Village Mall Revitalisation Programme Update

Council Ownership, Responsibility, and Maintenance: 1.6 The Council also has a peppercorn lease on a toilet block in the mall. Includes: Bishopdale Commercial Centre Fact Sheet 2017

16. Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas


16.1 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Richmond Village

https://www.riuseuprichmond.nz/richmond-village/

This area does need a makeover to help tell the Richmond Village story. We have an identity, we have a rich Māori heritage and early settlers/archaeological/architectural history, but we haven’t been sharing this story with the Christchurch locals and our international visitors.

- Richmond Village website, with a page for each: business address on Stanmore Road, community facilities & groups.

We need a “Richmond Village Master Plan” similar to the “Edgewater Village Master Plan”.


Action 1a: Develop a pedestrian priority environment
Action 1b: Incorporate major cycleway
Action 1c: Reconfigure parking and taxi arrangements
Action 1e: Install amenity planting
Action 1f: Install street furniture, cycle stands and lighting
Action 2a: Access and wayfinding improvements
Action 2b: Install wayfinding signage
Action 12: Support development of an Edgewater Village market
Action 14: Develop transitional activities/beautification projects
Action 15: Improve building signage

The “Richmond Village Master Plan” could also include a ‘walkable centre’, with lower 40km/h traffic speed, making the area safer for pedestrians and cyclists.

As part of the “Richmond Village Master Plan” we could change the look of Stanmore Road to create a more welcoming environment, with ‘wayfinding signage’, more street lighting with colourful flags of the different countries in our community, landscaping and outdoor seating/picnic space, and more events like a Richmond Village Market to utilise the Richmond Village Green, and “Rise Up Richmond”.

- Cycle Route: connect existing cycle route from River Road, by Evelyn Couzins Ave, to North Parade, to avoid the Hi Frequency Bus Route & known safety issues on Stanmore Road, connect with https://www.riuseuprichmond.nz/avon-otakaro-cycle-route/.
- Parking Sign: on lamp post opposite London Street, to indicate there are car parking spaces beside the Richmond Village Green.
- Lower/remove hedge Stanmore Road frontage on the Richmond Village Green, for better visibility of the green space (available for those driving along Stanmore Road) & the Richmond Neighbourhood Cottage car parks on London Street.
- Remove/relocate steel planter boxes currently down Stanmore Road to the Richmond Village Green. Due to the size, they encroach on the footpath & restrict ability to open car doors when parked beside them. Repaint & replant with a small tree or repurpose into seating?
- Richmond Village Directory/Noticeboard: Corner of Stanmore Road/London Street, by the bus stop. Map of area (highlighting shops/community facilities/groups), with QR Code links to website/s [create new pages on the CCC Community Board https://ccc.govt.nz/the-council/how-the-council-works/elected-members/community-boards/ & ChristchurchNZ Richmond Suburb https://www.christchurchnz.com/explore/explore-your-place], so people can use their smart phone to use Google Maps & our non English speakers can use Google Translate.
- Picnic Tables: located on the outer edge of Richmond Village Green, outdoor dining for people buying takeaways (76% Food Retail, 13. Richmond Commercial Centre Factsheet 2017), bumping spaces, social wellbeing, enjoy nature/green space.
- Toilets? Installed by the playground, use the same services as connected to the Richmond Neighbourhood Cottage?
- Water Fountain?
- PlayGround: add accessible equipment that caters for younger children & children with different abilities.
- Bike Stand: for local cyclists shopping & cyclists using the Avon-Ōtākaro Cycle Route.
- StoryWalk: https://letsmovelibraries.org/storywalk/ “Typically, pages from a children’s book are installed along a path. As you stroll along the path, you’re directed to the next page in the story. Pages frequently are accompanied by activities or information.”
- Footpath Obstacle Course: painted gross motor skills movements/exercises on footpath going through the Richmond Village Green, https://www.facebook.com/kendalyounglibrary/videos/258362138811833/
  “Arahina ki Ōtatahi (former Richmond Primary School, 19 Pavitt Street) is located in Richmond, Christchurch. We work with children and young people (age 10 – 16 years) in the care of Oranga Tamariki to increase engagement and participation in education.”
  https://www.seabrookmckenzie.net/ & https://www.seabrookmckenzie.net/the-jean-seabrook-memorial-school/
  “In February 2005 The Seabrook McKenzie Trust opened a full-time school. This was the culmination of years of planning, sparked by frequent requests for this type of service from parents who had children with severe SLD that were not coping emotionally or educationally in the mainstream. The school is divided into two levels (approximately 6 to 8 years and approximately 9 to 11 years). Each class has a maximum of twelve students. Social Skills Instruction and Occupational Therapy are part of the programme for all children – individually or in small groups as appropriate. Specialist Music and Art Teachers take the classes once a week.”

16.2 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Street Art
- https://www.riseuprichmond.nz/street-art/
Street Art would make a difference to Richmond’s streetscape, if blank shop walls facing the street, told a different part of Richmond’s history/heritage.
Street Art would brighten up the area and become interactive photo opportunities for not only the locals, but also our Christchurch visitors to the area and tourists.
Street Art is our modern day “visual postcard”. “Wish You Were Here?” photos are posted on social media. Selfies in front of Street Art from around the world, can be found throughout the internet, posted on Facebook, Pinterest and Instagram. Street Art has become our “new” landmarks. We have lost a lot of “iconic” buildings that were our landmarks, in Christchurch since the earthquakes.
Create a Street Art Competition “Watch This Space”, a wall/hoarding in Richmond Village Green, prime location opposite New World, and visible from Stanmore Road, with link to Richmond website showing Street Art entries, residents/visitors participation through voting via social media, engagement opportunities for youth/emerging local artists/arts community in Christchurch.
Invite more local artists/NZ/Overseas to participate in events, time-lapse videos saved/upload to Richmond Village website.

16.3 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Kai Town
https://www.riseuprichmond.nz/kai-town/
Kai Town creates an identity for this area, to promote the international smorgasboard of takeaways & restaurants, located throughout Stanmore Road in the Richmond Village.
Market untenanted commercial properties on Stanmore Road to potential restaurants/takeaways to become a part of Kai Town?
Make better use of the Richmond Village Green, opposite New World, redevelop landscaping so this area is “more visible” from the road, and create more outdoor seating/picnic space for Kai Town customers to enjoy their food. Creating the Kai Town brand could help the small business owners, to combine resources to create a website and marketing materials so it is more affordable for each business.

When you have visitors coming from overseas, and you don’t know what to feed them...Come to Kai Town, your local international smorgasbord, all within walking distance, through Stanmore Road, Richmond, Christchurch.

16.4 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Avebury House & Richmond Community Garden

“Avebury House dates from 1885 and is a fine example of a grand Victorian home. Like many of Christchurch’s garden parks, Avebury Park was once a private garden surrounding a substantial homestead. The house was leased by the Youth Hostels Association of New Zealand for many years and was known as the Cora Wilding Hostel, but currently operates as Avebury House community centre and is available for hire.”

Where? How do you get to it? Few people know that it exists and where it is in our community.

Rename/Rebrand ‘Avebury House & Richmond Community Garden’ to ‘Richmond House & Gardens’, similar destination space as ‘Riccarton House & Bush’.

Create an identity based on Richmond location, making it easier to find. A name more befitting the grandness of this historic building, that has had many lives/uses over the years & linking it to the Richmond area as a destination space for locals & visitors to enjoy beside the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor.

“It has an English style park setting with expansive lawns and large deciduous trees including specimens of lime, elm and oak.” Avebury House is situated at the beginning of the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor, its position is ideal as an information centre/centre (similar to Riccarton House), for local “Red Zone Futures” attractions, Heritage Trails, Richmond History Group, Event Hire etc.

Guided tours by appointment? Basic gardening classes? Propagation classes? Monarch Butterfly classes?

Signage, description of plant, uses. QR code links to Richmond Community Garden website, visitors can use Google translate to change English into their language.

Glasshouse to propagate new plants for the garden/for sale.

Create new car park (between 46-64 Vogel Street), easier access off Stanmore Road down Vogel/Forth Street, for visitors to Richmond Community Garden/Avebury House/River Road.

16.5 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Dudley Creek

https://www.riseuprichmond.nz/dudley-creek/

Create “Dudley Creek Trail” follow footpaths along newly landscaped Dudley Creek from 10 Shirley Road to Medway Street, “turning a negative into a positive” experience.

Tell the Flockton Basin story and why/how the flood remediation plan, has saved this community from flooding.

Educational opportunity to share the story through ‘wayfinding’ signage, to teach our local primary/intermediate/secondary school students, the rest of Christchurch and New Zealand and our overseas visitors.

Share the technical behind-the-scenes information and lessons learnt, with the professional visitors to this site, whose jobs are to design/implement flooding remediation projects for their communities.

Create a connection from 10 Shirley Road to Richmond, as you follow along the “Dudley Creek Trail”.

16.6 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | Sutton’s Place

https://www.riseuprichmond.nz/suttons-place/

Interactive Learning Experience: showcasing Bill Sutton’s life, art, creativity & his legacy to Christchurch.

Outdoor natural wood easels for painting, picnic tables and park benches along River Road in front of the river.

Landscape design that creates a “picture” you want to capture, with whatever medium you like to use as an artist. Outdoor natural wood picture frames, that frame a view, and/or create an opportunity to take a selfie or group photo, to share on social media.

Sutton’s Garden for Outdoor Teaching, Art/Sculpture Park, Arts/Crafts Market, Outdoor Arts Related Events, set in a beautiful garden setting over looking the Avon River, for all types of artists to come and be a part of Sutton’s legacy.

Car parking and bike stands for those using the Avon-Ōtākaro Cycle Route.

Parking by the tennis courts (less impact on Harvey Terrace residents and also provides parking for visitors to Sutton’s Place and the tennis courts). Parking for traffic coming from the north, on the corner of Harvey Tce & Fitzgerald Ave and for traffic coming from the south, on the corner of Draper St & Stanmore Rd. Bus stops are already located here, so tourist buses could use these bus stops also to drop off/pick up visitors. Why? Harvey Tce, Heywood Tce & Draper Street are narrow with on street parking bays. We don’t want to direct more traffic through this neighbourhood, than the occupants of previous houses did.

16.7 Richmond Village Revitalisation Ideas | River Road Park

https://www.riseuprichmond.nz/river-road-park/

- River Road

Becomes a multi use pathway from Swanns Road Bridge to the new Medway Street Bridge. Accessible for bikes, scooters, wheelchairs, mobility scooters, strollers etc. No vehicle access.

The new Medway Street Bridge and existing Swanns Road Bridge, create a loop from River Road to Avonside Drive.

