

**HALSWELL QUARRY PARK
SPECIAL COMMITTEE
AGENDA**

**MONDAY 25 MAY 2009 AT 1PM
TUESDAY 26 MAY 2009 AT 9AM**

IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES

Panel: The Mayor, Bob Parker (Chairperson).
Councillors Ngaire Button, Claudia Reid, Gail Sheriff, Sue Wells,
Chrissie Williams, and Norm Withers.

1. APOLOGIES

2. HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

Written submissions and a timetable for hearings on the Halswell Quarry Park draft Management Plan Review are separately circulated.

3. CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS

It is recommended that the Special Committee receive all submissions, as separately circulated.

An overview of submissions is attached.

HALSWELL QUARRY PARK - DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN

SUBMISSIONS OVERVIEW 2009

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Halswell Quarry Park Special Committee (Special Committee) regarding the public submissions on the draft Halswell Quarry Park Management Plan (draft Management Plan).

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

2. On 26 March 2009 the Council resolved to release the draft Halswell Quarry Park Management Plan for public consultation under the Local Government Act 2002, but in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Reserves Act 1977.
3. The public consultation period was from 1 April 2009 to 5 May 2009.
4. As a Regional Park with metropolitan significance, notification of the public consultation process and availability of the draft Management Plan was extensive, including:
 - Project Information Leaflet (PIL) and feedback form delivered to surrounding households and key stakeholders
 - front page display on the Council's website Have Your Say page
 - articles in "Our Christchurch" (1 April & 2 May 2009) and media releases resulting in articles in the West Community News (5 April 2009) and Christchurch Mail (1 April 2009)
 - notice in the South-West Area Plan newsletter
 - notice board at each of the two entrances to Halswell Quarry Park
 - PIL and submission forms left on site at regional parks that have brochures on display (Halswell Quarry Park, Victoria Park, Bottle Lake, Groyne and Botanic Gardens)
 - available at Council service centres and Libraries.

FEEDBACK

5. A total of 181 submissions were received within the consultation period:
 - 174 from within the Christchurch district boundary
 - 7 from outside Christchurch.
6. In response to the question, "Have you read the draft Management Plan?":
 - 158 submitters indicated that they had read the draft Management Plan
 - 11 indicated that they had not read the draft Management Plan
 - 12 did not respond (although, in many cases, the submission detail indicated they had read the plan).
7. In response to the question, "Do you support the proposals within the Halswell Quarry Park draft Management Plan?":
 - 123 submitters indicated Yes/Support (of which 107 made no further comment)
 - 42 indicated Mixed Views/Some Concerns
 - 6 indicated No/Oppose
 - 10 did not respond.
8. Points most commented on were:
 - Sister City botanical collections, with associated artwork and structures
 - Motor vehicle access beyond the internal parking area
 - Designated area for exercising dogs
 - Use of the former Managers House
 - Landscape values and type of planting
 - Future park management

Section 1 – Introduction

Section 1 of the draft Management Plan introduces the park, its purpose and metropolitan significance within the regional park network and current landscape character.

Seven submitters commented on the Purpose of the Park (page 2) and specifically about the order in which the purposes were listed. The majority (five) considered that “Promote biodiversity through habitat restoration” should be the main purpose of the park; one considered that the importance of the Sister Cities should be accentuated; and one considered the rural unspoilt nature of the park should be the defining value.

Objective 1 – Open Space

There was support for retaining areas of open space (policy 1.1), but mixed views as to how much and how these areas should be managed (for example, mowing, sheep grazing).

Objective 2 – Heritage

There was mixed opinion as to the use of the former Managers House for rangers offices, park information and community rooms (policy 2.4), with the suggested alternative use being a café/restaurant/wine bar.

Positive reference was made to displaying historic Halswell Quarry machinery in the Quarry Buildings (policy 2.4) and restoring the gardens around the former Managers House (policy 2.3).

Those who commented on reflecting and reconstructing historic connections between heritage places (policy 2.6) had mixed feelings about the merits of constructing a trail along the historic tramway, but were supportive about the path and road approach to the former Managers House.

