



24.4.2012

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

24 APRIL 2012

**PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION**

**1. SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT SYDENHAM MASTER PLAN**

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

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is:
  - (a) to inform the Council of the community's response to the draft Sydenham Master Plan (the Plan);
  - (b) to seek a decision on whether or not submissions on the Plan should be heard (in accordance with the Council's resolution on 27 October 2011); and
  - (c) to 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 Sydenham 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 held in late May and early June 2011. The resulting concepts were tested through a series of community feedback presentations in July 2011, which drew 36 submissions, after which the Plan was developed. Having been approved by the Council for public notification in October, the Plan was subject to public consultation over a four-week period from mid November 2012. The Plan drew 43 formal submissions from both individuals and organisations within the community.
4. The 43 submissions were collated and analysed and the overall summary of findings is provided as **Attachment 1**. This shows that far more submissions expressed a liking for the draft actions (244) than a dislike (19). **Attachment 2** lists the actions referred to by the 17 (40 percent) submitters who wish to be heard and whether they like or dislike them. **Attachment 3** contains a concise summary of all 25 actions and other matters covered in submissions, and staff comments as to how the Plan should be amended in relation to each action.

## 1 Cont'd

5. In general, given the high level of support, staff consider that the draft actions can be retained, but with some further amendments to address the matters raised through submissions. Staff do not consider any additional actions are required.
6. On balance, due to the level of community participation in the preparation of the draft Plan, the support for the draft actions, 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.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. Preparation of the Plan within the Strategy and Planning Group's budget was confirmed through the 2011/12 Annual Plan process. Funding for implementation of the Plan will be considered through the 2012/13 Annual Plan process, and subsequent Long Term Plan reviews.

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

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

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. There are no immediate legal considerations, other than having undertaken consultation in accordance with *S.82 Principles of consultation* of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). In summary, these require that, in relation to any decision or other matter:
  - (a) affected persons should have reasonable access to relevant information in a manner and format appropriate to their preferences and needs
  - (b) affected persons should be encouraged to present their views
  - (c) affected persons should be given clear information concerning the purpose of the consultation and the scope of the decisions to be made following consideration of the views presented
  - (d) affected persons who wish to have their views considered should be provided with a reasonable opportunity to do so in a manner and format appropriate to their preferences and needs
  - (e) the views presented should be received with an open mind and given due consideration
  - (f) affected persons who present their views should be provided with information concerning the decision/s and reasons for the decision/s.

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

10. 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 consistent with the Recovery Strategy and Recovery Plans. There is no requirement under *S. 19 Development of Recovery Plans* of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 for Recovery Plans for areas outside the CBD to be subject to public hearings.

## 1 Cont'd

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

11. Yes, as above.

### **ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS**

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

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

13. Yes, as above.

### **ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES**

14. The Plan is consistent with relevant strategies, including the objectives of the 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 Sydenham's 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 three 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. Nearly 120 people participated in these focus group and public meetings in May 2011.
  - Presenting the analysis of the ideas received and starting a dialogue to test with the community whether the concepts arising reflected what they want in late July 2011. Around 150 people attended the community feedback presentation. People could choose to provide feedback via the feedback form provided or by email or letter. People had three weeks from the presentations on the 19 July 2011 until the deadline for feedback on 12 August 2011 to do this. Thirty six submissions were received, all of which informed preparation of the Plan.
  - Having ongoing meetings and dialogue with individuals and organisations from the community.
  - Having the Plan considered by the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board in October 2011 prior to going to the Council.
  - Included in this consultation phase:
    - a four-week submission period, from 19 November until 19 December 2011
    - publicising the details via newspapers, the radio, posters and local networks

## 1 Cont'd

- delivery of:
    - a cover letter explaining the process to date, process forward and consultation details (what, where, when and how), a 24 page summary of the Plan (including how to access it) and a submission form to all land and business owners and anyone who had attended the consultation meetings or who had expressed an interest in the master plan process
    - a cover letter, the full Plan and a submission form to community groups
    - a cover letter and submission form to remaining land owners within the Sydenham industrial area and the wider residential area south of Brougham Street extending south towards Cashmere.
  - The 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; and, if they wish to assist with the implementation of any actions, and which ones. Written submissions were also accepted via the Council's Have Your Say website and emails or letters.
  - Placing of hard copies of the summary Plan, full Plan and submission form at all Council libraries and service centres open, Café 363 and Underground Coffee at The Colombo mall, and the Honey Pot Café, Sydenham.
  - Two drop-in display sessions at The Colombo Mall on 26 November and 8 December 2011 (i.e. on both a weekday and weekend and neither too early nor too late into the submission period).
  - Obtaining key tangata whenua values and objectives to consider in the final version of the Plan from Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (MKT).
17. The Plan drew 43 submissions from both individuals and organisations within the community.

