



SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY  
TE MANA TIAKI I TE ARA AKITU

---

## Te Mana Tiaki I Te Ara Akitu Summit Road Protection Authority and its Advisory Committee AGENDA

---

### Notice of Meeting:

A meeting of Te Mana Tiaki I Te Ara Akitu / the Summit Road Protection Authority and its Advisory Committee will be held on:

**Date:** Friday 26 March 2021  
**Time:** 5pm  
**Venue:** Boardroom, Beckenham Service Centre,  
66 Colombo Street, Beckenham

---

Authority Membership		Advisory Committee Membership	
Chair	Councillor Tim Scandrett (Christchurch City Council)	Chair	Paul Loughton - Summit Road Society Inc nominee
Members	Councillor Jeff Bland (Selwyn District Council)	Members	Christchurch City Councillor Tim Scandrett
	Community Board Member Tori Peden (Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū / Banks Peninsula Community Board)		Selwyn District Councillor Jeff Bland
			Banks Peninsula Community Board Member Tori Peden
			Rūnanga nominee (Hana Walton - pending affirmation)
			Dr Christine Dann - nominee of the Minister of Conservation
			Peter Graham - Landowner nominee
			Denis Aldridge - Landowner nominee
			Kelvin McMillan - Senior Policy Planner (open space expert)
			Environment Canterbury nominee (Gillian Jenkins as representative pending nomination)

---

### Executive Secretary

Mark Saunders  
941 6436

[mark.saunders@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:mark.saunders@ccc.govt.nz)

The Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 is the statutory basis of the Summit Road Protection Authority and its Advisory Committee, and states that the Summit Road Protection Authority is a Joint Committee of:



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### TE MANA TIAKI I TE ARA AKITU / THE AUTHORITY OPENS THE MEETING

1.	Ngā Whakapāha / Apologies for the Authority .....	12
2.	Ngā Whakapuaki Aronga / Declarations of Interest for the Authority.....	3
3.	Te Whakaāe o te hui o mua / Confirmation of Authority's Previous Minutes .....	3
4.	Ratification of Authority's Decisions in Lockdown .....	3
5.	Membership Changes to the Advisory Committee .....	4
6.	Public Participation / Te Huinga Tūmatanui .....	4
6.1	Te Huinga Whānui / Public Forum.....	4
6.2	Ngā Huinga Whakaritenga / Deputations by Appointment.....	4
6.3	Ngā Pākikitanga / Presentation of Petitions .....	4

### THE AUTHORITY ADJOURNS TO HEAR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

7.	Apologies for the Advisory Committee .....	4
8.	Declarations of Interest for the Advisory Committee .....	4
9.	Confirmation of Advisory Committee's Previous Minutes.....	4
10.	Christchurch City Council's Long Term Plan .....	5
11.	Summit Road Safety (Discussion Item) .....	6
12.	John Jameson Lookout .....	7
13.	Head Ranger's Update (Discussion Item) .....	7
14.	Annual Report for the Year Ending 30 June 2020 .....	7
15.	Draft Annual Plan and Budget for 2021-22 .....	8
16.	Members' Information Exchange .....	8

### THE AUTHORITY RECONVENES TO DELIBERATE

17.	Authority Consideration of Item 10: Christchurch City Council's Long Term Plan .....	9
18.	Authority Consideration of Item 12: John Jameson Lookout .....	9
19.	Authority Consideration of Item 14: Annual Report for the Year Ending 30 June 2020 .....	9
20.	Authority Consideration of Item 15: Draft Annual Plan and Budget for 2021-22 .....	9



## TE MANA TIAKI I TE ARA AKITU / SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY

### 1. Apologies for the Authority

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

### 2. Declarations of Interest for the Authority

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

### 3. Confirmation of Authority's Previous Minutes

**For the confirmation of the Summit Road Protection Authority:**

That the minutes of the Summit Road Protection Authority meeting held on Friday, 6 December 2019 be confirmed (refer page 16).

### 4. Ratification of Authority's Decisions in Lockdown

- 4.1 The Authority and its Advisory Committee were prevented from meeting on 31 March 2020 by the Covid-19 Lockdown when they were to consider the agenda appended to this agenda as **Attachment A**). In lieu of being able to meet in person in time to discuss its Annual Report, and Plan & Budget, the Authority by email agreed:
  - a. Having received the final detail of the City Council's application regarding the Dyers Pass Safety Improvements, the Authority is unanimously satisfied the effects on the amenities are minor such that a letter could be sent to the applicant signalling effective consent.
  - b. The (circulated) Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2019, and (circulated) Annual Budget & Plan for 2020-21, could be sent to the contributory councils as agreed subject to formal ratification at next formal meeting when the COVID-19 lockdown is lifted.
- 4.2 It was resolved last meeting that it was possible for the Authority to deal with the final detail of the Dyers Pass item on the papers like this (the letter sent is appended as **Attachment B**).
- 4.3 In respect of the annual reporting, i.e. requirement to 'prepare and send' estimates and reports of expenditure and activities, it was agreed this was fairly honoured in the circumstances of such a lockdown by the effort to send the councils these as subject to ratification, so they could be supplied without delay in the normal cycle.
- 4.4 As noted in email exchange with the Advisory Committee at the time, the Authority was well placed last year to levy \$0 from the contributory Councils, being mindful of the impact of Covid-19 Lockdown on ratepayers and the reasonably adequate reserves of the Authority for its core regulatory role.

**For the ratification of the Summit Road Protection Authority:**

That the Authority's agreement by email exchange during the Covid-19 Lockdown on or about 31 March 2021 to adopt the Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2019 (separately circulated), and the Annual Plan and Budget for 1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021 (separately circulated), and to approve levying \$0 from the contributory Councils for the year to 30 June 2021, be ratified.



## 5. Membership Changes to the Advisory Committee

- 5.1 Dr Christine Dann has signalled her resignation from the Advisory Committee as the Minister of Conservation's nominee. There will be opportunity to acknowledge Dr Dann's service at this meeting.
- 5.2 The General Manager for Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke (Rāpaki) has confirmed they nominate Hana Walton to the Advisory Committee.

### **For the affirmation of the Summit Road Protection Authority:**

[Affirms the appointment of Hana Walton to the Advisory Committee under section 9\(1\)\(e\) of the Summit Road \(Canterbury\) Protection Act 2001.](#)

## 6. Public Participation / Te Huinga Tūmatanui

### 6.1 Te Huinga Whānui / Public Forum

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

The Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 sets out the purpose, functions and powers of the Authority and its Advisory Committee.

### 6.2 Ngā Huinga Whakaritenga / Deputations by Appointment

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

### 6.3 Ngā Pākikitanga / Presentation of Petitions

There were no petitions received at the time the agenda was prepared.

## **AUTHORITY ADJOURNS TO HEAR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

## 7. Apologies for the Advisory Committee

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

## 8. Declarations of Interest for the Advisory Committee

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

## 9. Confirmation of Authority's Previous Minutes

### **For the confirmation of the Advisory Committee:**

[That the minutes of the Advisory Committee meeting held on Friday, 6 December 2019 be confirmed \(refer page 16\).](#)



## 10. Christchurch City Council's Long Term Plan

- 10.1 Consultation on the Christchurch City Council's Long Term Plan 2021-31 (LTP) is open for public submissions until 18 April 2021. It is not among the Authority's explicit statutory functions to submit on such long term plans, though it may wish to consider the impacts of the LTP on the Authority's purposes and functions. Relevant extracts of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 are copied below:

### **Section 3: Purpose**

*The purposes of this Act are as follows:*

- (a) to provide for the preservation and protection of the scenic amenity associated with the Summit Road and other roads, walkways, paths, and public open spaces within the protected land;*
- (b) to provide for the preservation and protection of natural amenities associated with land within the protected area;*
- (c) to provide for the improvement of facilities for the public enjoyment of the scenic amenity and the natural amenities.*

