



Christchurch City Council

BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD AGENDA NO 226

15 FEBRUARY 2006

5.00 PM

IN THE BOARDROOM,
CNR BERESFORD AND UNION STREETS
NEW BRIGHTON

Community Board: Glenda Burt (Chairperson), Carole Evans, Carmen Hammond, Caroline Kellaway, Tina Lomax, Don Rowlands, Gail Sheriff

Community Board Principal Adviser
Clare Sullivan
Telephone: 941-6601
Fax: 941-6604
Email: clare.sullivan@ccc.govt.nz

Community Secretary
Roger Cave
Telephone: 941-6624
Fax: 941-6604
Email: roger.cave@ccc.govt.nz

- PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION
- PART B - REPORTS FOR INFORMATION
- PART C - DELEGATED DECISIONS

INDEX

- PART C 1. APOLOGIES
- PART C 2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORT
- PART B 3. PETITIONS
- PART B 4. CORRESPONDENCE
- PART B 5. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT
- PART A 6. SOUTH BRIGHTON MOTOR CAMP - PROPOSED INCREASE IN CAMP CHARGES
- PART B 7. SUBURBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT INTERCHANGES CRITERIA
- PART B 8. RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS
- PART B 9. CUFFS RESERVE PLAYGROUND DEVELOPMENT
- PART B 10. RAWHITI DOMAIN AND THOMSON PARK DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN AND LANDSCAPING
- PART B 11. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE
 - PART B 11.1 Committee and Working Party Membership
 - PART B 11.2 Notice of Upcoming Board Reports
 - PART B 11.3 2005/06 Project, Discretionary and Youth Development Funds Update
- PART B 12. NOTICES OF MOTION
- PART B 13. QUESTIONS
- PART B 14. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

We're on the Web!

www.ccc.govt.nz/Council/Agendas/



1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF REPORT

The report of the ordinary meeting of the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board held on Wednesday 1 February 2006 has been circulated to Board members.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the report of the ordinary meeting held on Wednesday 1 February 2006 be confirmed.

3. PETITIONS

4. CORRESPONDENCE

5. DEPUTATIONS BY APPOINTMENT

6. SOUTH BRIGHTON MOTOR CAMP - PROPOSED INCREASE IN CAMP CHARGES

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Community Services
Officer responsible:	Community and Recreation Manager
Author:	Lyall Matchett, Financial Support Team Leader, DDI 941-8293

PURPOSE OF REPORT

- The purpose of this report is to enable the Board to make a recommendation to Council to approve, on behalf of the Lessee of the South Brighton Motor Camp, Dominic Brownin and Lyn Pilling, an application for an increase in the charges for tent and caravan sites only at the camp. The accommodation provided onsite is owned by the Lessee and is not determined by the Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Proposed changes to current fees are as follows:

South Brighton Motor Camp**Proposed Charge Schedule**

Camp Sites	Proposed Rate	Proposed Rate	Current Rate	Current Rate
	<u>Per Day</u>	<u>Per Day</u>	<u>Per Day</u>	<u>Per Day</u>
	Powered Sites	Non Powered Sites	Powered Sites	Non Powered Sites
One Adult	\$15.00	\$14.00	\$14.00	\$13.00
Two Adults	\$25.00	\$22.00	\$22.00	\$21.00
Each extra adult	No change	No change	\$10.00*	\$10.00*
Children	No change	No change	\$6.00	\$6.00
Family Rates (2 Adults and 2 Children)	\$35.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$29.00

The charges were last increased on September 2004 and the proposed increase represents a fee increase of between 5% and 15% on current fees.

* Note that the Extra Adult charge approved in September 2004 was \$11.00 but this increase has not been applied.

The following is a comparison with other similar camp facilities:

	South Brighton Motor Camp	Spencer Beach Holiday Park	Meadow Park	All Seasons Holiday Park
	New Fees	Inc 1 July 04	Inc Sept 05	Inc Sept 05
Power sites (2 persons)	\$25.00	\$22.00	\$33.00	\$25.00
Extra Adult	\$10.00	\$11.00	\$16.50	\$14.00
Children - under 15	\$6.00	\$5.00	\$8.50	\$6.00

Fixed costs in particular have risen significantly since the last increase of September 2004, with increases in electricity, rates, insurances, rent and in particular diesel fuel which is used for hot water heating. There are also likely increased electricity charges coming into force before the coming winter. The camp has recently had a change of lessee and the new lessees have indicated a willingness to undertake a number of improvements to the facility.