### THE HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

18. In normal circumstances, the Council would consider hearing submissions on a plan of this nature in order to maintain community confidence and encourage ownership of the plan. In considering the question of whether to hold hearings staff have taken into account the following matters:
- 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. The community consultation undertaken in Sydenham was comprehensive resulting in 244 likes and 19 dislikes of the actions identified to achieve the vision overall, clear majority support for the Plan is evident. The Plan anticipates further community consultation being undertaken during its implementation, to develop the detail around projects, and for 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 43 submissions received on the Plan, 17 (40 per cent) of submitters wished to be heard if hearings are held, 14 (32 per cent) don't wish to be heard and 12 (28 per cent) didn't say either way.

## 1 Cont'd

- Who wished to be heard: Notable submitters wishing to be heard include The Hon Ruth Dyson, The Sydenham Business and Community Association and various organisations such as Adult Reading Assistance Scheme, the Sydenham Heritage Trust, Spokes Canterbury, The Royal Foundation for the Blind and the Problem Gambling Foundation.
- The number and nature of actions and submission points on which submitters wish to be heard: In total the 17 submitters wish to be heard on 120 submission points which cover all of the 25 Plan actions. This is detailed in **Attachment 2**.
- The actions on which submitters most frequently wish to be heard: There were six actions identified as wishing to be discussed at hearings by a minimum of six submitters, in some cases these actions were disliked as well as liked in other cases there was only support for these actions however many comments included suggested changes or refinements to these actions:
  - M1: Road corridor review including public transport
  - E4: Former Sydenham School site development framework
  - M4: Cycle infrastructure
  - C2: Support the return of full Sydenham based postal services
  - M2: Parking investigations in the commercial area
  - M3: Pedestrian improvements.
- The level of support (like/dislike) for the actions on which submitters wish to be heard: Of the 120 submission points from submitters that want to be heard, 113 indicated that they liked the draft actions, whilst 7 disliked them. There were six actions that either one or two submitters clearly disliked who wished to be heard, these being:
  - E3: Pilot redevelopment project of a multiple ownership site
  - E4: Former Sydenham School site development framework
  - E5: Railway site opportunities
  - M4: Cycle infrastructure
  - N3: Buchan Park remodel
  - B2: Building Setbacks.
- The circumstances which currently justify a more streamlined approach than the hearing of submissions for the Suburban Centres Programme master plans. These 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, it is estimated that seven working days would be required for the holding of hearings and deliberation on the submissions, of which one day would be required in respect to Sydenham. This assumes that each submitter would only have 10 minutes to verbally present their submissions, similar to the Annual Plan 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.

## 1 Cont'd

19. The tables in **Attachment 2** summarise the actions the subject of submissions by the 17 (40 per cent) of submitters who wish to be heard.
20. On balance it is recommended that submissions should not be heard. This is because there has been considerable opportunity for both verbal and written community input into and feedback on the Plan, from which clear majority support for the Plan is evident. Further community consultation is anticipated during implementation of the Plan. The 40 per cent of submitters who wish to be heard raised submission points relating to all 25 actions. Twelve of those submitters identified only actions they liked and only five submitters identified actions they disliked. In all instances these actions gathered significantly more support than objection.
21. Should 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

22. The tables in **Attachment 3** summarise the submissions on the draft actions and staff comments as to how the Plan should be amended in relation to each draft action. These comments deal with suggestions to the plan where both positive and negative comments concerning an action have been raised. In general, given the high level of support, staff consider that the draft actions can be retained with some further consolidation and/or refinement to address the matters raised through submissions. Staff do not consider any additional actions are required.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) note the overall summary of findings in the Summary of Submissions on the Draft Sydenham Master Plan and the staff comments in relation to each action therein; and
- (b) decide not to hear the 17 submissions received that wish to be heard and endorse amendment of the Draft Sydenham Master Plan in accordance with the staff comments in relation to each action before it is presented for adoption at a later date.

### BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Board recommends to the Council that the staff recommendation be adopted.

### **Overall summary of findings**

This section begins with a discussion of the quantitative results found at the end of the report and then presents a summary of the qualitative findings (comments) discussing the most commented on issues and those that covered multiple areas.

The numbers below are a count of the number of people who identified they *liked/disliked*, or considered *urgent* or *important* on the submission form particular actions in the Plan, or clearly indicated such information on the Have Your Say form or on a submitter created response format.

Overall far more actions were *liked* (244) than *disliked* (19).

The actions that were liked the most were M1: Road corridor review including public transport (13) and C2: Support the return of full Sydenham based postal services (13), followed by M3: Pedestrian improvements (12), E3: Pilot redevelopment project of a multiple ownership site (11), N3: Buchan Park remodel (11) and C4: Investigate suburban community transport opportunities (11).

The results for the actions that were disliked were very low; B2: Building setbacks on Colombo Street being disliked by three respondents and E3: Pilot redevelopment project of a multiple ownership site and B4: Design and character guidance being disliked by two respondents each. It is difficult to draw any conclusions at all from these very low numbers.

The most important and urgent actions identified by respondents also had very low numbers with E1: Love Sydenham marketing and attraction campaign identified by the most respondents as being both important and most urgent, but this only equalled two respondents in each case.

It is not possible to draw any further conclusions than those stated above from this small respondent sample.

Of the 43 submitters, 17 stated that they wished to be heard during a submission process and 14 stated that they didn't wish to be heard. The remaining 12 respondents did not indicate either way if they wished to be heard or not.

Across all the comments made by submitters, a number of issues stood out and were commented on more than others. There is further discussion of each of these actions within the body of the report, but a short summary of the key issues for each of the most discussed actions is presented below.

E1: Love Sydenham marketing and attraction campaign - most respondents liked this action, and encouraged quick adoption of the prospectus. Other respondents made suggestions to improve or clarify aspects of this action in finer detail. Some agreed with the action but wanted a different name for the campaign.

M1: Road corridor review including public transport – all respondents commenting on this action agreed that a review of the public transport systems is necessary. A number of suggestions made about how this action should be achieved.

N3: Buchan Park remodel– responses to this action were mixed, although the majority of respondents seem to support the Buchan Park remodel as it would make a range of new relaxation and leisure activities possible.

C2: Support the return of full Sydenham based postal services - respondents strongly supported this action as it would: allow business owners to walk to the post office thus supporting active transport; encourage shopping in the same area of post collection; provide a community hub; and restore a key service for the centre.

B1: Targeted residential activities around Buchan Park - respondents were generally supportive of this action and felt that increasing the residential capacity in Sydenham (particularly 2 -3 storey housing) was essential to the success of the Plan.

**SYDENHAM'S CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE CENTRAL CITY IS CONSIDERED A REAL OPPORTUNITY FOR FUTURE REGENERATION OF THE AREA. A NUMBER OF COMMENTS SUGGESTED THOUGH THAT SYDENHAM SHOULD RETAIN ITS OWN CHARACTER AND BE ENHANCED IN A WAY THAT BOTH DRAWS ON SYDENHAM'S PAST AND DEVELOPS IN A WAY THAT IS DRIVEN AND SUPPORTED BY THE CURRENT BUSINESS PEOPLE. RESPONDENTS ARE SUPPORTIVE OF IDEAS THAT THEY CONSIDER WILL ENHANCE THE DEVELOPMENT OF BUSINESS IN THE FUTURE AND WISH TO BE INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS.**

## ATTACHMENT 2

The following table summarises the actions the subject of submissions by the 17 (40%) of submitters who wish to be heard. This table reflects where submitters have clearly stated which actions they like or dislike and what they would wish to discuss at a hearing. In some instance submitters have made general comments regarding issues and may have supported an overall action but wish to see changes or refinements to these actions, these are discussed in the section following the table.