### **Section 5: Obligations of persons exercising functions and powers under this Act**

- (1) A person or committee making a recommendation or decision on an application made under section 10 or section 11 or section 13 (whether initially or on appeal or otherwise) must give effect to the purposes of this Act, but must also have particular regard to—*
  - (a) the effect of the application on the maintenance and enhancement of the Summit Road, other roads, walkways, and paths; and*
  - (b) the effect of the application on the use of the roads for the public enjoyment of the scenic amenity and the natural amenities, and on the safety of road users; and*
  - (c) the effect of the application (if any) on farming operations; and*
  - (d) the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga.*
- (2) This section is subject to section 11(5).*

### **Section 19: Acquisition of land**

- (1) If the Authority considers that any private land or any interest in or over private land or any interest in a Crown lease should be acquired for the purposes of this Act, the Authority may recommend that such interest in the land be acquired by the contributory local bodies.*
- (2) All land or interests in land acquired on the recommendation of the Authority by way of purchase or gift may be held jointly by the contributory local bodies for the purposes of this Act.*
- (3) All interests in land acquired by way of lease under this section may be held jointly by the contributory local bodies and, during the term of the lease, are subject to this Act.*
- (4) Despite the requirements of section 12(2)(a), the owner of any allotment which lies partly within the protected land may subdivide that allotment for the purpose of transferring to the contributory local bodies that part of the allotment which lies within the protected land.*
- (5) This section does not confer on the Authority a power to take land compulsorily.*



- (6) *Land acquired for the purposes of this Act by the contributory local bodies is not a reserve for the purposes of the Reserves Act 1977.*
- 10.2 The City Council on 22 March 2018 resolved to not approve the installation of proposed Prohibited Times on Road Restrictions for the Summit Road following a significant response to the public consultation indicating the high significance of the Summit Road to the greater Christchurch region. The City Council also resolved at that meeting to request that the Port Hills Management Plan be advanced as soon as possible recognising that the outcomes and objectives of that Plan may assist in achieving positive outcomes for the Summit Road and other affected roads in the area covered by that Plan.
- 10.3 A Port Hills Management Plan could advance the purposes of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act and assist the functions of the Authority in various conceivable ways. Moreover, the Authority and its Advisory Committee have been considerably concerned to address anti-social, destructive and unsafe behaviours on the Summit Road, and to contribute to its elevation as a recreational, scenic, cultural/heritage and environment asset, which a Management Plan could advance.
- 10.4 The Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 is now 20 years old, in which time the scope for a Port Hills Management Plan in conjunction with district planning to achieve the purposes of the Act may prompt consideration of the future of how the land protected by the Act might be best and most efficiently regulated/protected, enhanced and promoted. The Act has a focus on regulating a limited range of activities on the protected land, inhibiting the desire implied in some discussions that the protected land should be managed, enhanced and promoted more broadly as a significant asset of the greater Christchurch region.
- 10.5 Over a decade ago the document, *A New Vision For The Summit Road And Port Hills - "A Heritage Road Through A Park"*, appended as **Attachment C**, was developed advancing an integrated management plan. Though the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence may for a time have been a source of deferral, it is reasonable that the City Council might again be reminded of its 2018 resolution to advance a Port Hills Management Plan as soon as possible. The Chair of the Authority at the time was heard by the City Council in 2019 in relation to their Annual Plan and given undertaking they would seek an update from their staff on their 2018 resolution (<https://councillive.ccc.govt.nz/video/8434>).
- 10.6 It would be proposed to contribute Authority reserves to the development of a Port Hills Management Plan if appropriate to enable its prioritisation, though its appropriateness should be further investigated before being offered.

## Staff Recommendations

That the Advisory Committee:

1. Recommends that the Authority makes a submission on the Christchurch City Council's Long Term Plan 2021-31 to: *Request that the City Council gives appropriate prioritisation to the advancement of a Port Hills Management Plan in line with its resolution of 22 March 2018 to request that the Plan be advanced as soon as possible recognising that the outcomes and objectives of that Plan may assist in achieving positive outcomes for the Summit Road and other affected roads in the area covered by that Plan.*

## 11. Summit Road Safety (Discussion Item)

Discussion with Andrew Hensley, City Council Traffic Engineer. No decision required.



## 12. John Jameson Lookout

Update from Summit Road Society on the progress of this previously discussed project. Updated designs and information to be separately circulated for Authority's final approval.

On 6 December 2019, the Authority resolved:

*That the Authority:*

1. *Resolves under section 17 of the Act that the application by the Summit Road Society to improve the car park opposite the Sign of the Bellbird as described in their application does not require public notification (which would invite a hearing process), having effects on the amenities that are no more than minor, provided that:*
  - a. *the final design of the John Jameson Lookout is signed off by the Authority on the papers as having no greater effect on the amenities than the draft design; and*
  - b. *the applicant, when submitting the final design, provides written comments on how they have considered the matters set out in section 5(1)(a)-(d) of the Act, so that the Authority may better consider the effects on the amenities with regard to these matters (the applicant should as part of this convey any feedback they have received from relevant groups, such as local rūnanga).*

### Staff Recommendations

*That the Advisory Committee:*

1. Offers the Authority any advice it has relevant to the Authority deciding under section 17 of the Act whether the application by the Summit Road Society to improve the car park opposite the Sign of the Bellbird has effects on the amenities that are more than minor.
2. Recommends the Authority resolves under section 17 of the Act that the application by the Summit Road Society to improve the car park opposite the Sign of the Bellbird as described in their application does not require public notification (which would invite a hearing process), having effects on the amenities that are no more than minor.

## 13. Head Ranger's Update (Discussion Item)

Discussion with Paul Devlin, City Council Head Ranger. No decision required.

## 14. Annual Report for the Year Ending 30 June 2020

The Authority's Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2020 is separately circulated for approval. Upon adoption by the Authority the report will be forwarded to the contributory Councils.

### Staff Recommendations

*That the Advisory Committee:*

1. Approves the separately circulated Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2020 and recommends it to the Authority for adoption.



## 15. Draft Annual Plan and Budget for 2021-22

- 15.1 The Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 requires the Authority to prepare an estimate of expenditure for the year ahead, in this case for the period 1 July 2021 - 30 June 2022, and submit it to the two contributory Councils. In furtherance of this requirement, a draft Annual Plan and Budget for the relevant period is separately for approval.
- 15.2 It is recommended to levy the two contributory Councils \$0 for the upcoming year. It is assessed that the Authority holds sufficient reserves to meet its core obligations for the upcoming year relative to reasonable anticipation of possible eventualities. The Authority should retain its statutory ability to levy further in the year if necessary in the unlikely event expenses arise that would exhaust the Authority's reserves.
- 15.3 Provision to contribute to the development of a Port Hills Management Plan noted in the Draft Annual Plan and Budget is subject to obtaining advice that this is permissible expenditure as sufficiently relevant to the purposes, functions and powers of the Authority. If the expenditure might be on the development of the Plan, and not merely on making submissions on it, then the Authority's purposes and functions should appropriately form part of the Terms of Reference for its development, or appropriate steps be in train for a vision for the Summit Road and Port Hills that may supersede and encompass the Authority's role.
- 15.4 The Authority is empowered by its Act to fulfil its functions, serving its Act's purposes; this is already enshrined in legislation and so relevant to the development of a management plan encompassing the protected land without need of advocacy. Though an integrated management plan could be expected to assist or encompass the Authority's role advancing its purposes beyond what the Authority alone can achieve, justifying contribution of Authority reserves to both plan development, allowing the developers to independently take account of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act, and to making submissions that offer the Authority's interpretation of the intent of Parliament in enacting the statute.
- 15.5 If the Authority's reserves are not forwarded for management plan development as budgeted, then, as with any unexpended budget, they stay in reserve, buffering the contributory councils from future levies. It is suggested delegations be resolved to enable efficient decision-making by the Authority around when and if to apply funds, and to put in place reasonable, practical and accessible delegations of the Authority's powers and functions more generally.