The current lease has only a further seven years to operate and it is important that the viability of the camp is maintained during this period to ensure that the facilities are well maintained and utilised. The camp is used more by out of town visitors than by residents. This is the opposite of Spencer Park Holiday Park, which is heavily utilised by Christchurch and Canterbury residents.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- The Lease agreement states that "the Lessee will not levy camping ground charges in excess of those approved by Council. The Council's consent to such charges shall not be unreasonably withheld". South Brighton Domain is held by Council as a recreation reserve, subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977 with the lease issued under section 54 (1)(a) of that act.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board seek Council approval to the proposed increased accommodation charges for the South Brighton Motor Camp to apply from 1 March 2006.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

That the abovementioned recommendation be adopted.

7. SUBURBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT INTERCHANGES CRITERIA

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Transport and City Streets Manager
Author:	Robert Woods, Transport Planner Public Transport and Sustainability, DDI 941-8060

PURPOSE OF REPORT

- The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's feedback on certain proposed criteria to identify locations for the development of three suburban bus interchanges. A further report will then present an analysis of potential locations using these criteria (once approved by Council) and a request for Board comment on a recommendation of the three locations for scheme development, prior to seeking a resolution of such from Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The development of suburban interchanges are integral to achieving the Council's vision and goals for public transport as set out in its Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy. In this Strategy, the Council has a target for the adoption of a plan identifying locations of interchanges and construction of three interchanges by June 2006.
- In December 2005 staff conducted a seminar for Council and Community Boards on the role of interchanges and highlighted the particular functions of them in Christchurch (attached). The seminar outlined the aim of achieving positive community outcomes through transport improvements that encourage increased suburban transfer between services forming the metro

network and also between public transport and other modes of travel. This is currently an under-utilised aspect of the system because despite the metro services being largely in place for people to move around the network, there are not the appropriate passenger interchange facilities at key points in the network to encourage transfers. By encouraging people to maximise the flexibility of the system by interchanging between services and modes, they will be able to make better use of the metro system to access a wider range of destinations, rather than be limited to just a single bus trip. This will improve the convenience of the system to present customers whilst also allowing new customers to take advantage of an improved metro system as the overall level of service becomes more aligned with their travel requirements and expectations.

4. The success of suburban interchanges depends upon improvements in a number of key areas. These improvements may be considered the key objectives for the development of the interchanges and comprise:

- The provision of quality interchange passenger facilities at the right locations.
- Appropriate passenger services to facilitate interchange.
- The provision of good access and arrangements for other modes.
- Strong ongoing marketing and promotion of the facility once it is up and running.

Success in these areas will require the Council to engage with other key stakeholders, such as Environment Canterbury, local businesses and the surrounding local communities.

5. In order to identify a fair and technically robust process for selecting the first three interchange sites, a number of different criteria options were considered. These comprised site selection by:

- (a) Geographical spread.
- (b) Existing passenger demand.
- (c) Existing level of passenger services.
- (d) Surrounding population catchment.
- (e) Importance of the suburban centre in comparison to other centres.
- (f) Status of the centre within the metro network.
- (g) Land availability and complexity of procurement.
- (h) Traffic management implications and impacts on other road users.
- (i) Extent of changes required to the existing metro services and for existing passengers.
- (j) Impacts on neighbouring landowners and uses.
- (k) Project cost.
- (l) Time to complete and time implications with other projects.

6. Having assessed these options it is recommended that criteria (d) to (l) form the criteria for selecting interchange sites as these are the most important aspects to achieving positive outcomes on the aims and objectives of the project. Criteria (d) to (f) cover matters of site significance, (g) to (j) cover matters of project feasibility and criteria (k) and (l) cover issues of project deliverability. Whilst criteria (a) to (c) qualify as equitable in one way or another they would not have any supporting technical rationale to indicate they would be the best opportunities for Council to take. If however assessments using (d) to (l) result in equal ratings of sites, (a) to (c) could be used to separate them by a second tier assessment.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. Funding for interchanges was first identified through adoption of the Metropolitan Christchurch Transport Statement stage 1 in December 2003. Budgets for suburban interchanges are currently identified in the Council's current draft LTCCP 2006/16.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Board:

1. Note the aims and objectives of the project.
2. Express their support for the proposed criteria for the development of a priority list of interchange locations.