Action # and description	Submitters who wish to be heard that: Like	Submitters who wish to be heard that: Dislike	Submitters who wish to be heard: Total and as % of those who wish to be heard
<i>E1: Love Sydenham marketing and attraction campaign</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Dorothy Haywood Barry Columbus Rod Stuart Sarah Epperson		5=29%
<i>E2: Appoint a Sydenham case manager</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Dorothy Haywood Barry Columbus Rod Stuart Sarah Epperson		5=29%
<i>E3: Pilot redevelopment project of a multiple ownership site</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Dorothy Haywood Rod Stuart	Barry Columbus	4=24%
<i>E4: Former Sydenham School site development framework</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Dorothy Haywood Barry Columbus Rod Stuart Rob Jamieson	David Harman Sue Russell	7=41%
<i>E5: Railway site property opportunities</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Rod Stuart Tom Williams	Barry Columbus	4=24%
<i>M1: Road corridor review including public transport</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Maureen M Vance Dorothy Haywood Barry Columbus Meg Christie Rod Stuart Tom Williams Sarah Epperson Keith Turner		9=53%
<i>M2: Parking investigations in the commercial area</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Dorothy Haywood Meg Christie Rod Stuart Tom Williams Sarah Epperson		6=35%
<i>M3: Pedestrian improvements</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Dorothy Haywood		6=35%



## ATTACHMENT 2

<i>community transport opportunities</i>	Barry Columbus Rod Stuart Carina Duke		
<i>C5: Local landscape and heritage interpretation</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Dorothy Haywood Barry Columbus Rod Stuart		4=24%
<i>B1: Targeted residential activities around Buchan Park</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Dorothy Haywood Rod Stuart Sarah Epperson		4=24%
<i>B2: Building setbacks on Colombo Street</i>	David Harman Hon Ruth Dyson Rod Stuart	Joe Bell	4=24%
<i>B3: Develop supportive City Plan amendments</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Dorothy Haywood Rod Stuart		3=18%
<i>B4: Design and character guidance</i>	Hon Ruth Dyson Dorothy Haywood Rod Stuart		3=18%
Total all actions	113	7	120

All actions were identified by a minimum of three submitters who wished to be heard and who stated they liked the actions. The Sydenham Business and Community Association have stated verbally that they would like to be heard if hearings are held, their written submission discussed all actions and was in general support for the plan with recommended changes.

Attachment 3 to this report discusses each of the 25 actions of the Plan and how they could be amended taking into account the issues raised by these submitters who wish to be heard and balanced against other comments received in support of these actions.

## ATTACHMENT 3

The following table summarises the submissions on and staff comments as to how the Plan should be amended in relation to each draft action.

Business and economy		
<b>E1: Love Sydenham marketing and attraction campaign</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 10	Dislike:0
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> Most submitters liked this action and encouraged a quick outcome; suggestions were made to improve or clarify aspects of this action in finer detail</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> The Sydenham Business and Community Association have been working on this action in consideration of its importance to the area in both its ability to attract new businesses and in changing the perception of the area. This action was considered by submitters to be one of the more important and urgent actions reflective of the desire of the community for help to get businesses up and running again.</p> <p>Having raised the funds independently, the association has recently devised a marketing strategy, by employing a local company Studio Publica, to promote Sydenham as a destination and a place to do business.</p> <p>This action should be amended as it would be counterproductive to work on a separate marketing and attraction campaign to that already being undertaken by the local community . However this action E1 should retain and strengthen the support for the Sydenham Business and Community Association to implement the campaign as this will be on-going.</p>		
<b>E2: Appoint a Sydenham case manager</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 10	Dislike:0
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> Most comments related to the skills required of the Case Manager and that these needed to include business experience, an approachable manner with good collaboration and communication skills and be responsive to the needs of the community in their support role in the rebuild of the area. The SBCA are looking at the possibility of funding a post that would help meet and promote the needs of the community.</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> The role of the Case Manager if funded by CCC or if funded by other means needs to clearly define the scope of the role as many issues raised by the businesses and owners may fall outside the scope of the CCC influence. Possibly a Case Manager funded by several separate entities could have wider scope of influence and usefulness in the recovery. However, the Case Manager also needs understanding of the operations and relationship between the Council and other government and non-government agencies with which they will need to liaise. This action needs to be amended to ensure the role of case manager fits the needs of the community.</p>		
<b>E3: Pilot redevelopment project of a multiple ownership site</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 9	Dislike:2
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> This action could help landowners with issues such as party walls and may make it easier regarding site investigations and economies of scale for adjoining owners to work together making the best use of limited resources (including engineers, architects and suppliers). Others felt that this should be left to individuals to sort out.</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> This action is worth pursuing to enable good urban design outcomes and to assist owners who may struggle through the rebuild process as individuals and to avoid where possible piecemeal and ad-hoc development. This generally applies to sites that were originally built as one building and consist of narrow sites with party walls making individual development with good urban design outcomes more difficult.</p> <p>The submitter who disliked this action and wished to be heard considered that this would be a "pipe dream" suggesting that this would not be workable however this is outweighed by the number of responders who liked this action. E3 also attracted support as both an important and urgent action.</p> <p>Information gathered as part of this action whether it leads to an eventual development or not, due to the complexities of the individual financial and personal situations of the individual property owners, would be of benefit to many other commercial locations throughout the City</p>		