### Staff Recommendations

That the Advisory Committee:

1. Consider and approve the separately circulated draft Annual Plan and Budget for 1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022, and recommend it to the Authority for adoption.
2. Recommend that the Authority revoke pre-existing delegations, and approve for immediate effect (replacement) delegations as set out in the proposed delegations register appended to the draft Annual Plan and Budget for 1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022.

## 16. Members' Information Exchange

This item provides an opportunity for Members to update each other on recent events and/or issues of relevance and interest to the Authority and its Advisory Committee.





## **AUTHORITY RECONVENES TO DELIBERATE**

### **17. Authority Consideration of Item 10: Christchurch City Council's Long Term Plan**

#### **Staff Recommendations**

That the Authority:

1. Makes a submission on the Christchurch City Council's Long Term Plan 2021-31 to: *Request that the City Council gives appropriate prioritisation to the advancement of a Port Hills Management Plan in line with its resolution of 22 March 2018 to request that the Plan be advanced as soon as possible recognising that the outcomes and objectives of that Plan may assist in achieving positive outcomes for the Summit Road and other affected roads in the area covered by that Plan.*

### **18. Authority Consideration of Item 12: John Jameson Lookout**

#### **Staff Recommendations**

That the Authority:

1. Resolves under section 17 of the Act that the application by the Summit Road Society to improve the car park opposite the Sign of the Bellbird as described in their application does not require public notification (which would invite a hearing process), having effects on the amenities that are no more than minor.

### **19. Authority Consideration of Item 14: Annual Report for the Year Ending 30 June 2020**

#### **Staff Recommendations**

That the Authority:

1. Adopts the separately circulated Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2020.

### **20. Authority Consideration of Item 15: Draft Annual Plan and Budget for 2021-22**

#### **Staff Recommendations**

That the Authority:

1. Adopts the separately circulated Annual Plan and Budget for 1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022 and approves levying \$0 from the contributory Councils for the year.
2. Revokes pre-existing delegations, and approves for immediate effect (replacement) delegations as set out in the proposed delegations register appended to the draft Annual Plan and Budget for 1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022.



SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY  
TE MANA TIAKI I TE ARA AKITU

## Summit Road Protection Authority and its Advisory Committee AGENDA

### Notice of Meeting:

A meeting of the Summit Road Protection Authority and its Advisory Committee will be held on:

**Date: 31 March 2020 (Cancelled due to COVID-19 Level 4 Lockdown)**

#### Authority Membership

Chair	Councillor Tim Scandrett (Christchurch City Council)
Members	Councillor Jeff Bland (Selwyn District Council)
	Community Board Member Tori Peden (Banks Peninsula Community Board)

#### Advisory Committee Membership

Chair	Paul Loughton - Summit Road Society Inc nominee
Members	Christchurch City Councillor Tim Scandrett Selwyn District Councillor Jeff Bland Banks Peninsula Community Board Member Tori Peden Rūnanga nominee (Vacant) Dr Christine Dann - nominee of the Minister of Conservation Peter Graham - Landowner nominee Denis Aldridge - Landowner nominee Kelvin McMillan - Senior Policy Planner (open space expert) Environment Canterbury nominee (Gillian Jenkins as representative pending nomination)

#### Executive Secretary

Mark Saunders  
941 6436  
mark.saunders@ccc.govt.nz

The Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 is the statutory basis of the Summit Road Protection Authority and its Advisory Committee, and states that the Summit Road Protection Authority is a Joint Committee of:





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Summit Road Protection Authority opens the meeting

2.	Apologies for the Authority .....	12
2.	Declarations of Interest for the Authority .....	12
3.	Confirmation of Authority's Previous Minutes .....	12
4.	Public Forum .....	12
5.	Deputations by Appointment .....	12
6.	Petitions.....	12

### Authority adjourns to hear the consideration of the Advisory Committee

7.	Apologies for the Advisory Committee .....	13
8.	Declarations of Interest for the Advisory Committee .....	13
9.	Confirmation of Advisory Committee's Previous Minutes.....	13
10.	Dyers Pass Road Safety Improvements .....	13
11.	Summit Road (Discussion Item) .....	15
12.	John Jameson Lookout (Discussion Item).....	15
13.	Head Ranger's Update (Discussion Item) .....	15
14.	Annual Report for the Year Ending 30 June 2019 .....	15
15.	Draft Annual Plan and Budget for 2020-21 .....	15
16.	Members' Information Exchange .....	16

### Authority reconvenes to deliberate

17.	Authority Consideration of Item 10: Dyers Pass Safety Improvements .....	16
18.	Authority Consideration of Item 14: Annual Report for the Year Ending 30 June 19 ..	16
19.	Authority Consideration of Item 15: Draft Annual Plan and Budget for 2020-21 .....	16



## **A Minute's Silence for Doug Couch**

The meeting will acknowledge the passing on 27 January 2020 of Douglas Falcon Herewini (Doug) Couch, who served on the Summit Road Protection Authority Advisory Committee, Mount Herbert County Council, Banks Peninsula District Council and Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board.

Doug was born in Lyttelton in 1932 and was raised at Rāpaki where he lived for most of his life.

Throughout his life Doug was heavily involved in the Rāpaki and the wider Banks Peninsula communities. In the late 1970s he served a term on the Mount Herbert County Council before going on to serve on the Banks Peninsula District Council and the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board.

He had stints as president of the Lyttelton Lions Club and the Lyttelton Youth Council and was a member of the local Civil Defence operations team. He was also an active figure within his rūnanga, Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke.

We acknowledge Doug's contribution to the Advisory Committee and therefore to the Summit Road Protection Authority.

## **Summit Road Protection Authority**

### **3. Apologies for the Authority**

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

### **4. Declarations of Interest for the Authority**

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

### **3. Confirmation of Authority's Previous Minutes**

**For the confirmation of the Summit Road Protection Authority:**

[That the minutes of the Summit Road Protection Authority meeting held on Friday, 6 December 2019 be confirmed.](#)

### **4. Public Forum**

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

### **5. Deputations by Appointment**

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

### **6. Petitions**

There were no petitions received at the time the agenda was prepared.

## **Authority adjourns to hear the consideration of the Advisory Committee**



## 7. Apologies for the Advisory Committee

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

## 8. Declarations of Interest for the Advisory Committee

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

## 9. Confirmation of Authority's Previous Minutes

**For the confirmation of the Advisory Committee:**

That the minutes of the Advisory Committee meeting held on Friday, 6 December 2019 be confirmed.

## 10. Dyers Pass Road Safety Improvements

10.1 At its last meeting, the Authority resolved:

*That the Authority:*

1. *Resolves under section 17 of the Act that the application by the City Council to improve the safety of Dyers Pass Road does not require public notification (which would invite a hearing process), having effects on the amenities that are no more than minor, provided that:*
  - a. *the final detail of the application and assessment of the effects on the amenities to be provided by the applicant is signed off by the Authority on the papers as having no more than minor effects on the amenities; and*
  - b. *the applicant, when submitting the final detail, provides written comments on how they have considered the matters set out in section 5(1)(a)-(d) of the Act, so that the Authority may better consider the effects on the amenities with regard to these matters (the applicant should as part of this convey any feedback they have received from relevant groups, such as local rūnanga).*

10.2 The separately circulated application on behalf of the City Council has now been received and time allowed it to come to this meeting, though the resolution of last meeting did allow the Authority to sign the final detail off on the papers if it saw fit to. The safety improvements will involve works that will affect the amenities, and it is among the purposes of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 to preserve and protect the amenities. Section 5 of the Act creates an obligation when considering an application to undertake such works on the protected land to give effect to that purpose to preserve and protect the amenities, but also to provide for the improvement of the facilities for the enjoyment of them.