These being:

- (a) Surrounding population catchment.
 - (b) Importance of the suburban centre in comparison to other centres.
 - (c) Status of the centre within the metro network.
 - (d) Land availability and complexity of procurement.
 - (e) Traffic management implications and impacts on other road users.
 - (f) Extent of changes required to the existing metro services and for existing passengers.
 - (g) Impacts on neighbouring land owners and uses.
 - (h) Project cost.
 - (i) Time to complete and time implications with other projects.
3. Request that staff report back to the Board with the proposed interchange location priority list using these criteria (once they are adopted by Council), prior to a resolution being sought by Council for the development of the first three suburban interchange locations.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

BACKGROUND ON SUBURBAN INTERCHANGES

8. The development of three suburban interchanges by June 2006 is a Council target of the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy. It sits amongst a range of other targets for both the Council and Environment Canterbury, emphasising the importance of ongoing and combined improvements in passenger services and infrastructure to achieve the vision set out in the Strategy.
9. Suburban interchanges aim to encourage people to transfer between different metro services and between metro public transport and other modes. With the availability of an urban network of convenient services and attractive interchanges, people will increasingly be able to move efficiently within it, making public transport a convenient alternative to most private car journeys. Interchange is a concept where customers can hop on and off different routes to reach their destination, as well as to join and leave the system via another mode. This will occur at its most optimal when the services have sufficient coverage and are of an appropriate cost, reliability and frequency to make their use realistic, supported by passenger interchange facilities that provide attractive surroundings of sufficient quality and functionality to make interchanging easy and convenient. The bus exchange is an excellent example of such a facility (albeit on a larger scale).
10. Interchanges and the supporting passenger services must therefore support the needs of people moving efficiently within a network and must also recognise where and how customers choose to join and leave the network (whether it be on foot, by bike or other mode¹) and what other business they may undertake on the way, such as shopping, entertainment, leisure or personal business. Interchanges thus operate on a number of levels, with the locations that will deliver the greatest benefits being those that can most effectively deliver the interchange concept in an area with a high passenger catchment. Criteria are needed to identify the extent to which any given location is likely to perform on these fronts and therefore their priority in terms of achieving the Council's aims and objectives.

AIMS

11. The Council works towards the achievement of a number of Community Outcomes, some of which relate directly to improvements in the transport system. These include "An attractive and well designed city", "A safe city", "A city of people who value and protect the natural environment" and "A prosperous city". Contributions to these Community Outcomes through transport improvements should be recognised as an important aim of the interchanges project. To achieve these outcomes interchanges aim to encourage more trips by public transport and less by private car by encouraging transfer between metro services and also between metro and other modes of arrival and departure from the interchange. In this way better use will be made of the existing road network, improving its efficiency and safety and making higher value road trips such as freight movement faster and more reliable.

OBJECTIVES

12. From these high level aims arise certain specific project objectives. The achievement of these objectives depend largely upon addressing the differences between metro and private transport in terms of time, cost, coverage, safety, image and accessibility (being the main drivers of mode choice). The project objectives are outlined below.
13. The first objective is to develop a suitable facility at the right location to encourage people to travel to a defined point in the network (via their chosen mode) where they can then transfer to another mode or service to get to their destination (or to another interchange). This infrastructure can impact upon a persons choice of travel mode by addressing common perceptions of security, image, journey time and accessibility. Feelings of security will be improved through the provision of a comfortable interchange environment, whilst its design and branding will determine its image. The way in which the facility allows the metro services to interact with the passengers (for example all services coming together at one point) also impacts upon journey time, safety and accessibility.

¹ Park 'n' ride is a form of 'interchange' not suited to the urban environment - which is the context for these bus interchanges. P&R is effective generally only on the edge of an urban area and along the line of a major high volume radial corridor such as a motorway, where car journeys can be readily intercepted. Typically, features of P&R include substantial managed free parking areas, low cost high frequency express services direct to the destination, supported by dedicated bus priority facilities. Parking controls in the urban centre, such as time limits, limited availability and price increases are also used to encourage transfer from the car at the P&R station. Park 'n' ride is a separately identified project in the Public Passenger Transport Strategy.

