

Summary of Submissions

1. Introduction

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

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

2. Methodology

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

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

3. Format

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

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

4. Overall Summary of Submissions

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

Submission Form Responses

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

Project references:

B1: North-west precinct

C1: Community facilities and open space

N1: North-east block

R2: Business and residents association

B2: South-west precinct

S1: Street Scene

R1: Linwood Village partnership

R3: Case Management

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

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

Two different street improvement options were put forward for consultation and only 5 submitters stated their preferred design option. Two people preferred Option A and 3 people had a preference of Option B. The response to the options provided was fairly low, and when reading the submissions as a whole, there were certain aspects of both projects that were favoured, i.e. curb build outs creating a stronger pedestrian environment.

General Submissions

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

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

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

5. General comments and Key Themes

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

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

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

6. Specific Projects

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

6.1 Comprehensive Site Development - Projects B1 and B2

(The North West Precinct and South West Precinct)

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

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

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

Urgent / Most Important Project

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

6.2 Community Facilities and Open Space - Project C1

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

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

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

Urgent / Most Important Project

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

6.3 Street Scene – Project S1

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

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

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

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

In terms of the preferred option:

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

Urgent / Most Important Project

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

6.4 The North-East Block – Project N1

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

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

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

Urgent / Most Important Project

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

6.5 Recovery Together - R1, R2 and R3

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

Three specific projects have been identified:

- R1 – The Linwood Village Partnership - *A shortage of key services have been identified in the village and opportunities for a more regular banking / post office services could exist on a permanent basis. Furthermore a Community Link partnership project would also be welcomed which supports social service agencies and the Police.*
- R2 – Business and Residents Association – *An active Business and Residents Association would provide support for local businesses and help maintain the strong*

community spirit and local pride. Opportunities to establish a Business Improvement District and effective marketing of the centre can aid the centres recovery.

- R3 – Case Management – *A case manager can help to implement the projects in the master plan and give a single point of contact for Council support and help facilitate meetings with dedicated Council Staff. Also they could help to promote activities and events within the village in conjunction with partner organisations.*

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

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

Urgent / Most Important

One submitter considered this to be the most important project.

7. Hearings

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

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

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

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

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

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