10.3 Section 5 of the Act also creates an obligation to have particular regard, among other things, to the effect of the application on the maintenance and enhancement of the Summit Road, other roads, walkways and paths, and on the use of roads for the public enjoyment of the amenities and the safety of road users. While the safety improvements on Dyers Pass Road will also improve it for commuting purposes, when the Act is more orientated to facilitating the use of the road to enjoy the amenities of the protected land, rather than to simply pass through it efficiently, the Authority



can recognise that the City Council holds the role and responsibilities of the road controlling authority.<sup>1</sup>

- 10.4 So the Authority can consider that while Dyers Pass Road might be appropriately maintained by the safety improvements proposed for that road, the City Council may appropriately maintain other roads on the protected land, such as Summit Road, through quite different treatments relative to their place in the road network.
- 10.5 The Authority's role is to decide the City Council's application to undertake the works associated with the proposed safety improvement to Dyers Pass Road in terms of its Act, and is triggered because of the substantive nature of the works. The Authority should have regard to the safety of road users in deciding whether the effects on the amenities are minor, but it does not have the role or responsibility to initiate road safety designs of its own accord; such designs may simply advance, or not, the Authority's actual purposes to preserve and protect the amenities of the protected land and the public enjoyment of them.
- 10.6 With these points in mind, though the safety improvements affect the amenities of the protected land in ways the Authority would generally protect against, the staff recommendation to the Authority is to consider this application under section 17 of its Act as having only minor effects on the amenities when it is factored that they facilitate access to the protected land in a context of the road controlling authority deciding that substantive upgrades for safety are appropriate in the case of Dyers Pass Road and its place in the roading network and warranted in terms of the safety of road users.
- 10.7 Staff consider that the applicant has duly fulfilled the Authority's resolution of its last meeting that when submitting the final detail, the applicant "*provides written comments on how they have considered the matters set out in section 5(1)(a)-(d) of the Act, so that the Authority may better consider the effects on the amenities with regard to these matters (the applicant should as part of this convey any feedback they have received from relevant groups, such as local rūnanga)*".
- 10.8 Staff consider that the applicant's comments on these matters appropriately reassure as to the process the applicant has undertaken enabling the effects on the amenities to be assessed as minor having regard to the matters the Act directs the Authority to. The Advisory Committee is invited to offer any further advice to the Authority should it have any following the discussion at the last meeting when a presentation was received from the project team deemed sufficient for the Authority to giving a final decision at this time with the written comments now duly provided by the applicant.

## **Staff Recommendations**

**That the Advisory Committee:**

1. **Recommends that the Authority resolves under section 17 of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Act 2001 that the application by the City Council to carry out section 12 activities (i.e. actions**

---

<sup>1</sup> Selwyn District Council is also one of the road controlling authorities over the greater length of roads on the protected land. The road controlling authorities are responsible for the traffic and roading aspects, which include traffic access, safety, parking and maintenance.



requiring the Authority's written consent) on the protect land described in the application and associated with safety improvements to Dyers Pass Road, will have effects on the amenities that are no more than minor, and does not require public notification under section 13 of the Act – the application being accordingly granted so that the section 12 activities entailed by the diagrams and descriptions in the application have the Authority's consent, provided only that:

- a. Best endeavours are made that the effects on the amenities are no more than necessary for carrying out the work as described and depicted in the application.

### **11. Summit Road (Discussion Item)**

Discussion with Andrew Hensley, City Council Traffic Engineer, seeking feedback on roading matters pertaining to Summit Road.

No application being considered. No decision required.

### **12. John Jameson Lookout (Discussion Item)**

Update from Summit Road Society on the progress of this project.

Last concept drawings will be separately circulated, though are not yet final. No decision is required at this point. Any feedback is invited from the Summit Road Society.

### **13. Head Ranger's Update (Discussion Item)**

Update from City Council Head Ranger, Paul Devlin, on various matters pertaining to the protected land.

### **14. Annual Report for the Year Ending 30 June 2019**

The Authority's Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2019 is separately circulated for approval. Upon adoption by the Authority the report will be forwarded to the contributory Councils.

### **Staff Recommendations**

That the Advisory Committee:

1. Approves the separately circulated Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2019 and recommends it to the Authority for adoption.

### **15. Draft Annual Plan and Budget for 2020-21**

The Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 requires the Authority to prepare an estimate of expenditure for the year ahead, in this case for the period 1 July 2020 - 30 June 2021, and submit it to the two contributory Councils. In furtherance of this requirement, a draft Annual Plan and Budget for the relevant period is separately for approval.

It is recommended to levy the two contributory Councils \$0 for the upcoming year.



### Staff Recommendations

That the Advisory Committee:

1. Consider and approve the separately circulated draft Annual Plan and Budget for 1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021 and recommend it to the Authority for adoption.

## 16. Members' Information Exchange

This item provides an opportunity for Members to update each other on recent events and/or issues of relevance and interest to the Authority and its Advisory Committee.

### Authority reconvenes to deliberate

## 17. Authority Consideration of Item 10: Dyers Pass Road Safety Improvements

### Staff Recommendations

That the Authority:

1. Resolves under section 17 of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Act 2001 that the application by the City Council to carry out section 12 activities (i.e. actions requiring the Authority's written consent) on the protect land described in the application and associated with safety improvements to Dyers Pass Road, will have effects on the amenities that are no more than minor, and does not require public notification under section 13 of the Act – the application being accordingly granted so that the section 12 activities entailed by the diagrams and descriptions in the application have the Authority's consent, provided only that:
  - a. Best endeavours are made that the effects on the amenities are no more than necessary for carrying out the work as described and depicted in the application.

## 18. Authority Consideration of Item 14: Annual Report for the Year Ending 30 June 2019

### Staff Recommendations

That the Authority:

1. Adopts the separately circulated Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2019.

## 19. Authority Consideration of Item 15: Draft Annual Plan and Budget for 2020-21

### Staff Recommendations

That the Authority:

1. Adopts the separately circulated Annual Plan and Budget for 1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021 and approves levying \$0 from the contributory Councils for the year.





**SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY**  
TE MANA TIAKI I TE ARA AKITU

## **Summit Road Protection Authority and its Advisory Committee MINUTES**

**Date:** Friday 6 December 2019  
**Time:** 4pm  
**Venue:** Boardroom, Beckenham Service Centre,  
66 Colombo Street, Beckenham

<b>Authority Membership</b>		<b>Advisory Committee Membership</b>	
Chair	Councillor Tim Scandrett (Christchurch City Council)	Chair	Paul Loughton - Summit Road Society Inc nominee
Members	Councillor Jeff Bland (Selwyn District Council)	Members	Christchurch City Councillor Tim Scandrett Selwyn District Councillor Jeff Bland Banks Peninsula Community Board Member Tori Peden Peter Graham - Landowner nominee Kelvin McMillan - Senior Policy Planner
	Community Board Member Tori Peden (Banks Peninsula Community Board)	Invited attendee	Gillian Jenkins - Environment Canterbury representative

**6 December 2019**

**Executive Secretary**

Mark Saunders

941 6436

mark.saunders@ccc.govt.nz

The Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 is the statutory basis of the Summit Road Protection Authority and its Advisory Committee, and states that the Summit Road Protection Authority is a Joint Committee of:



**Minutes of Previous Meeting 6/12/2019**

The agenda was dealt with in the following order:

The Summit Road Protection Authority convened at 4pm

## 1. Appointment of a Chairperson

The Executive Secretary convened the first meeting of the Summit Road Protection Authority following the recent triennial local government elections, welcoming the new appointees to the Authority from Selwyn District Council, Councillor Jeff Bland, and from the Banks Peninsula Community Board, Member Tori Peden (the Board having delegated authority from the Christchurch City Council to make this appointment).

The Executive Secretary noted the continuation of Councillor Tim Scandrett as Christchurch City Council appointee, and noted the need to appoint a new Chairperson to replace Councillor Grant Miller, who had faithfully served as such in the previous triennium, with the Authority's thanks.

### Authority Resolved SRPC/2019/00001

It was resolved on the motion of Councillor Tim Scandrett, seconded by Member Tori Peden that Councillor Tim Scandrett be appointed Chairperson of the Summit Road Protection Authority.

Councillor Scandrett/Member Peden

Carried

## 2. Apologies for the Authority

There were no apologies for the Authority.

