MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM A, WOODEND COMMUNITY CENTRE, SCHOOL ROAD,
WOODEND ON MONDAY 9 JULY 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, A Blackie,
R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Strategy and Engagement Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager),
C Brown (Community Greenspace Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport
Manager), Mayor D Ayers and E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 11 June 2018
Moved J Meyer seconded J Archer
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community
Board meeting, held 11 June 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
5.1 Julie, Wayne and Tyler Power (Pegasus residents) addressed the Board to
seek the removal of four lake side trees on the north side of Pegasus Lake
(Item 7.1). J Power spoke to a handout (Trim 180718079871) asking the
Community Board if four Griselinia Shrubs, three of which have formed a
hedge, could be removed from the front of their lake side section at 55 The
Esplanade, Pegasus Town as they blocked a good part of their lake view.
J Power advised that they loved shrubs, bushes and trees. They had started
a lifestyle property from a bare block where they planted a large variety of
trees, bushes and shrubs.

J Power advised that after finding their dream section at Pegasus Town with
a beautiful lake view they were disappointed and upset with the Griselinia
shrubs which have grown into large bushes. They impinge on the lake view
and if left will keep on growing. They were happy to pay for the removal of the
bushes and to pay for replacement trees in consultation with the Council, as
to variety. These would be trees that can be seen through as they form a
canopy with a trunk, unlike Griselinia that do not have a single trunk but a
variety of stems from ground level. A quote, from the Oxford dictionary tree
definition “A woody perennial plant typically having a single stem or trunk
growing to a considerable height and bearing branches at some distance from
the ground”. J Power noted that the Council had a tree policy and asked if
Griselinia shrubs fell under that policy.
J Power advised that she had spoken to several nurseries and had been told by all that Griselinia were well known, bought and produced for hedging which can be considered as unsuitable to grow in front of a lake side property. The growth rate was medium with one nursery saying that the shrub could grow up to 10 metres tall.

J Power advised that she first contacted Council in January 2017 asking if the Griselinia could be trimmed or removed. She received an email response from Council staff that it is not the intention to remove healthy trees or shrubs. Eventually, the shrubs did get a small height trim. J Power got back in touch with the Council April 2018 and met G Barnard (Parks Community Assets Officer) on site. It was then arranged to meet C Brown (Community Green Space Manager) and Shona Powell (Community Board Chair) on-site at which time options were discussed, however it was agreed that they could not be trimmed further than they had been. J Power believed that a suitable compromise could have been substantial trimming 18 months ago when first requested.

J Power referred to para 4.5 of Report 7.1 in the agenda which was a summary of concerns raised and staff responses. J Power provided replies to those items.

1. Concern is more than the height of the Griselinia. Griselinia form a hedge, which three already have. They grow to three metres in width and five metres plus in height which is a block unlike a tree which one can see through. All benefits for example: vertical relief and breaking up the built form as viewed from Western shores, will still be there with replacement "trees".

2. The bushes require ongoing maintenance as they grow onto the path. That cost would be eliminated, if the shrubs were removed.

3. The other planted shrub beds around the lake, are substantially further from residential properties. Most of them being on Lakeside Drive which has a berm, a footpath, a road, grass frontage then the bushes. J Power's property had the closest strip of reserve around the lake that has planting next to properties. At 5 Kewai Court there are just two bottle brush trees with a gap in the middle. As they are in tree form they do not block the lake view.

4. There would be no negative effects as listed and perhaps more benefits. A tree creates a canopy for all day shade unlike bushes. Regarding landscape amenity enhancement, it would be superior with a tree as you can see through the trunk area to other plantings. Wind protection is minimal on the inside of the bushes as you need to stand on the path, and on the lake side of the bushes there is no designated picnic area. There is also no lake access or lake edge access because of other plantings.

5. The report says there were no residents at the time of planting to consult with. There are now several residents.

6. An experienced landscape architect would be unlikely to plant hedging in front of a property with a lake view. Consideration needs to be given to how these lake side properties were marketed, sold and priced by the developer. Replacement trees will also benefit the wider Pegasus community.

