Fill This Space Beckenham

Graham Bennet Artwork ‘Engage’

Henry Howat, Beau Bennett, Ben Anderson, Matthew Klomp, Robbie Brown
Table of Contents:

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Literature Review
4. Methodology
   • 4.1 Preliminary Consultation
   • 4.2 Community Consultation
5. Results
   • 5.1 Mid-Heathcote Masterplan
   • 5.2 Engineering Evaluation
   • 5.3 Potential Options
   • 5.4 Community Amphitheatre
   • 5.5 Community Garden
   • 5.6 Farmers Market
   • 5.7 Native Community Landscape
   • 5.8 Dog Park
   • 5.9 Playground
   • 5.10 Descriptive Summary Graphs
   • 5.11 Beckenham School Workshop
   • 5.12 Other Research Method Results
6. Discussion & Limitations
7. Conclusion
8. Acknowledgements
9. References
10. Appendix
1. Executive Summary

1.1 Research Question:

To find the most beneficial and viable option for utilising the unused space behind the Beckenham South Library, including Hunter Terrace.

1.2 Aims and Objectives:

- To identify the current plan for the area and the stability of the ground
- To generate multi-use options for utilising space
- To consult the Beckenham community on what they believe to be the most beneficial and viable option
- To provide a recommendation for the most viable and beneficial option based on findings

1.3 Context of Research:

Beckenham is a primarily residential suburb at the base of the Port Hills. The Christchurch earthquakes heavily affected the small neighbourhood and the need for community driven projects became apparent. The space behind the Beckenham South library is currently unused and would be ideal for a short or long term development to benefit the community. This project draws similarities from on-going gap-filling projects within Christchurch, post-earthquake, aiming to best utilise vacant sites, with the theme of strengthening community ties.

1.4 Summary of Method:

Preliminary consultation involved gathering information from relevant parties and sources that our project will effect. These included; a site visit, Christchurch City Council contact, a literature review, and a meeting with the Beckenham Neighbourhood Association. Upon completion of the preliminary consultation,
we began our research in the community. We aimed to uncover both qualitative and quantitative data by using a variety of different research methods. These methods included; a flyer drop around the Beckenham loop, South Library display, South Library drop-in session, Beckenham School workshop, Beckenham School display, Beckenham School Market display, Facebook group, Survey questionnaires, Gmail address, cell phone number, community and school newsletters and a Southern View newspaper article.

1.5 Key Findings:

- Identified the Mid-Heathcote Masterplan as the current plan for the area
  - Currently on hold due to change in funding priorities
- All options received a high level of support except the Dog Park
- Three age dependent options:
  - Community Amphitheatre
  - Playground
  - Dog Park
- Three non-age dependent options:
  - Community Garden
  - Farmers Market
  - Native Landscape
- Qualitative data suggested multi-use
- Beckenham School Workshop showed a high level of support for the Playground

1.6 Limitations:

- Our interaction with the council wasn’t as envisaged and we found it difficult coordinating with them and finding the right person to speak to
- Coordination between the five of us was also a struggle at times because of everyone’s varying schedules
• The University of Canterbury guidelines restricts interaction with children due to ethical issues. This was a concern as it made it difficult to gather opinions from the youth of Beckenham
• Our research timeframe was also a limitation. If we had been given more time, we would have increased our sample size to the surrounding suburbs, local businesses, as well as more schools with the overall aim of strengthening the validity of the research

1.7 Suggestions for further research

• Further research is required around the feasibility of implementing each option. Investigation would be required into the level of Christchurch City Council funding available
• Investigation into the potential for local fundraising efforts
• Research into neighbouring suburbs would be beneficial to gauge community interest from a wider catchment area
• Consultation with landscape architects would provide a professional perspective on the potential development of the area
• The benefits of multi-use could be explored in-depth, and different combinations of each option could be analysed

2. Introduction

Fill This Space Beckenham was launched to find the most beneficial and viable option for utilising the unused space behind the Beckenham South Library, including Hunter Terrace (Figure 1). The Beckenham Neighbourhood Association wants to see the space used to its full potential and requires research on potential options to allow for further action. The positive use of green space is becoming increasingly important after the effects of the Christchurch earthquakes. Community relationships need to be strengthened and the development of this area will provide the necessary platform to do so.
The current plans for the area must be identified and the state of the ground assessed to move forward in the research process. A literature review is required to gather research on potential options and assess their suitability. Creating awareness of the project is necessary to involve the community and gather feedback on potential options. Community consultation is a crucial aspect of our research process as it covers the basis of our methodology. As the benefits of each option are subjective, the only way to quantify the level of benefit for each option is to gauge the popularity within the community while taking into account viability constraints. Based on this process we will make a final recommendation.