- Medway Street Bridge

Install a new wider bridge, from River Road/Medway Street to Avonside Drive. Accessible for bikes, wheelchairs, strollers, scooters etc. No vehicle access.
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https://ccc.govt.nz/parks-and-gardens/christchurch-botanic-gardens/visit/tours
Botanic Garden Caterpillar Tour: Botanic Garden Tours operate a guided audio tour of the Gardens in electric shuttles. Create a “Red Zone” Caterpillar Tour from River Road over the Medway Street Bridge, down Avonside Drive, over the Swanns Road Bridge, back to River Road.

- Medway Street Bridge Memorial
Install Richmond’s section of the original Medway Street Bridge (currently in storage at Ferrymead Heritage Park), as a memorial to the Christchurch Earthquakes.
Could include the names of those who died, and the street names of the residential Red Zone area.

- R. B. Owen Lime Trees
“In a ceremony on 1 September 1929, politicians local and national planted 53 lime trees on the north bank between the Swanns Road bridge and Medway Street.” https://www.riseuprichmond.nz/richmond-people/
It would be nice to replant these 53 lime trees to honor and tell R. B. Owen’s story.

- Avon-Ōtākaro Cycle Route
Starts in Draper Street, across Stanmore Road, to Swanns Road, where you can turn left on to River Road, or go straight ahead across the Swanns Road Bridge, connecting up with the Retreat Road Parks (‘Learn to Ride’ Park, Skate/Scooter/BMX Combo Park, Natural Playgrounds and Accessible/Sensory Playground).

- Park Benches/Picnic Tables
To honor the families that had a home in the residential Red Zone along River Road, I would like a park bench or picnic table to be installed between the footpath and the road, with a named plaque, to honor what they have lost, and so they can come back to visit and have somewhere to sit and enjoy the Avon River views again.

- ‘White Picket Fence’ Garden
Keep the remaining garden plants along the front of the residential Red Zone along River Road. Plant native trees/plants behind these garden plants, to create a tiered effect.
https://christchurchcitylibraries.com/Heritage/Publications/RiccartonBush/
Use a white picket paling, to mark the address of each house, with the house number on the paling, and a QR code, to link to a website/street view map, to remember and show visitors to the area the homes along River Road, from the 1900’s to pre Christchurch earthquakes.
https://apps.canterburymaps.govt.nz/CanterburyHistoricAerialImagery/

Council’s placemaking partners: Council proudly works with and supports urban regeneration groups whose projects help make the city more vibrant.

17. CCC Business Improvement District Grant Plan
“Business Improvement District Grant Fund
Christchurch City Council believes vibrant and thriving business districts are important to having strong and successful communities. Interesting and successful business districts help make Christchurch a great place to live and visit and strengthen the distinctive lifestyle, qualities and identity we share. The Council’s Business Improvement District (BID) programme enables businesses to lead local initiatives to improve their business environment.”

18. CCC Business Improvement District Policy
“Business Improvement District Policy
Business Improvement District programmes enable businesses within a defined area to work with their local community board, the Council and other key organisations to improve the local business environment. Business Improvement District (BID) programmes enable businesses within a defined geographic area to work with their local community board, the Council and other key stakeholder organisations to improve the local business environment. Working together can create stronger town centres and business districts that are better positioned to take advantage of economic opportunities and are resilient to economic shocks.
Town centres are about people and people’s needs; they are places with a history and a community story. They provide convenience, choice, value, comfort, leisure, entertainment and a sense of place. Centres are about place-making, and place-making is about communities having ownership, a sense of belonging and pride. This policy provides direction on how to establish a BID programme and the Council’s expectations of how a BID programme should function. The Council can assist with the establishment of a BID programme and support the implementation of the programme to leverage the contribution local communities make to the economic wellbeing of the district as a whole. The BID programme also provides a mechanism to advocate to the Council for appropriate infrastructure, facilities and services to support business activity and to have a business perspective inform Council policies and initiatives.”
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8. Proposed Bus Passenger Shelter Installation Beside 23 Ensors Road

Reference / Te Tohutoro: 20/196979

Report of: Serena Chia, Graduate Transport Engineer, Serena.Chia@ccc.govt.nz

General Manager: David Adamson, General Manager City Services, David.Adamson@ccc.govt.nz

1. Executive Summary / Te Whakarāpopoto Matua

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to consider for approval the installation of a bus passenger shelter at an existing bus stop located adjacent to 23 Ensors Road.

1.2 The origin of the report is staff generated. The bus stop locations prioritised for shelters to be installed are typically the bus stops where the average weekday passenger boardings meet a demand threshold of more than 20 people boarding a bus per weekday. This means shelters are being installed at bus stops that are most used by people accessing public transport.

1.3 Public transport is a key provision to support mode shift, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, traffic congestion and traffic crashes. Measures that promote the use of public transport helps the Council achieve its:
   - Strategic framework of providing a well-connected and accessible city promoting active public transport, as well as meeting the challenge of climate change through every means available.
   - Long Term Plan outcome of improved user satisfaction of public transport facilities, through providing sheltered waiting areas for customers commuting by bus.

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

1.5 The level of significance was determined by consideration of the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy and the requirements as set out in section 339 of the Local Government Act.

1.6 Only a shelter where the owner or occupier of the adjacent property has provided feedback indicating no objection or where there were no responses received to the consultation is included within this report. Where an objection has been presented by the owner or occupier of an affected property, staff present a decision making report to a Hearings Panel. The Hearings Panel then assess the objection against the criterion as outlined in Section 339 of the Act and make recommendations to the relevant Community Board or Committee. The Community Board or Committee will then determine the outcome of the objections in accordance with criterion outlined in Section 339 of the Local Government Act 1974.

2. Officer Recommendations / Ngā Tūtohu

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

1. In accordance with Section 339(1) of the Local Government Act 1974:
a. Approve the installation of a bus passenger shelter on the west side of Ensors Road (beside 23 Ensors Road) commencing at a point approximately 77 metres southwest of its intersection with Opawa Road and extending in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 3.6 metres.

3. Reason for Report Recommendations / Ngā Take mō te Whakatau

3.1 Each year the Council installs bus passenger shelters to improve the sheltered waiting areas at bus stops. A bus passenger shelter is proposed for the bus stop location presented in this report, due to the average weekday passenger boardings meeting the demand threshold of more than 20 daily passenger boardings per weekday. The bus stop beside 23 Ensors Road has an average of 44 passenger boardings per weekday.

3.2 The location of the bus stop, and hence the proposed shelter, relative to their surrounding locality, is indicated in the Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Bus stop beside 23 Ensors Road.](image)

3.3 The proposed bus passenger shelter to be installed at the bus stop will be a Council shelter type. The image shown in Figure 2 is an example of what the shelter is likely to look like.

![Figure 2: Example of the shelter type](image)
3.4 The advantages of this recommended option include:
   - Protection from the weather
   - Seating and timetable information provided within the shelter
   - Increases the visibility and legibility of public transport

3.5 The disadvantages of this recommended option include:
   - Increase in the number of bus passenger shelters to be maintained by the Council

4. Alternative Options Considered / Ėtahi atu Kōwhiringa

4.1 Option 2 – ‘Do nothing’, no bus passenger shelter is installed.

4.2 The ‘Do Nothing’ option does not assist the Council achieve its Long Term Plan or Strategic Framework outcomes as indicated in section 6 of this report.

5. Detail / Te Whakamahuki

Analysis Criteria / Ngā Paearu Wetekina

5.1 Staff assess each site based on the statutory requirement as set out in section 339 of the Local Government Act: “The council may erect on the footpath of any road a shelter for use by intending public-transport passengers or small passenger service vehicle passengers, provided that no such shelter may be erected so as to unreasonably prevent access to any land having a frontage to the road”.

5.2 Staff undertake geometric, road safety and bus stop best practice design assessments for each proposed shelter location. Examples of such assessments include:
   - The shelter will not restrict nearby driveway or intersection sightlines.
   - The shelter can be located at an appropriate location relative to the bus stop, which makes it a logical place for passengers to wait within the shelter.
   - That a 1.5 metre (minimum) continuous accessible path of travel for pedestrian movement is maintained in front of the shelter.
   - Does not adversely impact the underground utilities.
   - Determine if other existing bus stop infrastructure needs to be relocated to ensure the location is accessible to the people who use the bus stop as well as the people who walk past the bus stop.
   - Determine if other accessibility and operational improvements are needed to be made to optimise the usability of the bus stop, for example extending the footpath to the kerb to ensure there is a hardstand for customers boarding or exiting the bus, or marking the bus stop to the recommended bus stop length.

Community Views and Preferences / Ngā mariu ā-Hāpori

5.3 Consultation has been carried out with those specifically affected by this option due to the proximity of the property to the proposed shelter. The consultation period for the proposed shelter occurred from Tuesday 10 December 2019 to Friday 24 January 2020. The consultation notice and feedback form was posted by mail to the property owner, requesting their feedback.

5.4 No feedback was received during the consultation period and prior to the preparation of this report.
5.5 Environmental Canterbury is responsible for providing public transport services. The Christchurch City Council is responsible for providing public transport infrastructure. The installation of the bus passenger shelters are supported by Environmental Canterbury.

6. Policy Framework Implications / Ngā Hīraunga ā- Kaupapa here

Strategic Alignment / Te Rautaki Tiaroaro

6.1 The Council’s Strategic Framework is a key consideration in guiding the recommendations in this report. The recommendations in this report help achieve the:

- Community outcome of a well-connected and accessible city promoting active and public transport, and
- Strategic priorities of meeting the challenge of climate change through every means available.

6.2 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

6.2.1 Activity: Public Transport Infrastructure

- Level of Service: 10.4.4 Improve user satisfaction of public transport facilities. - >=7.3

Policy Consistency / Te Whai Kaupapa here

6.3 The decision is consistent with the Council’s Plans, Policies and Strategic Framework.

Impact on Mana Whenua / Ngā Whai Take Mana Whenua

6.4 The decision 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 Mana Whenua, their culture and traditions.

Climate Change Impact Considerations / Ngā Whai Whakaaro mā te Āhuarangi

6.5 Public transport is a key provision to support mode shift, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, traffic congestion and traffic crashes. Measures that promote the use of public transport make it a more attractive travel option, thereby supporting mode shift and the associated benefits to the environment.

Accessibility Considerations / Ngā Whai Whakaaro mā te Hunga Hauā

6.6 Accessibility by access to opportunities: Improvements to bus stops have a positive impact to the well-being and accessibility of our community through freedom to access opportunities by other means than the private vehicle.

6.7 Accessibility by inclusive design: The placement of the shelter considers the accessibility and movement needs of those waiting for a bus and those walking past the shelter that their way is unimpeded.

7. Resource Implications / Ngā Hīraunga Rauemi

Capex/Opex / Ngā Utu Whakahaere

7.1 Cost to Implement - $14,000 for the shelter supply and installation and hardstand, plus $1,000 for the planning, consultation and preparation of this report.

7.2 Maintenance/Ongoing costs – The maintenance of the proposed bus shelter will be undertaken through existing maintenance contracts and will incur costs of between $200 and $700 annually.
7.3 Funding Source – Traffic Operations, Capital Expenditure budget for bus stop, seating and shelter installations.

