Kōrero mai | Let’s talk

Globe Bay Reserve - tree planting plan feedback

Response No: 1

Contribution ID: **42879**

Q1 **Full name**

Short Text

Jolene Eager

Q3 **What is your relationship to the park?**

Multi Choice

Other: Chair of Templeton Residents' Association

Q4 **What is your property address?**

Short Text

Q5 **Is there anything the tree planting team needs to consider before this proceeds to the community board for a decision?**

Long Text

Overview
Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed Globe Bay Reserve Tree Planting Plan.

I have sought input from members of the Templeton community and received a range of perspectives. Overall, feedback reflects both support for the environmental vision of the proposal, as well as concerns about the impact on current use, views, and community character.

Summary of Community Feedback
1. Support for the Proposal
A number of residents strongly support the long-term vision of enhancing Globe Bay Reserve through increased tree planting and biodiversity.
Key points of support include:
• Recognition that the reserve is currently underutilised and lacks shade and ecological value
• Strong support for increasing tree canopy to improve:
o Amenity and usability (especially in summer)
o Biodiversity and habitat creation
o Climate resilience
• A view that this is a forward-thinking investment in the future of the community
There is also support for:
• Creating a more visually appealing and greener environment
• Enhancing opportunities for passive recreation such as walking and nature enjoyment.

2. Concerns Raised by Residents
Other residents have expressed clear concerns about aspects of the proposal:

Loss of Open Space
• Concern that tree planting may reduce open grass areas currently used for walking, gathering, and informal recreation
• The reserve is valued as a simple, open community space

Impact on Views
• Some residents are concerned about:
o Loss or restriction of rural outlooks
o Reduced views of farmland and the Southern Alps
• These views are seen as an important part of the local character and lifestyle

Perceived Use of Ratepayer Funds
• Concern from some that the proposal represents a poor use of ratepayer money
• Questions raised about whether this is a priority investment

Change in Character
• A broader concern that the proposal represents a shift from:
o An open recreational reserve
o To a more densely planted, nature-focused space
• Not all residents feel this change reflects how the reserve is currently used or valued

3. Suggested Refinements (Areas of Common Ground)
Across both supportive and concerned feedback, there are several constructive suggestions that could help balance outcomes:
• Retain clearly defined open central areas
 Ensure space remains for informal recreation, gatherings, and play
• Careful placement of trees near residential boundaries

 Protect sunlight, privacy, and outlook
• Maintain key viewshafts
 Particularly toward rural land and mountain ranges
• Preserve sightlines for safety
 Avoid creating areas that feel enclosed or unsafe
• Incorporate well-designed walking paths
 Reflect existing desire lines and encourage use
• Provide clarity on long-term maintenance
 Ensure the reserve remains safe, tidy, and accessible

Conclusion
The feedback received highlights that the community is not opposed to improvement, but there is a strong desire to ensure that any development:
• Respects the current character and use of the reserve
• Balances open space with planting
• Protects key views and residential amenity
• Represents good value for the community

There is an opportunity for Council to refine the proposal in a way that brings the community with it—achieving environmental gains while maintaining the qualities that residents already value.

Response No: 2

Contribution ID: **42644**

Q1 **Full name**

Short Text

Daniel Hamilton

Q3 **What is your relationship to the park?**

Multi Choice

I live next to the park

Q4 **What is your property address?**

Short Text

[redacted]

Q5 **Is there anything the tree planting team needs to consider before this proceeds to the community board for a decision?**

Long Text

Yes - please refer to my feedback (send via email to letstalk@ccc.govt.nz).

FEEDBACK/SUBMISSION on Globe Bay Reserve Urban Forest Plan

Christchurch City Council

Date: 16 March 2026

1. My details

Name: Daniel Hamilton

[redacted]

[redacted]

Property: Residential property on Roydon Drive, adjoining the eastern boundary of Globe Bay Reserve (see Figure 1).



Figure 1: Aerial image showing my property (blue boundary) and Globe Bay Reserve.

2. Introduction and Overview of Submission

I am the owner (and occupier) of a residential property on Roydon Drive, Christchurch, where I live with my partner and four young girls. Our property directly adjoins the eastern boundary of Globe Bay Reserve. I am strongly opposed to the Globe Bay Reserve Urban Forest Plan (UFP031, Issue 2, dated 02/03/26) prepared by Christchurch City Council ('the Council'), as it relates to the proposed planting at the eastern end of Globe Bay Reserve, close to my property boundary.