Figure 1: Map of Beckenham South Library with outline of specific project area

3. Literature Review

Our project takes shape and draws many similarities from the various ongoing gap-filling projects within post-earthquake Christchurch. Our core values encompassing our project were drawn from ‘Gap Filler’ (2004), a Christchurch initiative that aims to utilize vacant sites. The core values being, community engagement, experimentation, creativity and resourcefulness. Our group consulted various academic literatures in order to gain valuable insight
into the possible methods of community research. This aided in identifying options which could be suitable for the empty space in Beckenham while keeping within the guidelines of the research question, which is, again, to find the most beneficial and viable option for utilizing the unused space behind the Beckenham South Library, including Hunter Terrace.

Greene's (1992) paper was useful as a starting point for us as it distils the processes of community design in which our project wholly embodies. The article outlines the merits of community design projects, enhancing and beautifying the landscape and architecture of an area in order to foster a sense of community. This article also raised the issue of dramatic variations in public opinion that we took into account when undertaking our research and interpreting our results. The methods that we utilised were highly influenced by the work of Quan-Haase, Wellman, Witte & Hampton (2002) and Keitzmann, Hermkins, McCarthy & Silvestre (2011). These articles focused on the use of the Internet to encourage community engagement. What we took away from the Quan-Hasse, Wellman, Witte & Hampton (2002) articles in determining how we were going to approach our research was that the Internet is an excellent medium for stimulating community engagement as well as gathering input and feedback. However, community engagement through the Internet should only be used to supplement face to face and phone contact. While the Keitzmaan, Hermkins, McCarthy & Silvestre (2011) article provided us with valuable guidelines on how to best use the Internet through social media.

Public opinion as well as academic literature helped us to come up with six options that we felt were both beneficial to the community and viable. To exemplify this, much of our ideas were deemed beneficial and viable based on findings within the following literature; Mougeot (2006); Schipperijn et al. (2010); Lee, Shepley, & Huang: Sikes (2012); Coolen & Meesters (2012). These articles provided us with further knowledge and the grounds to select a Dog Park, Farmers Market, Natural Landscape and Community Garden as options for the gap-filling project at hand as the literature supported these options as both beneficial and viable.
4. Methodology

4.1 Preliminary Consultation

Preliminary consultation involved gathering information from relevant parties and sources that our project will effect. These include:

- Site Visit - This involved visiting the site as a group, gaining first-hand knowledge of the area and learning the practical limitations that we may face.

- Christchurch City Council - Contacting Ross Campbell, Christchurch City Council Park Operations Manager. This uncovered previous plans for the area including the Heathcote River Linear Park Masterplan.

- Literature Review - Reading previous academic research on similar topics that could provide us with advice on how to be most effective with our research and community engagement.

- Beckenham Neighbourhood Association Meeting - Initial contact with our community partner to learn their expectations from us, our initial thoughts and findings, and to discuss potential options for the area.

4.2 Community Consultation

Once the preliminary consultation was finished we began our research in the community. We had identified an already active group of members in Beckenham and wanted to utilise their passion. In response to this we incorporated methods which were about raising awareness of our project in the community. We also aimed to uncover both qualitative and quantitative data by using a variety of different research methods. These methods included:
• **Flyer Drop (Appendix 1)** – We dropped 1500 copies of our flyer around the Beckenham Loop that described our activities and intentions in the community in regards to the research project. It also provided contact information for our Gmail account, Facebook page, and drop-in times at the library and locations to fill out our survey.

• **Survey Questionnaires (Appendix 2)** - These questionnaires were left, along with a drop box for them upon completion, beside our displays at the South Library and Beckenham School. Our surveys used a 1 to 5 likert scale, this allowed participants to express the intensity of their feelings for each option while also having the choice of maintaining a neutral stance. We didn’t ask people to rank their preferred options as we thought this would limit our objective of providing a multi-use environment. A comments section was provided alongside each option and at the bottom of the page, for participants to share ideas and provide feedback on each option. We aimed to gather both quantitative and qualitative data. Overall 82 surveys were returned to the display drop boxes.

• **South Library Display (Appendix 3)** - This Display stood in the entrance of the South Library and provided information on our project as well as drop-in day times and a point to collect and fill out surveys.

• **South Library Drop in Session** - This drop-in session worked much like a focus group, it gave members of the community the opportunity to have face-to-face time with members of the group to talk about the project and express their opinions and concerns.