J Power noted that at no time was it said that they would like the trimming or removal because of the "distant mountains" view. One of the policy objectives 7.2.2 is to plant appropriate trees on Council managed land for the benefit of current and future generations. J Power believed it was unfair to plant an unsuitable bush just because it grew easily in the environment.

J Power thanked the Board for listening, saying that people’s genuine concerns and feelings were more important than bushes, especially bushes
that had a direct negative impact on someone and were able to be remedied. The Power family were hoping for the Board’s approval to remove the bushes. J Power commented that they loved Pegasus and were looking forward to living there.

R Mather noted that she had visited the site and referred to a tabled photo asking if it showed half the width of the section. J Power commented that one fence and the real estate sign on the other side could be seen. R Mather commented that the section had beautiful views and J Power advised that they had bought the section when it had a clear lake view and the bushes had grown up to impinge on that view. The issue was upsetting and getting worse.

J Archer advised that he had visited the site and noted that the Griselinia had been badly affected by trimming. He agreed with removal of some of the Griselinia and saw others as part of the view.

A Allen asked if removal of the three hedge Griselinia would suffice for the Power family. J Power replied she would be happy for the hedge (three shrubs) to be removed. T Power commented that would be a concession to remove three of the four shrubs.

S Powell asked if the section was currently on the market. J Power replied that they owned two lake side sections, both of which were on the market. The sale of one section would determine their building plans on the remaining section. If the bushes were removed there was a good chance that they would build on that section. They had received feedback from potential purchasers regarding the bushes, and how they detracted from the lake view, and potentially purchase of the section.

S Powell asked if it would be possible to leave the decision around bush removal for a potential purchaser in the future. J Power replied they had received a lot of feedback from Pegasus residents and potential purchasers that the hedge was unsuitable for a lakeside view. She did not think they would get a potential buyer if the bushes kept growing.

J Archer asked what they thought of cabbage trees as a suitable replacement and J Power liked that they had a single trunk.

*Item 7.1 was taken at this time. Note that the minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the agenda as circulated.*

5.2 J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) provided an update on roading priorities for 2018-2019 and sought feedback from the Board on the roading programme. J McBride advised that the renewal of kerb and channel and footpaths was driven by the condition rating for which an inspection was carried out every three years. Work was coordinated with the 3Waters and Greenspace teams.

R Mather asked about crossings in Pegasus. J McBride advised that Pegasus rumble strips were being taken out under maintenance. It was not sitting as a specific project in the three year plan. I Kennedy (Road Maintenance Engineer) was in contact with the Pegasus Residents Group and J McBride would follow-up with I Kennedy.

S Powell noted the extension of the footpath in Woodend to the Anglican Church which was in the Board Long Term Plan (LTP) submission. J McBride advised it had been assessed as part of the new footpath programme. Due to the presence of a large drain it was expensive, and from a cost/benefit analysis the project had fallen in priority. J McBride noted there was funding for cycleways and footpaths in a new NZTA category. There was potential to feed the project into that funding stream. Another factor was the NZTA funding set asked for safety improvements in Woodend. There was still a lot of work to do in that space connecting Woodend and North Woodend.
A Allen asked if there was potential for traffic lights as an alternative to the Pegasus Roundabout. J McBride commented in the future traffic movements would increase with Ravenswood and traffic lights may be required at some time in the future. The roundabout was a good interim measure.

A Thompson asked about a Woodend path extension north to Pegasus/ Ravenswood on the State Highway and asked if there was an option for path to go through Ravenswood. J McBride was not aware of details but understood there was a path planned; it was a few years away.

A Thompson referred to the drain on the eastern side on the main entrance to Rangiora and asked if there were plans for that drain to be piped. J McBride advised that there were plans to upgrade Flaxton Road and there would be discussions around what the road would look like. The project would likely include kerb and channel on the drain side, and improvements to tidy up the drain, but there were no plans to pipe as that was a costly exercise.

