

# Summary submission form

## Instructions

### Please read before completing your submission

It will help us process your submission if you clearly state the issue you want the Council to consider, what specific action you think the Council should take, and why that should be done.

If you wish, you can present your submission at a hearing. (If that is the case, please tick the box). The hearings will be held between Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006. Generally, 10 minutes are allocated for hearing each submission, including time for questions.

It will help us if your submission also refers to the page of either the full version or the summary version.

Please note: we are legally required to make all written or electronic submissions available to Councillors and to the public. This includes the name and address of the submitter. All submissions will be published on the Council's website from 10 May 2006.

No anonymous submissions will be accepted.

## You may send us your submission:

### By mail

Please mail your submission (no stamp is required) to:

Freepost 178  
Our Community Plan  
Christchurch City Council  
PO Box 237  
Christchurch 8003

### By email

Please email your submission to:

ccc-plan@ccc.govt.nz

Please make sure that your full name and address is included with your submission.

### On the internet

You may enter your submission using the form provided on the Council's web site at:

<http://www.ccc.govt.nz>

Please follow all the instructions on the web site.

Please remember to indicate if you wish to present your submission in person at one of the hearings.

Please ensure your submission arrives no later than Friday 5 May 2006.

## Your submission

You may use this form for your submission on the draft Our Community Plan if you wish. Whether you use this form or not, please include your name, address and contact telephone number with your submission.

Tick one  I do NOT wish to present my submission at the hearing, and ask that this written submission be considered OR  I wish to talk to the main points in my written submission at the hearings to be held between Thursday 25 May and Wednesday 7 June 2006

Are you completing this submission:  For yourself  On behalf of a group or organisation

If you are representing a group or organisation, how many people do you represent?

My submission refers to:  Full version  Page No:   Summary version  Page No:

Do you also want to respond to:  Development Contributions  Aquatic Facilities  Other

Contact Name Bevern Stank

Organisation name (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Address 29 Morzias St

Sumner

Phone No. (day) 353 8048 Phone No. (evening) \_\_\_\_\_

Email (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

Signature [Signature] Date 5-5-06

### **Background**

1. I am a member of the Lake Isaac Watersports Park Support Club.
2. The purpose of this submission is to object to the exclusion of a Flat Water Sports Facility from the LTCCP 2006 to 2016.
3. Flat Water Sports were provided for in the capital expenditure programme in the LTCCP 2004 to 2014. That plan (pages 37 to 40 attached ) sets out details of the proposal, reasons and the background to the need for a new facility. It refers to the growth in flat water sports activities and congestion at Kerr's Reach with its use by sports other than rowing. It notes that use of the river at Kerr's Reach has increased at least ten-fold in the last decade.
4. Provision was made in the 2004 to 2014 plan for a contribution by the Council of \$11 million towards a Flat Water Sports Facility.

### **Reasons for objection**

5. The \$11 million provided for in the 2004 to 2014 LTCCP lead to an expectation that those funds would be made available.
6. No valid reasons are given in the draft 2006 to 2016 LTCCP (page 82) for deletion of \$11 million of funding for the facility.
7. A report to the Christchurch City Council meeting on 18 March 2004 noted a Flat Water Sports Facility was accorded "top band" priority in the Council's Recreation and Sport Facilities Strategy and that the site proposed by the Lake Isaac Watersports Park Trust is clearly the best option when evaluated using the selected criteria.
8. It is unreasonable having accepted in 2004 that a Flat Water Sports Facility be included as a Major New Initiative to just two years later delete it altogether from the LTCCP.
9. That concerns of Christchurch International Airport relating to birdstrike can be met by careful management of the facility.

### **Decision Sought**

10. That the Council include provision for a Flat Water Sports Facility in the LTCCP 2006 to 2016.

# summaries of major proposals

## Christchurch Flat Water Sports Facility

### Proposal

- To find a suitable location, then to construct or contribute to the construction of a flat water sports facility 274m wide and 2500m long with a constant water depth of 4m.
- This facility will require approximately 169 ha of land
- Associated infrastructure facilities ( boat sheds, toilets etc) will be located on the land adjacent to the lake.
- The alignment of the lake (with the prevailing wind) will need to allow for the facility to be used for competition.
- The proposed facility will cater for all passive flat water sports for training and regional and national competition. ( triathlon, canoeing, rowing, waka ama, dragon boating, kayaking, etc).
- The costs associated with the construction of stage one of the proposal are estimated at \$15.45 million. The Council is prepared to provide \$11 million of this figure.
- Stage one is the completion of a training and competition course to replace Kerr's Reach.
- The operation costs associated with stage one are estimated to provide a break even result.