14. Probably as important as providing good infrastructure, is the need to provide the correct services to support the interchange concept. Attention in the areas of time, cost, coverage, image and accessibility will deliver this. Particularly essential are regular local services to get passengers to their interchange, fast and frequent links between interchanges to allow efficient movement within the network, quality buses that are clean with plenty of seats and attractive and accessible bus stops.
15. Recognising that passengers may make their way to and from the interchange using another mode, an objective should include encouragement of these types of journeys by reviewing access arrangements (for example pedestrian crossing facilities and cycle facilities on approach routes) and facilities at the interchange itself like secure cycle parking and secure storage facilities.
16. A final and often under-utilised objective for the project should be to actively inform, educate and promote interchanges before, during and after their development to ensure the maximum number of people are attracted to the facility and services. Only if people within the catchment of the interchange are aware of their options will they make use of them. Research in travel behaviour shows that changes in mode choice occur gradually and over a period of time. It is therefore important to undertake information and promotion work as part of an ongoing marketing campaign so that as people's needs and motivations change, they are regularly reminded of the alternatives available.

OPTIONS

17. A number of criteria were considered as a way to develop a priority list of sites for development.

These were as follows:

- (a) Geographical spread.
- (b) Existing passenger demand.
- (c) Existing level of passenger services.
- (d) Surrounding population catchment.
- (e) Importance of the suburban centre in comparison to other centres.
- (f) Status of the centre within the metro network.
- (g) Land availability and complexity of procurement.
- (h) Traffic management implications and impacts on other road users.
- (i) Extent of changes required to the existing metro services and for existing passengers.
- (j) Impacts on neighbouring land owners and uses.
- (k) Project cost.
- (l) Time to complete and time implications with other projects.

PREFERRED OPTION

18. Having considered each criteria and the aims and objectives of the project, it is recommended that criteria (d) to (l) form the criteria to prioritise a list of interchange locations. Criteria (d) to (f) cover matters of site significance, (g) to (j) cover matters of project feasibility and criteria (k) and (l) cover issues of project deliverability. This option reflects the significance of a location in the context of achieving high level Council aims and project objectives whilst it also recognises practical matters such as the availability of appropriate land and programming with other works². Using these criteria will also likely achieve the equity offered by the remaining options which could be employed if necessary to split options rated equally using the proposed criteria.
19. The following table outlines the proposed criteria recommended for use and how these criteria will be measured. Each criteria will receive equal weighting.

² The development of interchanges within LTCCP 2006/16 budgets is an underlying assumption.

CRITERIA	Measured by ...
Significance of the location as a potential interchange	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential user catchment (surrounding population within 10 minute walk/bike/bus ride buffer zone) - Status of centre (certain major and minor suburban centres as identified in the city plan, plus others of significance in the metro network) as a destination in the citywide context (no of employees, retail floor area). - Status of centre within the metro network (proximity, number and significance of neighbouring suburban centres and facilities, existing levels of service).
Feasibility of developing an appropriate interchange facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land availability and complexity of procurement. - Traffic management implications and impacts on other road users. - Extent of required metro changes and impacts on existing passengers and service integrity. - Likely impacts on neighbouring land owners and uses.
Deliverability of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget implications and time to complete. - Implications of/on other planned works.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option (Criteria (d) to (l))**

Criteria that identifies the potential of a site to most effectively deliver the Council's aims and objectives, whilst also taking into account certain practical issues around project feasibility and deliverability.

	Benefits (current & future)	Costs (current & future)
Social	Criteria will identify areas that improve citywide access for the most number of people first. New public spaces will provide opportunity for improved community identity.	None identified.
Cultural	Criteria will identify areas that most allow the opportunity for expressions of local cultural identity through building design and integrated artwork.	Potential for change in local identity and function of space.
Environmental	Criteria will identify areas that most achieve local and citywide improvements in air quality, rain water run-off quality and noise levels. Improved amenity of road network through reduced vehicle numbers.	Potential for change in the local environment, such as increased bus movements with noise and local air quality consequences.
Economic	Criteria will identify areas that most raised profile of suburban centres and improved accessibility increases visits from out of area, increasing local turn-over. Reduced traffic volumes improve network speeds and reliability, with benefits for movement of goods and services around the city.	Sites prioritised through these criteria will require the greatest investment as they stand to deliver the greatest benefits. Budgets already identified are believed to cover the foreseeable costs at this time.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: The most effective option to contribute towards "An attractive and well designed city", "A safe city", "A city of people who value and protect the natural environment" and "A prosperous city".</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: This option is the most effective way for the Council to develop interchanges as a sustainable response to meeting its transport capacity demands and responsibilities.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Maori will benefit equally in the outcomes of this option.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Consistent with the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy update particularly in respect to the adoption of a plan identifying locations for interchanges and implementation of three interchanges by June 2006. This option focuses on the key strategic aim of growing patronage and reducing traffic growth.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Views of Boards to be reported at meeting.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

Geographical spread Option (criteria (a))

Prioritise locations so that the implementation of interchanges is on a geographical basis and each board in turn gets an interchange.

