

# REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE HAGLEY/FERRYMEAD COMMUNITY BOARD

2 MAY 2012



## PART A – MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

### 5. SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT LINWOOD VILLAGE MASTER PLAN

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

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
  - (a) inform the Council of the community's response to the Draft Linwood Village Master Plan (the Plan)
  - (b) present the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board's recommendation 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 the Council. The draft plan was approved by the 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.

## COUNCIL 17. 5. 2012

### Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board 2. 5. 2012

#### 5 Cont'd

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 Section 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 Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (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 Section 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.

## COUNCIL 17. 5. 2012

### Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board 2. 5. 2012

#### 5 Cont'd

##### 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 Council:

- (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) Not hold hearings 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).
- (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 for adoption at a later date.

5 Cont'd

**BOARD RECOMMENDATION**

That the staff recommendation be adopted.

**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 **Attachment 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 percent) of submitters wished to be heard, 17 (47 percent) don't wish to be heard and 7 (19 percent) didn't say either way.

- Extent to which any projects received negative comments:

(i) as stated in Section 7 of the Summary of Submissions report, only three 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

(ii) 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.

## COUNCIL 17. 5. 2012

### Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board 2. 5. 2012

#### 5 Cont'd

- 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.

## Summary of Submissions

### **1. Introduction**

This report is intended to provide a summary of the public comments made on the draft Linwood Village Master Plan. The public consultation period was open between 19 December 2011 and 17 February 2012, an 8 week period. Submissions were received from a number of main sources: individuals; community groups and NGO's; professional groups; businesses and government agencies.

A total of 36 submissions were made on the Plan. Twenty one (58%) were provided on the submission form for the Plan or through the Have Your Say form and fifteen (36%) as free form submissions. Free form submissions were often in the form of a letter-style submission provided via an electronic (Word) document, generic email or by the respondent providing a submission formatted similarly to the official submission form.

### **2. Methodology**

Each comment has been categorised into one or a number of themes and topics. The themes were based on the Plan's structure, while the topics evolved from the comments made. This information has been inserted into a spreadsheet with a summary of the comments provided with each submission.

It is intended to present those points repeated by multiple respondents as well as any one-off ideas. Submissions were received where a person stated specifically whether they 'liked' or 'disliked' a project by ticking the appropriate box or stating in it writing. For other submissions received, while it is difficult to state whether a submitter is in total support or opposition for an action, each submission has been broken down into projects which they like or dislike, and if indicated, which project is considered to be most important or urgent. It is not possible to weight the strength of opinions for particular points within the whole community. The numbers of submissions made on each point however, provides a general indication of the level of support for each action. It must be recognised that all the numbers provided in this report are relatively low and are not a representative sample of the Linwood Village or Christchurch population.

### **3. Format**

The structure of this report broadly follows the sections set out in the Master Plan. The points made by submitters for each project are summarised and categorised to outline whether they are generally in support of or against the proposals put forward. Many submissions have been received which do not state a definite 'like' or 'dislike' for a project and have therefore been categorised as a general submission on a topic area and are sometimes in the format of a suggestion. However it has been possible to categorise these into categories of generally positive or negative feedback. The analysis of this report is focused on the quantitative responses asked for on the submission form as well as the most discussed topics and general comments / suggestions made in terms of the recovery and rebuild of the centre.

A small number of comments were received that were considered outside the scope of the Plan. Many of these comments could be useful for other aspects of the Greater Christchurch recovery and while not documented in this report will be made available to the relevant area. All other comments have been considered and included in preparing this report.

#### 4. Overall Summary of Submissions

The submissions have been received in a number of formats, on the dedicated submission form, in electronic copy via the 'have your say' website and in generic format by letter or email.

##### **Submission Form Responses**

From the specific submission forms it is possible to identify each submitter who 'liked' or 'disliked' a project based upon where the relevant box has been ticked or specifically noted that the project is 'liked' or 'disliked'. This information is displayed in the table below:

Project references:

*B1: North-west precinct*

*C1: Community facilities and open space*

*N1: North-east block*

*R2: Business and residents association*

*B2: South-west precinct*

*S1: Street Scene*

*R1: Linwood Village partnership*

*R3: Case Management*

	<b>B1</b>	<b>B2</b>	<b>C1</b>	<b>S1</b>	<b>N1</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R2</b>	<b>R3</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>'like' Total</b>	7	6	8	10	6	6	6	6	55	77%
<b>'don't like' total</b>	2	2	3	9	0	0	0	0	16	23%

From this table it is possible to see that the majority of specific comments made are in relation to project S1 (Street Scene). 19 of the 36 submitters stated whether they 'liked' or 'disliked' this project with a split of 10 'likes' and 9 'dislikes'.

