

REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE
SPREY/DON HEATHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD



PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

6. SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT SELWYN STREET SHOPS MASTER PLAN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Healthy Environment
Author:	John Scallan, Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - (a) inform the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board and the Council of the community's response to the Draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan (the Plan)
 - (b) recommend to the Council 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. The Plan was approved as a project by the Council in June 2011 to provide a vision, framework and action implementation plan to support the recovery and rebuild of the Selwyn Street Shops suburban centre, which was badly damaged in the Canterbury earthquakes.
3. Initial direction for the Plan was obtained via a series of focus groups and public workshops in August 2011. Having been approved by the Council for public notification in November, the Plan was made available for public consultation over a seven-week period from mid December 2011. The Plan drew 49 submissions from both individuals and organisations within the community.
4. The report on the consultation summary and findings on the draft Plan is provided as **Attachment 1**. In total 283 submission points were raised. These showed that the majority (83 percent) of submitters liked the proposed actions. 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.
5. In general, given the level of support, staff consider that the draft actions should be retained, with some amendments to address the matters that arose through the submissions. On balance given the level of consultation and support for the plan, the need for expediency in finalising the plan and the opportunity for further engagement in the implementation stage, it is recommended that hearings are not held.

6 Cont'd

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6. 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?

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

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. 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.

The Council is to observe these principles in whatever manner it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

9. Staff have met with officials from CERA and will continue to do so to ensure that the work on the Plan is informed by and 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?

10. Yes, as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

11. 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.

6 Cont'd

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

12. Yes, as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

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

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

14. Yes.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

15. The Council has endeavoured to ensure the Plan encapsulates the community's vision for the Selwyn Street Shops rebuild and recovery, by:

- Proceeding on a community-specific basis for master plan-related community consultation, taking into consideration the size and nature of each suburban centre
- Flagging early and often throughout the process that there would be two phases of community consultation
- Seeking ideas from stakeholders early in the process, including the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board, property and business owners, social and environmental interests and the community generally. Over 50 people participated in these focus group and public meetings in August 2011
- Having ongoing meetings and dialogue with individuals and organisations from the community
- Having the Plan considered by the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board prior to the Council in November 2011, for approval for the final phase of community consultation.
- Included in this consultation phase:
 - a seven-week submission period, from Monday, 19 December until 5pm on Friday, 17 February 2012
 - publicising the details of it via newspapers, the radio, posters and local networks
 - Delivery of:
 - a cover letter explaining the process to date, process forward and consultation details (what, where, when and how), a full copy of the Plan, a summary of the Plan, including an official submission form, to all land owners and businesses within the Selwyn Street Shops
 - a cover letter, the summary Plan and an official submission form to local residents in the area surrounding the Selwyn Street Shops.
- 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 about any aspects of the Plan or process; if submissions are heard, whether they wish to be heard if hearings are to take place; 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.

6 Cont'd

- Placing of hard copies of the summary Plan, full Plan and official submission form at all Council libraries and service centres open
- Two drop-in display sessions were held in the church hall in Selwyn Street in early February
- Copies of the draft Plan were also distributed upon request and to those who have expressed an interest in receiving a copy
- Copies of the draft plan summary were provided to a local Addington community group (Addington well-being, Manuka Cottage)
- Tangata whenua values and objectives have been sought via Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (MKT).

16. The Plan drew 49 submissions from both individuals and organisations within the community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Note the overall summary of findings on the Draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan and the staff comments in relation to each action.
- (b) Not hear the 49 submissions received on the draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan.
- (c) Endorse amendment of the Plan in accordance with the staff comments in relation to each action before it is considered for adoption at a later date.

BOARD CONSIDERATION

After consideration of the submissions the Board decided to provide a workshop to enable all submitters to further discuss the plan.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Note the overall summary of findings on the Draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan and the staff comments in relation to each action.
- (b) Agree the 49 submitters who wish to be heard on the draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan be heard and participate by way of a workshop.
- (c) Endorse amendment of the Plan in accordance with the staff comments in relation to each action before it is considered for adoption at a later date.

BACKGROUND

17. In normal circumstances, the Council would hear submissions on a plan of this nature, in order to maintain community confidence in the Council and encourage ownership of the plan. In considering the questions of whether to hold hearings staff have taken into account the following matters:

6 Cont'd

- The extent and nature of consultation undertaken to date: As noted in paragraph 14, there has been considerable opportunity for both verbal and written community input into and feedback on the Plan. With 149 likes and 30 dislikes of the projects identified to achieve the vision overall, majority support for the Plan is evident as a result. The Plan also anticipates further community consultation being undertaken during implementation of the Plan, to develop the detail around implementation projects, and various actions being implemented by local organisations, either separately or in conjunction with the Council and other partner organisations.
 - The number and proportion of submitters wishing to be heard: Of the 48 submissions received on the Plan, 13 (27 per cent) of submitters wished to be heard if submissions are heard, 28 (57 percent) don't wish to be heard and 8 (16 percent) didn't say either way.
 - The number and nature of actions and submission points on which submitters wish to be heard: All nine of the draft actions have been identified by submitters that expressed a desire to be heard. In total there are 52 submission points from these submitters (see table 1 in **Attachment 1**).
 - The level of support (like/dislike) for the actions on which submitters wish to be heard: Overall 85 percent of submissions liked the draft actions, with only 15 percent disliking them. Each of the draft actions had more submissions that liked the proposal than disliked it (see table 1 in **Attachment 1**).
 - The actions on which submitters most frequently wish to be heard: S1 – Street and Movement had the most submissions (10). B2 – 299 Selwyn Street (8) and N1 – Selwyn St Reserve (7) had the next most submissions (see table 1 in **Attachment 1**).
 - Circumstances which currently justify a more streamlined approach than the hearing of submissions for the Selwyn Street Shops master plan include:
 - Availability of resources: A Hearings Panel of elected representatives would need to be appointed. For the four draft master plans that have completed their final consultation phase (Lyttelton, Sydenham, Linwood Village and Selwyn Street Shops), it is estimated that seven working days would be required for the holding of hearings and deliberation on the submissions, of which a full day would be required for the Selwyn Street Shops. This assumes that each submitter would only have 10 minutes to verbally present their submissions, similar to the Annual Plan hearings process. 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 Council staff 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.
18. Table 1 in **Attachment 1** summarises the projects that are the subject of submissions by the 13 (27 percent) of submitters who wish to be heard. **Attachment 2** contains the consultation report for the draft Selwyn Street shops Master Plan.
19. On balance, it is recommended that submissions should not be heard in view of the level of consultation and support for the plan, and taking into account the potential impacts on implementation that could be caused by delaying adoption of the final version. Further community consultation is anticipated during implementation of the Plan, particularly with reference to the street layout and reserve actions.

6 Cont'd

20. Should the Community Board and the Council decide to hear submissions a Hearings Panel will need to be appointed and arrangements made for the hearing including timetabling and circulation of the officer report. Both the hearing format and officer report are likely to be similar to those regarding area plans.