## 3. Declarations of Interest for the Authority

There were no declarations of interest recorded.

## 4. Public Forum

There were no public forum presentations.

## 5. Deputations by Appointment

There were no deputations by appointment.

## 6. Petitions

There were no petitions received at the time the agenda was prepared.

## 7. Affirming New Nominees to the Advisory Committee

### Authority Resolved SRPC/2019/00002

That the Authority:

1. Affirms that Christchurch City Councillor Tim Scandrett, Selwyn District Councillor Jeff Bland, and Banks Peninsula Community Board Member Tori Peden are appointed as the members of the Advisory Committee under section 9(1)(a) of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001.
2. Confirms no change to the ongoing appointments to the Advisory Committee under section 9(1)(b)-(f) of the Act.
3. Requests that Environment Canterbury confirms their nomination to the Advisory Committee, and affirms that Gillian Jenkins will be appointed under section 9(1)(g) of the Act upon nomination.

Chair Scandrett/Member Peden

Carried

The Authority at 4:08pm adjourned to hear the consideration of its Advisory Committee which then convened with the Authority to reconvene at the conclusion of its Advisory Committee's meeting.

## **8. Apologies for the Advisory Committee**

### **Advisory Committee Resolved SRPC/2019/00003**

It was resolved on the motion of Chairperson Paul Loughton, seconded by Member Kelvin McMillan that the apologies for absence from Members Dann, Couch and Aldridge be accepted.

Chair Loughton/Member McMillan

**Carried**

## **9. Declarations of Interest for the Advisory Committee**

Chair Loughton declared an interest in Item 10 relating to his connection with the Summit Road Society.

## **10. John Jameson Lookout**

Chair Loughton presented this item for the Summit Road Society disclosing the application being made to the City Council's Capital Endowment Fund to contribute to the construction of the proposed improvements to the car park opposite the Sign of the Bellbird, which would be improved to become the John Jameson Lookout.

It was noted that the design presented in the agenda was in draft form with some amendments anticipated, such as, by example, in relation to the materiality of the deck, which may be substituted for a more fire/vandal-resistant material. Other elements conscious of the vandalism risk, such as appropriate, economically viable car park surfacing, and adjustment to the entrance (removing the divider) to accommodate buses dropping off school children were also discussed. The Authority was also made aware of the need for the applicant to ensure that any adverse effects arising from stormwater needed to be managed appropriately.

The staff recommendations thus contemplated that the final design would need to be submitted to the Authority in due course for approval, but could be assessed on the papers as having no more than minor effects on the amenities (and so be consented under section 17 of the Act) if the final design appears to have no greater effects on the amenities than the draft.

The Advisory Committee accepted the staff recommendations, while its discussions indicated that it will also be relevant to the consideration of whether the final design has greater effects on the amenities that the representation at the meeting of disabled person accessibility to the deck should be demonstrated in the final design, as well as appropriate directing of stormwater (confirming any relevant consenting requirements) and temporary run-off during construction.

The Executive Secretary noted pre-meeting discussions with the Society that had offered reassurances that the Society would find it fair and reasonable if the Authority deemed it necessary to add conditions around completing the work or stages of it in good time, endeavouring to keep the car park open to the public to the maximum extent possible (allowing for reasonable construction and safety restrictions), and not heaping spoil or materials during construction in a manner that obscures significant views.

The objectives of the Society and Authority were deemed sufficiently aligned that the Society would in good faith attend these points without explicit prescription, reserving that that they could be added if deemed necessary as part of signing-off the final design on the papers as relevant to

ensuring there is no greater effect on the amenities than that represented and envisaged at the meeting.

#### **Advisory Committee Resolved SRPC/2019/00004**

That the Advisory Committee:

1. Recommends the Authority resolves under section 17 of the Act that the application by the Summit Road Society to improve the car park opposite the Sign of the Bellbird as described in their application does not require public notification (which would invite a hearing process), having effects on the amenities that are no more than minor, provided that:
  - a. the final design of the John Jameson Lookout is signed off by the Authority on the papers as having no greater effect on the amenities than the draft design; and
  - b. the applicant, when submitting the final design, provides written comments on how they have considered the matters set out in section 5(1)(a)-(d) of the Act, so that the Authority may better consider the effects on the amenities with regard to these matters (the applicant should as part of this convey any feedback they have received from relevant groups, such as local rūnanga).

Councillor Scandrett/ Councillor Bland

**Carried**

Chair Loughton, having declared an interest in this item, took no part in the voting.

### **11. Dyers Pass Road Safety Improvements**

The applicant in this matter submitted the following introduction to the application prior to the meeting but after the agenda had been circulated:

*We plan to seek consent(s) to carry out safety improvements along Dyers Pass Road (between Hackthorne Road and Governors Bay), which is partially located within the area protected by the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act. A presentation will be given to introduce the project and explain the proposed scope of work, ahead of the full application being submitted.*

*The project aims to improve the safety of higher risk sites identified along the road to reduce the frequency of accidents and improve safety for motorists, cyclists and motorcyclists. All works will be located within the existing road reserve and consist of minor road widening, standardising the road cross-section, new drainage channel, new safety barriers supported with road edge gabion walls on the downhill side and cutting into rock on the upslope side. The work will be completed progressively over a period of up to 10 years as funding permits.*

City Council Project Manager, Peter Bawden, presented this item with the assistance of consultants from GHD, Andrew Watt and Sarah White; and City Council landscape architect, Chris Greenshields, transport engineer, Andrew Hensley, engagement advisor, Lori Rankin, and planner, Heather Holder-Lunn.

The Advisory Committee received a PowerPoint presentation of the application at the meeting (refer Minutes Attachments) with indication that the full application is to follow at a later date.

Given that the application was not complete enough at the time of the meeting to serve as a complete benchmark for the effects on the amenities, the Executive Secretary recommended, and the Advisory Committee accepted, an amendment to the staff recommendations to remove the

benchmarking remark about the final detail of the application and assessment indicating no greater effect on the amenities than the presentation at the meeting represented. Instead the Advisory Committee resolved to recommend that the Authority decide the application under section 17 as having no more than minor effects on the amenities if it deems that to be the case after receiving the final detail of the application and considering it on the papers.

In other words, the Advisory Committee saw fit to recommend that having received a thorough presentation of the application at the public meeting, the Authority deal with the final detail on the papers and reach a conclusion thus under section 17 of the Act whether the effects on the amenities are no more than minor and no public notification under its Act is necessary.

#### **Committee Resolved SRPC/2019/00005**

1. Recommends that the Authority resolves under section 17 of the Act that the application by the City Council to improve the safety of Dyers Pass Road does not require public notification (which would invite a hearing process), having effects on the amenities that are no more than minor, provided that:
  - a. the final detail of the application and assessment of the effects on the amenities to be provided by the applicant is signed off by the Authority on the papers as having no more than minor effects on the amenities; and
  - b. the applicant, when submitting the final detail, provides written comments on how they have considered the matters set out in section 5(1)(a)-(d) of the Act, so that the Authority may better consider the effects on the amenities with regard to these matters (the applicant should as part of this convey any feedback they have received from relevant groups, such as local rūnanga).

Chair Loughton/Councillor Bland

**Carried**

#### **Attachments**

- A Dyers Pass Road Guardrail and Safety Improvements Presentation to the Summit Road Protection Authority

## **12. Members' Information Exchange**

The Members discussed their concern around the upcoming fire season and requested that the Authority write to the Fire Service to request they monitor landowner compliance with keeping grass down to mitigate the fire risk.

The Advisory Committee concluded its meeting at 5:14pm, at which time the Authority reconvened to deliberate.

