

Draft Lyttelton Master Plan

for public consultation

November 2011

Summary of Submissions



PREPARED BY

AERU – Lincoln University

PREPARED FOR

Christchurch City Council

Table of contents

Introduction to this report	4
The total number of submissions	4
Methodology.....	4
How to read this document	4
Overall summary of findings	5
Submissions on Section 1 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan	7
1 Introduction	7
1.1 Why this suburban centre?.....	7
1.2 What is a Master Plan?	7
1.3 Policy and decision making	7
1.4 The Master Plan development framework	7
Submissions on Section 2 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan	8
2. Vision.....	8
2.1 The vision for Lyttelton's town centre and beyond.....	8
2.2 Lyttelton Master Plan goals	8
2.3 Master Plan actions.....	8
Submissions on Section 3 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan	9
3. The place	9
3.1 Lyttelton's place in the context of Christchurch.....	9
3.2 Lyttelton's history to the present	9
3.3 Lyttelton's earthquake damage	9
Submissions on Section 4 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan	10
4. Master Plan process.....	10
4.1 The process which has informed this Master Plan	10
4.2 Outcomes of community engagement	11
Submissions on Section 5 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan	12
5. Master Plan actions	12
5.1 Economy and Business actions	12
(E1) Funding provision for a Lyttelton Marketing and Attraction campaign.....	12
(E2) London Street WiFi.....	13
(E3) Appoint a Lyttelton case manager.....	14
(E4) Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace	14
(E5) Funding options and temporary support.....	15
Other Comments.....	16
5.2 Movement actions	17
(M1) Movement and the waterfront	17
(M2) Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement).....	19
(M3) Pedestrian linkages	21
(M4) London Street public realm enhancements and public event opportunities	21

(M5) Parking investigations	22
(M6) Access to and from Lyttelton.....	23
Other Comments.....	25
5.3 Natural environment actions	25
(N1) A new civic square.....	25
(N2) Pool garden off-season access	26
(N3) Rooftop park between, or on a combined, Lyttelton Library and Service Centre	26
(N4) Head to Head Walkway	27
(N5) Temporary landscapes	27
(N6) Local landscape and heritage interpretation.....	27
(N7) Interpretation of Tangata Whenua values.....	28
Other Comments.....	29
5.4 Community well-being/culture and heritage actions.....	29
(C1) Improved utilisation of the Lyttelton Recreation Centre	29
(C2) Alternative use of a Council property on Canterbury Street.....	30
(C3) Combined Lyttelton Library and Service Centre redevelopment	31
(C4) New public amenities in the town centre	31
(C5) Lyttelton War Memorial Cenotaph relocation investigation and reinstatement.....	32
(C6) Naval Point redevelopment	32
(C7) Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street.....	33
(C8) Performance/film venue.....	34
(C9) Emergency preparedness.....	35
Other Comments.....	35
5.5 Built environment actions.....	36
(B1) Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments	36
(B2) Design and character guidance	37
(B3) Inclusion of local involvement in the existing Urban Design Panel	37
(B4) Identify and assist retention of remaining built heritage.....	38
Other Comments.....	38
Submissions on Section 6 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan	39
6. The process from here	39
6.1 Lyttelton Master Plan actions	39
6.2 Implementation Plan	39
6.3 The process from here	39
Specific text change suggestions.....	40
Quantitative analysis of specific questions	41
The total number of likes and dislikes for each action	41
The nature and ranking of the most important actions identified.....	44
The nature and total number of the most urgent actions identified	46
Submitters	48
Submitter details.....	48
Total number and percentage of submitters who want to be heard.....	59
Submitters who want to be involved in implementation of each action	60

Introduction to this report

This report presents and summarises the submissions made on the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan (the Plan) dated November 2011. Submissions were provided by a number of main sources: individuals; community groups and NGO's; professional groups and businesses and government agencies.

The total number of submissions

In total, 197 submissions were made on the Plan. Sixty three (32%) were provided on the official submission form for the Plan, forty eight (24%) through the Have Your Say form and eighty six (44%) as free form submissions, often in the form of a letter-style submission provided via an electronic (Word) document or by the submitter providing a submission formatted similarly to the official submission form.

Methodology

Each comment within the submissions was categorised into one or a number of themes and topics. The themes were based on the Plan's structure, while the topics evolved from the comments made. The analysis team sorted, categorised, analysed and summarised the information in writing this report. Each comment has been read multiple times by the analysts.