• **Beckenham School Workshop (Appendix 4)** - This involved visiting Beckenham School to present to 77 year 7 & 8 children about our “Fill This Space Beckenham” project. Our aim was to gather quantitative and qualitative data from the children via a simplified survey and a brainstorm session. We were overwhelmed with the level of creativity and understanding the children had with regards to our project and what was
best for the Beckenham community.

- **Beckenham School Display (Appendix 5)** - This display was set up in the school reception and provided information on our project and a place to collect and drop off surveys. The school reception was a vital place to hold our project information as it allowed us to reach the important demographic of the parents of school children.

- **Beckenham School Market Day** - An open day at Beckenham School that parents of children and community members attend to buy, sell and socialize. We attended this with surveys and our display to connect with community members in a friendly, face-to-face environment.

- **Facebook Page (Appendix 6)** - The creation of our ‘Fill This Space Beckenham’ Facebook page allowed interested members of the community to keep up-to-date on our projects progress. It also allowed them to place their own thoughts, ideas and feedback in an open forum available 24/7. The Facebook group was very popular across all demographics having all ages posting openly. To date the page has received 1028 views and 62 likes.

- **Gmail Address** - We set up a Gmail address: fillthisspacebeckenham@gmail.com. This address was for people that may not use Facebook but still have access to the Internet. It proved helpful with 11 responses from around the Beckenham community.

- **Cell Phone** - We also activated a phone number for people to contact us who did not have access to the Internet.

- **Newsletters** - We sent information about our project to Beckenham School and Beckenham Neighbourhood Association to be published in their newsletters. This was effective in raising awareness of our project in the community.
Southern View Newspaper (Appendix 7) - We were approached and later organised an interview with a local reporter asking for our project to appear in a half-page spread in the Southern View newspaper, a local paper from the Christchurch Star Company. The article contained a photo and the interview that took place. This helped gain awareness of our project on a large scale as well as neighbouring areas which are exposed to this paper.

5. Results

5.1 Mid-Heathcote Masterplan

After research into the current plan for the area and consultation with various council staff, we came across the Heathcote River Linear Park Masterplan. This Masterplan was prepared to guide the management and enhancement of the river corridor so that it could become an increasingly beautiful and valued neighbourhood park, while preserving the many layers of natural and cultural heritage. The Mid-Heathcote Masterplan gives guidance for the long-term management of the mid-section of the Heathcote River that lies between Colombo Street and Opawa Road.

In 2005 public consultation was carried out. The main areas of interest identified during the consultation included; a desire for a healthy river ecosystem, improved recreation facilities, a plan for Hunter Terrace, exotic and native planting, and more picnic areas, seating and children’s play areas. Based on the vision, goals and objectives gathered through community consultation, the following key goals were identified:

- **Natural Heritage:**
  - To protect and improve the health, ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity of the river and its corridor

- **Cultural heritage:**
- To provide for Ngāi Tahu’s cultural associations with the river

- Community Use and Enjoyment
  - To deliver a beneficial green space for the whole community to enjoy

- Communication
  - To minimise human effect on the river by raising awareness

Figure 2 below shows the plan for the first section of the Mid-Heathcote Masterplan between Colombo Street and Malcolm Avenue. This area includes the section of vacant land behind the Beckenham South Library that this project relates to. The plan outlines extensive development for the area including the closure of Hunter Terrace with old existing seal to be removed and replaced with grass, trees and paths. Other developments include extending existing Graham Bennett artwork ‘Engage’ to connect with the river, a new footbridge, and added car parking. The plan also includes the proposal to remove the existing pipeyards to create a new reserve incorporating active wells, a tennis court, new paths, and an enhanced BMX area.

Figure 2: Section 1 of the Mid-Heathcote Masterplan (Christchurch City Council, 2009)
However, the effects of the Christchurch earthquakes changed council plans and priorities in a major way. Ross Campbell, the Parks Operations Manager at the Christchurch City Council, stated that the Council was forced to focus their finances on the rebuild, particularly horizontal infrastructure, and fixing the roads. Funding was taken away from projects like this. Ross assured us that a bid would be made for inclusion in the 2015-2025 Long Term Christchurch Development Plan. In the meantime, Ross indicated that the Council would welcome a proposal from a community group to better utilise this open space. Any proposal would need to be in keeping with the Masterplan and have no financial burden on the Council.

5.2 Engineering Evaluation

The Detailed Engineering Evaluation of the Christchurch South Library provided no details on the current stability of the land surrounding the building. We therefore assume that the area is safe for developments; however further investigation into the geotechnical findings would be necessary once they become available. Figure 3 below shows a panoramic view of the area behind the South Library. The future of the library is uncertain, according to the quantitative report. The library is considered to be earthquake prone due to significant differential settlement exceeding the maximum allowable levels specified in the Building Code. The risk of collapse is low due to the presence of a secondary structure and the lightweight nature of the building. However, given the observed damage, it is recommended that the Christchurch City Council review the occupancy of this building.