STAFF COMMENTS

21. The tables in **Attachment 1** summarise submissions for each project and provide staff comments as to how the Plan should be amended in relation to each draft action. In general, given the level of support for the draft actions, staff consider that they can be retained with some amendment to address the matters raised through the submissions. Staff do not consider that any additional actions are required.

Attachment 1 to the report: *Submissions on the Draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan*. Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board, 1 May 2012

Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan

Summary analysis of submissions, staff response and the need for hearings

This report is a concise summary of the submissions received on each project contained within the draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan (the draft Plan) and the possible actions arising in response to those submissions. The report also contains commentary on the question of hearings and presents analysis that may be used to inform the decision making process for whether to conduct hearings or not. The *Consultation Report for the Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan* contains more detail on the content of the submissions received, the details of the submitters and further analysis on the findings.

Consultation process

The draft Plan was published for consultation on 19 December 2011. Consultation closed on 17 February 2012. A summary of the draft Plan was distributed to households in the area around Selwyn Street Shops and to Council Libraries and Service Centres. This included a submission form. Full copies of the plan and summary were distributed to land owners and business owners and a number of other stakeholders. The draft Plan was also available electronically on the Council's 'Have Your Say' website and submissions could be made using the website. Two drop-in days were held in the Selwyn Street Shops in early February 2012 where people could talk about the draft Plan with Council staff, view poster size versions of the draft Plan concepts and also make submissions.

Overall response

In total, forty-nine submissions were received. Nineteen were made using the submission form and eighteen were made via the 'Have Your Say' Council website. The remainder were in the form of letters, reports and emails, some of which followed the structure of the submission form (to a greater or lesser extent).

Analysis of submissions

A summary of submissions received on each project contained within the draft Plan is presented in this section. For each project the table displays the project reference and name, a short description on the project, the number of submissions and of those the number that ticked or clearly stated an overall 'like' or 'don't like' preference (many respondents did not state a preference), a brief summary of the main points from the submissions and the staff comment on points raised.

Project area – Built environment

B1 – 320 Selwyn Street and 57 Somerset Crescent. Redevelopment of site to include a landmark building on this prominent corner.		
Submissions: 30	Like: 19	Don't like: 3
Issues/Themes raised:		
Support overall for a 'landmark' building on the site although some respondents questioned		

the boldness of the concept design shown. A number of respondents did not want to see a building over two storeys in height. Support was also expressed for the return of the Sylvan Café to the site.

Staff comment: Amend action.

The design of building shown in the concept is to illustrate what having a prominent building on the site could look like relative to the surroundings, as a landmark entry to Selwyn Street Shops. The intention is to show the bulk, scale and position of the building rather than detailed design elements. The final design of the building will ultimately be for the land holder to decide, although the Council is able to offer assistance with urban design, and the design is also likely to be influenced by whether the existing buildings on site are to be retained. A prominent building of three stories in height is possible on the site without impacting on nearby residential properties. The height would not be inconsistent with other buildings found along Brougham Street and is appropriate given the scale of adjoining Brougham Street and size of the mature trees in the Selwyn Street reserve.

It is acknowledged that to build to three stories on this site would be in excess of the maximum height permitted for the B1 zone and therefore necessitate a resource consent process or a future plan change. However, the potential to build to three stories should not be discounted for this reason alone as it would give the land owner more options to consider for redevelopment of their site.

The concept detail will be refined for the final version of the Plan while maintaining the bulk and scale suggested in the draft Plan. The concept artist's impression will be refined for the final version.

B2 – 299 Selwyn Street. Mixed use redevelopment to include retail and commercial with the potential for a small residential component. Site layout to include new parking to the rear and new areas of open space within the development.

Submissions: 31

Like: 19

Dislike: 4

Issues/Themes raised:

The concept shown in the draft Plan was generally well received. Respondents appreciated the creation of new areas of semi-public outdoor space and additional parking facilities for the centre. Concerns were raised regarding the design of the buildings, with a number of respondents preferring a design that was more in keeping with the building that was previously on the site. The layout of the site showing a strong street frontage and parking to the rear was supported by most respondents. Concerns were around the access arrangements for vehicles and the possible conflict with pedestrians and cyclists that may result. There was a variety of responses to mixed use on the site with some respondents favouring the inclusion of a residential component and others preferring a mix of retail and commercial only. A few respondents commented on the height of the development and most preferred only two storey buildings. One respondent suggested an alternative arrangement for the site incorporating part of the residential sites to the of the site rear (zoned Living 3) as part of the development to, amongst other things, provide more parking and improve vehicle access arrangements.

Staff comment: Amend action.

The design for site shown in the concept is to illustrate one possible option for

redevelopment. The intention is to show the bulk, scale and position of the buildings rather than detailed design elements. It includes the main features that emerged as desirable through the workshop process, namely: a strong building frontage, additional parking to the rear and new areas of open space. The size of the site does however, allow for a number of different development options or site configurations. The suggestion to expand into the neighbouring residential area has some merit in that it would afford more options to address access arrangements to the site (including avoiding the need for an additional mid-block access off Selwyn Street) and provide more parking. It could also have a range of effects on neighbouring residential properties which need to be carefully considered. Pursuing this option is likely to necessitate a more complex planning process (potentially involving a notified consent or plan change).

The existing concept will be amended to respond to some of the comments received including altering the access arrangements and the mixed use component. An alternative scheme could also be shown as an option, which would be dependent upon other planning processes being completed and that would allow for expansion of the business activity (while avoiding pre-determination of those planning processes).

The concept artist's impression will be refined for the final version.

B3 – South-east block. Replacement of buildings in keeping with the size and bulk of what has been lost while taking the opportunity to improve vehicle access arrangements to the rear parking area and to make more use of the green space at the southern end of the block.

Submissions: 31

Like: 19

Dislike: 4

Issues/Themes raised:

The redevelopment concept for this block was well received. Concerns were expressed regarding the potential to change the access arrangements to the site and the additional potential for conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians that may arise as a result of a new access.

Staff comment: Retain action.

While there is an opportunity to improve vehicle access to the site the existing access is functional and could be replicated with the new development. This is a detailed matter that can be addressed at the consents stage and need not impact upon the other objectives of the Plan.

The concept artist's impression will be refined for the final version.

Project area – Street and movement

S1 – Street and Movement

Submissions: 40

Like: 18

Dislike: 6

Issues/Themes raised:

- Cycle lanes –Overall the idea of cycle lanes was supported. Of those who expressed a preference five favoured on-street lanes and ten favoured separated lanes.
- Concerns were raised over the demarcation of road width for each lane and specifically over the width of the proposed cycle lanes (being less than 2 meters in

width). A number of other comments were made requesting changes to the design details of the on-street cycle lane option (that was shown in plan form in the Master Plan), for example, at the Brougham Street intersection to avoid conflict between motor vehicles and cycles. Other respondents commented on the apparent lack of space in the street to cater for both car parking and adequate cycle lane facilities. Some suggested that the removal of some on-street parking to accommodate wider cycle lanes should be considered as an option.