This report presents points made by multiple submitters and one-off ideas. The information presented cannot be considered total support or opposition for an action, as it is not possible to weight the strength of opinions for particular points within the whole community. The report does however contain descriptions of the amount of support for a particular point within the comments made. The numbers provide another general indication of the level of support for each action.

How to read this document

The structure of this report follows the sections contained in the Plan.

Each section begins with a summary of the Plan's text.

The points made by submitters under each section are categorised and described. The majority of comment is contained under each of the actions described in section 5 of the Plan; a reflection of the official submission form provided to the public and of the public's interest in providing comment on tangible actions.

A small number of specific text changes were provided and they have been listed in a section on page 40 of this document.

The Overall Summary of Findings section at the start of the report presents analysis of the quantitative responses asked on the official submission form, the most discussed topics and topics that were repeated in a number of plan sections.

A small number of comments received, considered outside the scope of the Plan but still useful for other aspects of the Greater Christchurch recovery, were categorised into a usable format for CCC and are not included in this report. All other comments have been considered and included in preparing this report.

Overall summary of findings

This section begins with a discussion of the quantitative results found at the end of the report and then presents a summary of the qualitative findings, discussing the most commented on issues and those that crossed a number of areas.

The numbers below are a count of the number of people who identified they *liked/disliked*, or considered *urgent* or *important* on the official submission form particular actions in the Plan, or clearly indicated such information on the Have Your Say form or on a free form submission.

Overall far more actions were *liked* (1808) than *disliked* (232).

The action that was liked the most was M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement) (76), followed by N1: A new civic square (72), E4: Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace (66), E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager (65) and M3: Pedestrian linkages (65). The actions that were disliked the most were M1: Movement and the waterfront (22), N3: Rooftop park between, or on a combined, Lyttelton Library and Service Centre (22), M5: Parking investigations (21), M4: London Street public realm enhancements and public event opportunities (13) and C5: Lyttelton War Memorial Cenotaph relocation investigation and reinstatement (12). It should be noted though that for even the actions that were disliked the most by submitters they were still liked by more submitters by a ratio of in most cases over 2 to 1. The actions that were most disliked in proportion to likes were M5: Parking investigations (39 like and 21 dislike) and N3: Rooftop park between, or on a combined, Lyttelton Library and Service Centre (48 like and 22 dislike).

The most important actions identified by submitters on the submission form were M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement) (33) then M1: Movement and the waterfront (24), N1: A new civic square (21), C7: Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street (19) and E3 - Appoint a Lyttelton case manager (15).

The most urgent actions were M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement) (20), N1: A new civic square (13), C7: Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street (11), B1: Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments (11) and E4: Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace (10).

When the most *like/dislike*, *important* and *urgent* actions are considered together, these actions stood out as the most significant actions for submitters: M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement), N1: A new civic square, E4: Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace, E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager and C7: Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street.

Of the 197 submitters, 67 stated that they wished to be heard during a submission process, 78 stated that they didn't wish to be heard and the remaining 52 did not indicate either way if they wished to be heard or not.

Of those who stated they wished to be heard, the actions most liked were M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement) (30), N1: A new civic square (30), E5: Funding options and temporary support (27), B1: Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments (27) and E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager (26). The most disliked actions were N3: Rooftop park between, or on a combined, Lyttelton Library and Service Centre (10), M1: Movement and the waterfront (9), M5: Parking investigations (8), M4: London Street public realm enhancements and public event opportunities (7) and C2: Alternative use of a Council property on Canterbury Street (7). The most important actions were M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement) (15); M1: Movement and the waterfront (10), N1: A new civic square (9); C7: Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street (9) and E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager (8). The most commonly stated *urgent* actions were M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement) (13), N1: A new civic square, C7: Donald Street arts precinct and art in

the street and B1: Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments (all 6).

Across all the comments made by submitters, a number of issues stood out and were commented on more than others. In most cases the high level of discussion of particular issues matched the quantitative results presented above. There is further discussion of each of these actions within the body of this report, but a short summary of the key issues for each of the most discussed actions is presented below.

M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement). Removing vehicles and providing access to Norwich Quay was considered a key step in ensuring the success of the Plan. Others balanced this argument with comments stating that it is important to retain a working port.

M6: Access to and from Lyttelton. This action was discussed from a number of different angles, including ensuring there are alternative routes out of Lyttelton during emergencies; repairing the route to Sumner and access to and from Diamond Harbour via the ferry.