S Powell asked about a compulsory stop at Flaxton Road/Fernside Road intersection. J McBride noted the new route linking West Belt and Townsend Road to Fernside Road.

S Powell asked about the Rangiora Woodend path ends. J McBride advised there was a project underway looking at cycleways in the district and where improvements could be made.

S Powell asked about Gressons Road improvements and J McBride noted that it would look at the bridges, road signs and markings to make sure they were suitable.

S Powell asked about the Rangiora Woodend Road, in particular road safety at the Boys Road intersection and J McBride advised there was funding this financial year for design.

J Archer asked about a Tuahiwi footpath noting the Board’s LTP submission. J McBride advised that project is part of the walking/cycling programme.

S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement) provided an update regarding the District Development Strategy (DDS) and provided a copy of the Waimakariri 2048 DDS. He commented it was the end of a long process to finalise the document. There had been workshops with the Board and members of the community to look ahead, set out and describe the broad direction for development for the next 30 years. It was expected that there would be a continuation of the significant growth in the district.

S Markham noted the other purpose of the document was to provide context within which to undertake the review of the District Plan. A wider context was the Greater Christchurch Partnership and the opportunities and constraints that it provided to the Council.

S Markham referred to page 43 of the 2048 DDS document which related to transport in the Woodend/Pegasus area. Even if the Council undertook no new zoning the community had an estimated population of 12,000. There had been some discussion at the workshop of what a community of that size needed or wanted. There needed to be thought about movement patterns within towns and connections. The eastern bypass was a live issue and the Council was mindful to engage with government to get certainty around the confirmed alignment and timing.

S Markham referred to page 33 of the document which related to key activity centres in the area. The proposed Ravenswood commercial area provided an element of opportunity. There would be a more intensive workshop discussion with the developer. Also in light of the persistent uncertainty regarding the Woodend Bypass there was a need to manage the existing Woodend Town Centre including safety until the long term situation was resolved. It was not about doing nothing but keeping a push on active management and looking to the long term role of the commercial area in Woodend without a highway designation.
The Board raised a number of corrections around road locations/names in the document.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Pegasus Lake Griselinia Removal Request — C Brown (Community Greenspace Manager)

C Brown spoke to the report noting that its purpose was to seek a decision regarding the four Griselinia trees located outside 55 The Esplanade. C Brown acknowledged the thorough deputation from the Power family.

C Brown highlighted para 7.2.1 in the report regarding legislation. The Griselinia were of a significant enough size to be treated as trees and therefore the Council's Street and Reserves Tree Policy applied.

C Brown highlighted the benefits of the four plants for the Pegasus area. It was important to note that the Griselinia were very healthy as many trees planted in Pegasus have struggled to grow in the difficult environment. The Griselinia provided vertical relief, native habitat biota nodes, wind protection, landscape amenity enhancement, creation of more discrete areas for passive recreation activities and breaking up the built form. C Brown commented that the Griselinia were effective in providing those benefits.

C Brown referred to para 4.5 in the report which was a summary of the request of residents for removal and staff comments. There had been no feedback from flyers distributed to three neighbouring residents.

C Brown referred to the criteria in the Council Street and Reserves Tree Policy and advised that currently the Griselinia did not meet the criteria to remove.

J Archer asked about the ongoing maintenance problem keeping the hedge off the path. C Brown replied that the bushes had been hedged and were not able to be 'lifted' as they had too many stems. They required maintaining off the path however the cost was not significant. J Archer noted the ongoing maintenance and asked if cabbage trees would provide the vertical relief. C Brown replied they would, however the lake was big and there was a need to plant new trees for vertical relief. He noted that trees were inspected on a three yearly basis and would require more ongoing cost than the bushes.

J Archer asked if the shelter provided would be minimal and C Brown replied that there would be some degree of shelter by tucking up on the other side if you were having a picnic.

A Allen asked C Brown who he perceived the lake edge users to be. C Brown advised that was anyone who used that lake as it was a public space. A Allen commented that no one used that area for picnicking or shelter as it was not possible to approach the water. C Brown commented that they could not monitor all parks and locations which was why the Community Board was important. The Griselinia did break up the space for passive and recreational use and by removing the Griselinia that opportunity was reduced for future users of the space.