7.4 If approved, the recommendations will be in the financial year 2020-2021. If the current stock of shelters is not suitable or available for this site, purchase of the appropriate style of shelter may delay the installation by approximately three months.

8. Legal Implications

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report / Te Manatū Whakahaere Kaupapa

8.1 Under Section 339 of the Local Government Act 1974, the Council may erect on the footpath of any road, a shelter for use by intending public transport passengers or small passenger service vehicle passengers provided that no such shelter may be erected so as to unreasonably prevent access to any land having a frontage to the road. The Council is required to give notice in writing to the occupier and owner of property likely to be injuriously affected by the erection of the shelter, and shall not proceed with the erection of the shelter until after the expiration of the time for objecting against the proposal or, in the event of an objection, until after the objection has been determined.

8.2 Staff confirm the shelters will not prevent vehicular or pedestrian access to any land having a frontage to the road.

8.3 The relevant Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of bus passenger shelters under Section 339 (1) of the Local Government Act 1974.

8.4 Where no objection to the shelter has been presented by the owner or occupier of an affected property, staff present a decision making report directly to the relevant Community Board.

8.5 Where an objection has been presented by the owner or occupier of an affected property, staff present a decision making report to a Hearings Panel. The Hearings Panel then assess the objection against the criterion as outlined in Section 339 of the Act and make recommendations to the relevant Community Board. The Community Board will then determine the outcome of the objections in accordance with criterion outlined in Section 339 of the Local Government Act 1974.

Other Legal Implications / Ētahi a tu Hīraunga-ā-Ture

8.1 There is no legal context, issue or implication relevant to this decision.

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

9. Risk Management Implications / Ngā Hīraunga Tūraru

9.1 Should the Community Board proceed with the ‘Do Nothing’ option (Option 2 of this report), the existing passenger waiting facilities remain, leading to no improvement to the level of service for passengers waiting for a bus. This may reduce patronage on wet days, as passengers may choose another mode of travel as there is no shelter provided at the bus stop.
**Attachments / Ngā Tāpirihanga**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23 Ensors Road - Proposed Bus Passenger Shelter - Plan 20/201640 - For Board Approval</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the attached documents, the following background information is available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Location / File Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Confirmation of Statutory Compliance / Te Whakatūturutanga ā-Ture**

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 / Ngā Kaiwaitohu**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Serena Chia - Graduate Transport Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Stephen Wright - Team Leader Traffic Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steffan Thomas - Manager Operations (Transport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Osborne - Head of Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **Provision of School Bus Stop with time of day parking restrictions at redundant Metro bus stops on Linwood Avenue**

Reference / Te Tohutoro: 20/201786

Report of: Serena Chia, Graduate Transport Engineer, Serena.Chia@ccc.govt.nz

General Manager: David Adamson, General Manager City Services, David.Adamson@ccc.govt.nz

1. **Executive Summary / Te Whakarāpopoto Matua**

   1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to consider for approval the installation of a school bus stop sign with time of day parking restrictions to replace the redundant Metro bus stop on Linwood Avenue.

   1.2 The bus stop has not been operating as a Metro bus stop since late 2018, however it continues to be used by three school bus routes (school bus routes 663, 665 and 666). To utilise the space when the school buses are not in service, staff are proposing to change the existing standard bus stop sign to a bus stop sign that includes time of day parking restrictions, which will be reflective of the school bus timetable.

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

   1.4 The level of significance was determined by consideration of the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2. **Officer Recommendations / Ngā Tūtohu**

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

   1. In accordance with Clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017:
      a. Approve that the stopping of vehicles is prohibited on the north side of Linwood Avenue (beside 293 Linwood Avenue) commencing at a point approximately 16 metres northwest of its intersection (signalised cycle crossing) with Chelsea Street and extending in a northwesterly direction for a distance of approximately 20 metres, is reserved as a parking place in the form of a bus stop for the exclusive use of school buses between the time of 7.30am to 8.30am and 2.30pm to 4.00pm, Monday to Friday during school term times.

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

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

3. **Reason for Report Recommendations / Ngā Take mō te Whakatau**

   3.1 The bus stop is not operating as a Metro bus stop but is used by three school bus routes for students who attend Avonside Girls’ High School and Shirley Boy’s High School. The school bus routes operate once in the morning to get students to school and once in the afternoon, to drop students home after school ends.
3.2 The location of the school bus stop is shown in Figure 1.

![Diagram of school bus stop]

Figure 1: Existing redundant Metro bus stop beside 293 Linwood Avenue.

3.3 The advantages of this recommended option include:

- Utilises the vacant bus stop space for on-street parking during the time of day when the school bus is not in service.

3.4 The disadvantages of this recommended option include:

- None.

4. Alternative Options Considered / Ėtahi atu Kōwhiringa

4.1 Option 2 – Do nothing, existing bus stop sign remains.

5. Detail / Te Whakamahuki

Analysis Criteria / Ngā Paearu Wetekina

5.1 Due to the limited operation of the school bus route, staff are recommending that the bus stop is designated by means of a bus stop sign that displays time of day parking restrictions, thereby allowing other motorist to utilise the space when the bus stop is not in operation. The length of bus stop marking restrictions remain as per the existing provision.

Community Views and Preferences / Ngā mariu ā-Hāpori

5.2 Staff consulted with the business complex beside the bus stop by personally handing in the consultation document. The consultation period for the proposed school bus park occurred from Thursday 16 January 2020 to Friday 31 January 2020.

5.3 No feedback was received during the consultation period and prior to the preparation of this report.
5.4 Environmental Canterbury is responsible for providing public transport services. The Christchurch City Council is responsible for providing public transport infrastructure.

5.5 Council staff have contacted Environmental Canterbury about the proposal to change the existing bus stop operation to time of day parking restrictions, thereby allowing continued use of the space for the school bus routes, and by other motorists when the school buses are not in operation.

5.6 Environmental Canterbury staff have agreed that the proposal is a suitable compromise.

6. **Policy Framework Implications / Ngā Hīraunga ā-Kaupapa here**

**Strategic Alignment / Te Rautaki Tīaroaro**

6.1 The Council’s Strategic Framework is a key consideration in guiding the recommendations in this report. The recommendations in this report help achieve the:

- Community outcome of a well-connected and accessible city promoting active and public transport, and
- Strategic priorities of meeting the challenge of climate change through every means available.

6.2 This report supports the Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028):

6.2.1 Activity: Parking

- Level of Service: 10.3.3 Improve customer perception of the ease of use of Council on-street parking facilities. - >=52%

**Policy Consistency / Te Whai Kaupapa here**

6.3 The decision is consistent with the Council’s Plans, Policies and Strategic Framework.

**Impact on Mana Whenua / Ngā Whai Take Mana Whenua**

6.4 The decision 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 Mana Whenua, their culture and traditions.

**Climate Change Impact Considerations / Ngā Whai Whakaaro mā te Āhuarangi**

6.5 The existing bus stops provide access to school bus services, which supports travel demand management and management of traffic congestion near schools. This is a key provision to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, traffic congestion and traffic crashes, thereby supporting mode shift and the associated benefits to the environment.

**Accessibility Considerations / Ngā Whai Whakaaro mā te Hunga Hauā**

6.6 Accessibility by access to opportunities: Providing access to school buses for students have a positive impact to the well-being and accessibility of our community.

7. **Resource Implications**

**Capex/Opex / Ngā Utu Whakahaere**

7.1 Cost to Implement - $350 for the installation of school bus park sign, plus $1,000 for the planning, consultation and this report.

7.2 Maintenance/Ongoing costs - Transport Unit Operational Expenditure budget, includes maintenance of bus stop infrastructure, as and when it is needed.
7.3 Funding Source – Traffic Operations, Capital Expenditure budget for bus stop, seating and shelter installations.

7.4 If approved, the recommendations will be implemented in financial year 2020-2021.

8. Legal Implications

8.1 Part 1, Clause 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides the Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.

8.2 The Community Board have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.

8.3 The legal consideration is that the installation of any signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

9. Risk Management Implications

9.1 Should the Community Board proceed with the ‘Do Nothing’ option (Option 2 of this report), this could negatively impact the public’s perception of the ease of use of Council’s on-street parking, where such improvements are feasible.

Attachments / Ngā Tāpirihanga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>293 Linwood Avenue - Proposed School Bus Parking TG135623 - Plan No. 20/206486 - For Board Approval</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the attached documents, the following background information is available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Location / File Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance / Te Whakatūturutanga ā-Ture

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 / Ngā Kaiwaitohu

| Authors                   | Serena Chia - Graduate Transport Engineer  
|                          | Brenda O'Donoghue - Passenger Transport Engineer |
| Approved By              | Stephen Wright - Team Leader Traffic Operations  
|                          | Steffan Thomas - Manager Operations (Transport)  
|                          | Richard Osborne - Head of Transport |
10. Removal of redundant Metro bus stops on Gloucester Street between Linwood Avenue and Woodham Road

Reference / Te Tohutoro: 20/365557
Report of / Te Pou: Serena Chia, Graduate Transport Engineer, Serena.Chia@ccc.govt.nz
General Manager / Pouwhakarae: David Adamson, General Manager City Services, david.adamson@ccc.govt.nz

1. Executive Summary / Te Whakarāpopoto Matua

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to revoke four redundant bus stops along Gloucester Street, between Linwood Avenue and Woodham Road. The location of the redundant bus stops are shown in Attachment A.

1.2 This report is staff generated with the intention to formally remove four redundant Metro bus stops along Gloucester Street that have been redundant since 2013.

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

1.4 The level of significance was determined by consideration of the criteria set out in the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

2. Officer Recommendations / Ngā Tūtohu

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

1. Pursuant to Clause 7 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017:

   Bus stop at 669/673 Gloucester Street
   a. That all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the north side of Gloucester Street commencing at a point approximately 31 metres north east of its intersection with Surrey Street (measured from the prolongation of the eastern kerb line of Surrey Street), and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of 12 metres, be revoked.

   Bus stop at 30 Surrey Street/662 Gloucester Street
   b. That all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the south side of Gloucester Street commencing at a point approximately 22 metres south west of its intersection with Surrey Street (measured from the prolongation of the western kerb line of Surrey Street), and extending in a south westerly direction for a distance of approximately 12 metres, be revoked.

   Bus stop at 615/617 Gloucester Street
   c. That all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the north side of Gloucester Street commencing at a point approximately 25 metres north east of its intersection with Rochester Street (measured from the prolongation of the eastern kerb line of Rochester Street), and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of approximately 12 metres, be revoked.
Bus stop at 612/614 Gloucester Street
d. That all existing parking and stopping restrictions on the south side of Gloucester Street commencing at a point approximately 12 metres north east of its intersection with Rochester Street (measured from the prolongation of the eastern kerb line of Rochester Street), and extending in a north easterly direction for a distance of approximately 15 metres, be revoked.

