

7. LIVING STREETS – THE PAPANUI CLUSTER

Officer responsible
City Streets Manager

Author
Paul Burden, DDI 941 8836

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Board concerning the Living Streets Project scheduled to occur within the Papanui area and to seek approval to the proposed “Collaboration” process.

BACKGROUND

Showpiece Projects

City Streets has been working on the development of Living Streets showpiece/pilot projects. The streets selected for the pilots were chosen using a series of factors that optimised both our potential for success and our potential for gaining knowledge and understanding. As such the streets present a diverse range of environments, traffic function and stakeholder groups.

One of the most significant purposes of the pilot projects is for experimentation. Whilst Living Streets is still in its infancy the “launch and learn” approach gives us the opportunity to broaden our knowledge base as well as built examples for marketing and demonstration. The projects themselves form the basis of a laboratory where a number of different processes can be tested and recorded allowing a series of critical success factors to be identified.

THE PAPANUI CLUSTER

From an early stage it was considered advantageous to identify “clusters” of kerb and channel renewal which provides considerable efficiency benefits both in the planning and implementation of capital works projects. There are eight streets located within the small residential catchment known as the “Papanui Cluster”. These Streets are Proctor, Mary, Gambia, Loftus, Horner, Wyndham, Frank and Grants.

Although only three of these streets were earmarked for Living Streets “showpiece” projects, in practical terms it is considered better, to consider the entire cluster as a showpiece. All eight streets are scheduled for kerb and channel renewal over the next 6 years. A schedule of each street, its budget and year is shown below. Whilst the renewal is spread over 6 years, it is proposed to develop a comprehensive planning process for the entire area at the outset with implementation being spread over the forth-coming years.

Year	Project Description	Budget
2002/03	Mary (Grants to Main North)	\$50,100
2003/04	Mary (Grants to Main North)	\$456,327
2002/03	Frank Street (All)	\$24,900
2003/04	Frank Street (All)	\$371,467
2002/03	Grants (Papanui-Culvert)	\$45,200
2003/04	Grants (Papanui-Culvert)	\$376,026
2005/06	Horner (Papanui-Proctor)	\$22,000
2006/07	Horner (Papanui-Proctor)	\$227,925
2005/06	Loftus (All)	\$17,000
2006/07	Loftus (All)	\$172,210
2005/06	Wyndham (Papanui-Proctor)	\$12,200
2006/07	Wyndham (Papanui-Proctor)	\$329,225
2007/08	Gambia Street (All)	unspecified
2007/08	Proctor (All)	unspecified

PRELIMINARY PLANNING WORK

East Papanui Neighbourhood Improvement Plan

A Neighbourhood Improvement Plan which contains the Papanui cluster was completed in 1990 by the then Planning Policy Unit (to be tabled). The plan identifies a number of issues relevant to the cluster and recommends traffic calming at the intersections of the side roads with Papanui Road and Main North Road. It is recommended that this document be used for reference but the outcomes should not be treated as binding given the age of the material.

Horners Branch Drain Improvements

A report/memorandum with the above title was written by the Parks and Waterways in August 2001 (to be tabled). The report identifies considerable deficiencies in the stormwater disposal system within the cluster and recommends a comprehensive planning approach to the problem. This is seen as a beneficial partnership opportunity between the City Streets and Parks and Waterways Units.

The Proposed Collaboration Process

A "Community Based Collaboration Process for Living Streets" has been developed and refined through application to specific Living Streets Projects.

In Christchurch traditionally we have developed scheme plans for road redesign and issued a publicity leaflet describing the extent of the project and calling for comments. This approach while suited to some projects may not provide stakeholders with a sense of ownership and may lower the overall quality of the project and outcome. When given the opportunity there is evidence to suggest that the people of this city do care about outcomes and can become committed collectively to enter into partnerships to achieve common goals. Living Streets aims to nurture community involvement and commitment to maximise the mutual benefits from governance partnerships. This will not be achieved through informing, it can only be achieved through a higher level of public participation such as collaboration and empowerment.

The Collaboration process adopts the same objective and promise used by the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) (to be tabled).