	Benefits (current & future)	Costs (current & future)
Social	Criteria will lead to people across the city equally receive an improvement in local public transport provisions.	Criteria will lead to the areas with the greatest potential response to local improvements not necessarily being the first to receive them.
Cultural	Criteria will lead to opportunity for expressions of local cultural identity through building design and integrated artwork.	Will potentially lead to change in local identity and function of space.
Environmental	Local improvements in air quality, rain water run-off quality and noise levels lower than through preferred option criteria. Lower improved amenity of road network outcome through reduced vehicle numbers.	Potential for change in the local environment, such as increased bus movements with noise and local air quality consequences. Reduced short term citywide benefits compared to Option (d).
Economic	Criteria will lead to (but less than preferred option) raised profile of suburban centres and improved accessibility increases visits from out of area, increasing local turn-over. Reduced traffic volumes improve network speeds and reliability, with benefits for movement of goods and services around the city.	Possibly lower up front cost than preferred option, however long term costs to provide interchanges at the key locations will increase.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Same outcomes as preferred option but to a lesser extent.

Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:

Is a sustainable response to meeting network capacity demands but less so than preferred option as the priority sites will not necessarily be improved at first.

Effects on Maori:

Maori will benefit equally in the outcomes of this option.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Consistent with the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy update particularly in respect to the adoption of a plan identifying locations for interchanges and implementation of three interchanges by June 2006. This option however does not focus on growing patronage which is the underlying aim of the Strategy.

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

Views of Boards to be reported at meeting.

Other relevant matters:

Existing passenger demand option (criteria (b))

Prioritise locations according to the existing level of passenger demand at the bus stops currently servicing the area.

	Benefits (current & future)	Costs (current & future)
Social	Criteria will lead to large number of existing passengers benefiting.	Possible that areas with a latent demand unfulfilled will not benefit.
Cultural	Will lead to opportunity for expressions of local cultural identity through building design and integrated artwork.	Potential for change in local identity and function of space.
Environmental	Local improvements in air quality, rain water run-off quality and noise levels, but probably less than the preferred option. Improved amenity of road network through reduced vehicle numbers.	Potential for change in the local environment, such as increased bus movements with noise and local air quality consequences. Reduced short term citywide benefits compared to preferred option.
Economic	Will deliver some increased local commercial activity. Minimal impact on network efficiency.	Possibly lower up front cost than preferred option, however long term costs to provide interchanges at the key locations will increase.

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Less than the preferred option, with the risk that delays in scheme development and a lack of local support will delay and possibly reduce the achievement of community outcomes.

Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:

Impacts on traffic growth will be largely coincidental.

Effects on Maori:

Maori will benefit equally in the outcomes of this option.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Consistent with the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy update particularly in respect to the adoption of a plan identifying locations for interchanges and implementation of three interchanges by June 2006. This option however does not focus on growing patronage which is the underlying aim of the Strategy.

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

Views of Boards to be reported at meeting.

Other relevant matters:

Existing levels of passenger services Option (criteria (c))

Prioritise locations so that the implementation of interchanges is co-incident with the highest existing levels of service such as the number and frequency of intersecting bus routes.

	Benefits (current & future)	Costs (current & future)
Social	Criteria will lead to possibly large number of existing passengers will benefit.	Possible that areas with a latent demand unfulfilled will not benefit.
Cultural	Opportunity for expressions of local cultural identity through building design and integrated artwork.	Potential for change in local identity and function of space.
Environmental	Local improvements in air quality, rain water run-off quality and noise levels. Improved amenity of road network through reduced vehicle numbers.	Potential for change in the local environment, such as increased bus movements with noise and local air quality consequences. Reduced short term citywide benefits compared to preferred option.
Economic	Will deliver some increased local commercial activity. Minimal impact on network efficiency.	Possibly lower up front cost than preferred option, however long term costs to provide interchanges at the key locations will increase.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Same outcomes as preferred option but to a lesser extent.</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: Impacts on traffic growth will be largely coincidental.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Maori will benefit equally in the outcomes of this option.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Consistent with the Christchurch Public Passenger Transport Strategy update particularly in respect to the adoption of a plan identifying locations for interchanges and implementation of three interchanges by June 2006. This option however does not focus on growing patronage which is the underlying aim of the Strategy.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Views of Boards to be reported at meeting.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

8. RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS

Time is allocated at Board meetings for Residents' Association representatives to address the Board on local matters.

