

9. CLAREVALE RESERVE PLAY EQUIPMENT

Officer responsible Parks Manager	Author Gary Harrow, Area Parks Officer Kevin Williams, Parks Projects Co ordinator
Corporate Plan Output: Playgrounds - New Installation 1998/99 (p.9.4.92)	

The purpose of this report is to report back to the Board on the outcome of further consultation with local residents and park users to identify an alternative site for the childrens' playground.

BACKGROUND

Board members will be aware of the report to the Board at its 17 August 1999 meeting where the immediate neighbour presented the background to this proposal, along with the objection to the existing site. The Board resolved:

1. That further consultation be carried out with local residents and park users to identify another position on the reserve for the play equipment.
2. That subject to an acceptable alternate site being agreed to the play equipment be relocated using voluntary labour where suitable to minimise the costs.

The minutes of this meeting outline Mr Wilkie's deputation as follows:

"Mr Jack Wilkie was in attendance to outline a personal grievance he had with the Christchurch City Council. Mr Wilkie explained that he had purchased a half-acre section adjacent to Clarevale Reserve in 1993. At that time a concept plan for the reserve had shown that a playground would be sited at the front of the reserve close to Clarevale Street. Mr Wilkie had approached the Linwood Service Centre in 1994 and had viewed plans to this effect. With this information Mr Wilkie then changed the siting of his house from the front of the section towards the fenceline overlooking the park. Subsequently, the siting of the playground had been changed to leave it adjacent to Mr Wilkie's house.

Mr Wilkie's area of concern was events that took place on the adventure playground in the reserve and the lack of privacy for him and his wife with people being able to peer into his house from the play equipment. Mr Wilkie noted that he and his wife were frightened by the lack of privacy and some of the activities, such as drinking, that took place on the adventure playground. Mr Wilkie advised that he had not responded to a publicity pamphlet on the resiting of the play equipment as he felt that it had asked for the type of equipment to be installed rather than the siting of the actual playground. Mr Wilkie also felt that recent consultation was misrepresented as a group of other local residents went around the neighbourhood lobbying to stop the playground being resited as they feared the same problems would be transferred on to them."

CONSULTATION

Over the last few weeks in September, I surveyed the residents in the 22 houses that are adjacent to or have views of a significant area of the park (*plan attached, page 53*). This was by personal interview.

As the park is in effect in two distinct areas, east and west, I gave the residents in those two areas an option of expressing their views on where they did NOT like a playground sited on their area of park only.

The eastern end has three other feasible sites for a playground, the western area has five.

The eastern area has 11 houses overlooking it, the western area has 12.

Counting the crosses as a vote on where NOT to put a playground, the results are:

Eastern Area (everyone has maximum of three votes)

A		X	X	X	X	X	X	6
B	X	X	X	X	X		X	6
C	X	X		X	X		X	5

Western Area (everyone has maximum of five votes)

D	X		X	X	X	X	5
E			X		X		2
F	X	X			X	X	4
G	X		X		X		3
H	X	X	X		X	X	5

Seven residents indicated they did not mind where it went.

All but one resident said they were adamant that the playground not be removed from the park.

Following my first interview round, I re-interviewed some residents in late October with the assistance of Board member David Dobbie to see if residents who objected to the least objectionable sites (E and G) would change their mind once the results of the survey were available and the alternatives were clear. Unfortunately this was unsuccessful and the position remains that for every alternative site on the reserve there is at least two residents that have a similar objection to the original submission from Mr Wilkie.

The interviews were undertaken between the hours of 9.00 am and 9.00 pm over three weeks coinciding with school holidays. I spoke to many park and playground users during this time and all verified that the playground was a great, often used amenity and no-one would like to see it removed.

Another object of my survey was to find out if I could identify the children and youths that were causing the problem with the neighbour, but to no avail. One resident verified Mr Wilkie's accounts of the behaviour but the perpetrators were not local.

No matter what, Mr and Mrs Wilkie's situation continues. I understand he will be in attendance at the meeting and can advise if the disturbances are still continuing. His request to have the playground removed must still be uppermost in the minds of Board members.

Mr Kevin Williams, Parks Projects Officer, will be in attendance at the meeting.

CONCLUSION

The current situation is that we have no clear solution, the alternatives for the Board are: (1) Leave it in the current location. This does not resolve Mr Wilkie's concerns and may result in further expense defending this decision should it be pursued further by Mr Wilkie or (2) relocate the equipment to position E on the attached plan. This is the most central position on the reserve with the least impact on all neighbours. There are however a couple of residents opposed to this site. The site is approximately 55 metres to the nearest neighbour, therefore any effects would be minimal. There would be a \$5-6,000 cost of relocation. This may be reduced by the use of voluntary labour as recommended previously.

Recommendation: That the playground be relocated to position E. The central position on the reserve.

Chairperson's

Recommendation: Not seen by the Chairperson.