- Signage – One respondent requested a consistent approach to signage on the street and buildings, potentially through the use of a design code.
- Brougham Street intersection – A number respondents expressed their safety concerns at the Brougham Street/Selwyn Street intersection. The intersection is considered by some respondents to be unsafe for all transport users in general but particularly for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Kerb build-outs and landscape – These were generally well received although some safety concerns were raised regarding visibility for vehicle drivers and the narrowing of the road space for cycles.
- Parking – Additional off-street parking was welcomed but concerns were raised about the potential increase in the number of vehicle access points across pedestrian and cycle lanes.
- Street art – Well received idea. One respondent suggested that there be more opportunities for local artists to create installations in the street.
- Pedestrian crossing - While kerb build-outs were generally well received for the opportunities they give for pedestrians crossing the street, a number of respondents requested that the existing pedestrian crossing be retained or that new pedestrian crossings be created.
- Coronation Street/Selwyn Street intersection – The proposed changes to the intersection were generally supported although some respondents requested a roundabout may be a better solution.
- Traffic – a number of respondents were concerned about the traffic increase anticipated from the changes to Simeon Street and gradual traffic increase anticipated along Brougham Street. A 30 km/hr speed limit was suggested for Selwyn Street through the shopping centre.

Staff comment: Amend action.

Cycle lanes – More design work will be undertaken for the separated cycle lane option to show this in plan form. Consideration will need to be given to how to best reach a compromise between lane widths and/or lane use given that the overall road width is less than ideal to accommodate separated cycle lanes and cater for all other road uses. The number of new vehicle access points to properties will be dependent on the design of new buildings and arrangement for site layouts, however there is the potential to reduce the number of new access points (see discussion on project references B2 and B3).

Landscaping - Details of landscaping are not finalised however, safety will be a primary consideration. Low planting in kerb built-outs can be used to avoid any impact on visibility to road users. These are matters that can be addressed at the detailed planning stage. The Master Plan can, however, be amended to include further reference to CPTED, mobility and safety issues.

Brougham Street Intersection – Pedestrian crossing of Brougham Street is recognised as an issue. There is limited scope for changing the crossing due to the classification and control of

Brougham Street. Following the response to this draft Plan and the anticipated upgrade to Selwyn Street north of Brougham, Council staff will be looking at the design of this intersection with regard to the positioning of the crossing points. The provision for cycles at the intersection will be examined in more detail as part of the further work on separated cycle lane design for Selwyn Street.

Pedestrian crossing – the existing pedestrian crossing shall be retained. Informal crossing points will be created by the kerb build-outs but there is insufficient room along Selwyn Street through the shops to safely add additional formalised crossing points.

Selwyn Street/Coronation Street – as part of the design process for the draft Plan a roundabout option for the intersection was investigated. While this would have a number of the benefits that some respondents mentioned, there is insufficient road space to allow for a roundabout/road layout that could cater for all sizes of vehicles.

Signage – This is one area where the formation of an effective business association could help in developing a brand for the Selwyn Street Shops. This could then be complemented by careful use of street signage and furniture over which the Council will have more direct control.

S2 – Church Hall Frontage

Submissions: 13

Like: 12

Dislike: 1

Issues/Themes raised:

A well supported project. The only concern raised was for the effect of landscaping on visibility and traffic. Some respondents commented in more general terms on the future use of the church hall to serve a community function.

Staff comment: Amend action.

Details of landscaping are not finalised and there are a wide variety of different landscaping options that can be used to address different safety issues that may arise. Safety will be a primary consideration at the detailed design stage of implementation. The Master Plan can be amended to make further reference to the consideration of safety matters, including CPTED, mobility and traffic safety, when detailed design work is undertaken.

Project Area – Natural environment

N1 – Selwyn Street Reserve

Submissions: 29

Like: 18

Dislike: 9

Issues/Themes raised:

- The daylighting of Jackson's creek generated approximately equal measure of positive and negative comments. A number of respondents liked the idea of exposing the stream and the improvement to the reserve this may bring. Concerns were raised regarding safety for children, and that the stream would collect windswept or dumped rubbish, or attract rats to the area.
- Play facilities – Additional play equipment or activities were sought.
- Dog control – a number of respondents requested that the reserve upgrade include

- an element of dog control and bins for dog mess.
- Toilets – Some suggestions for toilets to be removed while others wanted them retained and upgraded.
- Brougham Street – a few respondents questioned the usability of the reserve given the close approximation to Brougham Street. Suggestions included fencing the reserve along the northern edge (to make it safer for young children) and increase landscaping/planting to buffer the reserve from the traffic noise.
- Reserve development overall – Some respondents questioned the need for further work on the reserve, stating that it was adequate in its current form.

Staff comment: Amend action.

Jackson's Creek has surface flowing water in a number of other locations where it has been opened to daylight, notably in Addington Park, as have many other waterways across the city that are similar. The perceived safety issues in Selwyn Street would be similar to those waterways already developed like the proposal for Jackson's Creek. The Master Plan can be amended to include further details of how safety may be addressed and commentary on the outcome for similar projects elsewhere in the City.

The draft Plan has proposed that in the reserve and in other locations there may be opportunities to install street art. This is intended to serve a dual purpose of street enhancement and for children to play. One of the intentions in the naturalisation of Jackson's Creek is to make the reserve more interesting for children. More formalised facilities for play (with play equipment) are provided in nearby Simeon Park.

The draft Plan has proposed the retention of the toilet block. This is functional and has service life remaining. A longer term recommendation would be to revisit the toilet block design when the current facility requires replacement.

The Plan shall be amended to show an alternative option to introduce more landscaping to allude to the presence of Jackson's Creek without exposing the water.

Project Area – Recovery together

R1 – Case Management		
Submissions: 18	Like: 18	Dislike: 0
<p>Issues/Themes raised:</p> <p>This project was well received and a number of respondents noted the importance of assisting land and business owners in the recovery of the centre.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Retain action.</p> <p>Case management is taking place in parallel to the Master Plan process. Continued assistance has been offered to land owners and plans for rebuilding on some sites within the centre are progressing.</p>		
R2 – Local Business Association		
Submissions: 15	Like: 15	Dislike: 0

Issues/Themes raised:

A business association for the Selwyn Street Shops was enthusiastically endorsed by respondents. One respondent suggested that the business association may include local resident representation.

Staff Comment: Retain action.

The master plan process has provided some additional opportunities for dialogue between local business and property owners. The Master Plan aims to support the formation of a business association.

Project Area – Future concepts**F1 – Church precinct**

Submissions: 19

Like: 15

Dislike: 4

Issues/Themes raised:

Many of the ideas shown for the future use of the church area were well received by respondents. The main concern with potential future development of the area was the introduction of a higher density residential element.

Staff comment: Retain action.

The church site and the surrounding area is zoned for Living 3 residential so an element of medium density housing in any future development of the site would be consistent with what can potentially be built nearby.