Two different street improvement options were put forward for consultation and only 5 submitters stated their preferred design option. Two people preferred Option A and three people had a preference of Option B. The response to the options provided was fairly low, and when reading the submissions as a whole, there were certain aspects of both projects that were favoured, i.e. curb build outs creating a stronger pedestrian environment.

##### **General Submissions**

In relation to the more generic submissions, these have been categorised into the specific project areas where possible. Many of the submissions raised both positive and negative comments on aspects of the project. Therefore these have been summarised as individual comments in order to gain a balanced view to determine whether there is a generally positive or negative view of each project proposed. Those people who specified directly if they 'like' or 'dislike' a project have also been included in this table to get a true reflection of submissions received. Figures showing any general comments or suggestions have also been included below:

	<b>B1</b>	<b>B2</b>	<b>C1</b>	<b>S1</b>	<b>N1</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R2</b>	<b>R3</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Positive (incl 'like')</b>	9	8	14	11	7	7	7	7	<b>70</b>	<b>53%</b>
<b>Negative (incl 'dislike')</b>	2	2	5	21	0	0	0	0	<b>30</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>General</b>	6	6	6	3	5	2	2	1	<b>31</b>	<b>24%</b>

The above table demonstrates that there is general support for the majority of projects in the master plan with 53% of the total general submission comments received being positive. However a large number of comments (21) were received that raised negative comments regarding project S1. A recurring concern on the project related to the lack of provision for cyclists and feedback was that both options 1 and 2 created safety problems for cyclists. This theme will be discussed in more detail later in the report.

## 5. General comments and Key Themes

A number of general comments or suggestions were made on the plan. This related to matters such as the need to use sustainable building practices in the rebuild, the need to incorporate design friendly solutions for the elderly and blind as well as comments regarding the Tristan's pub and the location of its smoking area. These themes are incorporated into the master plan but do not necessarily have specific projects associated with them.

A key theme, and clearly a matter of importance within the Linwood Village is the future of the Linwood Arts Centre. A number of submissions state that there was an urgent need for this to be replaced as it plays a very important role within the village. Its association with Doris Lusk Park was also a topical matter with people wanting to see the park better utilised for community activities such as markets and fetes. At least two submitters felt that the site could be better utilised if the Arts Centre building could be moved to the rear corner of the site to open up a more functional usable space on the corner of the Worcester Street and Stanmore Road intersection.

Another urgent matter stressed by submitters was the need for essential services such as a bank, post office and essential retail stores which could be established in temporary accommodation on vacant sites in the centre. Furthermore several submitters outlined the importance of providing social/community based support in the nature of a resident community officer, WINZ department and drug / alcohol support networks. This is something that can be explored through the provisions of project R1.

## 6. Specific Projects

This section of the report sets out the specific projects of the Master Plan and outlines the number of submissions received on each project as well as a summary of some of the key comments. Figures are given in relation to the positive and negative comments received including where a respondent specified whether they 'like' or 'dislike' a project. Where appropriate a staff comment is made outlining any further actions required or whether there is potential for changes or modifications to the Plan.

### ***6.1 Comprehensive Site Development - Projects B1 and B2***

#### ***(The North West Precinct and South West Precinct)***

This project responds to the loss of buildings and business premises at the north west and south west corners of the Worcester Street and Stanmore Road Intersection. The project also seeks to address existing car parking options and safety in relation to these areas. The purpose of the project is to demonstrate how these areas could be developed to meet business objectives, current planning requirements and village character and aspirations of the community.

While these are separate projects in the master plan, the majority of respondents grouped the two projects together as they had similar concepts. The comments made were not necessarily specific to each project, therefore for the purpose of this summary report the issues are grouped together and where there is a distinction between projects is made clear.



