

01-15-227\02  
RDC- 1105569

# Kaupapataka Agenda

## STRATEGY, POLICY & FINANCE COMMITTEE HEARING Draft Open Space Level of Service Policy

---

**Date:** Thursday 11 March 2021

**Time:** 1.00pm

**Venue:** Council Chamber

---

### MEMBERSHIP

Chair

Cr Raukawa-Tait

Deputy Chair

Cr Kai Fong

### Members

Mayor Chadwick

Cr Bentley

Cr Donaldson

Cr Kumar

Cr Macpherson

Cr Maxwell

Cr Tapsell

Cr Wang

Cr Yates

Mr Thomass (Lakes Community Board member)

Mrs Trumper (Rural Community Board member)

Ms Marks (Te Tatau o Te Arawa Board member)

Mr Berryman-Kamp (Te Tatau o Te Arawa Board member)

**Quorum**

**8**

## STRATEGY, POLICY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE DELEGATIONS

<b>Type of Committee</b>	Committee
<b>Subordinate to</b>	Council
<b>Subordinate Committees</b>	n/a
<b>Legislative Basis</b>	Schedule 7, clause 30 (1) (a), Local Government Act 2002.
<b>Purpose</b>	The purpose of the Strategy, Policy and Finance Committee is to have oversight and make recommendations to the Council on the adoption and development of all Council's strategic, policy, planning and regulatory frameworks.
<b>Reference</b>	01-15-227
<b>Membership</b>	<p>Councillor Raukawa-Tait (Chair) Councillor Kai Fong(Deputy Chair)</p> <p>The Mayor and all councillors 2 Te Tatau o Te Arawa members 1 Lakes Community Board member 1 Rural Community Board member</p> <p>Full voting rights for all members</p>
<b>Quorum</b>	8
<b>Meeting frequency</b>	Monthly
<b>Delegations</b>	<p>The Committee's function is recommendatory only.<sup>1</sup> It is authorised to take actions precedent to the exercise by the Council of its statutory responsibilities, duties and powers, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receiving, considering, hearing submissions and making recommendations on draft plans (except the District Plan), strategies and policies (such as the Long-term Plan, Annual Plan; funding and financial policies; reserves management plans and asset management plans);</li> <li>• Considering and making recommendations on the development of the Council's rating policy; financial strategy and budgets;</li> <li>• Considering and making recommendations on the development of Council bylaws, including hearing submissions in relation to making, amending and revoking bylaws;</li> <li>• Considering and making recommendations on Council's strategic direction to ensure efficient and effective delivery of Council's objectives and District Vision;</li> <li>• Receiving and considering reports from working/strategy groups;</li> <li>• Considering and making recommendations on the development of guidelines for decision making to assist Council in achieving its strategic outcomes;</li> <li>• Considering and making recommendations on the establishment of levels of service across Council services to ensure alignment with strategic goals and priorities;</li> <li>• Considering and making recommendations on the development of Treasury and funding functions;</li> <li>• Considering and making recommendations on proposals for the establishment of Council controlled organisations (including the appointment</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Council is authorised to delegate anything precedent to the exercise of Council's powers, duties and functions - Schedule 7, clause 32, Local Government Act 2002

	<p>and remuneration of Directors, formation of constitutions and shareholder agreements);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considering and making recommendations on proposals for the sale and purchase of land;</li> <li>• Considering and making recommendations on issues relating to Council leases;</li> <li>• Considering and making recommendations on draft Council submissions/responses in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Central government policies, plans and proposed legislative reform;</li> <li>○ Proposals by other organisations/authorities (Local and Regional).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Performing such other functions as the Council may direct from time to time.<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>
<b>Relevant Statutes</b>	All the duties and responsibilities listed above must be carried out in accordance with the relevant legislation.
<b>Limits to Delegations</b>	<p>The Committee does not have the delegated authority to make decisions for and on behalf of the Council. All matters requiring a decision of Council must be referred, by way of recommendation, to the Council for final consideration and determination.</p> <p>In the event that the Council resolves not to approve or adopt a Committee recommendation, the item shall be returned to the Committee via the Chief Executive for review and subsequent referral to the Council for further consideration and determination.</p>

<sup>2</sup> A committee is subject in all things to the control of the local authority, and must carry out all general and special directions of the Council given in relation to the committee - see Schedule 7, clause 30(3), Local Government Act 2002.