## ATTACHMENT 3

ATTACHMENT 3		
<b>E4: Former Sydenham School site development framework</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 10	Dislike:1
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> A number of the submitters on this action who wished to be heard have proposals for alternative uses they would like the Council to consider for this site. There were many comments over the future use of the site, with some advocating for a particular use such as a music academy, Orion offices and depot or a New Zealand Textile Centre. Other views varied as to whether mixed use, residential or big box would be appropriate for the site.</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> The Christchurch City Council Property Unit's process for the sale of the land will be to invite expressions of interest for the development of the site which will need to include details of the proposed development, future land use and timeframes for the development. This process will not preclude any of these submitters proposals and all will have the opportunity to submit an expression of interest, however they would need to have firm proposals set out for the development including funding.</p> <p>The development framework the subject of this action is necessary to help guide the prospective purchasers of the site and the Council in making its decision to ensure that such proposals have consideration for the Master Plan actions and goals, therefore no amendments are suggested to this action.</p> <p>Prior to selling this site the Council may wish to consider whether this site is required for any future Council facility in light of the facilities review.</p>		
<b>E5: Railway site property opportunities</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 8	Dislike: 1
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> Many proposals were put forward for the future use of this site including use as an indoor market or a transport interchange given its prime location. However since the start of the Master Plan process KiwiRail who are the owners of the site have leased the premises to a demolition company whose activities and storage of rubble have upset local business and property owners.</p> <p>The submitter who wished to be heard and disliked this action considered it was now too late and a missed opportunity given the recent leasing of the site to a demolition company.</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> Given the recent use of this site has not been beneficial to the perception and regeneration of the area this action is more important to ensure that the Council works closely with KiwiRail to discuss a longer term use of the site that is more compatible with the proposed regeneration of the area. Therefore it is important to retain this action within the plan.</p>		
<b>Movement</b>		
<b>M1: Road corridor review including public transport</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 13	Dislike:0
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> There were a variety of suggestions on this action ranging from diverting all traffic away from Colombo Street; reducing the speed limit to 30km/h; creating a pedestrian mall; keeping buses on Colombo Street to reducing busses on Colombo St. This action created the most comments in the overall submissions and amongst those that wished to be heard. This action was considered the most important out of the movement actions.</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> There is clearly a diversity of opinions on what should happen however all submitters agreed that a review of the road corridor and public transport along Colombo Street was necessary to improve the existing situation and the local environment. It was considered by some submitters to be more important by those who made a response to this question on the submission form.</p> <p>No amendments are suggested for this action given it constitutes a proposed review as no decisions have been taken on the final design of the road corridor and public transport therefore options are still open and the review process will allow for further public consultation on the outcomes prior to any decisions being made.</p>		



