

11. CASS BAY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport and Greenspace Manager
Author:	Ann Campbell; Consultation Leader

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the Cass Bay Development Plan following public consultation (refer **Attachment 1**), in order to inform and be considered for future LTCCP funding.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Cass Bay is a small bay located in the Lyttelton Harbour Basin, Banks Peninsula between Rapaki Bay and Corsair Bay. There is a walking track which links Corsair Bay to the east and to Pony Point Reserve to the west. There is also a small playground on the foreshore which has a picnic table and a couple of bench seats. Recently Council installed a new flying fox in the reserve after it was identified the original one was located in an unsafe area of the reserve.
3. In September 2002 Peter Rough Landscape Architects Ltd prepared a proposal for the improvement and enhancement of the Cass Bay Reserves for the Cass Bay Residents Association. A small number of elements in the original plan have been implemented by volunteers on the Cass Bay Reserves Committee, however due to lack of manpower and available funds, the plan has not proceeded further.
4. This current development plan is the long term proposal for the improvement and enhancement of Cass Bay reserves areas, building on the Peter Rough proposal of 2002 and addressing ongoing issues raised over the years.
5. The public consultation indicated support for the proposed concept and the proposal has been amended in response to feedback received from the community. The amended plan is included as **attachment 1** and recommended for approval by the Community Board.
6. If approved, an application for funding will be made to the draft 2012-2022 LTCCP (Long Term Council Community Plan) for funding to be allocated for all new development. This will enable proposed works to be staged over the years to come.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. The Council does not currently have funding to undertake the work proposed in this draft plan. An application will be made to the draft 2012-2022 LTCCP (Long Term Council Community Plan) in 2012 for funding to be allocated for new development and ongoing maintenance.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

8. Not applicable.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. The Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board have delegated authority to approve the **attached** concept plan.
10. All necessary resource consents and building consents will be obtained before any construction is undertaken.
11. All works will be carried out by a Council approved contractor with the appropriate health and safety and work site management controls in place.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

12. Yes – as per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

13. LTCCP 2009-19

Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Page 116

- (a) Safety – by ensuring our parks, open spaces and waterways are healthy and safe places;
- (b) Community – by providing welcoming areas for communities to gather and interact;
- (c) Governance – by involving people in decision-making about parks, open spaces, and waterways;
- (d) Health – by providing areas for people to engage in healthy activities;
- (e) Recreation – by offering a range of recreational opportunities in parks, open spaces, and waterways;
- (f) City Development – by providing an inviting, pleasant and well cared for environment.

14. Parks and Open Spaces Activity Management Plan

Council's objective with urban parks is to provide and manage Community Parks, Garden & Heritage Parks, Sports Parks and Riverbanks and Conservation areas throughout the city that provide amenity values, areas for recreation and organised sport, garden environments and green corridors, that contribute to the city's natural form, character, heritage and Garden City image.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

- 15. Yes – as per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

- 16. Parks and Waterways Access Policy
Safer Christchurch Strategy
Recreation and Sport Strategy
Biodiversity Strategy
Open Space Strategy
Banks Peninsula Reserves Strategy

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

- 17. Yes – as per above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

Consultation Process

- 18. Prior to the development of a concept for the park, the project team had discussions with the Reserve Committee of the Cass Bay Residents Association. Also used, as indicated earlier in this report, was the proposal from Peter Rough Landscape Architects in 2002. The feedback and information provided in these discussions was taken into consideration with the development of the concept plan for Cass Bay.
- 19. Once the concept plan was drafted, the project team held a seminar with the Community Board to advise them that the plan was to go out to full consultation. This seminar discussed the proposed concept, consultation stakeholders, and provided the opportunity for Board members to comment on the consultation programme. Board members were also advised there was no funding available and that this would be sought through the next round of the LTCCP.

20. The consultation on the concept plan was open from 24 May 2010 to 11 June 2010. A public information leaflet (refer **Attachment 2**) was delivered to the residents of Cass Bay and a number of other interest groups and key stakeholders. This leaflet included a summary of the concept, an initial concept plan and a feedback form. The project team sought feedback from the community to see whether the proposal was supported and asked for any comments. The proposal was posted on the CCC *Have Your Say* website.
21. Each submitter that provided their contact details received an interim reply letter. This acknowledged that the submission had been received, and that it would be considered once the consultation period had closed. Submitters were also advised that they would receive further correspondence prior to a decision being made.
22. Once the project team finalised the concept, submitters that provided their contact details were advised of the outcome of consultation, the project teams preferred concept plan and the expected timeline for the project. They were also advised of the decision making process and how they could observe or be involved in this.
23. Submitters that provided their contact details will also be advised of the Community Board's decision about this proposal, after the Board meeting.