E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager was strongly supported. There was particularly strong support for a local person to be appointed who understands the place, the people, is accessible and has in-depth knowledge. The person also needs to have access to all levels of decision-making.

E1: Funding provision for a Lyttelton Marketing and Attraction campaign. There was support for this action as long as it was based on an understanding of the Lyttelton community. Some saw this as not the best spend of money though.

N1: A new civic square was a very popular concept. This would be a focal point for people to meet, for families to bring their children and which could be used for festivals/functions. There was a broad range of opinions on where the square would be best located.

C1: Improved utilisation of the Lyttelton Recreation Centre was seen as important, particularly to provide a venue that catered for more than 120 people, which is the current maximum in Lyttelton. Interest in this action reflects the general desire for the repair of existing or provision of new communal spaces for people to gather and undertake various activities.

C7: Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street. There was very strong support for this concept, as Donald Street is viewed as the cultural heart of Lyttelton. There was also strong support for rebuilding the Lyttelton Museum on its former site or nearby.

B1: Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments. Comments concerning this action were mainly to do with assisting business to get back operating and not to hinder activities, particularly by not imposing the existing on-site car parking requirements. There was a strong sentiment of finding Lyttelton solutions to urban design/planning issues and using Lyttelton people to find the solutions, such as appointments to an urban design panel.

The need to include the community in generating ideas, creating plans, running processes and making decisions ran through many topics. The community in Lyttelton showed and stated that it is keen and interested in being involved in all aspects of the recovery of the town.

Across some areas there seemed to be a tension between Lyttelton being a port community that caters for long term locals and a creative community that caters to a broad range of interests and range of people, including the wider Christchurch community and tourists.

Submissions on Section 1 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan

1 Introduction

Master Plan summary:

On February the 22nd 2011, the most destructive earthquake to hit a city in New Zealand in 80 years measuring in at 6.3 on the Richter scale, tore through Christchurch leaving in its tracks a series of major aftershocks, destruction and devastation. The continuous aftershocks have left the central city and smaller commercial centres, including Lyttelton, ravaged. Commercial centres such as Lyttelton are important to the city as they help to sustain social and economic wellbeing of the communities in Christchurch, being places where people can access a diverse range of goods and services. Due to the importance suburban centres for the city, the council has provided plans for the recovery of these local areas.

1.1 Why this suburban centre?

No comments.

1.2 What is a Master Plan?

No comments.

1.3 Policy and decision making

No comments.

1.4 The Master Plan development framework

People were mostly supportive of the Plan, with comments of congratulations and praise for the development of the Plan and in particular for recognising Lyttelton as a crucial part of the recovery of the Canterbury region. There was also appreciation for providing opportunity to comment.

One concern was expressed at the Plan containing too many unachievable dreams and visions and a suggestion to not over-manage the community. Another concern was that the Plan has not captured the aspirations of the Lyttelton people; of critical importance is public access to the water front, and that the Plan is deceptive in relation to the disconnect between peoples desires and those collated by the Community Board and the proposed 'Heads of Agreement' surrounding Port-related heavy traffic on Norwich Quay and public waterfront access.

Submissions on Section 2 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan

2. Vision

Master Plan vision:

People will be attracted to Lyttelton because of the lifestyle on offer, diverse businesses and unique entertainment options. It will once again be renowned as a thriving centre with a mix of shops, boutique businesses and spaces for creativity to flourish. Locals and tourists will enjoy the ease of access to dramatic volcanic landscapes, the harbour and waterfront as well as new civic spaces and leisure attractions. The township will grow and make better use of existing facilities that support creative expression, education and self-sufficiency.

2.1 The vision for Lyttelton's town centre and beyond

Few comments were made on this section.

However, a clear, concise, inspiring, strong and easily accessible vision statement was recommended.

It was suggested the vision should encompass the interests of all stakeholders and to provide a positive direction going forward. It was noted that the vision needs to be consistent with CERA's Draft Recovery Strategy and, accordingly, themes for the Lyttelton vision that could be included were: a thriving port and township, a great place to live, a maritime destination for all Cantabrians.

It was suggested that all opportunities and constraints be considered in detail, be informed by the past and future character and by the financial and technical feasibility of options.

It was also suggested to take a step back, that perhaps all those involved are too close to it and if Lyttelton does not hold appeal for visitors then it will be ignored as a destination. It was commented that Lyttelton needs to be special, memorable, include history and be recognisable, charming and have character.

A vision suggestion was for Lyttelton to be an energy efficient and environmentally sustainable community.