## ATTACHMENT 3

Submissions:	Like:10	Dislike:0
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> A diversity of opinions were raised concerning the provision of parking spaces along Colombo Street with some in favour of their staged removal whilst others were not, fearing a down turn in trade for those local businesses that rely heavily on the passing traffic. Most submitters were in favour of angled parking in the side streets and where mentioned were in favour of the reduction in the current parking standards for new development citing that in some instances the existing standards are prohibitive. One concern was to ensure that new parking provision was not supplied to the detriment of the area by being utilised as commuter parking for the Central City.</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> This action is for further investigation, this action does not include recommendations for changes to parking either on street or by way of provision. Only once the review of the parking provision and what changes need to be undertaken to help achieve the other actions and goals in the plan, such as; pedestrian improvements, cycle infrastructure and greening Colombo Street, will proposals be put forward for such changes. It is necessary to complete this review to achieve the best overall outcome for the area. Given the impact of parking requirements upon the ability to develop sites it is recommended the action be amended to make this an immediate action rather than a short term action.</p>		
<b>M3: Pedestrian improvements</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 12	Dislike:1
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> Most submitters supported this action with particular emphasis on safe crossing points especially over Brougham Street which included suggestions for a raised crossing. It was also stressed that consultations should include the Assembly for the Disabled, Living Streets Aotearoa and the Foundation for the Blind to ensure the best outcome for the area and make it a successful pedestrian environment for all.</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> Pedestrian safety along the whole route is a primary concern, this action is related to all the other movement actions in the plan and will require an overall response to how all modes of transport and movement relate to each other in an improved public realm. This action could be amended to include Assembly for the Disabled, Living Streets Aotearoa and the Foundation for the Blind as partners for this action to ensure the needs of pedestrians are fully represented in the design process.</p>		
<b>M4: Cycle infrastructure</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 10	Dislike:1
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> There were a number of issues raised particularly with regard to cycle lanes and cycle parking in both location and style. Although many respondents were in favour of improved cycle infrastructure many concerns were raised that the master plan did not emphasise the needs of cyclists strongly enough. The provision of cycle infrastructure was considered by some submitters who responded to the question of urgency to be the most urgent movement action in the plan.</p> <p>The submitter who disliked this action and wished to be heard had the opinion that as busy traffic and cyclists do not mix well then consideration should be given to diverting cyclists away from Colombo Street, this however is contrary to other submitters comments received who consider that buses and heavy traffic should be diverted away from Colombo Street.</p> <p>Suggestions by one submitter to change the plan from “considering improvements” to “making improvements” to show commitment to improving cycle infrastructure.</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> Cycle infrastructure in particular the on-road issues need to be emphasised within other actions of the plan such as action <i>M1 Road Corridor Review</i> and action <i>M2 Parking Investigations</i>. A clearer commitment in the plan to providing better cycling facilities both on and off road and better connection to the wider cycle network rather than only consideration or investigation could be introduced by way of amendments to the plan.</p>		
<b>M5: Colombo Street public realm improvements</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 7	Dislike:1
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> Fewer comments on this action, which include the desire to see more public seating however concern was raised over the location of some of the proposed outdoor areas.</p>		