Hearings

The submission form asked respondents to state their general preference to be heard if hearings are to take place. Thirteen people stated they wished to be heard (27% of all submissions). As respondents were asked to state their overall preference for hearings rather than their desire to be heard on one or more specific points it is not possible to directly associate hearing requests to specific projects. Some respondents who requested to be heard did, however, clearly focus their submission on specific areas of the draft Plan.

The thirteen respondents who indicated their wish to be heard commented on a range of projects within the draft Plan. Table 1 below shows for each project the number of respondents who commented on a specific project and has also indicated their overall preference to be heard. It also shows the number of those respondents that indicated an overall 'like' or 'don't like' for each project (not all did). Overall totals are provided to give an indicative guide of the number of points overall on which respondents wish to be heard.

Table 1 – Hearing Requests by Project

Project Reference		Submissions that wish to be heard: Total	Submissions that wish to be heard that: Like	Submissions that wish to be heard that: Don't Like
Built Environment	B1	5	5	1
	B2	8	5	2
	B3	5	4	1
Street and Movement	S1	10	6	1
	S2	4	3	0
Natural Environment	N1	7	7	2
Recovery Together	R1	6	6	0
	R2	3	6	0
Future Concepts	F1	4	4	1
Overall Totals		52	46	8

Analysis of comments

In most submissions respondents have indicated either a 'like' or 'don't like' overall preference for each project. However, respondents also included both positive and negative comments in the written part of their submission relating to each project. For this reason, in addition to recording the proportion of 'like' and 'don't like' responses further analysis was undertaken of the individual comments contained within each submission in order to give a clearer, but still general, indication of how each project was viewed.

Over 350 individual comments were identified. Of these it was possible to assign 283 to one or more specific projects. Other comments were either general in nature or addressed matters outside the scope of the master plan. Of those comment assigned to a specific project, each was assessed as being either a positive, negative or neutral. Table 2 below shows the total number of comments assigned to each project and the proportion that were assessed as either positive, negative or neutral.

Table 2 – Comment Analysis

Project Area and Reference		Total number of comments	Proportion Positive	Proportion Negative	Proportion Neutral
Built Environment	B1	33	70%	18%	12%
	B2	44	50%	39%	11%
	B3	27	56%	26%	18%
Street and Movement	S1	72	44%	46%	10%
	S2	13	85%	7%	8%
Natural Environment	N1	39	56%	44%	0%
Recovery Together	R1	19	95%	5%	0%
	R2	15	100%	0%	0%
Future Concepts	F1	21	76%	19%	5%

From this analysis it is clear that there is overall support for the draft projects and that, other than S1, all of the individual projects had more positive than negative comments.

Attachment 2 to the report: *Submissions on the Draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan*. Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board, 1 May 2012

*Consultation Report for the
draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan*

*April 2012
Suburban Centres Programme*

Table of Contents

Introduction and purpose	3
Structure	3
Part 1 – The consultation process	3
Submission format	4
Consultation response	4
Part 2 – Analysis of submissions to the draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan	4
Analysis process	4
Submission analysis	5
Section 1 – Comment on the Master Plan overall	5
Section 2 – Comments on Projects and project areas	5
Project Area – Built environment	6
<i>General comment applicable across the project area:</i>	6
<i>Project Reference B1 – 320 Selwyn Street and 57 Somerset Crescent</i>	6
<i>Project Reference B2 – 299 Selwyn Street</i>	7
<i>Project Reference B3 – South-east block</i>	8
Project Area - Street and movement	9
<i>Project Reference S1 – Street scene and roads</i>	9
<i>Project Reference S2 – Church Hall frontage</i>	11
Project Area - Natural Environment	11
<i>Project Reference N1 – Selwyn Street Reserve</i>	11
Project Area – Recovery Together	12
<i>Project Reference R1 – Case Manager</i>	12
<i>Project Reference R2 – Local Business Association</i>	12
Project Area – Future Concepts	13
<i>Project Reference F1 – The church precinct</i>	13
Quantitative summary	13
Section 3 – Other comments	14
Section 4 – Priority and urgency	14
Section 5 – Verbal and other feedback	15
Part 3 – Hearings	16
Appendix 1 – List of respondents and summary of preferences	17

Introduction and purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the consultation process undertaken for the draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan (the draft Plan) that was published by Christchurch City Council in December 2011. The report presents and summarises the public comments made on the plan during the seven week consultation period that closed in mid-February 2012. Comments were received from local residents, business owners, land holders and a variety of business, community and government organisations.

Structure

Part 1 provides a summary of the consultation process and the response this generated from the community. Part 2 contains the analysis of the submissions. Part 3 provides commentary on submitters preference for hearings on the submissions. Appendix 1 to this report provides full list of respondents to the draft Plan; their preference for a hearing; the projects they liked and did not like and which they wish to help implement.

Part 1 – The consultation process

The draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan was adopted for public consultation by the Christchurch City Council at the meeting of 24 November 2011. This followed a recommendation for adoption of the Plan for consultation by the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board on 18 November 2011.

The draft Plan and a summary document were published on 19 December 2011 with a consultation period that ran until 17 February 2012. Copies of the full plan were distributed to local businesses, land owners within Selwyn Street and to others who had requested a full copy. A summary of the Plan was distributed to over 2,000 local residential households. Both the full Plan and the summary document included a submission form and details on how to alternatively make a submission electronically, and how to obtain additional information. In addition, both the Plan and summary document were made available for download in portable document format (pdf) on the Council's 'Have Your Say' website and hard copies were placed in all open Council libraries and service centres. Submissions were also possible via the 'Have Your Say' website or by a dedicated email address for the Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan project.

Two drop-in days were run in late February in the church hall, 42 Selwyn Street. These were on Wednesday the 8th and Saturday the 11th of February. At each of the drop-in sessions poster versions of the concepts contained in the draft Plan were displayed and copies of the full plan available for viewing. Staff were present to answer any questions. Submission forms were available and informal comments encouraged. Both sessions were reasonably well attended with approximately sixty people visiting over the two days.

Submission format

The submission form and 'Have Your Say' website invited respondents to comment on each of the spatial and non-spatial projects contained within the draft Plan and to express an overall 'like' or 'don't like' opinion. Respondents were asked to state which of the projects they believed to be the most important and which the most urgent. A field for other comments was provided and respondents were also asked to indicate if they would like to present their submission at Council hearings if the opportunity arose.

Consultation response

The majority of submissions made to the draft Plan were from local residents, land owners and business owners. A number of submissions were also received from a variety of community and business groups as well as non-government organisations. Two submissions were submitted anonymously.

In total, 49 submissions were received. Of these nineteen were made using the submission form (seven of which were received at the public 'drop-in' sessions). Eighteen submissions were received electronically via the 'Have Your Say' website. The remaining eleven submissions were by informal letter or email. A number of the latter group of submissions did follow a similar format to the submission form (i.e. by the use of project references and the stating of like/dislike preference, priority and/or urgency).