Another vision suggestion was:

Portal to Canterbury's historic past, a vibrant sustainable community creating a living future (submitter 130).

2.2 Lyttelton Master Plan goals

In relation to *Goal 7 – Build the capacity of community facilities and services* attention was drawn to there being no mention of the pool being opened, Plunket Rooms being fixed or the fire station, St John's building and recreation centre, which are all essential services but are out of action.

Attention was also drawn to there being minimal comment on accessibility in the Plan and how this impacts on older persons who need to be able to continue to participate fully in the community as they choose.

2.3 Master Plan actions

No comments.

Submissions on Section 3 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan

3. The place

3.1 Lyttelton's place in the context of Christchurch

No comments.

3.2 Lyttelton's history to the present

No comments.

3.3 Lyttelton's earthquake damage

No comments.

Submissions on Section 4 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan

4. Master Plan process

April and May 2011

STAGE 1:
Information
gathering

31 May-2 June

STAGE 2:
Community
Engagement

7-10 June

STAGE 3:
Inquiry By Design
Workshop

July-August

STAGE 4:
Communication
and Feedback

September-October

STAGE 5:
Documentation for
consideration by
Community Boards
and the Council
followed by formal

public
consultation.

LYTTELTON
MASTER PLAN
PROJECT DELIVERY
Implementation of
actions and
projects with the
community.

4.1 The process which has informed this Master Plan

Process so far

There was a mixed response to the consultation and involvement of the public in the master plan process so far. Below are a selection of responses:

I thought it was a very well run process and I felt heard (submitter 110).

I have tried hard to participate in this process but as a building owner and resident, I am frustrated. I have seen so much energy and resources go into fancy plans that may lead nowhere because they are dependent on private land owners who have not been consulted (I know, because am one of them). While all these external consultants have been presumably well paid, and many resources thrown into the process, building owners have received little or no support as they work hard to bring actual recovery to Lyttelton (submitter 79).

Real consultation and going forward together is the way that communities flourish! You are moving in the right direction-Thank you for your efforts on our behalf (submitter 54).

It was also disappointing to be abruptly (and almost rudely) turned away from consultation meetings by council staff stating that the venue had reached capacity, with the implication that it was the fault of those who arrived near the start time that there was no more room rather than a council underestimation of local interest (submitter 95).

Thank you for listening to our community group concerns about the Master Plan process. You have given everyone a chance to participate in the submission process and also allowed locals to play a more hands on role. We do appreciate that (submitter 126).

Unhappy with public meeting with urban designers in which the people of Lyttelton were insulted by the Chief Designer. His brief was to work with us not insult us, take our view into account (submitter 146).

Other comments made were: working with people and organisations in Lyttelton rather than against them; better communication about the state of facilities; that the Plan and official submission form were not well lined up – with nine goals and responses sought on the actions for each of the five themes only five categories of response on the official submission form; to facilitate rather than impede local initiatives such as the desire to maintain the temporary stage and to move the market to London Street; to have made it clearer that people who contributed in the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board-driven process of April and May 2011 needed to have again stated their positions in later processes run by Council and sub-contracted consultants and that there was a lack of

consultation with LPC and Transit NZ regarding their intentions of Norwich Quay and waterfront/marina.

It was suggested that the process re-think how information is obtained from people as the submission process was not suited to many people; to remember that Council is supposed to be working for people; to ensure a series of working groups are created where Council staff and interested parties can help shape some of the new initiatives proposed and to hold community consultation and partnership as a key focus of redevelopment. It was also commented that Lyttelton is not necessarily a unified community and there are several competing strands of thought on key issues – for those who are not “consultation savvy”, views are not expressed as loudly and may have been overlooked in favour of new ideas.

Implementation and Rebuild

There were a number of comments suggesting involvement and utilisation of the community, organisations and local businesses in the implementation of the Plan. This would help create ownership of the Plan, which will help it become successful.

I think the process so far has been very good. I think when it comes to the next phase and the detail, a locally based committee approach is needed. Lyttelton folk are well organised, highly motivated and by far the best people to do this. (submitter 31).

Red tape and bureaucracy was commonly commented on as something that may hinder implementation and rebuild. Related to this was a common concern that the slowness of implementation will thwart good intentions of planners as well as business owners who need to get their businesses up and running as fast as possible. There was also a concern that some parties were being heard more than others.