Figure 3: Panoramic view of the area behind the South Library
5.3 Potential Options

We came up with five potential options based on site visits, literature review, and preliminary meetings with the Beckenham Neighbourhood Association. We added the Playground option after receiving substantial support from local residents. The following results are based on the quantitative and qualitative data gathered from surveys placed at each of our public displays. The options included:

- Community Amphitheatre
- Community Garden
- Farmers Market
- Native Community Landscape
- Dog Park
- Playground

5.4 Community Amphitheatre

A Community Amphitheatre involves a landscaped stage designed at the base of the naturally sloped land. Advantages include the promotion of local artists during community events and the potential for the area to double as a green space with minimal environmental impact. Disadvantages include the potential for noise pollution and the reliance on weather. Figure 4 below a large number of strong support votes at 28 with consistent votes for other levels of support. Popular community comments included; “A great example for local schools to perform Kapa Haka, dance and performance”.

![Community Amphitheatre chart](chart.png)

Figure 4: Community Amphitheatre results from library display surveys
5.5 Community Garden

A Community Garden is single piece of land gardened collectively by a group of people. Advantages include food production and providing a sense of community. There is the opportunity to run food education workshops to teach all members of the community proper gardening techniques. Disadvantages include the potential for vandalism and the need for volunteer input. Figure 5 below displays mixed results with a slight favour of support. Many neutral results may indicate the lack of interest in this option. Popular community comments include; “good idea, but vandalism is an issue”.

![Community Garden Chart]

Figure 5: Community Garden results from library display surveys

5.6 Farmers Market

A Farmers Market is a place where farmers sell their products directly to consumers. Advantages include the friendly, interactive environment and the opportunity to support local businesses in the area. Disadvantages include limited selection and the potential inconvenience compared to a larger supermarket. Figure 6 below shows the majority of voting in favour of this option with large amounts of strong support votes at 26. Popular community comments include: “paved surface good for incorporating stalls” and also “Dual purpose, could also incorporate small local events”.
5.7 Native Community Landscape

A Native Community Landscape involves native planting along the banks of the Heathcote River, incorporating the cultural significance of the area. Advantages include the benefits of native plants and their ability to provide a habitat for native wildlife. Disadvantages include the need for periodical maintenance. Figure 7 below illustrates a very similar voting pattern to the Farmers Market. A high number of neutral voters, and an even higher number of strong support voters. Popular community comments include: “Great for kids and adults, excellent to combine native plants and playgrounds”.

Figure 6: Farmers Market results from library display surveys

Figure 7: Native Community Landscape results from library display survey
5.8 Dog Park

A Dog Park is an open space allowing dogs to play without leads. Obstacles and seating areas would be added to the development to provide entertainment for the dogs and relaxation for the owner. Advantages include dog socialization and stimulation, which is extremely beneficial for a dog’s wellbeing. Human socialization also occurs which builds relationships within the community. Disadvantages include the potential danger to the public if the area is not secured. People who have a fear of dogs may be discouraged from visiting the library due to its close proximity to the Dog Park. Figure 8 below shows a high level of strong opposition towards this option with 41 votes. Safety issues appear to be the contributing factor with community comments such as “Dogs can be unpredictable and dangerous”.

![Dog Park results from library display survey](image)

5.9 Playground

The Playground option involves the extension of the original Playground area with added structures and enhancements of existing features. There is potential to incorporate a ‘natural’ theme to the Playground to link it in with the surrounding natural features, including the Heathcote River. Advantages include the ability for younger children to develop cooperative and problem solving skills
while also undergoing physical development. Disadvantages include the potential high cost of the project along with regular costly maintenance. Figure 9 below shows highest level of strong support out of all the options with 38 votes. This may be due to the large number of parents within the community, who wish to see improved play areas for their children. Popular community comments included; “Community asset, great for mums with young children at library”.

![Figure 9: Playground results from library display survey](image)

**5.10 Descriptive Summary Graphs**

![Figure 10: Average level of support for each option](image)
Figure 10 above shows the average level of support for each option from the surveys placed at the Christchurch South Library and Beckenham School displays. The Playground received the highest level of support with an average score of 3.69 out of 5. The Dog Park received the lowest level of support with an average score of 2.07 out of 5. The remaining four options received similar levels of support.