<b>B1 – North West Precinct / B2 - South West Precinct</b>		
Submission points:	17 (B1), 16 (B2)	Positive/Like: 9 (B1) 8 (B2) Negative/Dislike: 2 (B1, B2)
<i>Issues/Themes raised:</i>		
<p>Generally there is support for the 'village feel' with a good design and layout of buildings set out for each block in the master plan. Positive feedback was made regarding the provision of improved access to the car parking areas at the rear of buildings. <i>'It is important for these areas to be well lit and be safer areas for people to use them'</i>.</p> <p>The mixed use concept is supported and a maximum of 3 storeys encouraged.</p> <p>All but two submitters liked the use of colour in the buildings, giving it an 'arts and crafts' look and feel about the centre.</p> <p>The two submitters who 'dislike' the project felt that the painted buildings <i>'could lead to a confusing visual impact...'</i> and <i>'suggest it would be an eyesore and needs to be sensitive to anyone'</i>. Also a concern was raised that the colour in buildings could be used as an advertising tool – <i>'and there is a plethora of ugly signage already in the village'</i>.</p>		
<i>Staff comment:</i>		
<p>The majority of respondents are in favour of the design and layout of the precinct. It should be noted that the design and layout is only a guide to the property owners and creates a vision for future development. In light of some comments received, Council officers will look at refining some of the detailed images in the Plan. Ultimately, the final appearance of the buildings will be up to the developer to determine. Council officers can work with the developers to achieve good design outcomes.</p>		

*Urgent / Most Important Project*

Three of the submitters who liked this project felt that this was the most urgent item contained in the Master Plan. Furthermore, three respondents stated that this was also the most important project in the Master Plan.

**6.2 Community Facilities and Open Space - Project C1**

This project addresses the earthquake damage to the Linwood Community Arts Centre and the opportunities to create a 'village square'. It is focussed on the Council owned land on the south east corner of the Worcester Street / Stanmore Road intersection which also includes Doris Lusk Park. This project is intended to create a vision for the ongoing development of the area. The intention is to improve the relationship between the park and village and interaction between the Arts Centre and the park and associated amenities.

It centres around: the rebuild of the Arts Centre building; potential improvements to its layout and functioning; the creation of a new and improved toilet block; and creating a more usable and inviting park space for the Village.

<b>C1 – Community Facilities and Open Space</b>		
Submission points: 25	Positive/Like: 14	Negative/Dislike: 5
<p><i>Issues/Themes raised:</i></p> <p>The submissions received were generally supportive of the overall functioning of the park as a community venue for use by markets and stalls etc. The rebuild of the Arts Centre was important to all who commented.</p> <p>There was a mixed reaction with regards to the design of the toilet, some like the 'arts theme' and thought the concept was a good idea. Others did not like the artistic licence given to the proposal and felt it was 'childish' and 'impractical'. Another submitter felt the design of the toilet block could lead to more graffiti and noted that the quality of the toilet block is very important.</p> <p>Submissions were received that suggested that the Arts Centre building was not in the most usable position on the site and suggestions were made that this should be moved to the rear of the site to open up the park as a more usable community facility, which would enable markets and festivals to be held there. The moving of the building would also make it a safer environment being more open and would have greater visibility etc.</p>		
<p><i>Staff comment:</i></p> <p>It is encouraging to see the general support for the changes and improvements sought to the park. In terms of the toilet design, this is just an artist's impression and the details of any redevelopment of the toilet block would follow Council approval for capital funding and will require further consultation and approval from the Community Board. Council officers can undergo further work to refine the final imagery for the final Plan.</p> <p>In terms of the suggestions regarding the moving of the Arts Centre building, given its heritage listing this may prove difficult, however further discussions can be undertaken with heritage planners to look at the feasibility of this suggestion.</p>		

#### *Urgent / Most Important Project*

Three submitters felt that this project was the most important in the Master Plan. Several other respondents stated that the rebuild of the Arts Centre was an urgent action to help create a central meeting place and hub for the village.

#### **6.3 Street Scene – Project S1**

The project responds to local aspirations for a quality pedestrian environment with 'meet and greet' spaces and slowed traffic. It is focussed on the Worcester Street / Stanmore Road intersection and the road corridor adjacent to the shopping strip. The project has identified improvements to the look and feel of the street that builds on a village character, improves safety and supports good transport infrastructure and quality places for people.

Two options were presented in the Master Plan with requests for any comments and preferences. Each option was developed around key concepts such as: maximising space on footpaths, narrowing traffic lane widths, creating strong streetscape elements, shorter on-street parking periods as well as strong pedestrian crossing points.