2. That these resolutions take effect when the removal of the traffic control devices that evidence the restrictions being revoked as described in the staff report have been implemented.

3. Reason for Report Recommendations / Ngā Take mō te Whakatau

3.1 The bus stops along this section of Gloucester Street were originally serviced by a Metro bus route. The bus service, which travelled along Gloucester Street between Linwood Avenue and Woodham Road, has not operated along this route since 2013. At the time, when the bus route was changed, the bus stops were not formally revoked and the bus stop infrastructure remained.

3.2 Should a bus route return to this section of Gloucester Street in the future, staff would reconsider the bus stop locations and consult as required.

3.3 The infrastructure that remains at the bus stops include:
   - At 669/673 Gloucester Street: bus stop post and sign;
   - At 30 Surrey Street/662 Gloucester Street: seat, bus stop post and sign;
   - At 615/617 Gloucester Street: bus stop post and sign; and
   - At 612/614 Gloucester Street: bus stop box, bus stop post and sign.

3.4 The advantages of this option include:
   - Removes unnecessary infrastructure from the road and footpath network, and the associated maintenance costs.
   - Removes the potential confusion that some people may think there is a bus route along Gloucester Street because there are bus stops.
   - Removes the potential inconsistent messaging of parking at bus stops. Nearby residents may be aware that the bus stops are no longer in used and be parking at the bus stops. This could be sending the wrong message to other passing motorists who are not aware of this.

3.5 The disadvantages of this option include:
   - None, there is no bus route along Gloucester Street and hence there is no longer a need for the bus stops.

4. Alternative Options Considered / Ētahi atu Kōwhiringa

4.1 Option 2 – Do nothing, the redundant bus stops and the associated bus stop infrastructure remain.
5. **Detail / Te Whakamahuki**

*Community Views and Preferences / Ngā mariu ā-Hāpori*

5.1 Letters including the consultation plan were sent to the affected property owners and occupants who live closest to the redundant bus stops.

5.2 Two submissions were received and both were in favour with staff’s proposal.

6. **Policy Framework Implications / Ngā Hīraunga ā- Kaupapa here**

*Strategic Alignment / Te Rautaki Tiaroaro*

6.1 This report supports the [Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028)](#);  

   6.1.1 Activity: Parking  
   - Level of Service: 10.3.3 Improve customer perception of the ease of use of Council on-street parking facilities. - >=52%

*Policy Consistency / Te Whai Kaupapa here*

6.2 The decision is consistent with the Council’s Plans and Policies.

*Impact on Mana Whenua / Ngā Whai Take Mana Whenua*

6.3 The decision 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 Mana Whenua, their culture and traditions.

*Climate Change Impact Considerations / Ngā Whai Whakaaro mā te Āhuarangi*

6.4 Not applicable as the bus stops are no longer serviced by a bus route. The Orbiter and Yellow bus route continues to operate near both ends of the section of Gloucester Street and have captured passenger demand along Woodham Road and Linwood Avenue.

*Accessibility Considerations / Ngā Whai Whakaaro mā te Hunga Hauā*

6.5 Not applicable as the bus stops are no longer serviced by a bus route.

7. **Resource Implications / Ngā Hīraunga Rauemi**

*Capex/Opex / Ngā Utu Whakahaere*

7.1 Cost to Implement - $3,500 for the removal of line markings, a seat and four bus stop posts and signs. $1,000 for staff costs associated with planning, consultation and reporting.

7.2 Maintenance/Ongoing costs – the removal of the existing redundant infrastructure will also remove the need for future maintenance expenditure.

7.3 Funding Source – Traffic Operations, Capital Expenditure budget for bus stop, seating and shelter removals.

8. **Legal Implications / Ngā Hīraunga ā-Ture**

8.1 Part 1, Clause 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2018 provides the Council with the authority to install and revoke stopping and parking restrictions (including bus stops) by resolution.

8.2 The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.
8.3 The legal consideration is that the installation of any signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

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

9. Risk Management Implications / Ngā Hīraunga Tūraru

9.1 Should the Community Board proceed with the ‘Do Nothing’ option, all of the bus stop infrastructure will continue to need on-going maintenance as and when it is needed.

Attachments / Ngā Tāpirihanga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Attachment A - Proposed removal of redundant Metro bus stops along Gloucester Street between Linwood Avenue and Woodham Road _ Plan no.20/367399</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the attached documents, the following background information is available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Location / File Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance / Te Whakatūturutanga ā-Ture

- 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 / Ngā Kaiwaitohu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serena Chia</td>
<td>Graduate Transport Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Su</td>
<td>Passenger Transport Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved By</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Wright</td>
<td>Team Leader Traffic Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffan Thomas</td>
<td>Manager Operations (Transport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Osborne</td>
<td>Head of Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gloucester Street between Linwood Avenue and Woodham Road

Proposed removal of redundant bus stops

For Board Approval
11. Proposed No Stopping, Maryville Courts entrances on Salisbury Street and Colombo Street

Reference / Te Tohutoro: 20/173047
Report of: Peter Rodgers, Traffic Engineer, peter.rodgers@ccc.govt.nz
General Manager: David Adamson, General Manager City Services, david.adamson@ccc.govt.nz

1. Executive Summary / Te Whakarāpopoto Matua

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to consider approving no-stopping restrictions by the Salisbury Street and Colombo Street exits from Maryville Courts. This report is being provided to fulfil resolution LCHB/2019/00139 of the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board from its meeting of 9 December 2019 where the Community Board resolved to:

5. Request staff to consult on options for the removal of car parking to improve visibility for drivers leaving Maryville Courts and report back to the Board.

1.2 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. The level of significance was determined by the low level of impact and low number of people affected by the recommended decision.

2. Officer Recommendations / Ngā Tūtohu

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

1. Approve that all stopping and parking restrictions on the northern side of Salisbury Street commencing at a point 108 metres east of its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 19 metres be revoked.

2. Approve that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northern side of Salisbury Street commencing at a point 108 metres east of its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 19 metres.

3. Approve that all stopping and parking restrictions on the eastern side of Colombo Street, commencing at a point 64 metres north of its intersection with Salisbury Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 44 metres, be revoked.

4. Approve that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the eastern side of Colombo Street, commencing at a point 64 metres north of its intersection with Salisbury Street and extending in a northerly direction for a distance of 44 metres.

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

3. Reason for Report Recommendations

3.1 It is recommended to install no-stopping restrictions as per Attachment A. The length of no-stopping in this option is the minimum length needed to provide Minimum Gap Sight
Distance, allowing a driver entering the roadway sufficient visibility of approaching traffic to make the desired turn safety. This should also increase safety for cyclists by increasing intervisibility between exiting vehicles and cyclists and reducing the need for exiting vehicles to encroach into the traffic lane, which can pose a hazard to cyclists.

3.2 Advantages to this option include:

3.2.1 Provides visibility, resulting in an increased perception of safety for drivers exiting Maryville Courts.

3.2.2 Supported by the majority of submitters.

3.3 Disadvantages include:

3.3.1 May set an expectation that the Council will install no-stopping restrictions at other similar residential vehicle entrances that do not meet operational policy.

3.3.2 Loss of parking.

4. Alternative Options Considered

4.1 Option two – do not install no-stopping restrictions is another viable option.

4.2 Advantages to this option include:

4.2.1 Does not set any expectation that the same treatment is provided to other similar residential vehicle entrances.

4.2.2 Does not result in any change in on-street parking.

4.3 Disadvantages include

4.3.1 Does not provide any improvements to visibility.

4.3.2 Is not supported by the majority of submitters.

5. Detail

5.1 Maryville Courts have asked for parking to be removed to provide visibility from the vehicle exits from Maryville Courts.

5.2 Previous requests to install no-stopping restrictions at these vehicle entrances had been declined, as they are not consistent with operational policy. For further background information, refer to item 8 of the agenda of the 9 December 2019 meeting of the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board.

5.3 On 9 December 2019, the Community Board resolved to install no-stopping restrictions over the vehicle entrances, and requested consultation on options for the removal of parking to increase visibility.

5.4 Removal of parking by installing no-stopping restrictions has been proposed which will provide the Maryville Courts vehicle entrances with similar visibility to a minor road intersection.

Community Views and Preferences

5.5 Property owners and occupiers were advised of the proposal by a combination of post and letter drop. Consultation ran from 28 February 2020 to 23 March 2020. 46 submissions were received, of which:

- 44 submissions supported the proposal
- 1 submission did not support the proposal
• 1 submission had indicated on the submission form they did not support the proposal, but had written comments on the submission form expressing support for the proposal.

5.6 Several submissions from #143 supported the proposal and also requested that the no-stopping restrictions be extended to include the shared driveway to #143. These submitters were advised that current operational policy does not support extending the same treatment to the shared driveway of #143. The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board has considered the Maryville Courts entrance and had resolved to consider it an exception to operational policy.

5.7 One submission commented that parking was being removed to improve visibility to the driveway of 858/860 Colombo Street. The staff response was that the no-stopping lines on Colombo Street are not proposed specifically to improve visibility for 858/860 Colombo Street, these are proposed to provide visibility to the left from the Maryville Courts Colombo Street entrance, but these do have the side effect of providing the same or better visibility from 858 Colombo Street. On Salisbury Street, it is not necessary to provide visibility to the left as it is a one-way street.

5.8 Submissions with comments made are including in Attachment B.

5.9 The decision affects the following wards/Community Board areas:

5.9.1 Central Ward, within the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board area.

6. Policy Framework Implications

Strategic Alignment

6.1 : 

6.1.1 Activity: Traffic Safety and Efficiency

• Level of Service: 10.0.6.1 Reduce the number of casualties on the road network. <=124 (reduce by 5 or more per year)

Policy Consistency

6.2 The decision is consistent with the Council’s Plans and Policies.

Impact on Mana Whenua

6.3 The decision 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 Mana Whenua, their culture and traditions.

Climate Change Impact Considerations

6.4 The impact on climate change from this decision is expected to be minor.

Accessibility Considerations

6.5 The decisions in this report may have a minor positive impact to accessibility by improving the visibility for drivers exiting the retirement home. The decisions may have a minor negative impact by reducing the available on-street parking spaces.

7. Resource Implications

Capex/Opex

7.1 Cost to Implement - $200 for the installation of road markings.

7.2 Maintenance/Ongoing costs – minor increase in maintenance costs.
7.3 Funding Source – Traffic Operations signs and markings budgets.

8. Legal Implications

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report

8.1 Part 1, Clauses 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.

8.2 The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.

8.3 The installation of any signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.

Other Legal Implications

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

8.5 This specific report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit however the report has been written using a general approach previously approved of by the Legal Services Unit, and the recommendations are consistent with the policy and legislative framework outlined in sections 8.1 to 8.3.