### Reasons for the proposal

- From 1950 to 1990 Kerr's Reach on the Lower Avon River was mainly used by rowing, with the occasional recreational canoeist and surf boat.
- In the early 1990s the Arawa Canoe Club moved into the old HMNZS Pegasus building. This led to an increase in canoe activity, dragon boating and waka ama on Kerr's Reach.
- In the last decade rowing numbers have increased significantly, especially by schools. Registered rowers have increased from 342 in mid 1990s to 489. This does not include schools, which would increase this figure to around 800.
- There has been a marked increase in the storage facilities adjacent to Kerr's Reach for both rowing shells and canoes.
- The growth in multi sport events and recreational flat water users has added to the activity on Kerr's reach to the point that rowing organisations were for a time refused insurance. When insurance was reinstated the premiums were increased by 100%.
- The mixture of craft with differing manoeuvrability, speed and responsibility has made the use of Kerr's Reach a major safety issue. This is further complicated by the amount of weed in the river and its tidal nature in the lower reaches.
- The use of public roads and water areas for competitions and the need for appropriate safety plans has added significantly to the costs associated with sports events and has resulted in many events being cancelled. A suitable alternative to Kerr's Reach will mitigate many of these safety concerns and costs.
- Some sports like dragon boating who use Lyttleton Harbour are required to have coastguard in attendance for training and are impacted by adverse weather conditions.

## **Background**

### **Growth in flat water sports activities**

From 1950 till 1990 Kerr's Reach was very much the preserve of rowing with the occasional surf boat and recreational canoeist.

With the establishment of the Arawa Canoe Club in the old HMNZS Pegasus building more organized canoeist usage of the Reach commenced. Dragonboating also became a frequent user in the mid 90s and outrigger canoes also appeared in the late 90s.

During the last decade rowing usage has mushroomed with the number of rowing schools being increased by new participants such as Burnside who now have large squads. The average number of registered participants per school has also doubled as more young people take up the sport. In the mid 90s the Canterbury Rowing Assn had 342 registered rowers. Currently 489 rowers are registered for competition but the inclusion of school returns to their governing sports body increase this figure to just under 800. These additional rowers are at entry level and under 15 and they utilize the boats and training water on Kerr's Reach but are not registered for competition.

The recent construction of a new and significantly larger boatshed for the Arawa Canoe Club has boosted accommodation for kayaks from less than 100 to over 200. In 1992 the Avon Club required an additional boatshed to accommodate school boats and again in 1998 the Canterbury Rowing Association erected a much larger boatshed to accommodate the increasing number of shells utilizing the river. The Union and Canterbury Clubs have both extended their boatsheds at some stage to enlarge boat accommodation and the Avon Club has converted its gymnasium area to boat storage. As new boats are purchased by schools and to a lesser extent by clubs the replaced shell typically remains on Kerr's Reach under new ownership. Villa Maria College as an example has a large fleet, all purchased as secondhand shells from Christs College and Rangī Ruru. This is the only way that schools can meet the large capital investment in

plant to accommodate the burgeoning numbers of school rowers. In addition to these users there are a significant number of casual paddlers and rowers who use Kerr's Reach.

### **Congestion at Kerr's Reach**

During this period the Canterbury Rowing Assn has sought to impose a traffic flow pattern onto the river but its jurisdiction ceases with its own members. The free nature of many other users has constantly led to conflict and indeed in 2002 the craft of the Canterbury Rowing Assn were deemed uninsurable due to the high level of collisions with other rivers users. Representations saw cover reinstated but with a 1000% increase over the original excess on claims and with considerable restrictions on usage. The mixture of craft also causes conflict due to the variation in their manoeuvrability, speed and responsibility.

Usage of the river has increased at least ten-fold in the last decade. Year-round rowing, many additional kayaks, the arrival of dragon boats and outriggers and the increasing popularity of all flat water recreation including rowing now render Kerr's Reach incapable of delivering a safe environment for the current volume of flat water recreation. This was acknowledged by the Christchurch City Council in their May letter to the Canterbury Rowing Association expressing concern at the shortcomings of Kerr's Reach and the lower Avon River.

Safety is paramount to the continuance of all sports. The increasing use of public roads and waterways such as Kerr's Reach and Lyttelton Harbour for training and competition raises particular concerns for sports administrators when it comes to funding traffic management plans. This can cost thousands of dollars per event. For dragon boaters to train at Lyttelton they are required to have Coastguard (itself a voluntary organisation) in attendance. This can be a logistical nightmare given the uncertainty of water and sea conditions.