![City South Library and Beckenham School survey results](chart)

**Figure 11: Average level of support for each option from different age groups**

Figure 11 above shows the average level of support for each option from the four different age groups (0-20, 21-40, 41-60, and 61+) identified in the surveys placed at the Christchurch South Library and Beckenham School displays. The Playground received the highest level of support for participants aged between 0 and 20 with an average score of 4.45. The Dog Park received the lowest level of support for participants aged 61 and above with an average score of 1.67. The Community Amphitheatre option displays an age-dependent trend, as age increases so does the average level of support from participants. This may be due to older generations having a greater level of appreciation for local art and performances. The Playground and Dog Park options also display age-dependent trends, however with a negative relationship, as age increases the
average level of support from participant’s decreases. The remaining three options display a stable level of support across the different age groups.

5.11 Beckenham School Workshop

Figure 12 below represents the quantitative results of survey given to the children of Beckenham School. Not surprisingly, the Playground received the highest level of support with 34 strong support votes. There were no clear trends displayed across the six different options and their levels of support as the children had mixed opinions on each option.

The brainstorm session with the year 7 & 8 students produced excellent qualitative results in the form of comments and diagrams drawn on the sheets of paper. Popular ideas from the children for the vacant space behind the South Library included:
• Pool
• Outdoor Movie Screen
• Obstacle Course
• Skate Park
• Tree Hut
• Maze
• Paint Ball
• Half-court Basketball

5.12 Other Research Method Results

The Facebook page proved to be an excellent forum for the public to share ideas and provide feedback on the current options. Public ideas included:

• “I love the idea of an adventure playground for kids, maybe a junior assault course type thing…”

• “We hope the bike track stays, the kids love it! It would be great to incorporate maybe an “exercise themed” playground for kids”

• “I love the idea of a farmers market. Not only can you support local growers but the market expands to incorporate local entertainment for children and adults making it a great venue for family gatherings”

• “I would love to see a native community landscape that also provides natural filtering of the Heathcote with a view to improving the water quality”

The Gmail account proved to be reasonably helpful with eleven messages being received. The cell phone proved to be less popular with only one message being received, saying, “Dog Park please”. Unfortunately the drop in session had a poor turn out with only a few community members showing up, however this still added to our face-to-face community contact, which was difficult to acquire.
6. Discussion

Our research question aimed to discover the most beneficial and viable options for the space behind the Beckenham South Library, including Hunter Terrace. The Beckenham Neighbourhood Association had no existing ideas for this space to begin with, giving us an open opportunity to identify potential options for the space and to develop an asset for the Beckenham community. A low expectation of us from the beginning was beneficial, as any progress made was seen as a step in the right direction by the community. The research conducted has answered the research question and shows strong community support for a multi-use area. Five of our six options proved to be popular and applicable. The Dog Park option demonstrated the least amount of support due to safety issues and the exclusivity of the option. This was especially evident in elderly people who cited safety for children as a major factor. However, the other five options have the public support and flexibility to incorporate viable multi-use options for the designated area.

This project drew similarities from other gap-filling projects in Christchurch post- earthquake with common themes including community engagement, experimentation, creativity and resourcefulness. We believe the recommendations included in this report will achieve ‘gap-filler’ status and provide a developed green space for the community to enjoy. Greene’s (1992) paper highlighted the benefits of community design projects. This information influenced our choice of options and supported our goal of “enhancing and beautifying the landscape... in order to foster a sense of community” (Greene, 1992). The issue of dramatic variation in public opinion was also outlined by Greene (1992), this was not evident in our results as strong patterns were evident in our data.

Our initial findings, based on literature, identified benefits of Dog Parks, however negative aspects of Dog Parks were also outlined in literature (Association of Professional Dog Trainers, 2013) and these shone through in our
findings. The benefits of the five popular options were outlined in community comments obtained through our various research methods. This qualitative data was proven based on the following literature; Mougeot (2006); Schipperijn et al. (2010); Lee, Shepley, & Huang: Sikes (2012); Coolen & Meesters (2012).

6.1 Limitations

Throughout the research project we identified some limitations and things that didn’t go so well. For example, our interaction with the council wasn’t as anticipated and we found it difficult coordinating with them and finding the right person to speak to. Coordination between the five of us was also a struggle at times because of everyone’s varying schedules, however in saying that, the use of Facebook helped us overcome this hurdle. Also time was a bit of a limitation, if we were allocated more time we most likely would have increased our sample size. Although our sample size was an accurate representation of the Beckenham community, given a longer timeframe we would have increased our research area to the surrounding suburbs, local businesses as well as more schools with the aim of strengthening the research. There was also the issue of ethics with working with children, which we faced early on in our research but we successfully overcame this as Beckenham School actually invited us into their institute.