Attachments / Ngā Tāpirihanga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Proposed No Stopping, Salisbury Street and Colombo Street entrance to Maryville Courts, Plan for Board Approval</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Submissions - Maryville Courts Proposed No Stopping</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the attached documents, the following background information is available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Location / File Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board 9th December 2019 meeting</td>
<td><a href="https://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2019/12/LCHB_20191209_AGN_4178_AT.htm#PDF2_ReportName_25864">https://christchurch.infocouncil.biz/Open/2019/12/LCHB_20191209_AGN_4178_AT.htm#PDF2_ReportName_25864</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8. Maryville Courts (Salisbury Street and Colombo Street) - Proposed No Stopping Restriction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance / Te Whakatūturutanga ā-Ture

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 / Ngā Kaiwaitohu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Peter Rodgers - Traffic Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Approved By             | Stephen Wright - Team Leader Traffic Operations  
                          | Steffan Thomas - Manager Operations (Transport)  
                          | Richard Osborne - Head of Transport              |
Proposed No Stopping: Maryville Courts Salisbury Street entrance (see over page for Colombo Street entrance)

Plan for Board Approval
Proposed No Stopping: Maryville Courts Colombo Street entrance (see over page for Salisbury Street entrance)

Plan for Board Approval
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SubmissionID</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>I generally support the plan. I am interested to understand why specifically these exits are being considered. There are many driveway / access have poor visibility and it is not consistent to have these areas treated differently. Please send me an email with your reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. We are one of ten units situated at 143 Salisbury Street. We lived in the area for several years before moving to Akaroa, and now we use the property when we visit town regularly. Our property backs onto Maryville Courts. The issue is not solely confined to motor vehicles. The street is also the preferred route for a lot of cyclists and in particular secondary school students making their way to rowing practice (I think) several days a week. There have already been near misses and I am personally very worried about this because cyclists are just about impossible to see until it is too late. Even though its a one-way street all of the cyclists tend to keep to the left side of the road and this obviously exacerbates the problem. When a cyclist is eventually hit, it will happen, the fault will lay with the car driver and this is grossly unfair given the visibility issue. We also have the added difficulty of turning left into our driveway in higher traffic volumes because there is no place to pull over and slow down before making the turn. This causes clear problems for the following traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>David and Cushla</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>For some years, now, we have been faced with the identical problem that Maryville residents are dealing with. That is vehicles parking in such a position (often illegally) that prevents us from seeing approaching traffic travelling east along Salisbury Street when leaving the driveway in a car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pet</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are two available car parks immediately to the west of our property which are invariably used for all day parking (including weekends) and when they are occupied it is impossible to see approaching traffic from a position of safety (I have marked them on the plan). One needs to drive off the property sufficiently far to be able to see down Salisbury Street, and at that point half of the car is well into the left lane. Our safety is further compromised with this being a one-way street where vehicles (as you are no doubt aware) tend to travel a bit faster as drivers seek to catch the synchronised traffic lights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>anon</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think the proposal plan will address the need for improved visibility and the obvious safety issues around driveways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed changes will increase visibility &amp; improving safety when exiting Maryville Courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>The main culprit blocking the entrance to Maryville Courts I find on entering from Salisbury Street would be someone parked across the entrance waiting for a resident of Maryville Courts. Salisbury Street is well patrolled by the Council meterman (More frequent perhaps I suggest) otherwise rules are rules and fines are fines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Noeline</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>It was really difficult exiting Maryville with cars parked up to the entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bev</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is dangerous to have to put 1/2 your car out onto the road to see past a parked car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RJ</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>As a resident living in 143 Salisbury Street I generally support the plan. However I would like the no stopping restrictions to include the entrance to 143 Salisbury Street, as the same problem occurs there. Many of us are elderly (I am 82) and have difficulties and dangers when exiting our properties. The introduction of electric cycles and motorised scooters has greatly added to the problem. Please see attached for my request to extend the 'no stopping' plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently exiting Maryville Courts on Salisbury Street and Colombo Street is an accident waiting to happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rosamond</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>G Lewis</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>B W</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubmissionID</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed plan to reduce some of the car parks outside both entrances and exits of Maryville Courts is very welcome. We have had to come right out into the traffic lanes to be able to see the traffic clearly. This will be a great safety measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mrs E</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>For residents safety leaving Salisbury and Colombo St exists we look forward to the proposed no stopping as indicated above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mrs E</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entering on to the road will be more relaxed, when it is better to see what is coming. Salisbury Street traffic is often very fast, Colombo Street, being a two way at times the green light jumps on, while you are started to cross, so it gives you a hell of a fright. Am looking forward to the change. Better sooner than later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Graeme &amp; July</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>At the present time it is very hard and at times dangerous when leaving our place to enter both Salisbury and Colombo St. With cars parked right up to the entrance way. The speed of vehicles is at times is quite dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>The way it is it is very dangerous. I had an accident coming out cannot see oncoming vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Val</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is difficult to turn into Salisbury St as it is now. I was going out about 7:15pm one night recently, had checked was about to move out an almighty toot as a low car that I couldn't see zoomed along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>When leaving Maryville Courts village it is very dangerous due to cars parked close to driveways. Extending yellow lines as per plan will make it much safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colombo St is very busy at times. Difficult access. Cars are inclined to speed on Salisbury making it difficult to get out from Maryville Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Trevor</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit from Maryville is so risky as you are entering fast moving traffic lanes with no momentum. You are forced to look into the sun the opposite way to where you are going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not only are there the 40+ motorists there are also support health workers tradesmen and catering staff as well as visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A New hazard is cars leaving the childcare centre who want to get into the left hand lanes so they can turn up left into Manchester Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children on scooters going to or from school, e-scooters, baby buggies, all are footpath hazards one has to be aware of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillors refer to Maryville as a residence. It should be compared with a hotel for the vehicle traffic it generates. If you do away with the 5 minute parks that are east of the main gate them incorporate them into the general parking the loss of parking is negated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Milne</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely a very sensible move. Both entrances very difficult to exit. Especially Colombo Street. Bicycle riders especially a worry they come at you with such speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Having to move out so far onto the road to see what's coming not very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>While I do not live at Maryville Courts I do work there at weekends. To my mind it is patently obvious that parking should be prohibited so that residents can exit safely from the village. Salisbury Street is one way with fast moving traffic and if anything the Colombo St is even worse with two way traffic including cyclists which can appear from nowhere at speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be sure that the way is clear, drivers need to move too far onto the street to ensure they have a clear view. It seems that there is a simple solution to ensure our residents safety and the Council should use it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Horst</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>I agree with the loss of parking spaces to improve the safety of both cars leaving Maryville Courts as well as the cars passing the entrances on both Salisbury and Colombo streets. It is almost impossible to see cars coming from the right when leaving Maryville Courts and forces these cars going past to veer to the wrong side of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mrs</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>We need yellow lines to be extended at both gates. It's extremely dangerous situation to be in we could have a fatal incident which we feel can be prevented by you doing this extending some yellow lines, thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubmissionID</td>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>I agree there needs to be a loss of parking space to improve the visibility for cars and pedestrians leaving Maryville courts, crossing the road from both entrances is very difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan needed to be carried out for safety reasons for residents + non residents alike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colombo St and Salisbury St are busy city roads and this will provide an important part of ensuring the safety of those entering and leaving Maryville Courts as residents, visitors or staff or contractors. Although it will affect parking in a small way, this is not in proportion to the safety improvement it will provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>I feel very vulnerable when driving out of Maryville as often the right hand view is obscured by other cars parked close to exit. One needs to drive out into the line of traffic to have clear vision both ways. I feel it is only a matter of time before there is a serious collision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>It will provide general safety for potential traffic accidents from Maryville residents. For me it is best to extend the broken yellow line to consider those residents as older and it will be best for any residents driver to have a better view on the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is very limited right vision on both Salisbury &amp; Colombo St when attempting to exit Maryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cars and cyclists move at a fast pace which gives little time to see them approaching and then only by moving out on to the traffic lane It is also obvious that the senior residents of Maryville have by reason of age much slower reactions. This proposal is one to activity to improve road safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>I find the exit from Salisbury &amp; Colombo quite frightening despite having good eyesight, 2m from cars speed up to reach the 'go' lights &amp; proceeding onto the road to get a better 'view' is nerve racking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>We ask that this proposal proceeds for the safety of our elderly residents, staff, trades, health professionals &amp; visitors to the village I like many others feel we take our 'life in our hands' exiting both gates with poor visibility + the speed of oncoming traffic. It will only be a matter of time before a severe injury or death results from a collision at either of these gates Please ensure this great initiative succeeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>The fact that Salisbury Street is one way and the traffic is heavy + fast! Having cars parked hard up to the Maryville Courts entrance means that vehicles leaving Maryville must move out onto the left lane to get clear vision As at present is unsafe [dangerous in fact]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Proposed No Stopping Restrictions, Salisbury Street

Reference / Te Tohutoro: 20/795577
Report of / Te Pou Matua: Peter Rodgers, Traffic Engineer, peter.rodgers@ccc.govt.nz
General Manager / Pouwhakarae: David Adamson, General Manager City Services, david.adamson@ccc.govt.nz

1. Executive Summary / Te Whakarāpopoto Matua

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board to consider options for no stopping restrictions on Salisbury Street. This report has been written in response to a request from a resident of the area.

1.2 The decisions in this report are of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. The level of significance was determined by the low level of impact and low number of people affected by the recommended decision.

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

1.4 The recommended option is to install No Stopping restrictions in accordance with Attachment A. The length of No Stopping in this option is the minimum length needed to provide Minimum Gap Sight Distance, allowing a driver entering the roadway sufficient visibility of approaching traffic to make the desired turn safety.

2. Officer Recommendations / Ngā Tūtohu

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

1. Approve that all stopping and parking restrictions on the northern side of Salisbury Street commencing at a point 121 metres east of its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 20 metres be revoked.

2. Approve that the stopping of vehicles be prohibited at any time on the northern side of Salisbury Street commencing at a point 121 metres east of its intersection with Colombo Street and extending in an easterly direction for a distance of 20 metres.

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

3. Reason for Report Recommendations / Ngā Take mō te Whakatau

3.1 Safety concerns have been raised with Council regarding visibility for drivers leaving the car park at 199 Salisbury Street (Briscoes) towards oncoming traffic and cyclists. Implementing the noted recommendations will lead to a reduction in the risk of a crash by improving sightlines at the car park exit.

3.2 The recommendations in this report will help to achieve the desired community outcome of a well-connected and accessible city through improved road safety.

3.3 It is recommended to install No Stopping restrictions in accordance with Attachment A. The length of No Stopping in this option is the minimum length needed to provide Minimum Gap Sight Distance, allowing a driver entering the roadway sufficient visibility of approaching traffic to make the desired turn safety. This should also increase safety for cyclists by
increasing intervisibility between exiting vehicles and cyclists and reducing the need for exiting vehicles to encroach into the traffic lane, which can pose a hazard to cyclists.

3.4 Options within this report have been assessed against relevant industry-standard design guidance including the sight distance requirements of the Council’s Infrastructure Design Standard.

