



MISSION BAY-KOHIMARAMA RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION INC.

11 November 2016

Comments on **Tamaki Precinct Event Guidelines** – Draft July 2016

The Mission Bay Kohimarama Residents Association has the following comments on the draft guidelines.

1. Kohimarama and Mission Bay are represented by a single residents' association. Please change references to the separate organisations to 'Mission Bay Kohimarama Residents Association'.
2. There is an existing agreement to limit Tamaki Drive road closures to no more than 8 per year. Please include this existing agreement in the document in 4.2.3
3. In Table 4.3.2, Business Associations and Residents Associations are combined in the one group. The current description "*Provide feedback on events that may impact their operations*" relates purely to businesses. Please recognise the role of Residents Associations by adding "*or the community*" to the end of this statement.
4. Also in Table 4.3.2, the statement describing the role of the Local Board and involvement of community stakeholders is very weak, particularly the statement "*It is expected that this feedback will be representative of the local communities that the Orakei Local Board represent.*". We suggest adding "*To this end, the Local Board will advise relevant stakeholders representing the local community of such events, provide reasonable opportunity for them to provide feedback, and assess any feedback received*".
5. Much of the document relates to large-scale events. The Local Board is only required to provide feedback representative of the community where numbers are greater than 500 or various other thresholds are met. MBKRA is also interested in having clear principles around small scale events, particularly on Selwyn Reserve.

As an example, we were recently advised of an application for a Christmas party in Selwyn Reserve for Uniservices. They proposed to secure an area for their exclusive use, provide food trucks and supply food and alcohol. We considered this and did not have any specific objection, but it did raise more general questions about how to deal with such applications where there might be more local impact or conflict with other uses.

Rather than reviewing each such application at relatively short notice, based potentially on subjective considerations that could differ from application to application, we would like to see a simplified booking and assessment process for

small events, based on conformance with pre-agreed principles. The principles might include:

- a. The acceptable area or proportion of the overall area that can be removed from public use at high demand/low demand times. For example, during busy weekends, we would be reluctant to see more than minor areas set aside for exclusive use, with most of the Reserve remaining available for informal public use, but we might accept a greater exclusive area during the week, particularly during the day.
- b. A principle around the frequency of exclusive events. We would not want to get to the point where we had multiple weddings or other events every weekend that effectively carved off a piece of the reserve and excluded it from the public every weekend throughout summer.
- c. Specific parts of Selwyn Reserve which would not be available for exclusive use unless supported by a full assessment. For example, we would not want to see all the beach frontage areas taken over by exclusive use, preventing the public from having reasonable access between the beach and reserve. Nor would we want the playground or fountain to be taken for exclusive use.
- d. Noise level potential to be minor.
- e. Hours of use
- f. Purpose of the event; business functions, weddings, parties, commercial events – is everything acceptable?
- g. Alcohol use – we are not opposed specifically, just would like clarity around what is acceptable and what is not

If the event meets the principles/criteria, then no consultation would be required with community organisations, and the approvals process could be very streamlined. Where an event does not meet the principles/criteria, it would have to go through the full event application procedure.

We are keen to have public assets such as Selwyn Reserve well used by the public, and believe that small events can be beneficial to both the group concerned and the broader public by adding character and a 'buzz' to the area. This, however, should not be at the expense of the rights of the general public to enjoy local amenities. We would therefore like the principles around the balance between these two potentially competing interests to be set out clearly in the process.

We are not sure how this is best incorporated in your document. We note Vellenoweth Green has its own management plan. Perhaps a similar plan could be developed for Selwyn Reserve, concentrating initially on event management. Alternatively, we note that in Appendix 2 under Health and Safety, different types of events requiring different levels of detail and planning are defined. Perhaps a similar approach could be taken for all aspects of the application, defining a streamlined process for low impact non-commercial events, subject to them meeting the principles discussed above. We would recommend that this be incorporated right at the start of the document rather than in the rather lengthy appendices, to make it clear that there are multiple levels of events requiring different levels of planning.

6. The flow chart in Appendix 1 appears to be primarily aimed at internal management of an event application, rather than being addressed towards applicants to help them understand the process. The whole process looks rather daunting and complex, and is rather intimidating. You might consider another flowchart specifically designed to help applicants understand the things they need to get their event application submitted and approved, particularly for low-impact events. I would envisage it being based around a series of decision points, such as how many attendees, level of noise expected, area requested, is it a commercial event, amount of waste, any road closures, alcohol, security etc. It might also set out which, if any, stakeholders need to be involved in the process and how. This information is all there in the document, but is not that accessible for amateur organisers. If the goal is to support the use of public facilities, then you do need to provide a simplified guide.
7. The flowchart provides minimal guidance on the roles of the various stakeholders. Again, while the roles and criteria are contained within the overall document, the flowchart basically just says consult with stakeholders if required, and invite them to a debrief if required. This is pretty vague. While it is clearly the intent of the process to involve local community groups as appropriate, nothing in the document as written explicitly requires Residents Associations to be involved, nor sets out criteria when they should be involved. We would encourage you to be more explicit, either in the flow chart, Table 4.3.2 or the body of the document, or all three. We don't need much detail, just an explicit commitment to involve RAs and the criteria for doing so.

Overall, we are supportive of the Event Guidelines document, and with consideration of the above points, believe it could be very useful.

Yours sincerely

Don Stock
Chairman
Mission Bay Kohimarama Residents Association