## ATTACHMENT 3

<b>Staff comment:</b> This action is tied into the other movement actions <i>M1 Road Corridor Review</i> and action <i>M2 Parking Investigations</i> . The design of public realm improvements will form as part of the overall design for the transport and pedestrian improvements along Colombo Street and side roads. It also helps to create a positive identity for Sydenham, thus supporting action E1. It should therefore be retained.		
<b>Natural environment</b>		
<b>N1: Colombo Street public spaces</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 9	Dislike:1
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> General support for this action but comments noted the effectiveness of these spaces will depend on location and the volume and nature of traffic along Colombo Street. It was noted that there will be conflict for space between other uses such as transport within this existing narrow road corridor. Concerns were raised over the creation of small pocket parks where they result in the loss of land to individual sites that would make them uneconomic to develop. The creation or improvement of public green spaces within Sydenham was considered both important and urgent to those submitters who considered this question and includes other actions such as <i>N2 Street trees and lighting</i> and <i>N3 Buchan Park remodel</i> .		
<b>Staff comment:</b> This action is intertwined with all the movement actions and action <i>B2 Building Setbacks along Colombo Street</i> . When the design for the traffic movements, and public realm improvements are investigated as well as when individual sites are developed, opportunities for building setbacks to help create public spaces will be investigated. The plan showing proposed rest and open spaces should be amended in the Master Plan document to reflect feedback received from property owners regarding building setbacks and to reconsider some of the spaces facing a southerly and easterly direction.		
<b>N2: Street trees and lighting</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 10	Dislike:0
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> Few comments were received and most were highly supportive and considered improved street lighting and greening Colombo Street by the provision of street trees would enhance the area some saw this action as essential.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> The implementation of this action with regards to the planting of street trees is dependent upon other actions such as <i>M1 Road Corridor Review</i> , <i>M2 Parking Investigations</i> , <i>M3 Pedestrian Improvements</i> and <i>M4 Cycle infrastructure</i> in that the final design of Colombo Street and the space available to plant trees will be determined by the other demands for this public space.  Lighting was considered to be essential to the overall redesign and amenity of the area, consideration could be given amending the plan to include feature lighting in addition to functional lighting to give a distinctive character to the area at night. This will support action E1.		
<b>N3: Buchan Park remodel</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 11	Dislike:1
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> Most submitters supported this action and wanted to see improvements to this public space although there were different suggestions as to how this could be achieved especially with regard to the residential element. Concern was raised over reducing the size of the park but others saw this action as a great opportunity to make the redeveloped park the heart of Sydenham.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> This action could be intertwined with action <i>E3 Pilot project of a multiple ownership site</i> to redevelop this part of Sydenham to the advantage of the property owners and the area as a whole. This action needs amending so as to be timed with E3 to be in the immediate term and to ensure a comprehensive development.		
<b>N4: Relinquish and replace Carlyle Park</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 9	Dislike:1
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> Most submitters considered that better use could be made of this space and a number of suggestions were put forward although one submitter argued against the loss of the park as it is the only green space in the northern part of the Sydenham area.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> This action could result in a more positive outcome for the area if the proceeds		

## ATTACHMENT 3

from the sale of the park can be ring-fenced to pay for improvements to existing open spaces or provide other new spaces in the area.		
<b>N5: Temporary landscapes</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 7	Dislike:1
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> General support for this action, comments included that these temporary spaces and activities are value for money and bring visitors to the area. The only concern raised was that any inventive temporary uses should be controlled by the Council.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> Since the start of the master plan process Greening the Rubble and Gap Filler have undertaken various projects within Sydenham including the giant chess set, wall murals, green meeting spaces and the coffee cart. Other organisations have also undertaken various artworks and events and more are already planned for the area. All of these temporary landscapes and uses have been an asset to the area bringing visitors and vitality to the empty space. Support for the voluntary organisations should be maintained through this action as this has proved itself to be a very important aspect to maintaining confidence and vitality in the area.		
<b>N6: Gateway treatment Colombo Street</b>		
Submissions:	Like:8	Dislike:0
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> This action was strongly supported and seen as essential to re-establish Sydenham as a distinctive place, various suggestions were made as to what form these could take and where they should be located.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> Consideration should be given to amending this action to include introducing temporary gateways given it may take considerable time for permanent gateways in whatever form to be established. Temporary gateways will help define Sydenham and help instill confidence in the area during the rebuild.		
<b>Community well-being/culture and heritage</b>		
<b>C1: A Sydenham learning outpost</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 9	Dislike:0
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> General support for this action and suggestions were made to establish a youth trade training scheme in the area connected to local business and educational establishments. Since the start of the master plan process the Adult Reading Assistance Scheme ARAS has relocated to Sydenham, this organisation works with adults who need to improve their literary skills.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> The Council's Facilities Rebuild Programme will determine if resources are used to provide any Council run services in the area. However, connections between voluntary organisations and the Council to assist information exchange and learning are supported by this action and should be retained.		
<b>C2: Support the return of full Sydenham based postal services</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 13	Dislike:0
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> This action was strongly supported and is seen as an essential service to this business area, other suggestions included attracting other banking institutions and government agencies to service the area.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> This action is within the top six actions identified by submitters who wish to be heard all of whom supported this action. It was also considered as both the most important and most urgent action by those submitters who considered this question and should therefore be retained in the plan as an immediate action.		
Discussions have taken place with the Post Office and they have indicated a willingness to consider this if there is a business case. Other actions, such as N3 and B1, could help to increase the residential catchment for the centre which will help provide the business case to support this action.		
<b>C3: Support the Sydenham Heritage Trust</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 10	Dislike:1
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> General support for the Trust to rebuild a community facility on the site however concern was raised that this sites proximity to Brougham street made it unsuitable		