This feedback raises the following principal concerns:

- Serious and unmitigated adverse effects on sunlight access and solar gain to my property;
- Significant loss of outlook, views, and residential amenity, and related impact on property value;
- Unacceptable risk to life and property from tree failure in high-wind events (norwesterly conditions, which would blow trees towards my property);
- Procedural and legal concerns regarding the adequacy of consultation under the Reserves Act 1977;
- Non-compliance with the Council's own Tree Planting Guidelines set out in the UFP itself; and
- Inconsistency with the Christchurch District Plan's amenity protection policies.

I request that the Council substantially modify the planting plan to exclude all large trees from the eastern end of Globe Bay Reserve boundary, adjacent to Roydon Drive residential properties. The planting out of the western end of the reserve is supported, as it wouldn't raise any of the issues for residential properties as set out in my feedback.

3. Legal and Policy Framework

3.1 Reserves Act 1977

Globe Bay Reserve is classified as a Recreation Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. Section 17 of the Act specifies that recreation reserves are to be maintained and developed for the recreation and sporting activities and physical welfare and enjoyment of the public, and for the protection of the natural environment.

Section 40 of the Act sets out the functions of the administering body, which must act in a manner that balances public enjoyment with protection of the surrounding environment. Section 41 imposes obligations to prepare, consult on, and maintain management plans. The UFP, as a planning document guiding the future management of this reserve, should be assessed against the Act's purposes. The proposal to plant trees reaching 20 metres or more in height immediately adjacent to residential properties represents a significant and permanent change to the character and effects of the reserve that warrants rigorous scrutiny.

Critically, Section 120 of the Reserves Act provides rights of objection and submission by affected persons. As a directly adjoining property owner, I am an affected person with full standing to make this feedback/submission.

3.2 Local Government Act 2002 – Decision-Making Obligations

As the administering body of Globe Bay Reserve, Christchurch City Council is subject to the decision-making obligations in Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). These obligations apply to all significant council decisions and are mandatory — the LGA uses the word 'must' throughout, and compliance is not optional.

Section 77(1) of the LGA requires the Council to seek to identify all reasonably practicable options for the achievement of the objective of a decision, and to assess the advantages and disadvantages of each option. A recent Court of Appeal decision (Thorndon Quay Collective Inc v Wellington City Council) confirmed that merely presenting a preferred option to a committee, without a genuine assessment of alternatives, constitutes a failure to comply with s77. The UFP as presented does not demonstrate that the Council has genuinely assessed alternative planting approaches — for example, restricting large and very large trees to the interior of the reserve, well away from residential boundaries, or using a graduated height buffer adjacent to Roydon Drive.

Section 78(1) of the LGA requires the Council to consider the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by, or to have an interest in, a matter. Directly adjoining property owners on Roydon Drive are plainly affected persons. Section 78 requires more than token notification — it requires that affected persons are provided with sufficient information to meaningfully engage. As submitted in section 4.4 below, affected residents have not been given solar shadow studies, species lists (merely photos of young, scrawny looking tree specimens), wind risk assessments, or ground-level visual simulations, and are therefore unable to assess the true nature of what is being proposed.

The degree of compliance required under the LGA is proportionate to the significance of the decision (s79). A proposal to permanently transform a reserve's canopy cover from 1% to 68%, through the planting of 74 specimen trees and 13,700 m^2 of native forest immediately adjacent to residential properties, is plainly a significant decision. It is permanent and irreversible, it directly and materially affects the amenity and safety of adjoining property owners, and it involves a substantial commitment of public resources. The Council's own Significance and Engagement Policy should be applied, and the Council must demonstrate that it has done so.

3.3 Christchurch District Plan – Recession Planes and Sunlight Access

While the Christchurch District Plan does not directly regulate tree planting on reserve land, it provides authoritative evidence of what this community has collectively determined constitutes acceptable impacts on residential amenity. The District Plan's

recession plane rules and their explanatory notes are directly relevant as a policy benchmark against which the Council's own actions should be measured.