In total, thirteen respondents indicated that if the opportunity arose they would like to present their submission at a Council hearing.

Part 2 – Analysis of submissions to the draft Selwyn Street Shops Master Plan

Analysis process

The format of the Plan and the submission form encouraged respondents to comment on the specific spatial and non-spatial projects contained within the plan. The majority of submissions followed the submission format which aided analysis.

The number of responses to each project reference where either 'like' or 'don't like' was recorded. In addition each submission was objectively read to identify individual comments which were recorded against one or more of the projects contained within the draft Plan. From the 49 submissions more than 350 individual comments were identified. Of these 283 were assessed as relevant to specific projects.

Each comment was assessed and recorded as a 'positive', 'negative' or 'neutral' comment against one or more of the projects contained within the Plan. Comments

were recorded against an individual project more than once where, for example, a comment contained both a 'positive', 'negative and/or 'neutral' component.

Submission analysis

This analysis is in five sections. The first section provides commentary on submissions that were made on either the Plan overall, the processes involved in developing the Plan or the consultation process itself. The second section of this analysis provides feedback on each project area and on the individual projects contained within the Plan. The third section concerns the few comments that discussed themes uncommon with other submissions to the Plan or that were outside the scope of the project. The fourth section provides analysis of the responses received to the questions of 'priority' and 'urgency' that were asked on the submission form. The fifth and final section provides a brief commentary on the verbal and non-formal feedback received during the course of developing the draft Plan and also that received at the two 'drop-in' days.

Section 1 – Comment on the Master Plan overall

The vast majority of comments received were specific to the individual projects or project areas of the draft Plan. Some respondents made more general comments on the overall draft Plan:

- A number of respondents were generally positive about the draft Plan and vision it presented for the Selwyn Street Shops.
- One respondent felt there was little in the draft Plan to address the health outcomes for the local community. Another suggested that the draft Plan be assessed against the World Health Organisation *checklist for friendly cities*.
- One respondent felt that the draft Plan placed too much emphasis on gaining the support of local business owners.
- One respondent felt that the draft Plan should try to respond to the changing demographic in the area that was showing a trend towards more 30-40 year olds with young families.

Section 2 – Comments on Projects and project areas

The submissions and comments on each project or project area (where applicable) have been summarised in the tables found in this section. The table for each project section shows the number of respondents who ticked either 'like' or 'don't like' box on the submission form or otherwise clearly indicated their overall preference in their submission (where a form was not used). The second half of each table shows the results of analysing the comments made in each submission to determine which were positive, negative or neutral. The final column in the table is the number of those who gave comment on a specific project and who also indicated a general preference to present their submission to a hearing.

Project Area – Built environment

Overall Project Reference B1 and B2 attracted the majority of the comments on this section of the Plan. Many respondents also commented on the built environment in general terms.

General comment applicable across the project area:

- The mix of shops – many respondents supported a good mix of shops returning to the centre. There was strong support for the return of the café and the fruit and vegetable shop. Concern was expressed about the quality of the shops likely to return to the centre. Some respondents did not want to see a proliferation of second hand shops, take-away or liquor outlets. A number of respondents commented on the future role of the centre as primarily serving local resident's needs rather than competing against the malls (and in particular the nearby Barrington Mall). Others expressed a concern about the overall appeal of the shopping area and the risk of failing to find tenants leading to 'rows of empty shops'.
- Post-office – One respondent called for the return of the post-office to the centre and for it to include banking facilities.
- Viability – Concern was raised regarding the ability of prospective shop tenants to afford the rents in the new build premises and the potential for there to be empty shops as there were prior to the earthquakes.
- Character – Some respondents wanted the overall character of the new buildings to reflect the character of the area and to also make use of recycled materials from building demolitions where possible. Others wanted to see that new buildings include verandahs which are present on many of the remaining buildings (and were present on those lost).
- Character and identity theme – One submission suggested a re-branding of Selwyn Street as a village in the style and setting of the fictional British television drama 'Coronation Street'. The aim to be to attract tourists to the centre. The respondent suggested that the character of the drama's setting (a northern English industrial city) may be reflected in the rebuild of the Selwyn Street Shops. New community facilities could be themed accordingly and include a new theatre. The existing 'Celtic Arms' could be renamed the 'Rovers Return' and sponsorship sought from the BBC [sic], tourism Council or developers.

Project Reference B1 – 320 Selwyn Street and 57 Somerset Crescent

Total	Overall:		Positive	Comments:		Hearing 'Yes'
	Like	Don't Like		Negative	Neutral	
30	19	3	23	6	4	5

- Landmark and use – Generally a positive response to the concept overall. In particular there was support for seeing a 'landmark' building developed on the site to take advantage of the location on the corner of Brougham Street

and Selwyn Street. There was strong support for the former use of the site for the Sylvan Café and a number of respondents expressed their desire to see the café return to the site (or at the least to the centre).

- Urban design - The criticism of the concept focused on the design and height. A number of respondents did not want a building taller than two storeys on the site. Two respondents (7, 37) felt that a radical design (as shown in the concept) was not appropriate for the centre.
- Parking - A number of suggestions were made for the site including the provision for cycle parking and for access arrangements for large vehicles to be considered.

Project Reference B2 – 299 Selwyn Street

Total	Overall:		Positive	Comments:		Hearing 'Yes'
	Like	Don't Like		Negative	Neutral	
30	19	4	22	17	5	8

Summary

Overall there was a generally positive response to the project, although a number of submissions included criticisms of some aspects of the concept. Some of the main topics for comments were:

- Urban design – Retaining the street frontage was favoured by many submitters. Others would prefer to see the buildings pulled to the back of the site, with car parking to the front (the shops on the corner of Tennyson Street and Colombo Street in Beckenham was given as an example). The design shown in the concept was criticised by some submitters as being too bold for the centre and that the design should better reflect what has been lost.
- Building height – There was some concern expressed for three storey building heights. Most of those respondents that commented on height would prefer a maximum of two storeys and one respondent (13) requested single storey only for the site.
- Mixed use – Overall a mix of commercial and retail use was well supported. Adding residential use on the site received approximately equal measure of positive and negative comments. Some respondents welcomed the mix of residential into the site for the potential to bring after hours life to the centre, while in contrast others were concerned about potential noise issues and conflict between commercial and residential uses.
- Vehicular access safety – additional parking to the rear of the site was welcomed but a number of respondents raised concerns around the safety of vehicle crossings off Selwyn Street and Rosewarne Street. There was concern expressed by some respondents for the potentially unsafe interaction of vehicles with pedestrians/cyclists at the proposed additional access point close to the Coronation Street/Selwyn Street junction. One respondent (10) suggested that expansion of the business activity into the adjoining

residential sections would afford greater flexibility in site design and provide the space to better resolve issues of vehicle access.