# Order of Business

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies - Ngā whakapaaha .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Declarations of interest - Whakapuakitanga whaipānga.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Hearing of Submitters – Te wā ki ngā hunga tono .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Staff Reports – Pūrongo Kaimahi.....</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1	Hearing on Draft Open Space Level of Service Policy .....	6

## 1 Apologies - Ngā whakapaaha

The Chairperson invites notice from members of:

1. Leave of absence for future meetings of the Rotorua Lakes Council; or
2. Apologies, including apologies for lateness and early departure from the meeting, where leave of absence has not previously been granted.

## 2 Declarations of interest - Whakapuakitanga whaipānga

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

## 3 Hearing of Submitters – Te wā ki ngā hunga tonu

(Timetable below)

**SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS  
DRAFT OPEN SPACE LEVEL OF SERVICE POLICY  
11 MARCH 2021**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Sub No.</b>
1.00pm	Miriam Ruberl, Grey Power Rotorua	2
1.10pm	Robyn McMillan	5
1.20pm	Tatau Pounamu Collective	8

## 4 Staff Reports – Pūrongo Kaimahi

---

60-12-023-03  
RDC- 1102285

### ROTORUA LAKES COUNCIL

Mayor  
Chairperson and members  
STRATEGY, POLICY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

#### 4.1 Hearing on Draft Open Space Level of Service Policy

**Report prepared by:** Stephanie Kelly, Senior Strategic Advisor, District Development

**Report reviewed by:** Jocelyn Mikaere, Group Manager Operations

**Report approved by:** Geoff Williams, Chief Executive

---

#### 1. TE PŪTAKE PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to recommend to Council to hear verbal submissions on the draft Open Space Level of Service Policy.

#### 2. HE TŪTOHUNGA RECOMMENDATION

1. That the report 'Hearing on Draft Open Space Level of Service Policy' be received.

#### 3. TE TĀHUHU BACKGROUND

At its meeting on 8 October 2020 the Strategy, Policy and Finance Committee resolved to adopt the draft Open Space Level of Service Policy for public consultation pursuant to Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.

The draft Policy is intended to inform open space requirements for new development areas as well as providing a consistent framework for assessing the existing open space network to ensure it is fit for purpose. In addition the draft Policy will:

- Provide clarity on what we want to achieve from our open space network
- Provide certainty to Council, developers and community on future open space provision
- Ensure an integrated approach to walking, cycling, stormwater etc.
- Provide the rationale for financial contributions
- Provide the link between the purpose of the reserve and how Council maintains it
- Ensure alignment with the Housing and Thriving Communities Strategy

The submission period ran from 16 November to 14 December 2020. Submissions were sought through:

- Advertisement in the local media informing the public of the draft Policy, where to get more information, and inviting submissions
- Through Council's online engagement portal Let's Talk – Kōrero Mai
- A direct letter to key stakeholders
- Notice of the consultation was circulated through Council's regular e-pānui

### **Submissions received**

Eight submissions were received. Three submitters wish to be heard.

### **Hearing**

The next step in the process is for the Strategy, Policy and Finance Committee to hear submissions, receive a staff report and complete deliberations with regards to the final adoption of the Policy.

## **4. NGĀ ĀPITI HANGA ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1: Submissions on Draft Open Space Level of Service Policy.