The explanatory note to the recession plane provisions (District Plan section 14.9.2) states that the purpose of those rules is to ensure that adjoining residential properties are able to maintain a sufficient standard of amenity in respect to sunlight admission. The recession plane also acts as a de facto height control as a means of protecting access to sunlight for neighbouring properties.

Trees reaching 20 metres or more in height planted immediately adjacent to the boundary of residential properties are at least as impactful as buildings in terms of shading, outlook obstruction, and dominance. It is inconsistent — and arguably indefensible — for the Council to prohibit neighbouring residents from erecting structures that breach the recession plane, while simultaneously planting trees on reserve land that will far exceed it. The Council should apply the same standard of protection to its own actions that it requires of the community it regulates.

The cross-sections on Sheet LO3 of the UFP show recession plane angles of 47 degrees applying at the Roydon Drive boundary for sections A-A and B-B. The proposed native forest revegetation planting and specimen trees shown in those sections will, at maturity, significantly intrude into the space above the recession plane as measured from the residential boundary. This is precisely the type of impact the District Plan's sunlight protection framework was designed to prevent.

3.4 Council's Own Urban Forest Plan Guidelines

The UFP itself (Sheet LO7) includes Tree Planting Guidelines that establish binding standards for the proposal. I note the following specific standards with which the proposed planting plan may be inconsistent:

- No tree shall intrude through the recession plane at maturity — the cross-sections on Sheet LO3 show proposed trees potentially at or near the recession plane angles applicable to the Roydon Drive boundary (47 degrees for sections A-A and B-B). As trees grow, this will need active enforcement.
- Tree spacings shall be a minimum of 5.0 m apart — the plan must demonstrate this is maintained throughout.
- CCC will aim for 40-60% of new tree plantings as natives — the Council should confirm the species mix meets this target and that selected species are appropriate to Christchurch's wind environment.

Compliance with these guidelines must be confirmed in writing prior to any planting proceeding.

4. Grounds of Opposition

4.1 Loss of Sunlight and Solar Access

The proposed planting plan (Sheet LO4) proposes 74 specimen trees plus 13,700 m^2 of native forest revegetation planting. This would increase canopy cover from the current 1% to approximately 68% — a 67 percent increase. My property on Roydon Drive faces west toward the reserve, meaning the setting sun — including afternoon and evening light — currently passes over open reserve land and directly benefits my family and property.

The indicative cross-sections on Sheet LO3 (Sections A-A and B-B in particular) show proposed trees immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary reaching heights of 15–20 metres and above. Trees of this height planted close to my boundary will cast significant shadows across my property in the afternoon and evening, materially reducing:

- Sunlight to habitable rooms and outdoor living areas during peak afternoon/evening use periods;
- Solar gain for passive heating during Christchurch's cold winters;
- The ability to generate solar energy from rooftop panels facing the western aspect; and
- Enjoyment of outdoor areas in afternoon sunlight.

This loss of sunlight is permanent and irreversible once trees reach maturity. The Council has not provided a solar shadow study or any assessment of cumulative shading effects on adjoining properties. This is a significant omission that must be remedied.

4.2 Loss of Outlook and Residential Amenity

My property currently enjoys an open outlook across Globe Bay Reserve — an expansive, open grassed area that contributes significantly to the character and amenity of the Roydon Drive streetscape and the residential properties backing onto it. The proposed concept plan (Sheet LO6) would replace this open landscape with dense native forest planting and a canopy that visually dominates the boundary.

The existing character of the reserve — open, grassed, rural in feel — is precisely the amenity that my property value and enjoyment reflects. Transforming this into a dense urban forest fundamentally and permanently changes the amenity environment of my property without any corresponding benefit to me as an affected neighbour. The plan provides no assessment of effects on residential outlook and visual amenity.

4.3 Risk to Life and Property from Wind Throw and Tree Failure

Christchurch experiences strong and frequent norwesterly wind events – which are tending to increase in frequency and severity due to climate change. These winds are well-documented as a significant natural hazard in the Canterbury region, capable of gusting to extreme velocities. The proposed planting of trees reaching 20 metres or more in height immediately adjacent to the boundary with residential properties on Roydon Drive presents an unacceptable risk of:

- Tree failure and wind throw onto residential structures, vehicles, and persons in high wind events;
- Branch fall causing injury or property damage during and after norwesterly events;
- Root system damage to fences, foundations, and underground services on adjacent properties; and
- Ongoing maintenance liability that falls disproportionately on Council (or in the event of neglect, on affected residents).