- **Public Spaces** – The creation of new public spaces as part of the development was supported. Some respondents (1) suggested potential for other attractions to be added including children's play equipment or art works. Some concerns were raised regarding cafes spilling into the pedestrian area and the addition of landscaping. The potential hindrance for disabled persons access along the pavement that this use may have was highlighted in particular (45).
- **Zone Expansion** – One respondent (10) commented on the need to expand into adjoining residential plots in order to make the develop financially viable and address parking and access issues.
- **Viability** – One respondent (10) questioned the financial viability of redevelopment based on the economic assessment included in the draft Plan.

Project Reference B3 – South-east block

Overall:			Comments:			Hearing
Total	Like	Don't Like	Positive	Negative	Neutral	'Yes'
23	15	3	15	7	5	5

- **Design** – The single storey element was welcomed by some respondents while others preferred the two storey element. A number of respondents wanted the design to better reflect what had been lost or to include character buildings with a modern element to them and that the concept shown was too boxy and angular. New Regent Street in the Christchurch CBD was given as an aspiration example by one respondent.
- **Access** – Two respondents raised concerns about vehicle access to the rear parking and the safety risks to pedestrians and cyclists inherent in vehicle crossing points. Another respondent would like provision made for delivery vehicles to the site.
- **Pocket Park** – The use of the (privately owned) green space immediately to the south of the buildings was supported.

Project Area - Street and movement

The majority of comments in this project area concerned the street scene in general, with a significant proportion of comments concerning the addition of cycle lanes to Selwyn Street and the form these may take.

Project Reference S1 – Street scene and roads

Overall:			Comments:			Hearing
Total	Like	Don't Like	Positive	Negative	Neutral	'Yes'
40	18	6	32	33	7	10

Cycle Lane Preference ¹ :	
On-street	Separated
5	10

- Cycle lanes – A majority of the respondents discussed the creation of cycle lanes along Selwyn Street. Overall the idea of cycle lanes, in some form, was supported. Reasons given included the safety aspect, overall improved health of residents and sustainability. Of those that indicated a preference, ten were in favour of cycle lanes separated from traffic with one respondent suggesting that adequate facilities are those which parents feel comfortable in allowing their young children to use. Five respondents favoured the on-street option, the concern of cycle/pedestrian conflict in the separated alternative being the most common reason given for this preference.
- Cycle Lanes- Concerns were raised over the demarcation of road width for each lane and specifically over the width of the proposed cycle lanes, at 1.5 meters, putting the riders of cycles at risk from opening car doors (24, 25, 27, 44 and others). Lanes widths of 1.8 meters minimum were suggested with 2 meter widths, adequate buffer zone (for door swing) and also a change in level between lanes was seen as desirable. One respondent (44) provided in detail a number of alternative cross-section space allocation options for consideration in a redesign. A number of other comments were made that requested changes to the design details of the on-street cycle lane option (that was shown in plan form in the draft Plan), for example, at the Brougham Street intersection.
- Cycle Lanes - Other respondents commented on the apparent conflict for space in the street between car parking and adequate cycle lane facilities. One suggested solution was for more pooled off-street parking for the centre as a whole, thereby reducing some of the need for on-street parking space and allowing some of it to be removed to accommodate cycle facilities.
- Cycle Lanes – some respondents were concerned about delays in implementing the actions of the draft Plan. There was concern that the time

¹ A number of submissions commented on cycle lanes but did not specify a preferred choice of on-street or separated cycle lanes. In some cases, notably in the submission by SPOKES, alternative arrangements and/or cycle lane measurements were suggested.

scale for implementation was too extended and dependent upon funds becoming available.

- Street signage – One respondent requested a consistent approach to signage on the street and buildings, potentially through the use of a design code.
- Brougham Street intersection – A number of respondents expressed their safety concerns at the Brougham Street/Selwyn Street intersection. Generally respondents considered the intersection to be unsafe for all transport users and particularly unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. Respondents generally felt that the draft Plan could have done more to address this issue. Some suggestions were made regarding potential changes which included the physical separation of the cycle lane to prevent lane splitting by left turning cars (the south-bound Strickland Street approach to Brougham Street was provided as an example of where this activity causes problems), or alternatively restricting lane width to discourage lane splitting. Other suggestions included extending the pedestrian crossing times for Brougham Street and providing a pedestrian/cycle overpass or tunnel.
- Kerb build-outs and landscape – These were generally well received for the opportunities they afforded for ease of crossing, additional street landscaping and more seating. Concerns were raised over the impact these may have on safety for cyclists (e.g. road narrowing at junctions) and the potential for landscaping to restrict drivers view of the road. One respondent (45) was concerned that they introduced potential obstacles into the street environment for partially sighted people. One respondent did not want to see more trees in the street.
- Parking – Additional off-street parking was welcomed but concerns were raised from some respondents about the potential increase in the number of vehicle access points crossing pedestrian and cycle lanes. One respondent (14) suggested that Somerset Crescent be widened to increase on-street parking supply in the area. One respondent (44) requested cycle parking be convenient, secure and adequate (and expandable facilities for future increases in demand), with a requirement that 20% of trips to the centre (both visitor and employees) be by cycle
- Street art – This aspect of the draft Plan was well supported. One respondent (41) suggested that there be more opportunities for local artists to create installations in the street in a similar fashion to what has been done in Addington in recent years.
- Pedestrian crossing – While kerb build-outs were generally well received for the opportunities they give for pedestrians crossing the street, a number of respondents requested that the existing pedestrian crossing be retained or that new pedestrian crossings be created.
- Rosewarne Street – One respondent (8) was concerned about any further narrowing of Rosewarne Street would negatively impact upon the ability of the street to accommodate school related traffic, parking and any increase in traffic as a result of the Simeon Street/Brougham Street intersection changes.
- Coronation Street/Selwyn Street intersection – The proposed changes to the intersection were generally supported although some respondents suggested that a roundabout may be a better solution (18, 44).

- Traffic – a number of respondents were concerned about the traffic increase anticipated from the changes to Simeon Street and gradual traffic increase anticipated along Brougham Street. One respondent (11) suggested this may compromise redevelopment of the area and requested that a traffic plan be developed that takes into account this impact.
- Speed Limit – With the draft Plans emphasis on cycle and pedestrian use of the street, one respondent suggested that a 30 km/hr speed limit for vehicle was more appropriate through the shopping area.
- Large Vehicle Access – One respondent wished to ensure that access and parking for large vehicles (service and delivery vehicles etc) was maintained in the street and for new buildings with servicing to the rear of the site.

Project Reference S2 – Church Hall frontage

Overall:			Comments:			Hearing
Total	Like	Don't Like	Positive	Negative	Neutral	'Yes'
13	12	1	12	1	0	4

- This project was well supported by respondents. Suggestions were made regarding the future of the church hall itself. One respondent wanted the church hall to be redecorated while another thought it could have its profile raised and be used as more of a focus for the community and community events.
- Road safety concerns were raised by one respondents around the potential for new landscaping and planting to obscure the view for traffic of the intersection of Selwyn Street and Somerset Crescent.