J Meyer asked whether the bushes could be shaped into individual trees. It was noted that it was not possible as there were now too many leaders.

J Archer asked about removing a selected few of the plants. C Brown noted that for the reasons identified individual plants were not recommended to be removed as it would still have a negative impact on values. It was the decision of the Community Board, as per their delegation from the Council.
A Thompson commented it was an important issue with a variety of views. He asked if there were other Griselinia around the lake and C Brown replied yes. A Thompson asked if staff had hedged the Griselinia and C Brown replied they had been pruned after requests by the owners and also due to their locality next to the footpath.

A Thompson asked if the area had been planted at the time of the section being sold. C Brown replied yes they were planted as part of the overall development with a lot of thought from the landscape architect to provide a cohesive planting plan including the bottle brush to attract birds.

R Mather asked if there was a precedent for the plants removal elsewhere in the district and what the likelihood was for it setting a precedent in Pegasus. C Brown replied that other residents did have plants in front of the properties in Pegasus. In those instances the trees were generally further away. A precedent could be set anywhere. The Community Board had the delegation to approve the removal of trees from Council Green Space land and there were many situations where trees were removed or retained outside of policy. It was looked at on a case by case basis.

Moved A Allen seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180629072319
(b) Notes that removal of the shrubs would not be consistent with Councils Tree Policy.
(c) Notes that three adjacent residents were sent a letter asking for feedback however, no replies were received.
(d) Approves the removal of the three hedged Griselinia and the lone Griselinia and request they are replaced with alternative planting at the cost of the Power family. Replacement options to be determined by Community Greenspace and presented to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board for approval by way of report and sample photography.

CARRIED

J Archer and R Mather Abstained

A Division was called

For: A Allen, A Blackie and J Meyer
Against: S Powell and A Thompson
Abstain: J Archer and R Mather.

Motion carried 3:2

A Allen commented that it was a comprehensive report and there had been a passionate submission from the Power family.

A Blackie referred to previous requests for tree removal for example silver birches near schools and Kaiapoi cherry blossoms. He supported the motion as he believed there were a number of items in favour of the request to remove including, costs would be met by the applicants and not the ratepayers, although the Council had signed off planting it was not a Council arborist who had chosen the trees, he believed the Griselinia were ugly, shelter was limited and it was a solvable issue at no expense to the Council.

A Thompson did not support the motion for a number of reasons including that there were many situations where people liked or disliked public plantings, there was still a substantial view from the property, the plants were present when the property was purchased and the representation was from one
property owner rather than a group of residents. He noted the owners had offered to meet the costs.

R Mather remarked she found the decision difficult. She agreed with A Thompson, believing there was nothing wrong with the view, the photograph shown was a part of the property, and the plants had the advantage of blocking the view of the apartments. As a house was yet to be built on the section, the impact of the view from the future house was yet to be determined. R Mather was concerned approving the tree removal would open it up for more residents to request tree removal in the future. On the other side there was minimal disruption if the trees were replaced.

J Meyer appreciated the submission from the family. He supported the motion to remove the shrubs as the plants were hedges rather than true trees. He did not believe that it would encourage others to request tree removal. He had been swayed by the photographs of ‘true’ trees provided by the family.

J Archer noted that he had walked around the area and looked at the trees. He believed from parts of the property there were clear views and the trees added to the landscape. He would prefer a selection of the trees to be removed. Any remaining Griselinia would still require maintenance.

S Powell advised that she had been to the section a number of times. The plants did provide wind shelter and broke up the landscape. It was possible to picnic in that area. She was concerned about precedent setting and believed, looking at the big picture, the plants did add value to the community and visitors to the lake.

7.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 and General Landscaping Fund 2018/2019 - E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report and asked the Board to start thinking over the next few months how they would like the landscaping money spent. The funding application criteria remained the same with minor tweaks to the funding form. It was the same form for all Community Boards. It would be uploaded to the website after the Board signed off. S Nichols provided some clarification on the ‘who will benefit’ question on the application.