The UFP contains no wind risk assessment, no arboricultural safety assessment specific to the Christchurch wind environment, and no analysis of which tree species are appropriate for a high-wind exposure site immediately adjacent to dwellings – and this is a real concern, given the propensity for the council to plant poplar trees in many of its reserves (a species noted for their shallow root systems) . This is a serious gap. The Trees Planting Guidelines note that '*tree species shall be well suited to local conditions*' — local conditions here include extreme wind exposure. The plan does not demonstrate compliance with this guideline.

I request that the Council commission a specific wind risk assessment from a qualified arborist before any planting proceeds adjacent to the Roydon Drive boundary, and that only species certified as appropriate for a high-wind urban interface be planted within 20 metres of the boundary (and then, only species that don't reach a height of greater than 2 metres at maturity).

4.4 Procedural Concerns — Adequacy of Consultation

The Reserves Act 1977 Section 41 requires that management plans be prepared with appropriate public consultation. Directly affected adjoining property owners are particularly important stakeholders in this process. I am concerned that:

- The scale and permanence of the proposed changes — from a 1% to 68% canopy cover — have not been clearly communicated to affected Roydon Drive residents in terms of the on-ground impacts they will experience;
- Residents were not provided with solar shadow studies, wind risk assessments, or specific species lists to enable informed feedback; and

- The visual simulations (Sheet LO6 concept plan) show a bird's-eye photomontage that does not adequately convey the experience of the reserve from within a neighbouring property at ground level.

I submit that the consultation process has been inadequate for a proposal of this significance and that affected neighbouring residents should be provided with the following information before any final decision is made:

- A solar shadow study showing cumulative shading on Roydon Drive properties at summer and winter solstice;
- A wind risk assessment from a qualified arborist specific to this location;
- A full species list for proposed plantings, with confirmation of suitability for a boundary-adjacent, high-wind location (including only planting species that are no greater than 2 metres in height at maturity within 20 metres of the Roydon Drive properties adjoining Globe Bay Reserve); and
- Ground-level visual simulations showing the view from residential properties at maturity.

4.5 Inconsistency with the Recreation Reserve Classification

Section 17 of the Reserves Act 1977 defines the purpose of recreation reserves as the provision of areas '*for recreation and sporting activities to promote physical welfare and enjoyment of the public, and for the protection of the natural environment and beauty of the locality.*' The transformation of Globe Bay Reserve from an open recreation space into a dense native forest fundamentally changes the character of the reserve.

While urban forest planting can have ecological merit, the Council must demonstrate that the proposed planting is consistent with the reserve's classification as a recreation reserve. Dense native forest planting that eliminates open grassed areas and passive recreational space may not be consistent with the recreation reserve purpose, particularly for a small suburban reserve of approximately 2 hectares that primarily serves the local residential catchment. For example, the reserve is currently mostly used for running, walking, dog walking, cycling and kite flying – all of these would be impacted by the changes proposed.

5. Relief Sought

I request that the Council:

- Decline to adopt the UFP in its current form;
- If the UFP proceeds, exclude large (16–20 m) and very large (20+ m) specimen trees from a minimum 20-metre buffer zone adjacent to the Roydon Drive residential boundary;

- Restrict any tree planting within 20 metres of the Roydon Drive boundary to small trees (2 m maximum height at maturity) and low-growing native understorey species only;
- Commission and make publicly available a solar shadow study assessing shading impacts on all Roydon Drive properties adjoining the reserve;
- Commission and make publicly available a wind risk assessment from a qualified arborist prior to any planting;
- Provide a binding commitment to ongoing tree maintenance, including regular inspection and pruning to ensure recession plane compliance and wind safety;
- Confirm the species list for all proposed plantings and demonstrate compliance with the Council's own Tree Planting Guidelines, including wind suitability and native species targets; and
- Undertake further targeted consultation with directly adjoining Roydon Drive residents, providing the above studies as part of that consultation.

Signed: 

Name: Daniel Hamilton

Date: 16 March 2026