Project Area - Natural Environment

Project Reference N1 – Selwyn Street Reserve

Overall submissions:			Comments:			Hearing
Total	Like	Don't Like	Positive	Negative	Neutral	'Yes'
29	18	9	22	17	0	7

- Jackson's Creek – The daylighting of Jackson's creek generated generally equal measure of positive and negative comments. A number of respondents like the idea of exposing the stream and the improvement to the reserve this may bring. Concerns were raised regarding water safety, in particular for children from the nearby schools and play centre. A number of respondents were concerned that the exposed stream will attract rubbish dumping, collect windswept rubbish or attract rats to the area. One respondent (14) suggested that Jackson's Creek no longer had aesthetic value, now primarily being a storm water drain, and should be left flowing underground. Another respondent suggested keeping the actual flow underground but alluding to the Creek's presence on the surface through the use of landscaping, planting and rocks.

- Jackson's Creek – One respondent (47) suggested using the Creek to create a small pond in the reserve to attract ducks and cater for model boat sailing.
- Play facilities – One group of respondents (1, 19) requested additional facilities for children in the reserve. Suggestions included the addition of play equipment, a skate ramp and a BMX track.
- Dog control – a number of respondents requested that the reserve upgrade include dog control and bins for dog mess.
- Cycle lanes – one respondent (11) suggested incorporating a left-turn cycle only lane (from Selwyn Street to Brougham Street) into part of the reserve.
- Toilets – One respondent (40) wanted the toilets removed from the reserve and incorporated into the new shopping area. A number of others wanted to see the toilets retained and upgraded, in particular to a design more suitable for disabled users.
- Brougham Street and the reserve – a few respondents questioned the usability of the reserve given the close approximation to Brougham Street. Suggestions to address this issue included fencing the reserve along the northern edge (to make it safer for young children) and increase landscaping/planting to buffer the reserve from the traffic noise. One respondent (27) suggested replanting the reserve to re-focus it south towards the church hall. Another suggested fencing the reserve to create a hidden park.
- The need for development – Two respondents (34, 43) questioned the need for further work on the reserve, stating that it was adequate in its current form.

Project Area – Recovery Together

Project Reference R1 – Case Manager

Overall:			Comments:			Hearing
Total	Like	Don't Like	Positive	Negative	Neutral	'Yes'
18	18	0	18	1	0	6

- This project was well received and a number of respondents noted the importance of assisting land and business owners in restabilising in the centre.
- One respondent (47) noted the importance of the consenting team at the Council being involved in this process.
- One respondent (25) was concerned that council funds may be used to support existing businesses at the expense of others trying to become established.

Project Reference R2 – Local Business Association

Overall:			Comments:			Hearing
Total	Like	Don't Like	Positive	Negative	Neutral	'Yes'
15	15	0	15	0	0	3

- The idea of a business association for the Selwyn Street Shops was enthusiastically endorsed by respondents. One respondent (29) suggested that the business association may include local resident representation.

Project Area – Future Concepts

Project Reference F1 – The church precinct

Overall:			Comments:			Hearing
Total	Like	Don't Like	Positive	Negative	Neutral	'Yes'
19	15	4	16	4	1	4

- Most respondents liked the future vision for the church area. Some saw it as an opportunity to improve part of Selwyn Street that does not look good at present, while others liked the opportunity this might create for community gardens. Some respondent endorsed residential development but urged that this was done carefully and that the impact on neighbours was fully assessed.
- Some respondents did not welcome the potential for more or higher density residential development in the area. One respondent (11) suggested that part of the land could be purchased to create a cycle lane through the area.

Quantitative summary

The total number of Likes is 149 and the total number of dislikes is 30. The three most commented on projects in descending order were: S1 – Street scene, B2 – 299 Precinct and N1 – Selwyn Street Reserve.

Table 1 below shows the total number of comments assigned to all projects and the proportion of these that were assessed as positive, negative or neutral.

Table 1 – Comment weighting summary

Project Area and Reference		Total number of comments	Proportion positive	Proportion Negative	Proportion Neutral
Built Environment	B1	33	70%	18%	12%
	B2	44	50%	39%	11%
	B3	27	56%	26%	18%
Street and Movement	S1	72	44%	46%	10%
	S2	13	85%	7%	8%
Natural Environment	N1	39	56%	44%	0%
Recovery Together	R1	19	95%	5%	0%
	R2	15	100%	0%	0%
Future Concepts	F1	21	76%	19%	5%

Section 3 – Other comments

Some submissions to the Plan contained comments that fell outside the scope of the Master Plan or applied to other areas of Council work in addition to the draft Plan. These comments have been brought to the attention of other parts of the Council where applicable:

- Rosewarne Street – Some respondents were concerned about traffic levels (associated with Simeon Street/Brougham Street intersection changes) and the impact these would have on Rosewarne Street. Other felt that Rosewarne Street is too narrow to support increased traffic volumes while still adequately serving residents, the Selwyn Street Shops and Addington School. The traffic engineers covering the Spreydon area has been made aware of these concerns.
- One respondent was concerned that planning for the city in general (including for Selwyn Street, which has been noted) was not addressing the opportunity to alter the approach to traffic engineering in the City in a way that would cater for active modes of transport. The respondent felt that the mandate that emerged from the Central City Plan '*Share an idea*' process was being ignored. These comments were brought to the attention of the council staff involved in the development of the Christchurch Transport Plan.
- A number of respondents commented on aspects of the other Master Plans currently being completed as part of the Suburban Centres Programme (specifically those for Linwood Village and Sydenham). Comments applicable to Selwyn Street were identified and are addressed in the analysis presented in sections 1 and 2. Copies of these submissions were passed to the appropriate project leaders for the other plans.

Section 4 – Priority and urgency

On the submission form respondents were asked to state which of the projects they would like prioritised and which they considered urgent. Twenty-five respondents completed the 'Priority' section of the form; some listed one or more projects, while others indicated more general priorities. Eighteen respondents completed the 'Urgent' section of the form.

Overall the project areas concerning the built environment and street and movement were considered the highest priority and more urgent. The street and movement topics (cycle lanes, intersections, pedestrian environment and parking) were mentioned most frequently.

Number of respondents indicating priority or urgency to individual projects:

Project:	Priority?	Urgent?
B1	8	6
B2	8	7
B3	3	5
S1	12	9
S2	2	1
N1	6	2
R1	2	3
R2	2	2
F1	1	1

Six respondents suggested the re-build in general, or that the whole Master Plan, should be considered high priority. Three also believed these to be urgent.

Section 5 – Verbal and other feedback

Verbal feedback from visitors to the two consultation drop-in days was positive overall with reference to the event, location and opportunity afforded to discuss the draft Plan with council staff. Approximately sixty people visited the church hall site over the two drop-in days, which compares well to similar consultation events undertaken for similar projects. One person thought the Council had done a good job of communicating with the public on the plan. A number of visitors were keen to share their historical knowledge of the Selwyn Street Shops and some indicated that they would like to see an expanded historical context included in the final Plan.