4. Alternative Options Considered / Ėtahi atu Kōwhiringa

4.1 Maintain the status quo – Do not install no stopping restrictions.

4.2 This option is not considered viable as this is a high volume vehicle entrance likely to be used by users unfamiliar with it and the road environment, and doing nothing does not address the concerns raised.

4.3 The advantages of this option include:
4.3.1 Retaining three on-street parking spaces.

4.4 The disadvantages of the option include:
4.4.1 Does not address the concerns raised.
4.4.2 Does not improve visibility at the high volume vehicle exit from 199 Salisbury Street.

5. Detail / Te Whakamahuki

5.1 The Council has received a request to install no stopping restrictions in order to improve safety for cyclists travelling along Salisbury Street, who are coming into conflict with vehicles exiting 199 Salisbury Street (Briscoes). Exiting vehicles have poor visibility towards oncoming traffic due to vehicles parked close to the vehicle exit, and are encroaching onto the road reserve in order to improve visibility.

5.2 Visibility can be limited by parked vehicles on Salisbury Street. There are high parking demands in the area, primarily for long term commuter parking.

5.3 This is a vehicle entrance/exit. Vehicles entering the road from private property are legally required to give way to users of the footpath and also required to give way to all traffic on Salisbury Street.

5.4 There have been no crashes recorded at this location in the last five years. Salisbury Street is classified as Low-Medium risk under the Council’s risk mapping system.

5.5 Operational policy is to install no stopping restrictions at high volume commercial vehicle entrances with estimated traffic volumes of over 250 per day. This is considered on a case by case basis when requests are received. This vehicle entrance meets this criteria.

5.6 Approval is required by the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board.

5.7 If approved, the recommendations will be implemented within the current financial year (generally around four weeks after the contractor receives the request, but this is subject to other factors such as resourcing and prioritisation beyond the Council’s control).

Community Views and Preferences

5.8 Affected property owners and residents were advised of the recommended option by post and letter drop.

5.9 One response was received from Briscoes, in support of the proposed restrictions. No comments were received.
5.10 The Team Leader Parking Compliance supports the preferred option.

5.11 The do nothing option is inconsistent with community requests to improve visibility at the intersection.

6. **Policy Framework Implications / Ngā Hīraunga ā- Kaupapa**

**Strategic Alignment / Te Rautaki Tīaroaro**

6.1 The Council’s strategic priorities have been considered in formulating the recommendations in this report, however this area of work is not specifically covered by an identified priority.

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

**Policy Consistency / Te Whai Kaupapa here**

6.3 The recommendations in this report are consistent with the Christchurch Suburban Parking Policy.

**Impact on Mana Whenua / Ngā Whai Take Mana Whenua**

6.4 The effects of this proposal upon Mana Whenua are expected to be insignificant.

**Climate Change Impact Considerations / Ngā Whai Whakaaro mā te Āhuarangi**

6.5 This proposal includes measures to encourage walking/cycling/public transport and therefore will result in positive changes to reduce carbon emissions and the effects of Climate Change.

6.6 This proposal does not have any significant effect upon carbon emissions and Climate Change.

**Accessibility Considerations / Ngā Whai Whakaaro mā te Hunga Hauā**

6.7 This proposal improves accessibility for pedestrians/drivers/cyclists, by providing a safer means of exiting the car park.

7. **Resource Implications / Ngā Hīraunga Rauemi**

**Capex/Opex / Ngā Utu Whakahaere**

7.1 Cost to Implement - $200 for installation of road markings.

7.2 Maintenance/Ongoing costs - Maintenance costs will be covered under the existing maintenance budget.

7.3 Funding Source – Traffic Operations signs and markings operational budgets.

8. **Legal Implications / Ngā Hīraunga ā-Ture**

**Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report / Te Manatū Whakahaere Kaupapa**

8.1 Part 1, Clauses 7 and 8 of the Christchurch City Council Traffic and Parking Bylaw 2017 provides the Council with the authority to install parking restrictions by resolution.

8.2 The Community Boards have delegated authority from the Council to exercise the delegations as set out in the Register of Delegations. The list of delegations for the Community Boards includes the resolution of stopping restrictions and traffic control devices.

8.3 The installation of any signs and/or markings associated with traffic control devices must comply with the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004.
Other Legal Implications / Ėtahi atu Hīraunga-ā-Ture

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

8.5 This specific report has not been reviewed and approved by the Legal Services Unit however the report has been written using a general approach previously approved of by the Legal Services Unit, and the recommendations are consistent with the policy and legislative framework outlined in sections 8.1 to 8.3.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>199 Salisbury Street - Proposed no stopping restrictions plan for Board Approval</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance / Te Whakatūturutanga ā-Ture

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 / Ngā Kaiwaitohu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Peter Rodgers - Traffic Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Stephen Wright - Team Leader Traffic Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steffan Thomas - Manager Operations (Transport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Osborne - Head of Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Port Hills Grazing Deed of Licence

Reference / Te Tohutoro: 20/112417
Report of: Felix Dawson, Leasing Consultant; felix.r.dawson@ccc.govt.nz
General Manager: Brent Smith, Principal Advisor Citizens and Community
Brent.Smith@ccc.govt.nz

1. Executive Summary / Te Whakarāpopoto Matua

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Waikura/Linwood Central-Heathcote Community Board to authorise the granting of a licence for the grazing of the Port Hills. This report has been written because the current grazing arrangements are holding over and a new licence is required.

1.2 The decision in this report is of low significance in relation to the Christchurch City Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. The level of significance was determined following completion of the assessment matrix. The choice of grazier itself will affect a low number of people and have limited impact on the level of service or finances.

1.3 The Port Hills Reserves/Parks run from Scarborough to Bowenvale and are managed by the Regional Parks Team with the broad aim to manage the land for community benefit.

1.4 Stock grazing is a key management tool to achieve the aim and manage fuel load.

1.5 A Request for Proposal process has been undertaken for the purpose of selecting a grazier to enter into a grazing licence. Two complying proposals were received and evaluated.

1.6 The Port Hills Reserves/Parks are held as Recreation Reserve, Scenic Reserve and ‘Park’ depending on the land parcel. Staff hold the delegated authority to issue a five year grazing licence in regard to the Reserves Act land but not for the ‘Park’. Staff are happy to enter into a licence with the preferred grazier for the reasons set out in this report.

1.7 The decision in this report deals specifically with that part of the Port Hills Reserves/Parks that are not held under the Reserves Act 1977 but are held as ‘Park’. For these properties the Community Board holds the delegation to issue a grazing licence and Board approval is sought to accept the proposal of the preferred grazier and to enter into a grazing licence with them for the ‘Park’ land as shown shaded on the attached plan (refer Attachment A).

2. Officer Recommendations / Ngā Tūtohu

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

1. Approve the acceptance of Respondent A’s proposal to graze the Port Hills.

2. Approve a Licence to Graze Park pursuant to s138 of the Local Government Act 2002 for the properties shown as Park and listed in the “Port Hills Grazing lease/report schedule in schedule 1, refer Attachment A of the officer report attached to the agenda for the meeting.

3. Note that the Manager Property Consultancy and the Head of Parks acting jointly hold the delegation to enter into an Agreement to Graze Recreation Reserve pursuant to s53(1)(a)(ii) of the Reserves Act 1977 for the properties shown as Recreation Reserve and listed in the “Port Hills Grazing lease/report schedule in schedule 1, refer Attachment A of the officer report attached to the agenda for the meeting.

4. Note that the Manager Property Consultancy and the Head of Parks acting jointly hold the delegation to enter into an Agreement to Graze Scenic Reserve pursuant to s55(1)(f) and
s55(2)(a) of the Reserves Act 1977 for the properties shown as Scenic Reserve in schedule 1, refer Attachment A of the officer report attached to the agenda for the meeting.

5. That the licence terms and conditions be:
   (a) For a period of (3) years with a right of renewal for a further two years providing a total of five years.
   (b) Annual rent, refer PX attachment
   (c) Other licence terms and conditions generally in accordance with the Licence attached to the Request for Proposal, dated 14 October 2019, tender number 21664419.

6. Authorise the Property Manager Consultancy to conclude and administer all necessary licence negotiations and documentation.

3. Reason for Report Recommendations
   3.1 The report recommends granting a licence to Respondent A because they achieved the best score out of the two proposals received.
   3.2 The advantages of the preferred offer are:
      • There were no assumptions attached to the proposal.
      • Proven experience in management of much of the site including dealing with public access.
      • Close to market rental offered.
      • Allows opportunity to run Council land in conjunction with the grazing of neighbouring properties, allowing more efficiency in stock movements.
   3.3 No disadvantages identified.

4. Alternative Options Considered
   4.1 Grant licence to Respondent B
      The advantage of this option is that it provides a new approach to grazing the land.
      The disadvantages of this option is that:
      • Some assumptions attached to the proposal.
      • No on site experience.
      • No experience in grazing with public access.
      • Below market rental offered.
   4.2 The option of running another Request For Proposal was considered and discounted on the basis that the potential advantage of producing a better offer is out-weighed by the cost of staff time and relatively low likelihood of a better offer, given the quality of those received.

5. Detail
   Background
   5.1 The Port Hills Reserves/Parks (the Land) run from Scarborough to Bowenvale.
   5.2 The property associated with this report (the Land) runs from Scarborough to the Rapaki Track and contains the following Reserves/Parks: Scarborough Hill Reserve, Greenwood Park,
John Britten Reserve, Mt Pleasant Scenic Reserve, Scotts Valley Reserve, Castle Rock Reserve, Montgomery Spur Reserve. Refer to Attachment B for a map overview.

5.3 The balance of the Port Hills Reserves/Parks are contained in Bowenvale Park which falls within the Waihoro/Spreydon-Heathcote ward.

5.4 This decision affects the following ward/Community Board areas:
5.4.1 Waikura/Linwood–Central-Heathcote Community Board.

5.5 The Land is managed by the Regional Parks Team. In broad terms the aims in managing the Land are to provide community benefit by way of access, and ecological value through enhancing the natural biodiversity of tussock grassland whilst protecting existing forest remnants and allowing regeneration in some areas.

5.6 Stock grazing is a key element to achieving the aims described above and in addition provides a mechanism to manage the fire fuel load.

5.7 Grazing has been undertaken for a number of years through contract grazing with individual licences for each Reserve/Park. The current licences are held by two graziers.

5.8 All current licences have either expired and are holding over or are due to retire early this year. The issue therefore is that for management purposes a new licence needs to be issued for all Reserves/Parks in the Port Hills Reserve/Park.

Request for Proposal

5.9 A Request for Proposal (RFP) process was undertaken for grazing all Reserves/Parks under one grazier. A key emphasis in the RFP was for the grazier to work in partnership with Regional Parks Staff so that the aim for the Reserves/Parks can be achieved. Sometimes this involves moving stock on request and includes lighter grazing than would be undertaken on a strictly commercial operation.