## **13. Authority Consideration of Item 10: John Jameson Lookout**

### **Authority Resolved SRPC/2019/00006 (Advisory Committee Recommendations Accepted Without Change)**

That the Authority:

1. Resolves under section 17 of the Act that the application by the Summit Road Society to improve the car park opposite the Sign of the Bellbird as described in their application does not require public notification (which would invite a hearing process), having effects on the amenities that are no more than minor, provided that:
  - a. the final design of the John Jameson Lookout is signed off by the Authority on the papers as having no greater effect on the amenities than the draft design; and

- b. the applicant, when submitting the final design, provides written comments on how they have considered the matters set out in section 5(1)(a)-(d) of the Act, so that the Authority may better consider the effects on the amenities with regard to these matters (the applicant should as part of this convey any feedback they have received from relevant groups, such as local rūnanga).

Member Peden/Councillor Bland

**Carried**

## **14. Authority Consideration of Item 11: Dyers Pass Road Safety Improvements**

**Authority Resolved SRPC/2019/00007 (Advisory Committee Recommendations Accepted Without Change)**

That the Authority:

1. Resolves under section 17 of the Act that the application by the City Council to improve the safety of Dyers Pass Road does not require public notification (which would invite a hearing process), having effects on the amenities that are no more than minor, provided that:
  - a. the final detail of the application and assessment of the effects on the amenities to be provided by the applicant is signed off by the Authority on the papers as having no more than minor effects on the amenities; and
  - b. the applicant, when submitting the final detail, provides written comments on how they have considered the matters set out in section 5(1)(a)-(d) of the Act, so that the Authority may better consider the effects on the amenities with regard to these matters (the applicant should as part of this convey any feedback they have received from relevant groups, such as local rūnanga).

Member Peden/Councillor Bland

**Carried**

**Meeting concluded at 5:15pm.**

**UNCONFIRMED**

**COUNCILLOR TIM SCANDRETT  
AUTHORITY CHAIRPERSON**

**MR PAUL LOUGHTON  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON**



**SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY**  
**TE MANA TIAKI I TE ARA AKITU**

8 April 2020

Sarah White  
Environmental Planner  
GHD

By email to: Sarah.White@ghd.com

Dear Sarah

**Christchurch City Council's Application to the Summit Road Protection Authority to undertake road safety improvement works along Dyers Pass Road within the Summit Road Protection Area**

The Summit Road Protection Authority ('the Authority') has considered the City Council's above application ('the Application') contained in your letter dated 21 February 2020.

The Authority is satisfied with your comments on how you have considered the matters set out in section 5(1)(a)-(d) of the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001 ('the Act'). This is on the understanding that the recommendations from the rūnanga as noted in section 5 of your letter are being adopted.

The Authority has furthermore considered the Application on the papers and decided that:

*Under section 17 of the Act the Application to carry out section 12 activities (i.e. actions requiring the Authority's written consent) on the protected land described in the Application and associated with safety improvements to Dyers Pass Road, will have effects on the amenities that are no more than minor, and does not require public notification under section 13 of the Act – the application being accordingly **granted** so that the section 12 activities entailed by the diagrams and descriptions in the Application have the Authority's consent, provided only that:*

- a. *Best endeavours are made that the effects on the amenities are no more than necessary for carrying out the work as described and depicted in the Application.*

Again, this is on the understanding is that recommendations noted in the Application (including those in Attachment C, the Landscape Assessment – refer pages 22-23 thereof) are being adopted, and the works occur as represented with any deviation/change pertaining to a section 12 activity tending to increase that activity or relocate it in the protected land coming back to the Authority for consideration, as should any non-fulfilment of the mentioned recommendations.

It is noted that section 12(2)(e) of the Act sets out plantings requiring the Authority's consent. The applicant may make further applications as they see fit to the Authority in this regard for plantings. Consultation with City Council staff who understand the purposes of the Act (including the Head Ranger) is reassuring and encouraged, and if in consultation with those persons and purposes it is felt there is good reason for activities that require the Authority's consent, particularly if the negative effects on the amenities would be assessed by those staff as nil to minor (and there are some positive

effects), then the applicant can make further application to pursue optimal landscaping, rather than artificially avoiding triggering need for further consent.

If any significant plantings would be recommended to enhance the natural amenities, which would have nil to minor effect on the scenic amenity, the Authority would appreciate to be consulted and not wish to suggest that anything needing consent is discouraged if there could be opportunity to enhance the natural amenity of the area.

Noting the reference in the Application to tree replacement, some of the current plantings/trees (and also weedy or unnatural areas) adjoining Dyers Pass Road appear to have negative effects on the scenic and/or natural amenities, so any opportunities to enhance the amenities will hopefully be seized, and replacements would hopefully be questioned and considered through the lens of the purposes of the Act and its definitions of the amenities.

Some of the trees that may currently have a negative effect on the amenities may be unauthorised, wild, or outside the protected area. While the regulatory jurisdiction of the Authority pertains to trees likely to grow taller than seven metres, or any hedge, forest or shelter belt, and pertains to the protected land, if the applicant has opportunity, right and ability to remove (or use additional plantings to screen) plantings/trees (or structures) with negative effects on significant views or the naturalness of the surrounds to the road and nearby tracks, it would be encouraged for the applicant to take such opportunity to eliminate or mitigate such negative effects.

The Authority has powers to deal with unauthorised plantings (and other actions contrary to section 12 of the Act), so the applicant can approach the Authority for assistance if it observes any of these, and would be assisted by the Authority's powers. More generally the Authority would be grateful to be informed of any such observations or suspicions, regardless of whether they need to be addressed as part of the works.

No planting that would require the Authority's consent should occur without further application, regardless of it being a replacement. It would be undesirable for plantings with negative effects to be replaced with plantings with negative effects, though it is quite conceivable that some plantings/trees that would require consent could have a positive effect on the natural amenities through removing or screening artificiality (e.g. structures, pine plantation, weedy/disrupted areas, or unnatural contours) or through restoring natural/native biodiversity.

Restoring some taller native trees to the area if appropriate and possible may enhance its natural amenity; in that case and with some consideration of placing them to avoid or minimise negative effects on the scenic amenity, application for such trees requiring consent would not be discouraged and I would be happy to have early discussions to avoid any undue discouragement and to facilitate the presentation of planting plans to the Authority as the project progresses that may include taller species with sensitive placement.

Creating a mix of the best views and a natural range of floral biodiversity may maximise the pleasantness of using the roads and tracks in the area. The Act focuses on protecting and preserving the amenities from negative effects, but it is hoped any opportunities could also be seized to restore the amenity of the protected land adjoining Dyers Pass Road where that amenity has been compromised or ideally needs enhancement. Particularly, it is hoped that consideration could be given to partially screening pine planation or the unpleasant sight that may be left when it is felled, and other unnatural areas or structures, through thoughtful plantings, if this opportunity can be taken to encourage that, thank you.

Yours Faithfully

Mark Saunders  
Executive Secretary  
Summit Road Protection Authority





SUMMIT ROAD PROTECTION AUTHORITY  
TE MANA TIAKI I TE ARA AKITU



## A New Vision For The Summit Road And Port Hills

### *“A Heritage Road Through A Park”*

#### Executive Summary

A new vision for the maintenance and heritage development of the Summit Road is urgently needed. It is now over a century since the Road was first conceived and the first section of it was built. During that time there have been huge changes in the ways in which New Zealanders live and play. These have had a major impact on how the Road is used, and they also indicate how it could better be used.

The most important differences between then and now which affect the use of the Road are:

- Changes in private motor vehicle ownership and use patterns;
- Changes in outdoor recreation activities;
- Changes in attitudes and activities related to natural and human heritage conservation and interpretation, and;
- Changes in land use on the Port Hills and the increasing areas of land adjoining the road that are now in public and trust ownership.

All these changes mean that it is time to re-visit the original vision for the Road, and see how it can be reinterpreted to take into account a century of changes. While circumstances may have changed, the intentions of Harry Ell and others who brought the Road into being remain as valid as ever.

This paper;

- Examines what changed circumstances mean for the Summit Road today, in the light of the original vision of its founder, Harry Ell; and
- Outlines a vision for the Road which is appropriate to twenty-first century circumstances while still remaining true to the original vision of its creators.