## ATTACHMENT 3

given the noise from heavy traffic.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> The issues surrounding the position of the Sydenham Heritage Trust are complicated and efforts are already underway to help the Trust with these before the Trust can make a decision on their future actions. It is therefore still considered appropriate to keep this action.		
<b>C4: Investigate suburban community transport opportunities</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 11	Dislike:0
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> General support received for this action, accessible and affordable transport seen as essential link for some to access community and social services.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> This is a community led action but is connected also to the movement actions in the plan.		
<b>C5: Local landscape and heritage interpretation</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 9	Dislike:0
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> Sydenham has been a significant location throughout both Maori and European history. Given the devastation and loss of heritage and character buildings in the Sydenham area along Colombo Street it is important to ensure history of the area and buildings are captured as well as the history of the Maori occupation of the area and retold in the rebuild. Support for this action together with suggestions for how this could be achieved were put forward.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> On-going consultation with MKT and the community to ensure this outcome. This action is related to the street design and creation of meeting spaces along Colombo Street which will have regard to the history of the area.		

<b>Built environment</b>		
<b>B1: Targeted residential activities around Buchan Park</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 10	Dislike:1
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> Although there was general support to see increased residential activity around Buchan Park concerns were raised over the issues of the negative impacts of the close proximity of industry, the Crematorium and late night uses on the residential amenity as well as on industrial land values.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> This action proposes further investigation into the City Plan amendments to support this development including rezoning and subdivision. The implementation of this action is longer term given the need for plan changes and will be dependent upon the success of other actions in making this a desirable area for residential activities. This action should be retained as written.		
<b>B2: Building setbacks on Colombo Street</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 10	Dislike: 3
<b>Issues/themes raised:</b> The support for this action was varied although the general feeling was supportive of achieving more space along Colombo Street to create a better environment by the planting of street trees, provision of benches, wider footpaths etc. Objections, including the submitter who wished to be heard, tended to come from individual land owners concerned at the impact of building setbacks on the economic viability of site redevelopment.		
<b>Staff comment:</b> This action needs to be amended to state more clearly that this action will only be undertaken with landowners consent and where this will make a positive contribution to the street scene. Also this action needs to highlight that such improvements can be achieved by only setting back the ground floor , rather than the whole façade, or by inventive use of opening shop fronts to create a link between the street and the retail/commercial use without losing valuable floor space.		
This action is also dependent upon City Plan amendments given the current rule 3.4.5 Development Standards within the Sydenham B2 zone in the City Plan which requires that all buildings shall be built up to the road boundary of Colombo Street along the full frontage of the site. It is therefore appropriate to investigate the potential for setbacks in order to inform action B3.		

## ATTACHMENT 3

<b>B3: Develop supportive City Plan amendments</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 9	Dislike:0
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> These amendments were seen as important to support short term growth in particular with relation to reduction in parking standards for new developments and was considered as a most urgent action by those submitters who responded to this question. Comments included ensuring community input into the proposed plan changes and consultation with key agencies such as the telecommunications services.</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> The process of City Plan amendments will require consultation with the community to ensure support for such changes. The City Plan amendments are considered an immediate action but tie in with the parking investigations which are considered to be short term, the master plan needs to be amended to ensure these actions align by making the parking investigations an immediate action.</p>		
<b>B4: Design and character guidance</b>		
Submissions:	Like: 10	Dislike:2
<p><b>Issues/themes raised:</b> There were various suggestions as to how this design guidance could both help build on the identity of the area as well as reflect on the history. Suggestions included the inclusion of continuous verandas and the promotion of green building technologies. Some submitters wished to see that the facades retained Sydenham heritage whilst others considered that developments should be allowed to grow organically.</p>		
<p><b>Staff comment:</b> The core design principles as set out in the plan will help guide development however there are currently no design rules in the City Plan that require such design principle to be adhered to. This action requires investigation and assessment prior to the development of the guidance. As this action is still in principle no amendments are considered necessary.</p>		