# summaries of major proposals

Congestion at Kerr's Reach increases the potential for accidents, and this is made worse when the weed remains uncut during parts of the year. The weed makes it difficult for any crew who do fall in to right their boat or to make their way safely to shore.

## *Reasonably Practicable Options*

### **Do Nothing**

#### *Benefits*

##### **Social / Cultural**

No Council funds will be committed. Money could therefore be available for other activities that may promote social well-being.

##### **Economic / Financial**

This option incurs no financial cost to Council.

#### *Costs/Disadvantages*

##### **Social / Cultural**

**Water Safety**- Increasing popularity of all flat water recreation, including rowing, now render Kerr's Reach incapable of providing a safe environment for the current volume of flat water recreation.

**Congestion at Kerr's Reach** - increases the potential for accidents, and this is made worse when the weed remains uncut during parts of the year. The weed makes it difficult for any crew who do fall in to right their boat or to make their way safely to shore.

**Availability** - There are considerable restrictions on usage. The mixture of craft also causes conflict due to the variation in their manoeuvrability, speed and responsibility.

**Road safety** - the increasing use of public roads and waterways such as

Kerr's Reach and Lyttelton Harbour for training and competition raises particular concerns for sports administrators when it comes to Health and Safety issues and the funding of traffic management plans.

**Competitions** - There are no prospects of national or international competitions being hosted at Kerr's Reach.

#### *Promote Community Outcomes*

If Kerr's Reach remains the only principal area for flat water recreation, there is a potential risk of running counter to the community outcome of "Our City provides the natural and built environments that enable people to enjoy long and healthy lives."

#### *Views and Preferences of those affected*

This option is inconsistent with views of those affected. Current users clearly want a solution to problems associated with Kerr's Reach, and are actively seeking appropriate alternatives for training.

**Option 2: Council provides funding to construct a flat water facility at a suitable alternative to Kerr's Reach, yet to be determined.**

Without Council commitment such a project would be unlikely to proceed.

#### *Benefits*

##### **Social / Cultural**

There will be a safe environment for the current volume of flat water recreational, i.e. non-competitive users. A suitable facility will be available for competitive training and, in time, hosting national and international competitions.

## summaries of major proposals

### **Economic / Financial**

Feasibility studies done to date suggest a small operating surplus would be realised in the first year's operation of the facility, rising over time.

The facility would provide the possibility of hosting national and international competitions with the economic benefits they would bring to Christchurch.

### **Costs/Disadvantages**

#### **Social / Cultural**

Money may not be available for other initiatives that may produce social outcomes

#### **Economic / Financial**

The Council is prepared to contribute \$11 million towards the capital cost of a suitable facility.

#### **Environmental**

Any environmental and resource consent issues associated with the chosen location must be able to be resolved.

### **Promote Community Outcomes**

The project would promote the Community Outcome "Our City provides the natural and built environments that enable people to enjoy long and healthy lives."

### **Statutory Responsibility**

In general, council's role is to promote social, cultural and economic well-being through a democratic process.

If Council decides to support this proposal then the opportunity to have some form of ownership or tenure in the site needs to be resolved to ensure funding can be sourced from the Council's Capital budget.

Resource consents will be required.

### **Views and Preferences of those affected**

This proposal is consistent with the views of those affected. Current users clearly want a solution to problems associated with Kerr's Reach, and are actively seeking an appropriate alternative for training.

Christchurch International Airport is concerned that any facility not be an attraction for nuisance birds to the vicinity of the airport.

### **Option 2a – the Council provides grant money to a suitable project**

A grant of this magnitude, even if it was spread over several years, would have a significant impact on the Council's rates. The impact of giving a \$1M grant to an organisation increases the rates by 0.63% in the year it is granted. (An \$11M grant in any one year would increase rates by 6.93%).

### **Option 2b – the Council seeks ownership or other equity participation in a suitable project**

The impact of including \$1M in the capital budget is an increase in rates of 0.05%. (0.09 over two years) (An \$11M increase in the capital programme in any one year would increase rates by .55% for 20 years) As can be seen from this it would have a more moderate impact on rating changes to have a situation in place that would allow the Council to support this proposal through the capital programme.

### **Conditions**

Any contribution from the Council will be conditional upon the following:

- The Council is able to fund its contribution through its capital programme.
- The Council is satisfied that a suitable site is available.
- Environmental and resource management issues associated with the project can be resolved.