It was noted there was a CPI increase to the landscaping budget.

Moved A Allen    seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180627071293.
(b) Notes that the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2018/19 is $12,160.
(c) Notes that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2018/2019 is $4,000.
(d) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No. 180627071237).
(e) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No. 180621068888).
(f) Approves that Discretionary Grant Fund applications will continue to be considered at each meeting for the 2018/2019 financial year (July 2018 to June 2019).

CARRIED
7.3 Approval of the updated Woodend-Sefton Community Board Plan 2018/19 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report noting the layout would be improved when it was in a different format.

Moved R Mather  seconded J Meyer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180627071416.
(b) Approves the final draft of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board Plan 2018-2019 (Trim 180606062276) subject to any minor edits discussed and approved by the Board Chairperson.

CARRIED

R Mather commented that she had provided feedback and was happy for the Chair to approve minor edits.

A Allen was glad the updated version was less ‘wordy’.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

S Powell noted the tabled Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 submission response (Trim 180619067680).

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for June 2018

S Powell commented that it was good to see Board members at the Rangiora-Woodend Path opening.

Moved S Powell  seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180703073564.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 7 June 2018 (Trim No. 180530059840).

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 June 2018 (Trim No. 180606062470).

10.3 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 21 May 2018 (Trim No.180518054887).

10.4 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 18 June 2018 (Trim No.180618067116).

10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – 29 May 2018


Moved J Archer seconded A Thompson

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.19.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 March Diary for J Archer, A Thompson and R Mather

(Trim No. 180703073567)

R Mather
- Noted that she was yet to hear back from the meeting regarding the Pegasus Community Centre.
  Commented that the Transport Forum had been interesting and noted the public transport focus of the new government.

J Meyer
- Noted the presence of the new Roading Manager at the meeting and encouraged Board members to review the roading programme.
- Commented that Councillors and staff had been busy with the LTP.
- Noted upcoming meetings regarding water quality and the challenges in that space for the future.
- Consultation for Kaiapoi Town Centre opens on 6 August and closes on 3 September 2018 with hearings in late September. A Blackie, K Barnett and J Meyer were on the hearings panel.

A Blackie
- Advised that S Stewart had provided an update from the Waimakariri Zone Committee and there was planned consultation in July 2018. Nitrate levels were expected to climb for the next 20 years. Silverstream had risen from 6.2 Nitrate-N g/m³ to 11.2 Nitrate-N g/m³ in 12 months, the maximum allowable value was 11.3 Nitrate-N g/m³. It was an intergenerational problem that would take decades to fix. Individuals and Council needed to look at solutions to high nitrate levels in water supplies.
- Advised that the Kaiapoi River scheme was facing difficulties around timing constraints and delays. In mid-February 2019 there was to be the River Carnival opening which could include the Christchurch Boat Show on regeneration land.

A Allen
- Attended North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support (NCNS) planning meeting. Noted NCNS had good support from Hurunui and Kaikoura District Councils but there was some push back from the Waimakariri District Council. Looking to do a presentation to the Community Boards to improve the relationship. The New Zealand Police were happy with NCNS.
- Public Spaces Policy question and answer session at Rossburn Reception 26 July 2018.

A Thompson
- Commented planting at Taranaki Stream was going well.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy
Consultation closes Monday 30 July 2018.  

S Powell noted the Kaiapoi Town Centre consultation would occur through August.

13  **FOSTERING COMMUNITIES**

Nil.

14  **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1  **Board Discretionary Grant**

Balance as at 9 July 2018: $4000.

14.2  **General Landscaping Fund**

Balance as at 9 July 2018 $12,160.

15  **MEDIA ITEMS**

Item in the last issue of the Sefton Community Newsletter regarding funding.

16  **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Nil.

17  **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Nil.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 13 August 2018 at the Pegasus Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.45pm

CONFIRMED

______________________________

Chairperson

______________________________

Date