A representative from the North New Brighton Residents' Association, will be in attendance to outline the group's activities. Each residents' group is invited to do this in rotation.

9. CUFFS RESERVE PLAYGROUND DEVELOPMENT

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Greenspace Manager
Author:	Kim Swarbrick, Parks and Waterways Area Advocate, DDI 941-5314

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to confirm Board support for the plan of Cuffs Reserve Playground following community consultation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Cuffs Reserve is a small neighbourhood park that is widely used by the local community for ball sports. It currently has no play equipment. Records show many inquiries have been made since 1999 requesting play equipment. The Mayor's Office received a request from children in the Cuffs Road, Ontario Place, Niagara Street neighbourhood for a playground in their area. The nearest playgrounds to the area are in Bromley Park which requires them to cross Pages Road or Avon Park and this means crossing Wainoni Road.
3. On 1 March 1999 the Board accepted the proposal for a playground to be installed subject to appropriate fencing. Transport and City Streets Unit have now inserted a bollard and cable fence extending around the entire circumference of the reserve. The Greenspace Unit has \$35,900 available on the capital works programme this financial year for the provision of playground installation.
4. A preliminary development plan was circulated to key stakeholders in November 2005 to obtain feedback on its design. The final plan, which is attached to this report, aims to reflect the views of the community and has been refined in response to community feedback.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

5. There is \$35,900 available in the Greenspace 2005/06 financial year to implement the playground. Whilst this is not a significant amount, obtaining the play equipment recently removed from Spencer Park has made the provision of Cuffs playground achievable. \$4,000 will go towards painting and renovating the existing play equipment before installation.
6. Whilst Cuffs Reserve is a roading reserve it is managed by the Greenspace Unit and I have checked with Richard Bailey (Amenity Maintenance team leader) to ascertain any legal requirements associated with it being roading reserve, of which there were none outside of standard playground in parks legal responsibilities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve option (b) to accept the Cuffs Reserve Playground Development Plan.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATIONS

That the abovementioned recommendation be adopted.

BACKGROUND

7. A public information leaflet seeking responses on the preliminary plan was distributed to residents and key stakeholder groups in November 2005. Residents were asked to indicate their acceptance/non-acceptance of the plan and were given the option to comment. In total, 84 response forms have been received from the 300 consultation packages delivered.

96% accept the proposed plan (81)

4% do not accept the proposed plan (3)

8. A number of suggestions and comments were made that have been considered and where appropriate integrated into the design.
9. A copy of the final plan will be circulated to residents and stakeholder groups prior to the construction date.

OPTIONS

10. There are two possible options:

- (a) Do nothing or status quo. This option is not practical as Greenspace sees merit in carrying out suggestions put forward by local residents. This option disregards the community feedback and input.
- (b) Accept the Cuffs Playground Development Plan with its minor changes to the original plan in recognition of residents' feedback.

PREFERRED OPTION

11. To adopt option (b) and accept the Cuffs Playground Development Plan.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Mitigate risks to public and property.	Landscape planting and playground installation \$35,900.
Cultural	No benefits identified.	No costs identified.
Environmental	Improved reserve facility for community. Additional native planting will enhance opportunities for bird life.	
Economic	No positive or negative economic impact for the community identified.	

Extent to which community outcomes are achieved:

Primary alignment with community outcome: *"Our City's natural resources, biodiversity, landscapes, and ecosystem integrity are protected and enhanced"*.

Also contributes to *"Our City's infrastructure and environment are managed effectively, are responsive to changing needs and focus on long-term sustainability"*.

Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities:

No impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities have been identified.

Effects on Maori:

No effects on Maori identified.

Consistency with existing Council policies:

Consistent with the Environmental Policy and specifically: *"Open Spaces and Planting - The Council will manage and maintain the open spaces of the City in ways that enhance amenity, avoid adverse effects and minimise maintenance requirements"*.

"To acknowledge and promote the "Garden City" identity of the City by protecting, maintaining, and extending planting which complements this image".

Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest:

From 84 submissions received, 81 supported the landscape plan.