Anecdotal stories suggest that the current red tape and council hurdles are enormous. I would like to see the council advocating for Lyttelton much more actively and utilising the powers that CERA hold to help our community get back on its feet. If the market wants to move to London Street and that idea has community and business support, resource consent should be waved. CERA can do that. The council should ask it to. If the supermarket is ready to open, small Building Act requirements should be waved. CERA can do that. The council should ask it to (submitter 79).

It was suggested that each action is broken down into individual logical steps and that there is a clear, transparent and publicly available priority list, planned timeframe and progress towards completion information available – otherwise progress and effort will not be noticed. It was also suggested that Lyttelton recovery is looked at as a whole, undertaken in a holistic way and that the Plan is aligned with other City Council, Regional and CERA plans.

4.2 Outcomes of community engagement

No comments.

Submissions on Section 5 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan

5. Master Plan actions

Master Plan Summary:

The Lyttelton Master Plan has been broken down into 5 sections concerned with a variety of themes, these themes are; Economy and Business actions, Movement Actions, Natural Environment actions, Community well-being/culture and heritage actions and Built Environment actions. Under each of these headings is a further breakdown of the actions, ranging between four to nine different actions per theme. The following analysis of submissions is relative to particular master plan actions that were described in the Master Plan Actions section and described in detail in the appendix of the document.

This aspect of the Plan (the proposed actions to achieve the Plan's goals) received the most comments from public submissions. Each of the Plan's actions are listed by theme below, followed by tables summarising the number of submitters who 'liked' or 'don't like' each action and a summary of the public responses to them.

5.1 Economy and Business actions

Total Economy and Business	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	315	30

(E1) Funding provision for a Lyttelton Marketing and Attraction campaign

Master Plan Summary:

Provide funding for a Lyttelton-specific business attraction and investment prospectus. A prospectus can help to engender confidence in the long term prosperity of the centre and celebrate the strength of the community post-recession and earthquake. Look to reinforce Lyttelton's role as a niche centre, facilitate and encourage the re-establishment of hospitality and local service businesses.

Highlights:

~ Lyttelton's uniqueness.

~ The Master Plan opportunities and key redevelopment sites.

~ Its proximity to recreational opportunities and strategic networks. Its strong, diverse and innovative community.

~ The desire to strengthen the creative economy.

E1	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	64	6

There was support for this action and in particular, focusing on Lyttelton by understanding the community and reflecting it. The action was referred to as essential, a must, necessary, one of the key actions, critical and an excellent initiative. There was also particular support for economic prospects from the cruise ship terminal, tourism sector, port and hospitality sector as well as ensuring a wide range and mix of businesses.

I support reinforcing Lyttelton's role as a niche centre. It's historic buildings, history, unique 'old town' feel... (submitter 169).

The main concern with the action was in relation to necessity – that it wasn't the best use of money and that businesses are already aware of opportunities in Lyttelton.

Not sure we need to market to attract appropriate businesses. Businesses who understand the potential of Lyttelton are who we want and will fit in best and probably already have plans. Unnecessary idea (submitter 150).

Other concerns expressed were: whether it was appropriate to compete for investment; that existing businesses and port-related activity should be built upon first; that it was too bureaucratic; that Lyttelton is not a glitzy suburb, niche or boutique but rather a working port and that marketing a community risks painting an inaccurate picture.

It was suggested that the campaign is smart and focused, that it supports health and social services, that it changes the “wrecked” image of Lyttelton and dispels the myth of being ‘far away’ (for example through a weekend of free bus trips out to Lyttelton) and that Lyttelton could be a market township. Comments made in relation to factors that would assist the campaign were: low rental and low interest financial agreements; not being bogged down by rules; immediate funding and certainty and a strategy to be developed prior to implementation that focuses on how the existing Lyttelton attributes, new initiatives and branding will deliver sustainable tourism, as well as the development of Key Performance Indicators. Also stated was the for the campaign to be coordinated with action E2, be based on what is already happening/was happening and be seen as a medium-long term goal.

Comments were also made in relation to lead groups/agencies/organisations in charge of, and partners involved in championing, the action. There was support for both the Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre and the Lyttelton Harbour Business Association taking the lead role. Reference was also made to managing the action locally and involving Project Lyttelton. Lyttelton-based control was also considered important.

(E2) London Street WiFi

Master Plan Summary:

Investigate technology needs and associated costs to establish broadband wireless (WiFi) access within the town centre. An advertising-supported portal with local content could promote the town, businesses and the community.

E2	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	57	8

There was strong support for this action predominantly as a way to attract and keep people in the town centre and the subsequent flow on business benefits. The action was referred to as an essential facility, attractive to visitors, excellent, crucial infrastructure, huge business, an excellent marketing tool, and good and simple.