7. Conclusion

To summarise our main results, first was the Mid-Heathcote Masterplan, which was the plan in place for the area prior to the earthquake. Since then no further action has been taken and nobody we contacted at the council could confirm this plan was still in place at this stage. Many of the objectives of this plan tie in with themes of our project, such as emphasis on the natural landscape, enhancement of existing features of the area and to promote the use of urban green space. Our research results showed an overall high level of support for all
of the proposed options with the exception of the Dog Park. We found support for three of the options varied greatly with age, the Amphitheatre was more popular with older demographics while the Playground and Dog Park options were much more popular with younger demographics.

Qualitative data we gathered further highlighted the popularity of multiple uses for the space. Not surprisingly, the school workshop data showed very high support for the Playground. Based on our research we determined two key areas of development, natural landscape and community facilities. Many improvements to the natural landscape were proposed in the Mid-Heathcote Masterplan, based on this and our other research we felt native planting along the Heathcote river bank, as well as removal of some of the paved section, approximately 200m at the Colombo Street end, would be appropriate for the space. We feel this would enhance the natural landscape of the area and ties in well with the objectives of our project.

Our research also showed strong support for many of the community facilities outlined in the survey, these would go beyond the scope of the Mid-Heathcote Masterplan. The area is spacious enough to accommodate some semi-permanent facilities that would provide communal activities and strengthen community ties, fulfilling another one of our objectives. Based on this, facilities we would recommend would be a natural amphitheatre, using the natural incline of the grass area. Playground was also a very popular option, additions to the existing library Playground could prove to be a great community asset. Finally the remaining section of paved area could be well utilized for a Farmers Market or another appropriate option.

Further research is required before developments can take place. This would include researching the feasibility of implementing each option which involves investigation into the level of Christchurch City Council funding available and necessary safety regulations adhered to. Research into neighbouring suburbs and local businesses would be beneficial to gauge public
and private sector interest. Consultation with landscape architects would provide a professional perspective on the potential development of the area and would highlight the benefits of multi-use. Different combinations of each option could be explored and analysed to identify the most beneficial and viable option(s) for the use of the space behind the Beckenham South Library, including Hunter Terrace.
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Appendix 1: Flyer

Kia ora,

We are 5 students from the University of Canterbury geography department, here to conduct research in the Beckenham area on behalf of the Beckenham Neighbourhood Association. We are investigating possible uses for the unused land including and surrounding Hunter Terrace adjacent to the South library. The most beneficial and viable short and long term ideas will be presented to the Christchurch City Council to encourage further action.

- Farmers/Night Markets - Designated times where local arts, craft and produce stalls can set up shop.
- Community Amphitheatre - landscaped garden on the river could host community and school productions over summer.
- Community Garden - Urban organic vegetable patches open for the community.
- Dog Park - Open space allowing dogs to play without leads.
- Natural Landscape - Native planting landscape with picnic areas
- Natural Playground - Natural themed playground which integrates surrounding features

If you have any thoughts or ideas on how to best utilise this space, feel free to email us on fillthespacebeckenham@gmail.com, text us on 022 074 8808, or visit our Facebook page at www.facebook.com/fillthespacebeckenham.

Please come down to the South Library from September 2nd - 8th to see our display, fill out a survey, and add to our suggestion box. We will also be available for a community feedback session between 3-5pm on Thursday the 5th of September in meeting room 1 of the library. We look forward to hearing from you.

If you have any questions in regards to the research project please contact Prof Simon Kingham simon.kingham@canterbury.ac.nz 384 2893 (Simon is also a resident of Beckenham).

Regards,

Beau, Ben, Henry, Matt, Robbie
Appendix 2: Survey Questionnaire

Fill This Space Beckenham

What are we doing?

We are five students from the University of Canterbury Geography department and are conducting research in the Beckenham area on behalf of the Beckenham Neighbourhood Association. We are looking for possible uses for the unused land including and surrounding Hunter Terrace adjacent to the South Library. This is a community driven project and the research gathered will be used to present the most beneficial options to the Christchurch City Council.

