

Canterbury

District Health Board

Te Poari Hauora ō Waitaha

Proposed Sale of Former Templeton Hospital Site

Summary of Submissions

April 2003

Published in April 2003 by the
Canterbury District Health Board
PO Box 1600, Christchurch, New Zealand

This document is available on the Canterbury District Health Board web site:

<http://www.cdhb.govt.nz>

Introduction

The Canterbury District Health Board wishes to thank all those individuals and groups who contributed to making a submission on the proposed sale of the ex-Templeton Hospital land.

This Summary of Submissions sets out the key points and issues raised by the submissions received as part of the Canterbury District Health Board consultation process.

The Summary of Submissions will be forwarded to the Minister of Health, together with Canterbury District Health Board's recommendation relating to the proposed sale.

When sales of hospital land and buildings are proposed, District Health Boards are required, under the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 to obtain the Minister of Health's approval to the sale. Before approving the sale the Minister must be satisfied that the Canterbury District Health Board is aware through consultation, of the views of the Canterbury population to the sale of the land.

It is noted that in the papers sent to stakeholders, we invited them to indicate whether they wanted to attend a meeting as part of the consultation process. A separate notice about this meeting is **attached** with these papers.



Jean O'Callaghan

Chief Executive : Canterbury District Health Board

The Consultation Process

In early December 2002, the Canterbury District Health Board commenced the consultation process for the proposal to dispose of the ex-Templeton Hospital land. The process included:-

- 1 Sending copies of the Consultation Document and Submission Booklet to known stakeholders.
- 2 A mail drop in the Templeton area involving 600 addresses.
- 3 The publication of notices in the Christchurch Press and Christchurch Star from early December 2002 through until mid February 2003.
- 4 Posting the Consultation Documents on the Canterbury District Health Board website.

The Consultation Document provided a brief background of events leading up to the sale proposal, why the DHB wishes to sell the property, and the key components of the proposed sale process. The document requested feedback on four questions which were included in the Submission Booklet attached to the Consultation Document.

Submissions could be made either in writing, by email or verbally. If a verbal submission was made, Canterbury District Health Board staff would record the view communicated.

Feedback

32 written submissions were received. Of those 8 were from non-government organisations, 1 was from a local lobby group, 20 were from private citizens and 3 from local government.

Responses to the Questions

Question 1 – Do you think the land should be disposed of, if not, why not?

Of the 32 responses to this question, 8 said that the land should be sold, 11 said the land should not be sold and 12 noted that if the land was sold, a portion of it should be retained. One submission made no comment on this question. Key points to emerge included:-

- ❑ Comment that the submitter believed the land had been gifted to the predecessor of the Canterbury District Health Board for the care of intellectually disabled persons. As such, it should be retained in whole or in part for that purpose.
- ❑ Some of the submissions suggested that the buildings and land be used for accommodation/recreation for intellectually disabled persons.
- ❑ Other submissions said that if the land was sold, a portion should be retained for use by Brackenridge Estate Limited (Brackenridge Estate Limited is a subsidiary of Canterbury District Health Board and since October 1999 has operated a residential facility for up to 86 intellectually disabled persons for whom community care may not be appropriate. Brackenridge is located on the southern portion of the ex-Templeton Hospital land), or set aside as a reserve.
- ❑ Those supporting disposal made comment that as the land was no longer in use and there was an ongoing cost in retaining it, the land should be sold and the proceeds used for other health purposes.

Question 2 – Do you think the Canterbury District Health Board should retain the land? if so, why?

Many of the comments received expanded upon question 1 above. In particular:-

- ❑ The land and buildings should be retained for rehabilitation and accommodation facilities for intellectually disabled persons.
- ❑ There was a lack of recreation facilities for the intellectually disabled and the land would provide an open space for their use and use by the wider community.
- ❑ The land should be retained as an asset for future use and leased out to help recover costs in the meantime.

Question 3 – If you think the Canterbury District Health Board should retain the land? What should it be used for?

Again, themes noted in questions 1 and 2 came through. In addition, comments were made that:-

- ❑ The land could be used for various health purposes such as a hospice care centre.
- ❑ Use for community housing/older persons housing.
- ❑ Use for farming.

Question 4 – Do you have any other issues about the proposed sale you would like to raise?

Comments from questions 1 to 3 emerged. In addition, comments were made that:-

- ❑ There was a need to protect the long term security of facilities and land for the intellectually disabled. A feasibility study should be carried out on best use of the land pending that end use.
- ❑ A Trust could be set up to run the property for the intellectually disabled.
- ❑ Funds from any sale should be put towards people with intellectually disabilities rather than in the general health pool.
- ❑ The land should not be re-zoned. The green belt should be protected.
- ❑ The land should not be used for a high density housing development.

Comment from Canterbury District Health Board

- ❑ A number of submissions commented that the land had been gifted to the Crown for use in the care of intellectually handicapped persons. The submissions note that because the land was gifted for this use, the Canterbury District Health Board has moral and legal obligations to continue to make it available for that purpose.
- ❑ This is not correct. The Canterbury District Health Board confirms the land was not gifted but purchased by the Crown. The first portion of land was purchased in 1917 as part of the Crown buying a large block of land for 12,500 pounds. The Ministry for Public Works was the department responsible at the time. The second block was purchased at the value of 35.00 pounds per acre from the estate of E E Jenkins in 1929. Neither purchase contained an obligation on the Crown as to how the land was to be used.

- A number of the submissions made comment that an area of land should be gifted for utilisation by Brackenridge Estate Limited for recreation and possibly rehabilitation for the intellectually disabled or as a reserve.

We note that the Brackenridge Estate Limited submission considers that the site leased by them is sufficient to meet clinical and recreational needs of their residents. The submission sets out that the Brackenridge site includes an area currently fenced off and forested, which they intend to develop over time as a recreational area for residents.

- The underlying view of a number of submissions related to the requirements of people with intellectual disabilities and the need for the land to be retained for future use by them.

The issue of the needs of the intellectually disabled community of Canterbury was dealt with at the time that the decision was made to close Templeton Hospital. Considerable consultation was undertaken with community at that time. Templeton Hospital was finally closed in March 2000.