In these high tech times street WiFi would be a good draw card for the locals and tourists encourage people to stay in Lyttelton (submitter 34).

Some attention was drawn to the timeframe, with preference for the action to be immediate or short term rather than medium term. It was also suggested that an all weather portal was provided for port visitors to access the WiFi and that the WiFi should not be restricted to London Street but rather should be for the whole Lyttelton town centre commercial area. It was recommended on logging in, that the homepage is used as a tool for promoting Lyttelton.

Some did not see the importance of the action, stating that it is unnecessary, that people should just get their own and that it should not be a priority. Some concern was also raised over the health risk at being exposed to a 24/7 EM field as well as a suggestion to be mindful of liability and the new copyright downloading law.

Isn't this what an information centre is for? Not important in a recovery situation and tourists using a computer in public spaces is not appealing, nor what they come to Lyttelton for (submitter 104).

(E3) Appoint a Lyttelton case manager

Master Plan Summary:

Employ a Lyttelton case manager to provide a single face of recovery to landowners and developers, to ensure that people who need assistance are able to access available services.

E3	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	65	8

This action was strongly supported and referred to as urgent and should be done in the short term, absolutely crucial, a high priority, really important, essential, vital and good to have a person to go to and be a 'voice' for the community.

There was particularly strong support for a local person to be appointed due to understanding the place, the people, being accessible and having in-depth knowledge. The preferred appointment process was through local consultation or recommendation.

...Especially important to appoint a case manager who understands and is part of the unique character of Lyttelton and harbour people (submitter 12).

A local person is preferred, selected by a local selection panel made up of representatives from the community and/or Community Board (submitter 130).

It was also commonly suggested that the case manager is given authority to act, be able to operate and have access to 'all levels' and not held back or tied up by bureaucracy.

Having one person as the key development link between local people and the Council would be advantageous in supporting this process. This person must have authority in regard to the various organisations that make decisions (submitter 141).

There were some comments made that the creation of a case manager role was just creating more bureaucracy.

More bureaucracy at greater cost (submitter 14).

(E4) Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace

Master Plan Summary:

A targeted effort to stimulate business re-establishment in the creative, professional and entrepreneurial employment sector. Investigate:

- i) The possible use of public land and buildings;*
- ii) Ensure the District Plan supports various types of creative and business uses; and*
- iii) Make contact with the private sector to elicit expressions of interest in this vision.*

E4	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	66	7

There was strong support for this action with many submitters citing the loss of affordable commercial spaces due to the earthquake and how action E4 will assist overcoming this and serve to enhance Lyttelton's existing unique, vibrant and creative community.

Lyttelton has a growing creative community, which can only be enhanced by the concentration of arts-based creatives in an affordable precinct (submitter 169).

There was strong support for the creative hub to be incorporated into other actions, in particular with C7: the Donald Street Arts Precinct and C8: the performance/film venue. There was also strong support for further investigation by the Harbour Arts Collective into this action.

Particularly like (E4) Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace: but think it needs to be combined (as it was originally proposed) with (C7) Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street as well as (C8) Performance/film venue. In separate forms it seems more watered down and less impactful for the economic recovery and vibrance of the community (submitter 114).

In the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan the project now appears to be split into: C7 – DSAP and art in the street – sculpture park – medium cost (\$100,000 - 1million),

C8 – Support the community to find an experimental black box performance and film venue – low cost (up to \$100,000), short term.

E4 and C7 – Creative hub – occupying council buildings – low cost – short term (1 - 3 years)

I believe these aspects should be brought back together to create one dynamic centre for the arts, incorporating work spaces, exhibition spaces, education spaces and performance spaces. (submitters 190,106, 133, 151, 152, 157, 158, 184, 42, 63, 75, 76, 77 and 91).

Other suggestions made were: encouraging sustainable businesses and ensuring provision for the Farmers' Market, Lyttelton Museum and community participation; that this action was something the case manager could do; ensuring workspaces are cheap, safe and include noise control; that the creative hub should extend links into Banks Peninsula; and that London Street to Dublin Street should be zoned commercial; and eliminate bureaucracy.

Questions raised over this action were the priority of the action and whether there is enough spare land. Another uncertainty was around Lyttelton being a working port and how to reflect this, as well as concern over selecting particular sectors for particular areas.

Affordable space for businesses is fundamental to the rebuilding of Lyttelton but should not involve 'picking winners' in any particular sector (e.g. artistic endeavours) (submitter 164).