**Submissions on Draft Open Space Level of Service Policy**

60-12-023-03

RDC-1103169

Sub No.	To be heard	Submitter Name / Company
1	N	Jenny Nahu
<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>As a member of the Bay of Plenty District Rugby League I am very familiar with Puketawhero Park as our home of Rugby League and our main venue. I have managed Puketawhero on behalf of the BOPDRL for many years and am very familiar with the park and it's surrounding community. I am submitting the following as an enhancement to Puketawhero Park and it's many users, (these would grow if my submission was successful.) Develop Puketawhero to connect from Te Ngae Rd through to Vaughans Rd with a pathway suitable for prams, trikes, bikes, scooters, mobility users, walkers, runners, children and adults. Make a space to rest a while with some seating under some Native trees. Provide a water fountain along with a cultural remembrance to the history of what was first here as the center piece of this area. We have 4 pre school day cares all close by, also a retirement village opposite on Te Ngae Rd, the proposal of the walkway is to encourage users from both these groups as well as our own to use the whole of the green space. Encouraging others from the surrounding community to use this beautiful green space will not only make better use of the park, the resting space will enable users time to reflect, and give more purpose and definition to Puketawhero Park.</p>		
Sub No.	To be heard	Submitter Name / Company
2	Y	Miriam Ruberl, Grey Power Rotorua
<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>"Our community do not have to walk far to experience open spaces. The open space network is connected. Recreation, transport and ecological corridors are created. Communities are linked together", and at Options 2.2.2 "improving connections between open spaces (using streets, accessways, cycle ways etc) ... The base level of service for accessibility is that the majority (90%) of residents located in urban areas are able to walk 10-15 minutes (or 500 metres)"</p> <p>Particularly in relation to the recreational needs of seniors, but also for everyone else, the document fails to mention people with disabilities and those using aids such as wheelchairs, Zimmer frames, mobility scooters, the ability to charge them and securing them safely when using public toilets in the area (these are not mentioned at all, but will no doubt be installed).</p> <p>Walking for 10-15 minutes or 500 meters is too far for a large number of people over the age of 70. We would envisage a free, modest hop on – hop off looping electric van service, possibly even a driverless one, with a published timetable.</p> <p>Grey Power Rotorua would seek the specific exclusion of Lime scooters and skate boards from designated walking and electric mobility scooter paths.</p> <p>We would also seek seating at regular intervals, safe drinking water likewise, and shelters from the occasional showers we experience in Rotorua. In addition, defibrillators should be available at reasonable locations, as should first aid kits, emergency telephones and direct links to police and St Johns Ambulance.</p> <p>Grey Power Rotorua has made extensive representations to Council regarding the state of our footpaths generally, and the failure to comply with Disability access standards specifically. This will be a great opportunity to remedy substandard existing paths, and build new ones that meet the standards.</p> <p>Finally, a useful item for consideration would be readily available maps of the open space network and its links, including the location of off-lead areas for dogs, and places with seating provided where groups of seniors and others could meet and socialise.</p> <p>We look forward to expanding on our ideas at the relevant Council Meeting.</p>		



Sub No.	To be heard	Submitter Name / Company
3	N	Heidi Nielsen
<b>Comments</b> I agree 100% as what the committee is thinking. Save Springfield!		
Sub No.	To be heard	Submitter Name / Company
4	N	Amber Styles
<b>Comments</b> Myself and other members of the community have expressed an interest in having a family park/area much like the park by Hillcrest stadium in Hamilton. A family friendly recreation area around Kawaha point/fairy springs with small stores (coffee/florist/green grocer) would be much appreciated. Adding value with a small cafe or of the like would draw local families out during good weather and Rotorua is lacking somewhat in recreational areas for parents to bring their children and relax without having to venture into town.		
Sub No.	To be heard	Submitter Name / Company
5	Y	Robyn McMillan
<b>Comments</b> "This is an important & essential policy needing very careful consideration at a critical time in the development of the Rotorua community. As a resident & ratepayer, Rotorua's open spaces is of major concern to me, in what seems to be a time of encroachment by local council. It is important that Council looks at ALL 'open spaces' available to the general community -whether they are currently designated as 'open spaces' or not. As a resident of Springfield I have been horrified by the council proposal to take the open spaces currently leased & maintained by the Springfield Golf Club -to turn into roading, carparks, maintenance buildings, HOUSING, etc; -for the sake of a few playing field for senior rugby. The Golf Club currently allows this space to be available to the community on a daily basis - for all ages & for all types of recreation. This will certainly not be the case if the 'sports hub' proposal is pushed through. It is interesting that the considerations of this open spaces draft proposal is exactly what the springfield community considers the LDC to be ignoring in their 'Sports Hub' proposal. If the 'Sports Hub' proposal goes ahead, Springfield & all the new housing developments in the Pukehangi Road area will lose the only major green space available to it. Where will the open space needed to compensate for that be located? Why is the Springfield Golf Course not listed as one of the current open spaces? The Springfield Golf Course also lists mature trees, wildlife -birds & insects, wetlands, & the Uuhina Stream as part of its space. All these will be potentially lost to housing & sporting developments. This proposal discusses responsible maintenance of our open spaces & this is an area of neglect by our council -that has led to the deterioration of our current community sports fields -leading to the councils excuse for closing or selling of some of the more problematic of these. The council could certainly take a lesson from the Springfield Golf Club in the faultless maintenance & upkeep of the Golf Course -at no cost to the general community or ratepayers. I urge the council to take time to gather comprehensive feedback from the community, particularly those most affected; & to consider these carefully. The local community considers its open spaces to be taonga, and as such -sacrosanct. In a world where space & nature are becoming increasingly under threat, they need to be saved & protected. Once they are lost to the community, they will never be recovered. I challenge what seems to be the accepted idea that it is within Councils power to dispose of this particular assets as it chooses.		

