

9. SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT LINWOOD VILLAGE MASTER PLAN

General Manager responsible:	Strategy and Planning Group Manager, DDI 941 8281
Officer responsible:	Healthy Environment Programme Manager
Author:	Marcus Blayney, Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - (a) inform the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board and the Council of the community's response to the Draft Linwood Village Master Plan (the Plan)
 - (b) recommend whether or not submissions on the Plan should be heard (in accordance with the Council's resolution on 24 November 2011)
 - (c) provide an indication of the initial staff response to the submissions and proposed direction for finalising the Plan, in the event the Council decides not to hear the submissions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. In June 2011, the Council approved the commencement of a master plan for Linwood Village (corner of Worcester Street and Stanmore Road). The centre was badly damaged in the Canterbury earthquakes and the master plan provides a vision, framework and implementation plan to support the recovery and rebuild of this suburban centre.
3. Focus groups and public workshops were undertaken in late August 2011 to determine the centre's specific needs for a master plan and the actions needed to help rebuild the centre. The resulting concepts were presented to the local property/business owners in November, prior to the draft plan being presented to the Community Board and Council. The draft plan was approved by Council for public notification in November. An eight week consultation period on the Plan followed from November 2011 to February 2012. The draft plan received 36 submissions from individuals and organisations within the community.
4. A Summary of Submissions on the Plan is provided as **Attachment 1**. This includes concise summaries of the public feedback to the eight actions/projects set out in the master plan as well as other matters and suggestions raised in submissions. The document also includes officer comments as to how the Plan could be amended in relation to certain actions.
5. The submission form asked whether respondents would like to present their comments at a hearing. This resulted in 12 submitters indicating that they would take this opportunity if available. Regardless of whether or not submitters indicated that they would like to be heard, all comments (both positive and negative) have been assessed. Where it is considered that suggested changes would work within the wider framework of proposals and improve the Plan these have been recognised for inclusion.
6. With the exception of one project, S1 Street Scene, there were no submitters seeking to be heard that dislike or have negative views on a project. It is therefore proposed that, rather than hold hearings, a further workshop be held on this matter to which all submitters would be invited. This would enable those individuals with a particular interest in this project to have further input into the detailed road/street scene layout.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. Preparation of the Plan within the Strategy and Planning Group's budget was confirmed through the 2011/12 Annual Plan process. Any hearings would fall within this plan preparation budget. Preparatory implementation work is proposed in the coming financial year, with the majority of funding for implementation of the Plan to be considered through the Long Term Plan process in 2013.

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

8. Yes, funding for preparation of the Plan has been provided within the Strategy and Planning Group's 2011/12 budget.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. There are no immediate legal considerations, other than having undertaken consultation in accordance with *S.82 Principles of consultation* of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). In summary, these require that, in relation to any decision or other matter:
- (a) affected persons should have reasonable access to relevant information in a manner and format appropriate to their preferences and needs
 - (b) affected persons should be encouraged to present their views
 - (c) affected persons should be given clear information concerning the purpose of the consultation and the scope of the decisions to be made following consideration of the views presented
 - (d) affected persons who wish to have their views considered should be provided with a reasonable opportunity to do so in a manner and format appropriate to their preferences and needs
 - (e) the views presented should be received with an open mind and given due consideration
 - (f) affected persons who present their views should be provided with information concerning the decision/s and reasons for the decision/s.
10. Staff have met with officials from CERA and will continue to do so to ensure the work undertaken on the master plan is consistent with the Recovery Strategy and Recovery Plans. There is no requirement under *s.19 Development of Recovery Plans* of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 for recovery plans for areas outside the central city to be subject to public hearings.

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

11. Yes, as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Yes, completion of the Plan is provided for within Activity Management Plan *1.0 City and Community Long-Term Policy and Planning* updated as at 1 July 2011.