(E5) Funding options and temporary support

Master Plan Summary:

Explore the range of funding options available to the Council and community to assist rebuilding and recovery.

E5	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	63	1

This action was generally supported but a number of comments were made in relation to funding not being the issue but rather red tape and bureaucracy.

E5 Misses the point. Businesses don't need funding as much as less red tape to get back to business. This means recognising that the standard CCC consenting process is not appropriate for the extraordinary circumstances that exist now, so

"temporary" consent requests which are reasonable even if they don't meet the letter of the council requirements should be fast tracked...(submitter 21).

Concern and opposition was also present in relation to the levy of development contributions on replacement development.

Any requirement for a development contribution constitutes a further hardship for a site owner's total rebuild budget which in turn, could lead to a less desirable development outcome. (submitter 144).

Other comments made were: recommending a detailed analysis of funding options and timeframes to ensure goals proposed are achievable and public expectations managed; support for funding of the Loons building; concern regarding existing use rights under section 10 the Resource Management Act; and support for extending existing use rights.

Other Comments

Other, more general comments in relation to the economy and business (in order of comment numbers):

Reducing red tape, regulations and general slow place to help support and encourage businesses to reopen.

Whilst I understand a need for policy and procedure, I think council should be more adaptive and accommodating and recognise that we are all experiencing difficult times and to stall a process and re-opening with too much red tape might just prevent the business from re-opening at all. Good will is not infinite and the people who rely upon their business for their livelihood should be supported and encouraged, not deterred. Please listen. submitter 36).

Reinforcing links and access with the rest of Banks Peninsula, in particular Diamond Harbour and Sumner.

In general, from an economic and business-recovery point of view, I would like to see the Diamond Harbour ferry terminal remain at B jetty instead of being moved west. This will encourage ferry users from the southern bays to use Lyttelton businesses without worrying about a long walk back to the terminal carrying their purchases or after visiting a creative or social event. It will work the other way too, promoting Diamond Harbour to Lyttelton residents and visitors, to establish an upwards spiral of economic resilience on both sides of the harbour as we all recover from 22 February. In addition, tourism offers a vital opportunity to the Harbour communities for earthquake recovery and sustainability, and a ferry terminal centrally available for domestic and international tourists is a key component.(submitter 127).

Sumner Road is vital to the economy of Lyttelton business (submitter 185).

Removing or diverting traffic from Norwich Quay.

The possibility of vibrant retail and hospitality businesses populating the area will be frustrated by the constant heavy traffic and road noise. (submitter 144).

Enabling the Farmers' Market.

Enabling the market to operate on London St on Saturday mornings is another example of an urgent need to address bureaucratic barriers and costs to support businesses stay alive. (submitter 129).

Other comments made were:

- Suggestion and support for a 'Rebuild and expand The Loons facilities, use and services' project.
- Designation of Naval Point as recreational to protect the area (which is used as an access point to various ports) from commercial development.
- Provide an opportunity for the business community to identify barriers to businesses setting up.
- Concern over lack of emphasis on economy for the town arising from port activities.
- Concern at the emphasis being placed on retail.
- The need for Council planners to return permanently to Lyttelton to aid recovery for businesses.
- Open Grubb cottage.
- Importance of rail activities as a part of the region's economic future.

5.2 Movement actions

Total Movement	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	348	83

(M1) Movement and the waterfront

Master Plan Summary:

Undertake small-scale amenity improvements within the kerb on Norwich Quay in the short term to improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists whilst maintaining freight and vehicle movements. Accommodating the needs of all users is a challenge with a limited road width of only 20 metres.

Identify a long term strategy for providing access to the waterfront and the Lyttelton Port of Christchurch.

M1	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	64	22

What came through significantly at the outset was how closely linked this action is with Action M2: Moving Port Access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement). A vast number of submitters commented that moving the heavy truck traffic off Norwich Quay is needed before the environment for pedestrians and cyclists can be improved and before there can be access to the waterfront.

As long as trucks roar down Norwich Quay, nothing can improve the environment for pedestrians (submitter 15).

The Norwich Quay and Lyttelton revitalisation relies on access to the waterfront, originally described as an "excellent promenade". This can only be achieved by rerouting heavy traffic from at least Canterbury St (submitter 140).

There were also a significant number of comments relating to the Diamond Harbour Ferry Terminal. Concern was raised over there being minimal reference to it and no consideration of accessibility, amenity and design of the Terminal. Many submitters also suggested that the action should incorporate keeping the terminal at B Jetty because of its centrality.