This project received the most feedback from submitters and this is documented in the table below:

<b>S1 – Street Scene</b>		
Submission points: 35	Positive/Like: 11	Negative/Dislike: 21
<p><i>Issues/Themes raised:</i></p> <p>The general consensus is that people like the extended footpaths that create a safer, more user friendly environment for pedestrians. Submitters like the improved crossing points and planting to make a greener village area.</p> <p>Two respondents supported the raised median concept which help to slow down traffic and it would also 'green' the road corridor. One submitter suggested that this could even be extended to stop right turning traffic out of the west side car park.</p> <p>For those who disliked this project, the majority of concerns related to the narrowing of the traffic lanes and lack of provision for cyclists. Many people are concerned for the safety of cyclists especially with the parking being retained along Stanmore Road.</p> <p>However other submitters were concerned by the reduction in on street parking as it is convenient for the disabled and elderly.</p> <p>Two submitters also raised specific concerns with regards to the planting within the central median due to loss of views to the Port Hills and problems with maintenance.</p> <p>This general feedback indicates that there is a high proportion of submitters who dislike the proposals put forward. The main reason for this relates to the lack of provision for cyclists. It is claimed that the design would not encourage cyclists to use the roads in future. The layout is considered to be dangerous for cyclists and cars to mix in the same environment and that the 'slow core' principle would not work in practice.</p>		
<p><i>Staff Comment:</i></p> <p>Given the amount of feedback on this proposal it is considered that further work may be necessary to investigate alternative options that would satisfy concerns raised in submissions. This may involve the incorporation of a designated cycle lane but it is acknowledged that there is a need to retain the footpath build outs which have received a large amount of support.</p> <p>One option to develop this concept further would be to hold a workshop with those persons who have expressed a view on this project, especially those people who wished to be heard if a hearing is held. Such a workshop may enable further discussions or input into a revised scheme.</p>		

In terms of the preferred option:

- One Submitter stated a preference of Option 1 (which includes the central median),
- Three Submitters stated a preference of Option 2

*Urgent / Most Important Project*

One respondent feels that this project is the most important within the Master Plan.

#### 6.4 The North-East Block – Project N1

This project responds to safety and security concerns in off street parking areas. It focuses on the north east car parking area associated with the Supervalu supermarket and the commercial block of shops fronting Worcester Street. The project recommends enhancements to the look and feel of the privately owned car parking area.

The intention of this work is to improve the connection between the car park, the street and the shops. Furthermore, the frontage of the car park could be improved through new planting and paving detail. This could lead to an improved car park layout which provides an overflow space for events/markets. The table below shows the consultation response to this project:

<b>N1 – The North East Block</b>		
Submission points: 12	Positive/Like: 7	Negative/Dislike: 0
<i>Issues/Themes raised:</i>		
<p>All respondents on this project 'liked the improvements to the car parking layout as it provided a much safer environment and improves pedestrian links and connectivity. The planting will improve the amenities of the area.</p> <p>Respondents outlined the importance of these areas being well lit so that people would feel safer utilising these areas.</p> <p>Comments were also received regarding the Tristan's smoking area which fronts the car park. People would like to see this moved or fully enclosed as it can create an intimidating environment for passers by.</p>		
<i>Staff comment:</i>		
<p>While there is no guarantee this work can take place with the land being in private ownership, discussions can be held with the owners to discuss potential improvements to this area.</p>		

#### Urgent / Most Important Project

One person stated that this was the most important project in the master plan.

#### 6.5 Recovery Together - R1, R2 and R3

These projects respond to the opportunity to bring business and the local community closer together in mutual support. It is recognised that people working together to rebuild and improve the village, and maintaining community interest and engagement in the area, will be very important for the Village's economic recovery. There are a number of existing organisations that are recognised and contribute to the Linwood Community and opportunities arise to help build partnerships and relationships between these organisations.

Three specific projects have been identified:

- R1 – The Linwood Village Partnership - *A shortage of key services have been identified in the village and opportunities for a more regular banking / post office services could exist on a permanent basis. Furthermore a Community Link partnership project would also be welcomed which supports social service agencies and the Police.*

- R2 – Business and Residents Association – *An active Business and Residents Association would provide support for local businesses and help maintain the strong community spirit and local pride. Opportunities to establish a Business Improvement District and effective marketing of the centre can aid the centres recovery.*
- R3 – Case Management – *A case manager can help to implement the projects in the master plan and give a single point of contact for Council support and help facilitate meetings with dedicated Council Staff. Also they could help to promote activities and events within the village in conjunction with partner organisations.*

The response on these projects has been grouped together to reflect the way that feedback was provided. The response is outlined in the table below:

<b>R1 – The Linwood Village Partnership</b> <b>R2 – Business and Residents Association</b> <b>R3 – Case Management</b>		
Submission points: 9	Positive/Like: 7	Negative/Dislike: 0
<p><i>Issues/Themes raised:</i></p> <p>R1 - The community link / hot desk idea would be a great idea and help contribute to the village feel. Need a variety of services present in the village.</p> <p>R2 – It would be great to have dialogue between businesses and residents. It would be essential to have a cohesive response to the rebuild.</p> <p>R3 - A single point of contact is essential to aid recovery.</p> <p>The work of existing community groups needs to be acknowledged and this can form the foundations of any further initiatives going forward.</p>		
<p><i>Staff comment:</i></p> <p>There is strong support shown to these actions and no negative 'general' comments were received regarding these principles. The plan needs to emphasise the importance of the work already being undertaken within the local community. Furthermore, the plan needs to demonstrate how the implementation plan can help to facilitate the temporary use of sites and try to encourage the presence of essential services and social service agencies into the village. This can be achieved through the provision of an ongoing case manager.</p>		

*Urgent / Most Important*

One submitter considered this to be the most important project.

## 7. Hearings

Out of a total of 36 submissions received on the master plan a total of 12 respondents wish to have their submission heard. This equates to 33% of the total response.

The table below sets out the number of respondents that wish for their submission to be heard, if a hearing is held, and the topic area that the submission relates to:

Project No.	<u>Number of Submissions</u>	<u>Submissions</u> that wish to be heard that: <b>Like / Positive</b>	Submissions that wish to be heard that: <b>Dislike / Negative</b>	Submissions that wish to be heard: <b>General</b>	Submissions that wish to be heard: <b>Total</b>	% of Total Submissions
B1	15	2	0	2	4	27%
B2	14	1	0	2	3	21%
C1	17	4	0	1	5	29%
S1	31	5	7	1	13	42%
N1	12	3	0	1	4	33%
R1	9	3	0	1	4	44%
R2	9	3	0	1	4	44%
R3	8	3	0	1	4	44%

The table above shows that apart from project S1 there were no submitters seeking to be heard that disliked or have negative views on a project.

Given the nature of the submissions received and the main area of contention being project S1 – Street scene, it is apparent that further work is required to investigate alternative layouts that could potentially accommodate cycle lanes in to the road layout. A further workshop, involving the submitters who commented on this project, would appear to be a solution to enable discussions and preparation of a more viable road/street scene layout.

In terms of other projects in the master plan, these will continue to be reviewed in the light of submissions received and opportunities for changes will be investigated i.e. the location of the Arts Centre building and the imagery of the building designs notably the North and East Blocks as well as the new toilet block facility.

## Consultation process

The consultation process involved:

- undertaking a centre specific master plan that has involved consultation with the local property / business owners and the local community to encapsulate the needs for the Linwood Village centre.
- ensuring strong communication over community consultation events.
- seeking ideas from stakeholders early in the process, including the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board, property and business owners, social and environmental interests and the community generally. More than 140 people participated in these focus group and public meetings in August 2011.
- providing feedback to the property and business owners prior to finalising the details of the draft plan in November.
- having ongoing meetings and dialogue with individuals and organisations from the community.
- having the Plan considered by the Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board prior to the Council in November 2011, for approval for the third and final phase of community consultation.
- including in this consultation phase:
  - an eight-week submission period, from Monday, 19 December until 5.00pm on Friday, 17 February 2011 (60 days) allowing for the Christmas holidays;
  - publicising the details of the document via newspapers, posters and local networks (e.g. Council's Strengthening Communities Advisor).
  - delivery of:
    - a cover letter explaining the process to date, process forward and consultation details (what, where, when and how), a 13 page summary of the Plan (including reference to the full Plan and where to get it) and an official submission form to all land owners within the Linwood Village catchment area; and
    - a cover letter, the full Plan and an official submission form to community groups.
  - placing hard copies of the summary Plan, full Plan and official submission form at all Council libraries and active service centres.
  - two drop-in display sessions at the Aspire Centre on Saturday 28 January and Thursday 9 February (i.e. on both a weekday and weekend and neither too early nor too late into the submission period).
  - the set up of a mobile booth within the village on 3 February to promote the plan and to encourage members of the public to come along to the drop in sessions.
  - Tangata whenua values and objectives have been sought via Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (MKT).