Sub No.	To be heard	Submitter Name / Company
6	N	Tanya Mead, Kainga Ora
<b>Comments</b>		
<b>Notes of support:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is excellent that this is entitled a level of service policy, not a provision document. Community infrastructure should be about service not quantity. It would be great if this was clearer/ reiterated in the purpose and clearly restated in the main body of the document.</li> <li>• Positive that the explanation of enhanced is not just environmental</li> <li>• Positive reference to community involvement in design and that partnership is addressed as a separate point</li> <li>• Good to see reference to integrated /multifunctional uses of open space e.g. park + storm water and reference to streets and civic spaces (great to see a broad consideration which understands the value of all spaces)</li> <li>• Great to see reference that the quality of open space should be the same across the city and the particular reference to lower socio-economic areas – but back to issue of LTP / funding how will this be achieved?</li> <li>• Good that maintenance is referenced but as above need to consider the potential funding challenge which has occurred in Auckland where any budget effectively has to be directed to renewals / maintenance – how to ensure funding for the aspirations of the policy? Again how do you ensure provision in growth areas if Financial Contributions are insufficient?</li> <li>• However, it is positive that there is clear reference to divestment and why – but may need to be add to this so it is clearer whether this is likely to be necessary / frequent...how many back land unsafe 'areas of grass' do they have e.g. Mangere. All about managing expectations and the inevitable community concern re divestment</li> <li>• It is positive that there is reference to the cumulative effect on parks as a result of redevelopment and need to correspondingly address quality</li> <li>• The below are very positive pragmatic approaches that do reject that service rather than asset title of the policy</li> </ul>		
<p>2.2.2 Council will measure the amount of open space using a population-based ratio, in other words the actual number of hectares of open space provided for every thousand people. This will only be used to identify how much open space is available based on actual provision, and how this changes over time. The ha/1000 ratio is a common way of comparing provision against other Councils. It will not be used to determine the quantity of open space required in the district as this is primarily driven by standards for the accessibility, quality and function of the open space network.</p>		
<p>2.3.2 The base level of service for accessibility is that the majority (90%) of residents located in urban areas are able to walk 10-15 minutes (or 500 metres) to a neighbourhood park or the equivalent function of a neighbourhood park provided on a different type of reserve, for example a sports park.</p>		
<p>If it is considered impractical to achieve accessibility standards because of the nature of the built environment or the cost/benefit involved in doing this (e.g. purchasing a number of residential properties), then the priority will be on increasing accessibility, visibility and quality of the nearest reserve(s).</p>		

**Suggested amendments:**

- Kāinga Ora recommends that clarification be sought in regards to the implementation of the policy and to the difference and how to address the challenges of capex v. opex. The policy states that the implementation is subject to Council's Long Term Plan and Annual Plan processes. It is recommended that the implementation be outcomes based and these outcomes be tangible and/or with timeframes to ensure the policies be achieved.
- It would be useful to have a diagram that shows the relationship of the different Council policies that relate to open space (they have listed these but it is how they relate any hierarchy etc. that often becomes a challenge in practice) and to be able to read these alongside to ensure complementary – ideally the Council will have done the latter
- Definition does not mention gifted land
- Good to reference Financial Contributions but as with LTP reference this needs greater clarification – what if FCs are insufficient e.g. Auckland situation where policy would recommend new open space but growth charges (through DCs) is insufficient – question is the rest funded through rates? Targeted rates? Again need to beef up the LTP references
- In the table which sets out the 'metrics' for open space there are limited amenities suggested for pocket parks. The value of these 'smaller' parks should not be undervalued particularly in med/ higher density areas
- Kāinga Ora recommends that extra policies are introduced to include:
  - a) For any open space proposal, it is recommended that an evaluation is undertaken to understand potential uses for a particular open space (e.g. communal hangi pit vs large meeting area vs playground vs communal veggie gardens), noting that it is part of a wider network and understanding what the needs might be.
  - b) Kāinga Ora recommends that for where planting is investigated, that eco-sourced (where appropriate) native planting is the preferred species and that suitable species is collaborated through partnership with mana whenua