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

13. Yes, as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. The Plan is consistent with relevant strategies, including Urban Development Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

15. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. The Council has endeavoured to ensure the Plan encapsulates the community's vision for the rebuild and recovery of Linwood Village, by undertaking consultation throughout the process as described in **Attachment 2**.
17. The official submission form asked submitters to state which actions they liked, disliked and why; which actions they considered the most important; of those, which actions they considered the most urgent; any other comments they had regarding any aspects of the Plan or process; if submissions are heard, whether they wish to be heard; and, if they wish to assist with the implementation of any actions, which ones. Written submissions were also accepted via the Council's Have Your Say website and free-form emails or letters.
18. The Plan received 36 submissions from both individuals and organisations within the community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board:

- (a) note the overall summary of findings in the Summary of Submissions on the Draft Linwood Village Master Plan and the staff comments in relation to each action
- (b) recommend to the Council that hearings are not held for the 36 submissions received on the Draft Linwood Village Master Plan
- (c) endorse the holding of a further workshop to investigate opportunities for a new road/street scene layout (Project S1), and
- (d) endorse amendment of the Draft Linwood Village Master Plan in accordance with staff comments in relation to each action, and taking into account feedback from the proposed workshop, before it is considered by Council for adoption at a later date.

CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.

BACKGROUND

19. In normal circumstances, submissions are heard for plans of this nature in order to maintain community confidence in the Council and ownership of the plan. In assessing the need to hold hearings, officers have taken into account the following matters:
 - The extent and nature of consultation undertaken to date:

As noted in Appendix 2, there has been considerable opportunity for both verbal and written community input into the Plan.
 - Future consultation:

It is evident that most respondents support the majority of the Plan. Further community consultation is anticipated during implementation of the Plan. This will help develop the detail around implementation projects, including various actions being implemented by local organisations, either separately or in conjunction with the Council and other partner organisations.
 - The extent of public response:

While the community consultation undertaken in Linwood Village was comprehensive, the public response was limited. In a general sense most people were satisfied with the projects the master plan sets out. The exception to this is project S1 (Street Scene) which received mixed feedback and a number of negative comments.

- The number and proportion of submitters wishing to be heard, if hearings are held:
Of the 36 submissions received on the Plan, 12 (33%) of submitters wished to be heard, 17 (47%) don't wish to be heard and 7 (19%) didn't say either way.
- Extent to which any projects received negative comments:
 - as stated in section 7 of the Summary of Submissions report, only 3 submitters specifically stated that they dislike project S1 and wish to be heard. Other respondents didn't specifically identify that they 'disliked' this project but the feedback from some included negative comments concerning it
 - no persons who stated they 'dislike' or had negative views about any other project in the Plan stated that they wished to be heard.

20. Current circumstances would justify a more streamlined approach than the hearing of submissions for this process, given:

- A suitable alternative:

The key issue that would be a focus for hearings is project S1, which may be equally suitable to progress further via a workshop with those submitters who gave feedback to this project.

- Availability of resources:

A Hearings Panel of elected representatives would need to be appointed and there is limited availability of elected members to hear submissions on Suburban Centre master plans. The likely timing for hearings also presents a timetabling difficulty as it clashes with the hearings schedule for the Annual Plan. There would also be implications for administering the process.

- Alignment with the Annual Plan process:

In order to progress the implementation of the master plans, the Council needs to confirm its work programme and funding for 2012/13 before the end of June 2012. Failure to include implementation projects within the 2012/13 Annual Plan could cause a 12 month delay, prior to the next opportunity to programme projects in the Long Term Plan review in 2013.

- Expediency:

Finalising the master plans quickly will provide property owners and the community with more certainty over the context for the rebuild of their centre.

21. On balance, it is recommended that submissions do not need to be heard because there has been considerable opportunity for both verbal and written community input into and feedback on the Plan. In addition, further community consultation is anticipated during implementation. It is clear the majority of submitters support the Plan, with the exception of Project S1 there were no submitters seeking to be heard that dislike or have negative views on a project. Given the feedback provided on project S1, there is an opportunity to investigate further options for a road/street scene layout through holding a workshop. All persons who submitted on the Plan would be invited to participate.