Other relevant matters:

10. RAWHITI DOMAIN AND THOMSON PARK DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN AND LANDSCAPING

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment
Officer responsible:	Greenspace Manager
Author:	Kelly Hansen, Parks and Waterways Planner, DDI 941-8688

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board's recommendation to the Council that the Rawhiti Domain and Thomson Park Draft Management Plan be released for public consultation. Approval is also being sought to consult on a proposed picnic and volleyball area for this year's financial programme in conjunction with the management plan process.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. On Wednesday 13 June 2001, the Council publicly notified, with advertisements in the public notices of The Press and The Star, its intention to review the Rawhiti Park Management Plan in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977. A discussion document was distributed to stakeholders and their ideas and comments invited.
3. At its meeting on 2 July 2001, the Board was informed of the process being undertaken by the Parks and Waterways Unit to review the 1988 Rawhiti Park Management Plan and was invited to submit comments and suggestions in developing a draft plan. The Board decided:
 - (a) That the information be received.
 - (b) That the North New Brighton Residents' Association, New Brighton Residents' Association, and Ascot/ Freeville Residents' Group be included as key stakeholders.
 - (c) That key stakeholders, including the Community Board, be given an opportunity to meet together before a draft management plan is prepared.
4. During July - August 2001, Council staff met with many of the sport and community groups who use Rawhiti Domain and Thomson Park to discuss their specific needs or issues in the reserve.
5. On 25 September 2001, a public workshop was held at the Rawhiti Golf Clubrooms to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to share ideas and agree on a direction for future management of the reserve, and for staff to outline the process for development of the management plan. Comments from this workshop and from various groups and individuals have been incorporated into the draft plan.
6. In March 2002, stakeholders were informed of a delay in development of the management plan when it was discovered that the reserve was incorrectly vested and classified under the Reserves Act 1977. Following a resolution by the Council on 28 August 2002, classification of the reserve was advertised in the New Zealand Gazette on 25 August 2005 and the draft management plan was subsequently completed (attached).
7. Funding is available in the current financial year to begin landscaping of Rawhiti Domain. It is proposed to use this funding to enhance the picnic opportunities between the community garden and tennis courts with planting, furniture, and a grass or sand volleyball court. Both for efficiency and to illustrate how the picnic and volleyball area fits in with the bigger picture for the reserve, it is intended to consult on the proposed landscaping for this year simultaneously with consultation on the longer term management plan, rather than conduct two separate consultation procedures.
8. The planned consultation process will involve the following:
 - (a) Public notification of the draft management plan in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977.
 - (b) Information regarding the draft management plan and the proposed picnic and volleyball area displayed on a notice board on site.
 - (c) The draft management plan and information about the proposed picnic and volleyball area displayed on the Council's 'Have Your Say' website inviting comment.

- (d) A letterbox drop to approximately 1,000 households neighbouring the reserve with a leaflet (attached) advising of the availability of and highlighting key points of the draft management plan. Included in the flyer will be information about the proposed picnic and volleyball area will and public comment invited.
 - (e) A leaflet and a complete copy of the management plan sent to all key stakeholders (including groups with a lease or licence on the reserve, three residents' associations, honorary wardens, and individuals who have previously expressed interest in the process) inviting comment.
- 9. Results of consultation on the proposed picnic and volleyball area will be reported back to the Board in May so that work may begin this financial year if approved.
 - 10. Consultation on the management plan must follow the procedures set out in the Reserves Act 1977 which requires that the plan be publicly notified and that interested parties be given at least two months to make submissions. The Act also allows for a hearing if required. All written submissions and hearings will be considered in development of the final plan which will be reported to Council for approval.
 - 11. As Rawhiti Domain and Thomson Park together are categorised as a metropolitan park, delegation for final approval of the management plan rests with Council.

FINANCIAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 12. Limited funding has been allocated to progressively develop Rawhiti Domain over the next five years (including this financial year). It is intended to spend the 2005/06 and 2006/07 allocation, a combined total of \$68,700 on the proposed picnic and volleyball area in accordance with the Rawhiti Domain Landscape Plan included in the management plan.
- 13. A proposed development programme and budget for the remainder of the reserve is included in the management plan. It is anticipated that, following approval of the final management plan, this will be considered for future budget allocation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board recommends to the Council that approval be given for the Rawhiti Domain and Thomson Park Draft Management Plan and information about the proposed picnic and volleyball area to be released for public consultation.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATIONS

That the abovementioned recommendation be adopted, subject to:

- (a) The consultation process in paragraph 8(e) being amended to have the plan being presented to a meeting of key stakeholders.
- (b) The public being included into the consultation process, by way of two on-site informal meetings (to be held on Rawhiti Domain and Thomson Park), the meetings to be held on days of high public usage of the domain and park.