A number of people attending the drop-in days sought clarification on the extent to which the Council could control the implementation of the Master Plan and, in particular, the pace and type of development on the land in private ownership. Other questions received were around the timing for completion of the plan, the process for doing this and if there would be further consultation on the final draft or any particular aspects of it.

Throughout the process there were frequent enquiries regarding various aspects of the plan, requests for further information and on the timing for completion of the plan. There was discussion with many of the land owners around the redevelopment options and planning processes for their site(s) in Selwyn Street. The draft Plan was discussed at a meeting of the Addington Well-being group and also presented to a meeting of the Addington Neighbourhood Association.

The students of Year 5 (the Green Thumbs) from Addington School, used the Selwyn Street redevelopment as a basis for their class project. They made a well researched and comprehensive submission to the draft Plan.

Part 3 – Hearings

ATTACHMENT 2

Overall thirteen respondents wished to be heard (27% of all submissions). Respondents were asked to state their overall preference for hearings rather than their desire to be heard on one or more specific points. It has therefore not been possible to categorically associate hearing requests to specific projects within in the draft Plan.

The thirteen respondents who indicated their wish to heard commented on a range of projects within the draft Plan. Table 3 lists for each project the number of respondents who commented on each specific project and who also indicated their general preference to be heard. It also shows the number those respondents that clearly indicated an overall 'like' or 'don't like' for each project (not all did).

Table 3 – Hearing Requests

Project Reference		Submissions that wish to be heard: Total	Submissions that wish to be heard that: Like	Submissions that wish to be heard that: Don't Like
Built Environment	B1	5	5	1
	B2	8	5	2
	B3	5	4	1
Street and Movement	S1	10	6	1
	S2	4	3	0
Natural Environment	N1	7	7	2
Recovery Together	R1	6	6	0
	R2	3	6	0
Future Concepts	F1	4	4	1

Appendix 1 – List of respondents and summary of preferences

Note: 'Like' and 'Don't Like' are only recorded where specifically and clearly indicated in submissions.

Number	Name	Organisation	Hearing?	Like	Don't Like
1	Year 5 Green Thumbs	Addington School	Yes	B1, B2, B3, S1, N1, R1, R2	
2	Jeanette Parlane	Individual	Yes		B2, B3
3	Karen Smith	Individual	No	B1, B2, S1, N1, F1	F1
4	Bruce Waddleton	Canterbury DHB	No		
5	Prof. Simon Kingham	Department of Geography, University of Canterbury	Yes		
6	Daniel Hartwell	Individual	No	S1	
7	Pamela G Nunn	Individual	No	F1	B1, B2, B3
8	Matt Sparrow	Individual	Yes		
9	Stephen Phillips	Age Concern	No		
10	Rosie Heaney	Lee Pee Ltd	Yes	B2, S1, N1, R1, R2	B2, S1, N1
11	Derek Kraak	Individual	Yes	B1, S1, N1, R1, R2, F1	B1, S1, N1, F1
12	Pauline Daly	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, S1, S2, N1, R1, R2, F1	
13	Anonymous	Individual	No		
14	Geoff Creed	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, S2, R1, R2, F1	S1, N1
15	Beth M Nobes	Latham House for Mental Health Advocacy and Peer Support..	No		
16	Jessie Trevella	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, S1, S2, N1, R1, R2, F1	
17	Gareth Rodda	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, S1, S2, N1, R1, R2, F1	
18	Meg Christie	Living Streets Canterbury	No	S1	
19	Nial Bleakley	Individual	No		
20	Mike Peters	Paddington Bush Society	Yes	N1	
21	Deborah McCormick/Phi Jopson	Individuals	Yes	B1, B2, B3, S1, S2, N1, R1, R2, F1	
22	Rob Brown	Individual	Yes		
23	John Collins	Road Transport Association	No		
24	A G Talbot	Individual	No		
25	Mark Penrice	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, S1, N1	
26	Linda Pascoe	Individual	No		
27	M A Hadley	Individual	No	B1, B2, S2, R1, R2	S1, N1

Number	Name	Organisation	Hearing?	Like	Don't Like
28	Philip Strang	Individual	No		
29	Trisha Coffin	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, S1, S2, N1, R1, R2, F1	
30	Des Bailey	Individual	No	B1, R1, R2	N1
31	A J Koller	Individual	No		N1
32	Philip Smith	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, S1 S2, R1, R2	N1, F1
33	Trudy van der Weerden	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, N1, R1, R2, F1	
34	John Wilson	Individual	No	N1	
35	Heather Knox	Individual	No		
36	Roger Wakefield	Individual	Yes	B1, B2, B3, S1, S2, N1, R1, R2, F1	
37	Jennie Down	Individual	No		
38	Betty Lancaster	Individual	No		
39	Carol McAlavey	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, S1, S2, N1, R1, R2, F1	
40	Anonymous	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, S1, S2, N1, R1, R2, F1	S1
41	Terry James	Individual	No	B1, B2, B3, S1, S2, N1, R1, R2, F1	
42	Tim Steward/Helen Alderson	Individuals	No	N1	B2
43	Julie Derrick	Individual (also a member of the Addington Neighbourhood Association)	No	B2, R1, R2	B1, B3, S1, S2, N1, F1
44	Keith Turner	SPOKES	Yes		
45	Carina Duke	Royal NZ Foundation for the Blind	Yes		
46	LA & MJ Mckee	Individual	No		
47	Colin Stokes	Individual	Yes	B1, B2, B3, S1, S2, N1, R1, R2, F1	
48	Murray Horton	Individual	No		
49	Neil Smith and Glenys Lloyd – Smith	Individual	No		

Wish to Assist

Respondents were asked if they wish to assist in the implementation and if this in any particular aspects of the draft Plan. The following list shows the submitter number, name and in what way they wished to assist (if stated).

#4, Canterbury District Health Board, is keen to work in partnership on any public health related issues that arise from the plan.

#5, Prof. Simon Kingham, wished to assist as an individual.

#11, Derek Kraak, offered assistance on the street layout (traffic plan) and Somerset Crescent layout

#15, Beth M Nobes, offered continued involvement on behalf of the community of mental health and addiction service users/tangate whaiora

#17, Gareth Rodda, wished to assist as an individual.

#20, Mike Peters, as a member of the Addington Bush Society, offered to assist in the restoration of Jackson's Creek

#21, Deborah McCormick and Phi Jopson, offered practical assistance such as gardening in public spaces, painting and where fund raising activities are required, promotion of local amenities.

#30, Des Bailey, wished to assist as an individual.

#37, Jennie Down, is happy to be involved in further consultation for ideas.

#41, Terry James, as a member of the Addington Neighbourhood Association, offered to be involved in art work on Burke Street.

#43, Julie Derrick, as a member of the Addington Neighbourhood Association, wished to assist.

#44, Keith Turner, for SPOKES Canterbury, offered to be involved in the development of infrastructure which meets people's needs for safe and inviting cycling.

#47, Colin Stokes, offered to help in the development of better Council processes for the implementation of key planning strategies and rules.