This paper is intended as an orientation guide and resource for Community Boards, and for Council staff who have responsibility for parks, reserves and open spaces, outdoor recreation, roading and traffic management, tourism, natural and built heritage conservation and protection.

The Summit Road encompasses all these areas of interest and value. The Summit Road Protection Authority believes it is now time for Council to take an integrated approach to planning for the use of the Summit Road and surrounding areas which takes into account its multiple and overlapping values and uses.

Our vision of *A Heritage Road Through A Park* is intended to make it easier to understand how all these uses and values connect to each other, and to facilitate planning and development which will enhance all these aspects of the Road for those who come to enjoy the ‘summit experience’ which it offers.

## 1. The Summit Road then and now

The importance of the Summit Road and the sky line of the Port Hills as the landscape backdrop of the City of Christchurch, has been recognised by a special Act of Parliament for over 40 years now. For over 60 years the Summit Road Protection Society has provided strong community leadership and support in these matters. A number of landowners in the area have also made important contributions.

The Summit Road today has uses which were never envisaged by its creators. So does the surrounding land. Some of these users and uses enhance the recreational amenity and heritage values of the road, and some detract from it. The Summit Road Protection Authority has the following principal areas of concern with regard to the changes in the way the road is used today, which need to be addressed if the Road is to stay true to the purposes for which it was created – to give its users better access to natural beauty and recreation along the summit of the Port Hills.

### a) Changes in private motor vehicle ownership and use patterns

When Sir Charles Bowen broke the first sod on the Summit Road in 1908, motor vehicles were a very recent invention and very few individuals or families owned a private motor vehicle. The Summit Road was not originally intended for use by motor cars, but rather by walkers, coaches and horse riders, and perhaps by some rugged cyclists. The rest houses on the road were intended for the benefit of tired, hungry and thirsty walkers and riders, not for motorists able to cart their own refreshments (or toss food and drink containers out of car windows on to the Road).

The Road was later sealed making it much more convenient for motorists, although its narrow and winding nature means it is still a challenging drive, albeit a very pleasant one if taken slowly. Since being sealed it has become a wonderful cycle route. Walkers are now perhaps better served by the Crater Rim Walkway, which loops around and across the Road, yet the Road itself may still offer the best views and photo opportunities, as well as access to historic sites.

Unfortunately, by the end of the twentieth century some motorists had begun making destructive use of the Road, and this destructive usage has become worse over the past ten years. The so-called ‘boy racers’ use the Road at night in ways which endanger other road users, damage the carriage way, and pose a threat to the surrounding land and vegetation from off-road car use, fire and leaking car wrecks. Also there has been many incidents of vandalism to signs, toilets and fences, the theft of stock and dumping of rubbish. The relative isolation of the Road means that policing such behaviour is difficult, and problems keep recurring. There is also a need for better fire-fighting facilities, possibly with helicopter access.

The Authority has spent many meetings deliberating on the best way to deal with this threat to the Road, and has come to the conclusion that the best way forward is to enhance the Road experience for bona fide users by upgrading the amenity status of the Road to *A Heritage Road Through A Park*. This would at the same time provide for stronger measures for traffic control and restriction (such as those currently applied in Victoria Park) and hence better options for protecting the Road from misuse.

### b) Changes in outdoor recreational activities

When the Road was built bicycles were the standard form of every-day personal transport, and were also used for carrying light loads. Bicycles have changed in the course of a century from heavy, gear-less machines, used by a majority for getting to school and work, to light, multi-gear machines used by a minority for mainly recreational purposes, such as road-touring, road racing and off-road (‘mountain’) biking.

The Summit Road is an increasingly popular destination and route for recreational cyclists of all kinds. This is totally within the spirit of the original vision for the Road, but raises safety issues when cycles share a narrow and winding road with modern motor vehicles. There are also issues around off-road biking on tracks and roadsides which are either intended primarily for walkers, or have vegetation that needs protection. Cyclists can not damage the Road itself in the way in which motorists can, but they are quite capable of creating nuisances, from littering to traffic hazards. The Authority is of the view that cyclists as well as motorists need to be aware that the Road is not just any old race track. Tourist traffic along the Summit Road is increasing with greater use by campervans.

We consider that their safety, as well as their amenity, along with that of other road-users, would be enhanced by developing the Summit Road as *A Heritage Road Through A Park*.

**c) Changes in attitudes and activities related to natural and human heritage conservation and interpretation, and changes in land use**

When the Summit Road was conceived, most of the native forest on the Port Hills had been destroyed, the tui and several other native bird species had gone or become very rare, and there was only one bush reserve of any size which ran from the valley floor to the summit (Kennedy's Bush).

The purchase and preservation of Kennedy's Bush was Harry Ell's first big achievement with regard to conserving nature and providing public access to it. In his mind the Summit Road was primarily a route for improving public access to the unique natural heritage – geological, biological, ecological – of the Port Hills. It was also meant to give access to the glorious aesthetic values of the hill landscape itself, and the magnificent views of harbour, plains and mountains from the Hills. Ell was a friend of New Zealand's leading botanist (and premier ecologist) of the time, Dr Leonard Cockayne, and accompanied him on many botanical explorations. Their work built on the work of earlier notable Canterbury naturalists, such as Thomas Potts of Ohinetahi, and has contributed to that of their notable successors, such as Hugh Wilson.

Harry Ell was a leading exemplar of and advocate for the changing mindset towards native species and ecosystems which began to occur at the beginning of the twentieth century in New Zealand. Although Ell's dream of large roadside bush reserves every few miles across the Canterbury Plains never came to pass, once he focussed his energies on a particular place, his beloved Port Hills, he was able to inspire others to take more care of their natural heritage, to conserve and enhance it.

By the end of the twentieth century Kennedy's Bush and the few other much smaller nature reserves adjacent to the Summit Road had been joined by a good number of other, much larger, reserves. Today almost three-quarters of the Road passes through or beside reserved land. (*See Appendix I – Map of the Summit Road and adjacent reserves*). Some reserves are being developed and maintained mainly for recreational purposes (mostly off-road biking and /or walking) while in others nature and biodiversity protection and restoration is the primary focus. Both types of reserve also provide landscape amenity, whether at close range or when viewed from the city.

The natural values and public use and amenity values of the land adjacent to the Summit Road are therefore much higher than they were when it was first built, and they have the potential to be further enhanced with careful planning and development work. In addition, the Road now has its own intrinsic heritage value, and its stories are part of Canterbury's history. It has the historic rest and refreshment houses which Ell envisaged, although today only the Sign of the Kiwi is fully functional in this regard. It has old milestones, horse troughs, gateposts, and stone seats.

Over this time pastoral farming activity on the Port Hills has been reducing as market conditions have changed and more land has been acquired for reserves.

The Authority believe that the time has come to better recognise, protect and celebrate the heritage of the Road itself, as well as to integrate its management with the now extensive areas of public and trust land adjoining.

#### **d) Changes in administrative arrangements**

Over recent years the number of local Councils having jurisdiction over the Port Hills has reduced from five to just two, the Christchurch City Council and the Selwyn District Council. Since the original Summit Road Protection Act of 1963, the Resource Management Act was passed in 1991 providing the potential for District Plans to better achieve many of the outcomes sort by the 1963 Act.

## **2. A Vision for the Future**

A century of change has brought good things for much of the land beside the Road, with more conservation and restoration of nature and more opportunities for outdoor recreation. At the same time it has created problems for the Road itself, and for recreational users of the Road. Further, it has created problems with regard to the proper recognition, protection and enjoyment of the now historic sides and artefacts along the Road.

The role of the Authority is to safeguard the Road from inappropriate development, and to protect and promote (as far as its budget allows) the heritage and landscape values of the Road and adjoining land. (*See Appendix II – The Role of the Summit Road Protection Authority*). The Authority does not own the Road nor have the powers to regulate its daily use. It can only advise those with these powers on how to best manage the Road, so that the purposes for which it was built are protected, and where possible enhanced.