**Further clarification:**

- Page 8 Acquisition, Divestment, Funding and Implementation references the Ngati Whakaue Gifted Reserves Protocol Agreement. We haven't seen a copy of this – are you able to email me a copy? We have a bit of concern around the process where we seek to undertake an exchange or revocation under the Reserves Act as part of – the above states that reserves not being used for their original purpose should be returned to the Pukeroa Oruawhata Trust, unless there is agreement otherwise. It would be good for us to understand that this is and what the potential implications are for Kāinga Ora, should we seek to acquire reserve land.
- Can you please clarify what is meant on page 10 where it is stated that "if located on land that does not belong to Council, then a legal agreement protecting public rights to use the area must be executed".

Sub No.	To be heard	Submitter Name / Company
7	N	BOPDHB
<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Toi Te Ora Public Health is currently dedicated to responding to COVID-19 and therefore we are unable to review your policy and provide a submission. As an alternative, we are keen to promote and endorse the criteria contained in the attached Natural Environment Scoring Tool (NEST) as way of conducting a health lens over your policy.</p> <p>Additionally, a particular emphasis for us is recommending that RLC include drinking water fountains in your level of service policy. Having healthy and safe drinking water readily available makes 'the healthy choice the easy choice' and also supports plastic waste reduction. You will already be aware of the current child obesity epidemic, child dental health issues, and concerns about the environmental effects of single-use plastic. Providing good coverage of drinking water fountains is one effective strategy in the toolkit for addressing these issues.</p>		
Sub No.	To be heard	Submitter Name / Company
8	Y	Tatau Pounamu Collective
<p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>The Tatau Pounamu Collective (TPC) is a community collective with the vision for Eastside Rotorua to be a safe place where every tamaiti (child) reaches their potential. TPC responds to the needs of its Eastside community by providing a range of environmental and health &amp; wellbeing initiatives. More information on the <a href="#">Tatau Pounamu Collective can be found here</a>.</p> <p>TPC acknowledges that the draft RLC Open Spaces Policy has informed the Eastside Community Wellness Plan to date. The Plan currently reflects the Draft Policy as to where open spaces could be provided in Eastside's future development.</p> <p>TPC think it is important for our community that the current provision of open spaces remains in the future, even if there is a change of activity on those spaces. TPC advocates that the Open Spaces Policy ensures there is equitable opportunity of access to open spaces for all our neighbourhoods. Considering the diversity of individual circumstances in the Eastside, having high accessibility standards for the open spaces in our rohe is important. These standards need to allow for easy access for all ages to all open spaces and via a variety of modes of active transport.</p> <p>The Eastside Community, including our tamariki, need to have the ability to self-access our open spaces via having safe transport choices/routes and safe spaces for play and enjoyment.</p> <p>TPC advocates that RLC thinks differently about how 'open space' is defined and how this definition can be best developed to create thriving communities. The traditional reflection of open spaces has been in the form of neighbourhood reserves. By taking a wider approach, open spaces could also include other communal areas, such as 'connecting routes' that could contribute towards 'liveable streets'.</p> <p>In relation to how the policy is implemented, TPC advocates to Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the development and decision about future activity on Eastside open spaces is done in partnership with Eastside Hapū</li> <li>• That the development of and decisions about future activity on Eastside open spaces is done via engagement with the surrounding community likely to be the primary users. This includes our tamariki/rangatahi, ensuring their youth voice is included in all consultation regarding open spaces.</li> </ul> <p>Lastly, TPC would like to see community programs being developed to encourage engagement and increased use of Eastside open spaces. These open spaces should include essential services such as water fountains and BBQ areas. Open spaces should also be developed to be safe/inclusive, whānau friendly and intergenerational spaces that align with Tatau Pounamu kaupapa.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Draft Policy. The Tatau Pounamu Collective look forward to continuing our partnership with Council to make the Eastside a thriving community where all young people can reach their potential.</p>		