The process is as follows:

Stage One – Getting Underway

Initiate the project, allocate a planning leader, and define the scope of the project. Gather an all-inclusive internal team of stakeholders who will be working on the project and ensure commitment to the staged process. This team should include but not be limited to landscape architects, urban designers, cycle advocates, pedestrian advocates, traffic engineers, safety auditors, environmental planning and policy personnel, arts advisors, parks and waterways personnel and designers.

Stage Two – All Ears Listening and All Eyes Looking (Workshops, Walks, Interviews, Street Stalls and Surveys)

Identify all stakeholders and ensure inclusive list is developed to include but not limited to residents, property owners, business operators, community and special interest groups. Design a process that will ensure all stakeholders are able to have their say and to identify: What they like and don't like about their street and neighbourhood improvements they would like to see in their street. Include things they could do and things others could do. Note that there is no one way that this can be achieved. What matters is that everyone can have their say and understands how what they say will influence the process. Stakeholders must understand that this is a staged process and that there will be a seamless and transparent process between each stage. Every stakeholder is an expert in his or her own opinion. It is important that technical experts stand back from this process and should be discouraged from leading discussion with "in my view" statements. Follow up calls to support invitations to participate are usually required. It is important to include as many stakeholders as possible at this stage.

Stage Two A – Professional and Technical All Eyes looking and All Ears Listening

Here the Council's or road controlling authority's professional and technical experts identified in stage one undertake their observations and analysis in order to identify strengths, issues, needs and opportunities. This analysis needs to be documented in a way that will be understood by the key stakeholders. Visual imagery is important.

Stage 3 – Analysis of stages two and three – Identification of Draft Objectives – Development of Possible Options

Complete analysis of all outputs from Stage Two to identify what the stakeholder's value most and want to preserve, enhance and celebrate. Identify what the stakeholders like least and what opportunities for improvement they see. Based on this analysis identify the emerging vision for the street. Each professional should present their technical and professional findings including opportunities and issues. From here develop possible options based on the above, which will *enhance quality of life* for the citizens.

Stage Four – Work In Progress – Did we Hear You Right? – Workshops and Street Stalls – This is what you told us – Draft Options for Review.

Words and photos to tell the findings from stage Two and Three to identify what the stakeholder's value most and want to preserve, enhance and celebrate. What they like least and what opportunity for improvement there are. Based on the above identify the emerging vision for the street and the objectives. Add in the professional and technical inputs, challenges and opportunities and present possible options for review.

Stage Five – Refine Options Based on the Outputs from Stage Four

Stage Six – Present Draft Option for Stakeholder Review

Stage Seven – Refine Based on Outcomes of Stage Six – Produce Final Scheme Plan

Distribute and launch the plan. Some further fine-tuning of a minor nature may be required.

Stage Eight – Detailed Design and Implementation

TOUCH POINTS FOR ELECTED MEMBERS

It is often unclear and seldom implicitly stated where in a process elected members should give their approval or sign off for the next stage in the process to commence. Elected members fulfil two very important roles in the collaboration process:

(1) Informal contribution: The collaboration process described above is "all inclusive" and therefore elected members are encouraged (and will be specifically invited) to attend and participate in all three public meetings/workshops.

(2) Formal contribution: Formal approval of elected members is sought at four specific points in the process:

- Prior to commencing (The project exists, background information, is there agreement on the process?)
- Prior to commencing Stage four (reporting the analysis of the "All Ears Listening" phase, "Did We Hear You Right?")
- Prior to Stage 6 (approval of the preferred option prior to release to the public)
- Prior to Stage 8 (approval of the final plan prior to detailed design and implementation)

TIME FRAME

The All Ears Listening Workshop will be held in October 2002. Work up to Stage Four is expected to be completed prior to Christmas 2002. The final scheme plan for the area is expected to be completed by May 2003.

CONCLUSION

The Papanui cluster represents an excellent opportunity to approach enhancement of the area in an integrated fashion. The proposed collaboration process has proven to be well received by the public producing excellent outcomes. The Papanui cluster will be a “cluster” showpiece example of the practical application of the Living Streets philosophies.

Staff

- Recommendation:**
1. That the information be received.
 2. That the Board support the collaboration process as outlined above.

Chairperson’s

- Recommendation:** That the officer’s recommendation be adopted.