The Authority *is* the statutory guardian for the Road and its purposes, and it is from this position of knowledge of and responsibility for the Road that we have developed a twenty-first century vision for the Summit Road – a vision of *A Heritage Road through A Park*. This concept included measures aimed at enhancing the Roads status, protecting its heritage, promoting its values, and streamlining and improving its management. Specific actions which we would like to see taken to these ends are given in the Recommendation. The important elements of the vision are sketched out below.

#### **a) Improved status for the Road**

While the Summit Road is arguably the highest status road in the whole country, by virtue of having its own unique Act of Parliament, this fact is hard to reconcile with the reality of the Road itself today. Travelling along the Road and seeing the extent of vandalism on the roadway and its adjacent features, and also seeing that there is almost nothing by way of signage or interpretation that indicates that this is a special road, and tells the traveller what its special nature consists of, one would be forgiven for thinking that the Road is just a sealed track, of no special value or merit. Only the solidly-built Sign of the Kiwi gives any hint that this road was meant to be something special.

The Christchurch City Council web page for visitors (<http://www.ccc.govt.nz/visiting/index.aspx>) informs them that “travelling by foot or wheel, the Summit Road winds tantalisingly around the rims of two extinct volcanoes and offers the traveller enough scenic views to fill a lifetime”. Correct grammar and geology are not the only things lacking in this sentence. It does not tell visitors how to get to the Road, let alone all the other things that are special about it. Nor are there links to a page with a map of the Road, a history of the Road, information on natural features to be seen from the Road, or anything else that would really encourage a visitor to experience what the Road has to offer. (By contrast, there are links to visitor attractions of much lesser historic, natural and recreational value, such as the restaurant tram).

In the Authority’s view this is a great opportunity missed. We would like to work with the Council in improving the status of the Road so that it is both a draw card for visitors (encouraging them to stay longer in Christchurch, when they find out that they can have a great encounter with nature and some recreational thrills right here, and don’t need to go further south), and for citizens who can come to this natural playground regularly.

The best way to do this is to manage and promote the Road in a way which is consistent with what it has to offer – hence the concept of *A Heritage Road Through A Park*. The Road needs its own integrated management plan which recognises that:

- Most of the Road now passes through or runs beside reserve lands with public access ie it is a road through a de facto park, and
- The Road is of significant historical value in itself ie it is a heritage road.

An integrated management plan for the Road would use these two concepts as its guiding principles.

It would also make explicit provision for remedying the major problems which are currently stand in the way of realising the *Heritage Road Through A Park* vision. These are outlined in (b) and (c) below:

#### **b) Better indication and interpretation of the Road**

The Summit Road needs proper signage at appropriate points eg Evans Pass, Dyers Pass, Gebbies Pass which indicate that the Road begins, ends or continues at these points. These signs can be simple (ideally of stone and wood) and need only indicate the name of the Road. They should also be all of the same design.

Signage for reserves and tracks beside and leading from the road also needs to be improved to a more uniform and consistent standard. Interpretation panels are needed at or close to key features on the Road, and/or at the points of entry to the Road. The Authority currently has some money in its budget allocated for signage, including interpretative panels, and would like to work in with the Council to make its contribution to better signage and interpretation for the whole road.

#### **c) Better protection for the Road and its users**

The Road itself, and roadside structures, including car parks, are being regularly damaged by motorised vandals. Dangerous driving also puts other road-users at risk. It is not possible to police such behaviour adequately, and therefore other preventive measures must be considered.

These could include reducing the speed limit on the Road, and closing all or part of the Road to motor vehicles (except for the passes, and with provision made for residents who live beside the road) between dusk and dawn.

The Road is not an essential route to anywhere, and while closing the road to cars would be somewhat inconvenient to residents along the Road, as well as to those few citizens who find it a pleasant place for peaceful night-time driving, it would be easy to ascertain if the majority of residents prefer this inconvenience to destructive drivers on the road at night, while bona fide night-time drivers would surely appreciate the public good reasons for a night-time closure.

All recreational drivers and other users of the Road would also be reconciled to any speed restrictions and closures by knowing that as a result the Road would be safer and more pleasant to use.

### 3. Further Work

Further work needs to be undertaken to investigate how the integration of the management of public reserves and private trust lands with the Summit Road itself, can better promote the objectives of the Summit Road Protection Act and further the concept of a “Scenic Drive” or “A Heritage Road Through A Park”, and ensure that in the ongoing management and planning of the Port Hills, the original vision of Harry Ell to develop a scenic roadway along the summit is not lost.

In particularly this work would establish:

- An overview of the present patterns of reserves/trust lands along the Summit Road between Evans Pass and Gebbies Pass.
- An overview of existing management plans and goals/objectives for existing reserves and trust lands and previous studies into these matters.
- An understanding of the purpose, function and classification of the Summit Road from Evans Pass to Gebbies Pass.
- Establish the views of existing management personnel of reserves/trust/roads and identify issues, problems and opportunity and possible forms of future management.
- Identify statutory restraints that may limit opportunities for developing the vision.
- Possible scope of concept in terms of adjoining reserves such as Godley Head, how far down the hill it should extend, retention of access to private land, and links with the Gondola, ‘Sign of the Kiwi’, Bridle Path and Rapaki Track, and the development of wider cycleways across Banks Peninsula.
- Examples with illustrations of similar ‘scenic drives’ in New Zealand and overseas.
- Identify and illustrate opportunities and ways ahead that would help achieve of the vision.

### 4. Recommendation

That the Christchurch City Council investigate the ways in which improving the status of the Summit Road to *A Heritage Road Through A Park*, including developing an integrated management plan for the Road and adjacent reserve land would meet the objectives of both the Council and the Summit Road Protection Authority, (within its jurisdiction) with regard to enhancing the heritage and natural values of the road and adjacent reserves, making it a safer and more enjoyable place for all users.

**Appendix I** – Map of the Summit Road and adjacent reserves  
([resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/PortHillsMap-theporthills.pdf](https://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/PortHillsMap-theporthills.pdf))

**Appendix II** – Background to the Summit Road Protection Authority

## Appendix I

### Map Of The Summit Road And Adjacent Reserves

([resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/PortHillsMap-theporthills.pdf](https://resources.ccc.govt.nz/files/PortHillsMap-theporthills.pdf))



## Appendix II

### Background to the Summit Road Protection Authority

In 1963 Parliament enacted the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act. This Act was originally administered by the Christchurch Regional Planning Authority, then by the Canterbury United Council and between 1989 and 1992, the Canterbury Regional Council. In 1993 Parliament amended the 1963 Act to provide for the establishment of the Summit Road Protection Authority as a joint standing committee of the Christchurch City Council, the Banks Peninsula District Council and the Selwyn District Council.

The Summit Road Protection Authority was established on 1 July 1993.

The function of the Authority is to carry out its responsibilities under the Summit Road (Canterbury) Protection Act 2001. The purposes of this Act are as follows:

- To provide for the preservation and protection of the scenic amenity associated with the Summit Road and other roads, walkways, paths and public open spaces within the protected land;
- To provide for the preservation and protection of natural amenities of land within the protected area;
- To provide for the improvement of facilities for the public enjoyment of the scenic amenity and the natural amenities.

Scenic amenity includes the extensive views from the Summit Road and other roads, paths and parks within the protected land, to the Port Hills, Christchurch, the Plains and the Harbour. Natural amenities means the natural or physical qualities of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, coherence and cultural and recreation attributes.

The area protected by the Act runs along the summit of the Port Hills from Evans Pass to Gebbies Pass and is generally the land above a line running about 30 metres below the Summit Road.

In carrying out its functions, the Authority has identified four areas of significant activity:

- Regulation
- Advice and advocacy
- Provision of interpretative facilities
- General administration

In March 2006, Banks Peninsula District Council joined with the Christchurch City Council. As a result, membership of the Authority changed to include two representatives of the Christchurch City Council and one of Selwyn District Council.

The Authority is advised by an Advisory Committee who include representatives of the land owners, the Department of Conservation, The Summit Road Society, Ngāi Tahu, Environment Canterbury and an open space expert.