Please rate the following options on which how beneficial you believe they will be to the surrounding community after having a look at our Facebook page @ https://www.facebook.com/fillthisspacebeckenham

Responses and any other comments you might have in regards to our project research can be dropped into the box situated beside our display at the City South Library inside the main entrance between the 2nd and 8th of September or sent to our group email @ fillthisspacebeckenham@gmail.com

Which age group do you belong to? □ 0-20 □ 21-40 □ 41-60 □ 61+

Community Amphitheatre

☐ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5
Oppose Support
Comments:

Community Garden

☐ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5
Oppose Support
Comments:

Dog Park

☐ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5
Oppose Support
Comments:

Farmers’ Market

☐ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5
Oppose Support
Comments:

Native Community Landscape

☐ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5
Oppose Support
Comments:

Adventure Playground

☐ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5
Oppose Support
Comments:

Feel free to include any additional comments you might have in the available space or overleaf:
Appendix 3: South Library Display
Appendix 4: Beckenham School Workshop

![Image of students participating in the workshop]

**Figure 13: Simplified Beckenham School survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community AmphiTheatre</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Garden</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dog Park</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farmers’ Market</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Community Landscape</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adventure Playground</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Beckenham School Display

Appendix 6: Facebook Page
Research seeks uses for Beckenham space

Five university students are researching what can fill unused space in Beckenham.

The Canterbury University geography third-year students are finding out people’s opinions of the best use for space on and surrounding Hunter Ter, near the South Christchurch Library.

Student Matthew Elmsley said they all had an interest in helping the Beckenham area.

To present the Christchurch there is less and less usable space following the destruction that the various earthquakes have caused, meaning leftover space like this unused would be a shame not only to the local community but to Christchurch City as a whole.

"The feedback from the community highlights the need for an option that benefits the community and provides a good foundation to build stronger community relationships," he said.

Ideas the group have come up with include a farmers’ night market, community amphitheatre, community garden and dog park. People are able to suggest their own ideas via the Fill This Space Beckenham Facebook page. Members of the Beckenham community can give their opinions at both the South Christchurch Library and in at the office of Beckenham School.

A poll on the Facebook page has found the farmers’ market to be the most popular idea.

Comments on the page have suggested a bike track, adventure playground, outdoor sculpture, native community landscape, tree to filter the Horsea River and a natural playground.

"It’s an attractive piece of land which could have numerous possibilities and I’d be happy to see a Saturday morning market there, especially if it sold second-hand books," Speedo Stockdale, Community Board chairman said the site is currently being investigated by the city council as a possible location for the a purpose-built building serving as space for community groups.

"It will be a good project alongside what we’re doing," he said.

Members of the community are also invited to contact the students at Fill This Space Beckenham@gmail.com or on 0210 660098 with any questions they might have.

The research findings will be presented to the community on the September 30 at the Catherine New Life Church, Calestane St.
Appendix 8: Library Display Survey Comments

**Community Amphitheatre:**

1-2
- Too much congestion of people in small space
- Christchurch too cold for this
- Not used enough
- Don’t want anything to complicate outlook from library
- May attract skateboarders
- Weather dependent

3
- Agree provided noise levels and hours are acceptable to local residents
- Parking issues
- Not sure what would be used for, especially in winter

4-5
- Fits with art focus for Beckenham
- Good for local entertainment
- Would complement South library activities
- Fantastic idea, especially for long summer evenings
- “An excellent idea, all ages could enjoy live theatre generated at a community level, wonderful for school productions and theatre sports.”
- Could be incorporated with natural landscape
- Activities would encourage active, native, people centred environment
- Good but wind shielding and parking need addressing
- Ballet and performances
- Out of main city, malthouse and other amateur drama groups in area
- “Brilliant for building community and multi-use for many sectors”
- “great example for local schools to perform Kapa Haka, dance and performances”

**Community Garden:**

1-2
- Not in front of library, too public, too exclusive, by rifle range?
- Don’t want anything to complicate the outlook from the library
- Needs volunteer input
- Not necessary
- Lack of Security for food.
- Already plenty around in area.
- May disrupt multi-use of land

3
- Could end up being for a select group and not for all of the community
- As long as it is up kept
- Possible, but long-term sustainability for maintenance needs exploring
- Not for whole area

4-5
- Good idea, but can look messy and vandalism is an issue
- I just completed research that showed community gardens help to increase existing social capital. A great tool for helping to rebuild and strengthen the community as well as teaching new skills
- Already community garden in Strickland Street
• Enhance use of library and red cafe
• “Excellent, more education is needed about our food systems and we need to take food out of corporate hands”

**Dog Park:**

1-2
• Plenty of other spaces for this area
• Too exclusive
• Too close to small children using library
• Some kids may be scared of dogs
• Dogs can be unpredictable and dangerous
• Definitely not
• Unfriendly to those who don’t own dogs
• Too close to major road to have dogs loose
• Too much noise (barking)
• Issue of dog poo
• Inappropriate space, too small, Victoria park much better
• Victoria park close
• Dogs anti-social, Beckenham park already full of dogs
• It's about people first
• Dog owners not always most responsible