Consultation Outcome

24. The consultation on the concept plan received 60 responses (24% response rate) and the feedback received was largely positive as indicated by the following:

Number of Respondents	Feedback Option Selected
19 respondents (32% of submissions)	<i>"YES – I fully support the proposal"</i>
32 respondents (54% of submissions)	<i>"MIXED VIEWS – I have some concerns that I would like to be considered"</i>
2 respondents (3% of submissions)	<i>"NO – I completely oppose the proposal"</i>
7 respondents (11% of submissions)	<i>Preference not indicated</i>

25. Submitters also provided comments about this proposal. There were numerous comments of support for the proposal and also a number of issues raised for the project teams consideration. The qualitative community feedback and project team responses will be circulated to elected members, prior to the meeting. This information will also be made available to all submitters on request.
26. The key issues raised in the public consultation, and project team responses were as follows:

Retain a slipway/boat ramp with a preference for the gravel slipway to be retained and upgraded

The gravel slipway will be retained and upgraded. Signage will be installed prohibiting parking on the grass area as well a post and cable fence could be installed alongside the slipway. The concrete slipway will be removed and the area landscaped.

Opposition to the installation of lockable barrier arm

No barrier arm will be installed along the roadway down to the Sea Cadets building.

Concern over proposed new track and plantings in the open grassed area

Pedestrian track through the grassed area on beach front is no longer proposed, this will be retained as a large green open space area. Pedestrians will be able to walk along the beach. Post and cable could be installed alongside slipway to guide people down to the foreshore and also to stop vehicles driving onto the grass area.

Concern over the low plantings proposed along beach at the bottom of grass area

No planting will be undertaken, grassed area to remain open and just grass.

Future of the pine trees

A lot of feedback was received about the future of the pine trees on the foreshore. A number of submissions advised of the history surrounding the trees and the overall intention of their eventual removal. It is also acknowledged that this area has been underplanted with ngaios, which are currently quite well established, in preparation for the pine tree removal.

21 submissions were received regarding the pine trees with 6 in favour of retaining the pine trees and 15 in favour of removing them.

The trees and surrounding site were assessed by a Council Arborist and he comments as follows: *I can make the following comments about the three pine trees located outside the property at number 15 Harbour View Terrace, which are on the Cass Bay foreshore as part of the Council road reserve area.*

*All three pine trees have had the top half of the stem removed at some point in the past. As a result of this the trees have continued to grow upwards, with a variety of reactive regrowth. This regrowth is often not well attached to the main stem of the tree and can result in the failure of such branches due their poor branch attachments. Over the long term these trees will have this very issue and it is also a concern that decay will become present at the point where the stem was removed. These problems have all occurred because of the removal of the main stem in the past. This practice is often referred to as "topping" and is a poor arboriculture practice, because it creates hazardous trees such as these. Taking into account the long term future of these trees there are two options. The first option is to retain the trees and monitor them on an annual basis with reactive pruning work being carried out to remove any dead, dying or dangerous branches in the canopies of these trees. The second option is to remove the three trees to ground level and replace with such species as nikau (*Rhopalostylis sapida*), kowhai (*Sophora microphylla*), titoki (*Alectryon excelsus*), ribbonwood (*Plagianthus regius*), ngaio (*Myoporum laetum*), pittosporums (*Pittosporum tenuifolium*, *P. eugenioides*) and broadleaf (*Griselinia littoralis*). The Council Botanist would be the best contact for future tree species in this area.*

Taking into account the tree issues raised with option one, I would recommend that the trees are removed and replaced with the various species mentioned above.

It is proposed to remove the pine trees to allow existing ngaios to become established. The adjacent willow will also be removed due to its poor condition.

Comments and concerns were raised around the extent and density of the existing native plantings and the Fir trees.

Removal of the majority of the native plants on the upper slopes excluding all flax plantings and established trees. Cedar trees to be retained at existing height in the short term to provide temporary shelter and shade with a view to removal in the future once other planting becomes established.

Comments regarding signage for dogs

New dog bylaw signage will be installed prior to Christmas.

27. The project team considered the consultation feedback and have responded in the following way:

- (a) Plan amendments
 - (i) Removal of concrete slipway and retention of gravel slipway and upgrade area
 - (ii) Removal of proposed lockable barrier arm
 - (iii) No track or plantings to be undertaken in the open grass area, keep as is
 - (iv) Removal of pine trees to allow existing ngaios to become established.
 - (v) Removal of proposed shade sail

- (b) Referrals (for investigation or action by other Council staff)
 - (i) Safety of concrete steps (these will be monitored by the Contract Manager)
 - (ii) Handrail on Pony Point track (Contract Manager to investigate)
 - (iii) Further access around to Rapaki Bay (will be investigated as part of Head to Head Walkway)

28. The final concept plan, which includes the above amendments is included as attachment 1.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board:

- (a) Approve the Cass Bay Development (Plan - LP 329902)
- (b) Request that funding for the proposed works be submitted for consideration in the preparation of the draft 2012-2022 LTCCP.