BACKGROUND ON RAWHITI DOMAIN AND THOMSON PARK DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN

14. Council's are required to keep reserve management plans under continuous review. Generally, a minimum of ten years is accepted as an appropriate review period. As the 1988 Rawhiti Park Management Plan was becoming out of date and obsolete, and a number of new initiatives were being proposed in the reserve, the Board requested that it be updated.

OPTIONS

15. As an alternative to approving the draft management plan for public release, Council could require changes to the current document before it is released for public comment. Unless significant gaps or incorrect information are identified in the document, this would be an unnecessary delay in the consultation process. Should Council have suggestions or comments on the draft management plan, it would be more appropriate to submit those comments through the consultation process so that they can be considered when preparing the final document. All submitters will also have the opportunity to speak at a hearing should they so desire.
16. The second alternative is to discontinue the management plan review entirely. However, this would contravene the Reserves Act 1977 and is therefore unacceptable.

PREFERRED OPTION

17. The preferred option is that the Council approves the Rawhiti Domain and Thomson Park Draft Management Plan for public release together with the landscape proposal for a picnic and volleyball area.

ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**The Preferred Option**

Approve the Rawhiti Domain and Thomson Park Draft Management Plan for public release together with the landscape proposal for a picnic and volleyball area.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Provides the opportunity for communication with the community, community involvement in management of the reserve.	Printing and advertising costs. Staff time.
Cultural	Raises awareness of and proposes a management direction for historical and cultural values of the reserve.	None.
Environmental	Raises awareness of and proposes a management direction for environmental values of the reserve.	Potential loss of open space from additional proposed buildings in the reserve.
Economic	Provides direction for future expenditure in the reserve.	No commitment at this stage but raises expectations of future capital and operating costs.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome: <i>'A well governed city'</i>. Also contributes to <i>'A city for recreation fun and creativity'</i> and <i>'A city of people who value and protect the natural environment'</i>.</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: Resources spent on Rawhiti Domain are not available for other projects.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: Input has been invited from Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Management plan required under the Reserves Act 1977.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Community input has been sought in developing the draft management plan.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

Maintain The Status Quo (If Not Preferred Option)

Discontinue the management plan review.

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	None.	No community input into future management of the reserve.
Cultural	None.	No direction provided for future management of cultural values of the reserve.
Environmental	None.	No direction provided for future management of environmental values of the reserve.
Economic	Savings in consultation and printing costs.	Potential for future inefficient adhoc expenditure.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome: Does not contribute to achieving any community outcomes.</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: No guidance for future expenditure in the reserve.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: No opportunity for Maori input into management of the reserve.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: Inconsistent with Reserves Act 1977.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: No opportunity for community input.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

Option 3

Make changes to the current document before it is released for public comment

	Benefits (current and future)	Costs (current and future)
Social	Opportunity to improve information in the plan.	Time delays.
Cultural	Opportunity to improve information in the plan.	Time delays.
Environmental	Opportunity to improve information in the plan.	Time delays.
Economic	Opportunity to improve information in the plan.	Time delays. Additional costs in altering the document.
<p>Extent to which community outcomes are achieved: Primary alignment with community outcome: 'A well governed city' Also contributes to and</p> <p>Impact on Council's capacity and responsibilities: None.</p> <p>Effects on Maori: None.</p> <p>Consistency with existing Council policies: N/A.</p> <p>Views and preferences of persons affected or likely to have an interest: Ensures accuracy and completeness of information.</p> <p>Other relevant matters:</p>		

11. COMMUNITY BOARD PRINCIPAL ADVISER'S UPDATE

11.1 COMMITTEE AND WORKING PARTY MEMBERSHIP

For members' information a list of all Board Committees and Working Parties is attached.

11.2 NOTICE OF UPCOMING BOARD REPORTS

- Adcock Park Development - March 2006
- Locksley Avenue Walkway - March 2006
- South New Brighton/Southshore Consultation Project
- Rothesay Road - Partial Road Stopping
- Thomson Park Safety Audit - April 2006

11.3 2005/06 PROJECT, DISCRETIONARY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FUNDS UPDATE

The attached schedule shows the allocations in the Board's Project, Discretionary and Youth Development Funds, to 1 February 2006.

12. NOTICES OF MOTION

13. QUESTIONS

Members may at any ordinary meeting put a question to the Chairperson concerning any matter relevant to the role or function of the Community Board concerning any matter that does not appear on the order paper. All questions are subject to Standing Orders 4.1.1 to 4.1.5.

14. BOARD MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Board members will have an opportunity to provide updates on community activities and/or Council issues.