3
• Not necessary as one up in Victoria Park
• Would need to be elderly and disability friendly

4-5
• Would really fill a gap in the community and keep dogs off school areas. I would use this frequently.
• Obstacles for dogs to play on
• High dog ownership in area

**Farmers Market:**

1-2
• Could impact Opawa farmers market
• Would prefer night market
• Must be between north side of the library and river
• Do we need more farmers markets?
• Already one in Fifield Ave
• Hunter Terrace often Floods.
• Issue of rubbish left behind

3
• Would only operate a couple of days during the week leaving a midweek gap, multiuse?
• Dual purpose could also incorporate small local events

4-5
• Provided sellers are the growers
• Local community would support
• Beware of litter
• Provided it doesn’t cut up the lawn
• Parking?
• “Yes! The more the merrier, a very healthy, happy option! Possibly a summer spring market?”
• “More local fresh produce is what Christchurch needs! Good socialising too!”
• Only if incorporated with natural landscape
• Paved surfaces good for incorporating stalls

Native Community Landscape:

1-2
• Too boring?
• Must only be natives and exotics
• Would have to be ‘low growing’ to prevent safety issues
• Can ruin Domestic gardening
• Plenty of native plants already

3
• Would fit in well with surrounding area
• Many great native landscapes along the river already

4-5
• Yes, but do not obliterate existing trees for political correctness
• The river attracts birdlife so it is important to provide habitats to support this wildlife
• Beneficial for the environment supporting ecosystems for this area
• Beneficial for all ages
• All ages could create and maintain
• Doesn’t need to be religiously native
• Would be ok, not very functional though
• “Great for kids and adults excellent to combine native plants and playgrounds”

Adventure Playground:

1-2
• Known paedophiles in the area
• Cannot be between north side of the library and river
• Too noisy
• Should be developing Beckenham park first
• Very close to busy roads e.g. Colombo Street.
• Already adequate facilities in area e.g. Beckenham School

3
• Could be part of multi-use plan

4-5
• The library is a big drawcard for families already so a playground here is likely to be well-used
• Positive extension of children’s physical development in exploration and complimentary to intellectual activities undertaken in the library. Aesthetically balancing the two learning environments
• Occupy children while parents visit library
• Lots of kids in area
• Would encourage children to visit library (attraction)
• Good to have near library
• Good to have a different playground
• Just a normal playground? Does it need to be different?
• Would augment the family atmosphere already provided by library and increase appeal of area as a family hub
• Community asset, great for mums with young children at library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Love to see family focus initiative to benefit Beckenham community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upgrade BMX track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adult exercise circuit – good for health and wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Picnic areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fix land and rebuild library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prime Riverbank. Make it user friendly and accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I would like to see picnic tables under the large trees that could be freely accessible for lunch/picnic/social occasions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I love it the way it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Car parking major issue at library being overlooked, bringing more cars to the area without adequate parking would cause major issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why not just leave it as a green space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “It is pleasant to have open vistas out of library windows, lots of green grass would be detrimental to integration of library to its surroundings. Connection to the river is also important.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 9: Beckenham School Workshop Survey Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Amphitheatre:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How would it be paid for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good for local schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good for Beckenham Drama Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Garden:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most people in Beckenham already have a vege garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good but downside that it could be vandalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Great idea, would be good if the school could supervise it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would be great fun to use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dog Park:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It’s near a road so not the best location for a dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too noisy and messy, especially next to a library x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not enough space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Noise from dogs could disturb the library atmosphere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4-5
- Great for dogs to play and exercise x3
- Awesome, need more
- Good idea, there’s not enough spaces for dogs in Beckenham

**Farmers Market:**

1-2
- Already too many x2
- Not practical next to a library, noise etc.
3
- Cool for busking opportunities (multi use – Amphitheatre)
4-5
- Beckenham doesn’t have a market so a farmers market would be cool
- It would be good for the school to have a stall sometimes
- There are not enough farmers markets in the area, just Rudolph Steiner
- Maybe once a week
- Cool idea if could get enough people to participate

**Native Community Landscape:**

1-2
- Boring
4-5
- Good idea, could have community garden in the middle
- Nice to go for walks in
- Good Idea, it would be used a lot
- Would be cool with a BBQ area

**Adventure Playground:**

1-2
- Already too many x2
3
- Only good for kids to use
- Already lots of playgrounds x2
4-5
- Fun for kids in the area x4
- As much as I want one it might be too noisy next to a library
- Do two playgrounds, one for little kids and one for older kids x2
- Adventure playground could be an extension of the already existing playground by the library