

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 with 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:		Comments:			Hearing ‘Yes’
	Like	Don’t Like	Positive	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:		Comments:			Hearing 'Yes'
	Like	Don't Like	Positive	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

Total	Overall:		Comments:			Hearing ‘Yes’
	Like	Don’t Like	Positive	Negative	Neutral	
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

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

Total	Overall submissions:		Comments:			Hearing 'Yes'
	Like	Don't Like	Positive	Negative	Neutral	
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

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

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

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

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.