

Attachment A: Comparison of options to progress management planning for Chelsea

		Option 1a: Re-initiate individual RMP	Option 1b: Begin individual RMP	Option 2: Include as part of a multi-park RMP
Process	Cost	\$45,000	\$74,000	\$120,000: more expensive than an individual plan but lower cost when coverage will be achieved across Kaipātiki Local Board's 161 parks
	Time	Six months	Nine months	15 months: slower than an individual plan but faster to develop when considering the number of parks that will be included in the plan.
	Consultation issues, risks or benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear how prior public consultation has informed the preparation of the draft reserve management plan (RMP) • Unclear if or how mana whenua engagement has informed the draft RMP and would probably not meet the statutory obligation to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi • Views sought in preparing the RMP may be up to seven years old and may not reflect the current community's or mana whenua's issues or aspirations for the reserve. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full statutory consultation carried out • Key stakeholders and mana whenua would have their views reconfirmed prior to notifying any draft RMP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits in reducing demand on community and mana whenua for engagement and consultation when considered across a number of parks • Opportunity for the community and mana whenua to consider how their park network best meets their needs and aspirations.
Content	Level of detail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level of contextual detail and individualised policies embedded in plan • Risk that it will raise expectations around the level of resourcing provided for Chelsea. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As for Option A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less contextual detail embedded in plan for each park; however bespoke policies to address special management issues of particular parks included at section/chapter level

		Option 1a: Re-initiate individual RMP	Option 1b: Begin individual RMP	Option 2: Include as part of a multi-park RMP
	Network view	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will not provide a view or address common management issues across the network or indicate which parks in the network will provide for particular recreational/community needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As for Option A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a holistic and integrated view of the local board's core park management issues across the local network • Allows choices to be made between which activities might occur in particular parks across the local board area. • Provides consistency of open space management across local board area and park type
	Ease of use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy for users to see vision, objectives and policies specific to Chelsea; • Potential confusion that Chelsea not included in multi-park plan and confusion that policies framed differently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As for Option A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for users to be confused about the general policies that apply across multiple parks and policies for specific reserves where not clearly delineated • Consistent layout of open space management plans across the region will enable ease of use and will highlight differences between local board approaches to managing parks within each area
	Ongoing currency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires separate resourcing to keep plan current into the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As for Option A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the plan will be included in work programme to keep it current and responsive to best practice and changing community needs.