5.10 Marketing was undertaken from 14 October 2019 - 6 November 2019 using the local government procurement tool ‘GETS’ and advertisement in the Christchurch Press. Two complying proposals were received:

4.10.1 Respondent A - Company principal currently grazes around half the Land. He has a proven relationship with Regional Parks, has demonstrated a willingness to graze at levels required by staff, move stock on request and an ability to deal with public access. Respondent A runs a backup farm of 360 ha in South Canterbury. Close to market rental was offered with no departures from the proposed agreement/licence or assumptions attached.

4.10.2 Respondent B – is a new entity established for the purpose of the proposal with ‘Director A’ an ex-high country shepherd and current agribusiness banker, and ‘Director B’ is the current owner and General Manager of a 2,900ha Hill Station in Rakaia. Rental offered was below market with some assumptions around quality of pasture and moving of stock on request leading to a suggestion that rental adjustment may be required. Also assumed early access which is not an option.

5.11 Both proposals were assessed by a panel of three staff (two Parks and one Property), using the evaluation tool developed in conjunction with procurement and applying the following criteria:

- Experience and track record
- Farm Operational Plan/Personnel
- Financial Resources/Proposed rental
• Service Delivery: Health and Safety/Environmental Sustainability

Assessment resulted in Respondent A as the preferred option with a total score of 75% compared with Respondent B at 60%.

5.12 Both proposals presented a similar operational plan in terms of stock levels and breed suggesting a comparable approach to grazing would be applied. Both also presented strong financial security and alternative farm back up demonstrating an ability to maintain the operation in changeable conditions. In terms of environmental management both referred to a similar Operational Plan that keeps impact to a minimum. Respondent B discussed introducing the concept of ‘Natural Capital’ to monitoring performance. This is a concept that could be explored further in the future.

5.13 The key differences between the proposals was that Respondent B lacked experience on site and with farming involving public access. Respondent B also offered almost 60% less in rent and included conditions to the offer that were likely to result in negotiations for rent reductions.

Preferred Respondent

5.14 Respondent A Ltd has grazed Scarborough Hill Reserve since 2001, Greenwood Park, since 2003, Castle Rock Reserve and Montgomery Spur since around 2017. In addition he currently grazes Department of Conservation (DOC) land on Godley Head, Taylors Mistake Bach owners land and Linda Stewart Reserve adjoining Castle Rock Reserve. He has a proven track record on the key management issues relating to the land such as:

• Moving stock on request.
• Managing public access requirements such as public enquiries, damage to fences, stock disturbance.

5.15 Linking the neighbouring properties with the Land under a single grazier enables it to be grazed as one providing greater options and efficiency in terms of stock movement and management with opportunities to move stock between blocks as conditions demand.

5.16 Based on a positive credit check supported by an Accountant’s statement as to financial position the evaluation panel is confident in the ability of Respondent A to run a viable farm operation.

Proposed Licence: key Terms and Conditions

5.17 Licence Term: Five years
Annual Rent: Refer Public Excluded attachment
Rent review: Three years
Parks Input: Regional Parks Staff have input into management including two monthly meetings with grazier and right to request removal, reduction or increase in stock
Public Access: Year round access for recreation purposes

Community Views and Preferences

5.18 A Reserves Act 1977/Local Government Act 2002 notice was made on 23 November 2019 with a one month opportunity for submissions as is required under the Acts. None were received. The five year licence term provides flexibility in terms of future grazing options. A Port Hills
Plan should be completed within the five year licence term. This would provide a broader consultation and engagement process on the long term future of the Port Hills as a whole.

6. **Policy Framework Implications**

   **Strategic Alignment**
   6.1 The following grazing policy applies:
      
      Grazing Licence Policy, 26 September 2002.
      
      Key sections are:
      1. That the Council tender(s) grazing licences for a maximum term of five years for any part of the approximately 708 hectares of Christchurch City Council administered land on the Port Hills
      2. That, where necessary the Council gives public notice in accordance with section 119 of the Reserves Act 1977 specifying the licence proposed to be granted.

   6.2 This report supports the [Council’s Long Term Plan (2018 - 2028)](https://www.christchurchcity.govt.nz/council-plans-

      6.2.1 Activity: Parks & Foreshore
      - Level of Service: 6.8.2.2 Parks are provided managed and maintained in a clean, tidy, safe, functional and equitable manner (Asset Condition).

   **Policy Consistency**
   6.3 The decision is consistent with the Council’s Plans and Policies as set out above.

   **Impact on Mana Whenua**
   6.4 The decision 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 Mana Whenua, their culture and traditions. Consultation in accordance with the Conservation Act 1987 is underway with a preliminary indication of consent. This will be updated at the time of presenting the report to the Community Board.

   **Climate Change Impact Considerations**
   6.5 The RFP contained an assessment criteria regarding climate change affects and measures to minimise emissions. In terms of environmental management both respondents referred to a similar Operational Plan that keeps climate change impact to a minimum.

   **Accessibility Considerations**
   6.6 The choice of grazier does not raise any accessibility issues.

7. **Resource Implications**

   **Capex/Opex**
   7.1 Cost to Implement – approximately $1000 covered in Opex budgets.
   7.2 Maintenance/Ongoing costs – ongoing management of the licence agreements covered in Opex budgets.
   7.3 Funding Source – Regional Parks Opex budgets

   **Other**
   7.4 Not applicable
8. Legal Implications

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report

8.1 The Community Board holds the delegation to authorise the granting of lease/licences over Park land held under the Local Government Act 2002, that is vested in the local territorial authority. (Staff hold the delegation to authorise the granting of lease/licences over Reserve land held under the Reserves Act 1977, that is vested in the local territorial authority)

8.2 The Council Chief Executive holds the delegation to authorise the consent of the Minister of Conservation as required pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977.

8.3 In exercising the Minister’s delegation the administering body (the Council) must give consideration to those matters previously applied by the Minister for example ensuring that:
   - The land has been correctly identified.
   - The necessary statutory processes have been followed.
   - The functions and purposes of the Reserves Act 1977 have been taken into account in respect to the classification and purpose of the Reserve as required under s40 of the Act.
   - The administering body has considered submissions and objections from affected parties and that on the basis of the evidence the decision is a reasonable one.
   - Pursuant to the requirements of section 4 of the Conservation Act 1987, the administering body has consulted with and considered the views of tangata whenua or has some other way of making an informed decision.

8.4 Council officers have publicly notified the Council’s intention to consider granting a licence to Respondent A for five years under the Reserves Act 1977 and the Local Government Act 2002.

8.5 Council officers are satisfied that the proposed licence complies with the Minister’s requirements. Consultation with the tangata whenua is underway through the office of the Council’s Pou Whakatohutohu Tumuaki- Principal Advisor- Ngai Tahu Relationships. Any concerns will be reported by officers at the time of presenting the report to the community Board and the Council.

Other Legal Implications

8.1 The legal consideration is the preparation of a Deed of Licence and the application of the appropriate delegations.

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

9. Risk Management Implications

9.1 There is a risk of:
   - Rent not paid
   - Grazing levels not achieved
   - Poor operational management including management of staff and equipment

9.2 The above consequences would be caused by a failure of the licensee to perform to expectations and could result in a loss of income through unpaid rent together with reputational damage/poor media coverage of bad management of a Council asset.

9.3 The risk is assessed as low on the basis that the financial consequences are relatively small and operational issues could be rectified. The likelihood of these consequences occurring is considered low based on experience and track record of the preferred respondent.
Attachments / Ngā Tāpirihanga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Port Hills Grazing Schedule - 1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board - Port Hills Grazing Plan - 2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Public Excluded Attachment - Proposed Annual Rental - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the attached documents, the following background information is available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Location / File Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmation of Statutory Compliance / Te Whakatūturutanga ā-Ture

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Reserve/Park</th>
<th>Area (ha) approx</th>
<th>Legal description</th>
<th>Certificate of Title</th>
<th>How held (purpose)</th>
<th>Statutory leasing authority</th>
<th>Delegation of DOC consent to CEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Hill Reserve</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Lot 1-3 DP 54492, Part Lot 1 DP 4807 and Part Lot 2 DP 10127</td>
<td>CB43A/1050</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S73(1), s53(1)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Park</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 331163</td>
<td>128260</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>LGA s138</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 331163</td>
<td>128261</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>S55(1)(f), s55(2)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pt Res 4630</td>
<td>CB 620/38</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>LGA s138</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RS 15420</td>
<td>CB208/833</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>S55(1)(f), s55(2)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RS 745</td>
<td>CB 554/39</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>S55(1)(f), s55(2)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 20 DP 414077</td>
<td>452775</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S73(1), s53(1)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Britten Reserve</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 383474</td>
<td>CB48C/724</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>LGA s138</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Pleasant Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 321545</td>
<td>86033</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>LGA s138</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Res 3817,</td>
<td>CB37C/1206</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>S55(1)(f), s55(2)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley Reserve</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 72702</td>
<td>CB47D/58</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S73(1), s53(1)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 82547</td>
<td>CB47D/58</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S73(1), s53(1)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 68058</td>
<td>CB 42D/43</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S73(1), s53(1)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 25 DP 393994</td>
<td>Ct 383994</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S73(1), s53(1)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 11 DP 83810</td>
<td>CB 48C/611</td>
<td>Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>S73(1), s53(1)(a)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.: 13</td>
<td>In Reserve/Park</td>
<td>Area (ha) approx</td>
<td>Legal description</td>
<td>Certificate of Title</td>
<td>How held (purpose)</td>
<td>Statutory leasing authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Castle Rock Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Pt Lot 3 DP 2907</td>
<td>CB42A/555</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>S55(1)(f), s55(2)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Montgomery Spur Reserve</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Pt Lot 1 DP 2855</td>
<td>CB 25A/1227</td>
<td>Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>S55(1)(f), s55(2)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Attachment A**

Item 13
1. **Purpose of Report / Te Pūtake Pūrongo**

   This report provides information on initiatives and issues current within the Community Board area, to provide the Board with a strategic overview and inform sound decision making.

2. **Officer Recommendations / Ngā Tūtohu**

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

   2. Receive and note the information provided to the Board on:
      a. Sydenham Suction Tank Project.
      b. Woolston Village – Ferry Road Masterplan Landscape Change.

3. **Community Board Activities and Forward Planning**

   3.1 **Memos/Information/Advice to the Board**

      3.1.1 **Sydenham Suction Tank Project** – Information is attached on the upcoming construction of a suction tank at the Sydenham Pump Station. The potable water storage tank (suction tank) at the pump station was damaged irreparably during the 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquakes. Since then, temporary water storage tanks have been in use. The Council must replace the temporary water storage tanks with a permanent tank so that the Council can meet the appropriate engineering standards and codes and so that the pump station can operate at full capacity. *(Attachment A)*.