Concern was expressed as to whether heritage aspects were given adequate protection generally: particularly protection of sites relating to Māori and consultation with Historic Places Trust.

Restoration of the grass tennis court behind the former Managers House, replicating the original workshop and the preparation of Heritage Conservation Plans were also mentioned.

Objective 3 & 4 – Structures

Of the 103 submitters who made further comments, 50 made comments about the Sister City botanical collections, and inclusion of associated artwork and structures. A few comments were in general support. The vast majority were in general and specific opposition. There was also specific opposition to the Songpa-Gu proposal (Appendix 3) and the withdrawn Gansu proposal (not included in the plan).

There was support for minimising the visual aspect of artwork and structures and screening with vegetation (policy 3.2).

The majority of submitters referred to limitation or constraint around the inclusion of artwork and structures, with specific reference made to the proposed standards (3.7).

Questions were raised about the gifting criteria and artwork/structures selection process, funding and ongoing maintenance.

There was mixed opinion about the style of signage (see policy 4.4).

Objective 6 – Habitats

There was support for progressing the wetland habitat, including kahikatea (policy 6.1), with the area being developed across to Cashmere Road as per the concept plan in Appendix 4.

Objective 7 – Amenity Planting

Those who commented had strong views about the type of planting within the park. There was opposition to developing stands of exotic trees typical of rural farming landscapes (policy 7.4). There was support for diversity and with Sister City/international connections. There was generally more support for promoting New Zealand indigenous planting.

Objective 8 - Recreation

Three submitters requested the addition of a playground (see policy 8.5).

Objective 9 - Access

A number of submissions were made about the area designated for exercising dogs (policy 9.2). There was general support for further definition of the designated area and for making Findlays picnic area dog-free.

Those who commented were in support of land acquisition adjacent or in close proximity to the park to improve recreation and heritage connections (policy 9.5), including one submitter who requested the addition of a specific objective to acquire land for further expansion.

Objective 11 – Transport

All those who commented on the inclusion of bicycle stands and a bus stop (policy 11.1) were in support of the proposal.

General reference was made regarding the need for further vehicle parking. Areas suggested for extension were the existing Cashmere Road area, the existing Information Centre area and the area near Findlays.

A proposed new vehicle parking area around 201 Kennedys Bush Road (policy 11.2) was considered remote from the main attractions within the park and would need to be designed in a way that took account of its location near residential areas. If developed, general parking restrictions were requested along Upper Kennedys Bush Road from 201 down to the park entrance.

Preventing motor vehicle access beyond the internal parking area (policy 11.3) was generally opposed on the basis that vehicles would be too far from the picnic area, making access to the picnic area problematic. One organisation submitted that the development of alternative picnic areas (Cashmere Road side and Christchurch/England botanical area) may go some way to compensate for the loss of vehicle access.

The addition of informal parking bays along the roadside between the main entrance on Kennedys Bush Road and parking area on Cashmere Road with associated foot access (policy 11.4) was generally supported.

In addition to vehicle parking, the issue of increased need for vehicle security was raised by nine submitters.

Objective 12 – Environmental Monitoring and Maintenance

Removal of white poplars as part of a weed removal programme (policy 12.1) was generally opposed because of the appearance of the trees and shade they provide.

Submitters referred to naturalising the concrete ponds (policy 12.2) in terms of the circulation of water and focal point the ponds provide.

Objective 13 - Management

The future management of the park (policy 13.1) was referred to by ten submitters, with the general sentiment being that some sort of management arrangement should be put in place and include representatives of stakeholder groups.

General

Submitters also made mention of:

- increasing current staffing levels
- use of the park for events
- classifying the park as a reserve
- use of the park for education purposes
- ranger residence

A further objective and policies were requested around recognition of Ngāi Tahu as manawhenua in relation to the park.

Five submitters requested that past public input, and specifically the role of the Kennedys Bush Road Neighbourhood Association, be acknowledged within the plan.