      3.1.2 **Woolston Village – Ferry Road Masterplan Landscape Change** – As part of the Woolston Village Masterplan project staff have been working with Matapopore to include cultural references in the Woolston Village. Matapopore do not support the use of Kauri in the planning scheme because Kauri are not endemic to the area. *(Attachment B)*

   3.2 **Board area Consultations/Engagement/Submission opportunities**

      3.2.1 At the time of writing this report there were no Council consultations within the Linwood-Central-Heathcote Board area.

   3.3 **Annual Plan and Long Term Plan matters**

      3.3.1 The Councillors are now considering the public feedback before the updated Draft Annual Plan 2020–21 is finalised at the Council’s 23 July 2020 meeting.
3.4 Board Reporting

3.4.1 The Board is asked to consider any matters they would like to suggest as articles for the Council’s Newsline.

3.4.1 The Board is also asked to consider any matters they would like the Board Chairperson to raise at Council.

4. Community Board Plan – Update against Outcomes

4.1 The Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Plan 2020-22 was adopted at the Board’s 1 July 2020 meeting.

4.2 Resolving the flooding problem at Moa Reserve – was identified in the Community Board Plan 2020-22 as a priority. The capping of the spring, and repairs to the drainage pipes was completed on 12 June 2020. Positive feedback has been received from the surrounding residents on the work within the reserve by the contractors.

5. Significant Council Projects in the Board Area

5.1 Strengthening Community Fund Projects

5.1.1 2020-21 Strengthening Communities Fund opened on Monday 9 March 2020 and closed Wednesday 15 April 2020. The Board will consider the applications at its 17 August 2020 meeting.

Community Pride Garden Awards 2020 – Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions in place during April and May 2020, this year’s Community Pride Garden Awards presentation ceremony was unable to take place. Certificates have been posted to recipients. Photos submitted by award winning gardeners, and a full list of the 2020 award recipients can be found at Garden Pride Awards.

5.2 Other partnerships with the community and organisations

5.2.1 Community Capacity Research Project

A Community Capacity Research project is underway to gain a better understanding of the extent to which communities have the ability to self-activate to achieve a common goal. Identifying communities that are well placed to self-activate will allow the Council to focus resources towards supporting those communities with less capacity to self-activate.

The next step in the project is to validate, the data gathered around levels of community capacity with Community Governance Teams, assisted by local community groups. This will take place through a series of local workshops facilitated by project team members and Community Development Advisors. The findings of the research project are anticipated to be shared with elected members in December 2020.

5.3 Community Facilities (updates and future plans)

5.3.1 Te Pou Toetoe

Within moments after the sod turning, groundworks for the new facility began. In addition to the mahi onsite, the project team are also working with the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote governance team to engage with community groups, schools, activity providers and individuals in the Community Board areas to gain a understanding of how people would use the pool, what activities they'd like to
see offered at Te Pou Toetoe and how these can complement the range of recreational opportunities already available in the greater Linwood area.

Opportunities for the public to engage with the project team have been held at the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board room on the 7 July 2020, at Eastgate Mall on the 9 July 2020 and the Greater Linwood Forum on 3 August 2020. Further opportunities have been planned for on-going conversations around the use of the facility.

6. Significant Community Issues, Events and Projects in the Board Area

6.1 Linwood Youth Festival Experience

Staff met with the Christchurch Youth Council on the 6 July 2020 at Eastgate mall to discuss the Linwood Youth Festival Experience (LYFE), its history, origins and review. The Christchurch Youth Council have agreed to work with staff to design and conduct a youth engagement for the greater Linwood area with a view to gaining a good understanding of what young people in the area want and need. It is anticipated that this mahi will involve planning and hosting an event, or a series of occasions which bring together young people to enable the group to conduct the research. The results will also provide guidance and recommendations on what form LYFE might take in future years.

It is hoped that this collaboration with the Christchurch Youth Council will help to refocus LYFE’s original vision, a celebration of Linwood’s youth, delivered by young people, for young people.
6.2 **Events Report Back**

6.2.1 **Matariki celebrations at Sumner**

Sumner Community Resident’s Association celebrated Matariki on the July 17, 2020. Bringing with them the stars, fashioned out of harakeke, lanterns made from tin cans and other creations, around 100 people from the local community turned out to mark the occasion.

Art At Sumner Hub held their free Matariki workshops leading up to the event where the local residents could come and learn about the meaning of Matariki and how to make a range of creations they could use and wear at the celebrations.
7. Updates from Other Units

7.1 Graffiti Update

7.1.1 The June 2020 Graffiti snapshot is attached (Attachment C).

8. Community Board Funding Update

8.1 The Board will consider at its 17 August 2020 meeting how much to transfer to the Board’s Discretionary Response Fund.
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Memorandum

Date: 24th June 2020
From: Grant Deeney – CCC Project Manager
To: Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board
Cc: Michele McDonald – CCC Project Sponsor
Subject: Sydenham Suction Tank Project
Reference: 20/767789

1. Purpose of this Memo

1.1 To inform the Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board of the Sydenham Suction Tank Project.

2. Project Details

2.1 **Location:** at Sydenham Water Supply Pump Station, 245 Milton Street (to the rear of the Citycare yard).

![Figure 1: Project Location](image)

2.2 **Background:** the potable water storage tank (suction tank) at pump station was damaged irreparably during the 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquakes. Since then, temporary water storage tanks have been in use. We must replace the temporary water storage tanks with a permanent tank so that we can meet the appropriate engineering standards and codes and so that the pump station can operate at full capacity.

2.3 **Project Scope:**
2.3.1 Construction of a new potable water storage tank and associated pipework.
2.3.2 Removal of the damaged potable water tank and temporary storage tanks.

![Detailed Site Overview](figure2)

Figure 2: Detailed Site Overview

3. Project Schedule
3.1 The project is in the preliminary design stage. The plan for the project is as follows:
   - Preliminary Design Completion: August 2020
   - Detailed Design Completion: November 2020
   - Construction Contract Award: February 2021
   - Construction Completion: August 2022

4. Next Steps
4.1 The preliminary design work has commenced and with detailed design in late August 2020.
4.2 We will liaise with all of the stakeholders in the area to ensure that they are aware of the project and to understand any additional project requirements.

Attachments
There are no appendices to this report.

Signatories / Ngā Kaiwaitohu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Grant Deeney - Project Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Michele McDonald - Team Leader Asset Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Beaumont - Head of Three Waters &amp; Waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item No.: 14
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Memorandum

Date: 30/06/2020
From: Jennifer Rankin – Project Manager
To: Waikura/Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board
Cc: Enter name(s) and title(s)
Subject: Woolston Village - Ferry Road Masterplan Landscape Change
Reference: 20/260133

1. Purpose of this Memo
   1.1 To update the Board on changes to some of the tree species proposed for the Woolston Village Masterplan Project.

2. Update
   2.1 As part of the Woolston Village Masterplan project we have been working with Matapopore to include cultural references in the Woolston Village. During our recent conversations with Matapopore they have stated that they do not support the use of Kauri in the planting scheme. This is because Kauri is not endemic to the area.
   2.2 At the time the Community Board made its decision to approve the Woolston Village Masterplan (LCHB/2019/00005), they heard a deputation from Rosemary Neave around the planting of Kauri. This deputation raised similar concerns about Kauri not being endemic to the area.
   2.3 Our landscape architect and arborist have investigated what can be achieved with different species. Kahikatea has been proposed as a suitable alternative and has the full support of Matapopore.
   2.4 This species is a good option as it has an upright form, is relatively fast growing and is a river species so has a connection to the Heathcote/Opāwaho River. A borelog from the Woolston site that was carried out in 2012 indicates that the soil conditions are appropriate for this species (i.e. not too dry).
   2.5 Nine of the trees where proposed to be Kauri, these will all be replaced with Kahikatea.

3. Conclusion
   3.1 Staff will replace the Kauri indicated in the landscape plan at the time of approval, with Kahikatea.
   3.2 As with all plants proposed in the landscape plan, they will be planted during the correct planting season either during or following construction.

Attachments
There are no appendices to this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatories / Ngā Kaiwaitohu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Rankin - Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved By</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon O'Neill - Team Leader Project Management Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette Ellis - Manager Planning and Delivery Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRAFFITI SNAPSHOT

**REPORTING** This is an indication (compared to the previous month) of how active our citizens are. Several people may report the same “tag” so this is not the best way to determine the amount of graffiti present.

**Ward Activity**

**Top 5 Reporting Suburbs**
(Compared to previous month)
- Central City
- Sydenham
- New Brighton
- Linwood
- Addington
- St Albans

**Hot Spots**
(Most Reported Location)
- Moorhouse Ave
- Armagh St
- Montreal St

**Volunteer Activity**
(Reports made by Graffiti Programme Volunteers)
- 461 Reports
- 6 Active Volunteers
- Top Reporter: Peter (Spreydon Ward)

**Asset Type**
(Reporting by asset)

**Most reported TAGS**
- DETOR
- GONZ
- PLOTZ
June 2020

4955 m²
(Council & Public Property)
(Last month 9039)

**Hot Spots**
(By area removed)
- Grimseys Road
- Bower Park
- Allen St

**Volunteer Removal Activity**
- 90 m²

**Graffiti Snapshot**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banks Pen</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwood</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashmere</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>3002</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fendalton</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halswell</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harewood</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathcote</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornby'</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papanui</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riccarton</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreydon</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimairi</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recent News**

**From the Police**
- Reparation - Willful Damage $158.00
- Reparation - Willful Damage x 6 $1522.80

**From Council**
Graffiti Recognition App has been developed and is currently being tested. It has the capability to analyse photos of graffiti incidents using machine learning and use the information captured to map and track graffiti offending across Christchurch.

**New Murals**
- Jungle Tribute – Hereford St, (DTR)
- Jungle Tribute – (DTR)
- Christchurch Art Gallery Wall – Worcester BvI (Kelcy Taratoa)
15. Elected Members’ Information Exchange / Te Whakawhiti Whakaaro o Te Kāhui Amorangi

This item provides an opportunity for Board Members to update each other on recent events and/or issues of relevance and interest to the Board.
16. Resolution to Exclude the Public


I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely items listed overleaf.

Reason for passing this resolution: good reason to withhold exists under section 7.
Specific grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution: Section 48(1)(a)

Note

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

(a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and
(b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority.”

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>SUBCLAUSE AND REASON UNDER THE ACT</th>
<th>PLAIN ENGLISH REASON</th>
<th>WHEN REPORTS CAN BE RELEASED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>PORT HILLS GRAZING DEED OF LICENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATTACHMENT 3 - PUBLIC EXCLUDED ATTACHMENT - PROPOSED ANNUAL RENTAL</td>
<td>S7(2)(l)</td>
<td>CONDUCT NEGOTIATIONS</td>
<td>PROTECT PRIVACY OF RFP SUBMISSIONS</td>
<td>ON AWARDING OF LEASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>PUBLIC EXCLUDED LINWOOD-CENTRAL-HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES - 8 JULY 2020</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>