Diamond Harbour Ferry Terminal 1: This should remain at or near its present location in the inner harbour, providing easy pedestrian access to the Lyttelton shopping/entertainment precinct (submitter 53).

I am concerned there is very little mention of action or strategy relating to access and amenities of the ferry terminal. (submitter 33).

Norwich Quay improvements

There was balanced agreement and disagreement on this action. Those who liked it commented that it would help bring life back to Norwich Quay, that it was common sense, a once in a lifetime opportunity to revitalise the main street, that it was critical, pivotal, important and vital. Of those who supported this action, the predominant reason was for safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

*More needs to be done to make Norwich Quay safer for families/small children.
It is a terrible road to cross (submitter 148).*

For those that disliked the action, it was for two main reasons. Firstly that it was pointless without heavy traffic being dealt with first and that this is just a 'band aid' solution and secondly that it was a waste of time, effort and money which would be better spent on other projects.

What are proposed are essentially temporary measures when what is required is a permanent solution. We would far prefer to see any resources or energy which could be committed to these improvements instead allocated to a high priority project to achieve a Heads of Agreement between the various agencies involved to allow for the complete removal of heavy traffic from Norwich Quay as soon as possible (submitter 144).

Other dislikes were the generic design aesthetic and how it won't make a positive contribution to something as accidental as the character of Lyttelton (Lyttelton is primarily a port town, rather than a suburb to be gentrified); traffic being needed for business; that it was an action to be seen to be doing something; that it was not the time to try and resolve major issues; and that it is not real progress.

Other more general suggestions were to ensure any development does not have impact on the functions of Norwich Quay to provide effective port access; to keep tree species in mind when thinking of what to plant; to not forget bus patrons and bus shelter needs; to clarify placing planter boxes in the northern parking lane; to not just have "small scale" improvements; to not have too many trees as they create shade; and that the timeline is too slow.

Water front access

This part of the action was strongly supported – waterfront access was referred to as a priority, urgent, very desirable and really important, crucial to improve opportunities and the local environment and that Lyttelton seems disconnected from the water and access could help that. The same concerns in relation to heavy traffic being diverted before this action could occur also apply.

The only way for this town to reach its full potential is to get access to the waterfront and get the trucks off of Norwich Quay (submitter 119).

Urgent or the waterfront becomes a dead zone (submitter 189).

Concern was expressed that the long term strategy is putting it in the too hard basket; that the Plan is attempting to divert public harbour access to Naval Point when it should be at the inner harbour which is closer, more accessible, interesting and of great heritage value. The Lyttelton Port of Christchurch also made the following comment.

While LPC shares the goal of providing greater access to the waterfront and inner harbour for development and public enjoyment, it is imperative the plan acknowledges the challenges LPC faces that may impact on the area, timing and extent to which this goal is achievable in the short term (submitter 111).

Other comments were: having fond memories of having access as a child and wanting the same for their children; for access to be made safe, as few vehicles observe the pedestrian crossings (an overhead bridge or underground route would make it easier); that the balance should stay as a

working port; that a tunnel should be made along the waterfront; and that the traffic should be diverted along the waterfront.

(M2) Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement)

Master Plan Summary:

Draft a Heads of Agreement between the Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, the NZTA, Kiwirail and Christchurch City Council to agree key responsibilities and clearly set down staged intentions with regard to Port access and Norwich Quay.

M2	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	76	11

This action was strongly supported and advocated as a priority and the first step that needs to happen in order to achieve the aims set out elsewhere in the Plan. This action was heavily commented on.

...the “bottom line” for any successful development of Lyttelton has to be the removal of all heavy vehicles from Norwich Quay (submitter 162).

This must be a key resolution as it would affect many other aspects of the plan and the design for a rebuilt Lyttelton (submitter 53).

Other reasons for support of this action related to safety, enabling expansion of the business district and the ambience and image of the town.

Heavy traffic on Norwich Quay is an increasing safety issue and seriously compromises the ambience of the town. The town has the potential to be attractive to pedestrians, locals and tourists but at the moment is neither attractive or welcoming (submitter 86).

Would be great to have road that people can enjoy and feel welcomed into Lyttelton – rather than being rushed along by a truck right up the back of them (submitter 46)!

A number of concerns by partner agencies/organisations of this action were expressed in relation to creating public expectation that this action was an outcome without considering the difficulties.

NZTA has some concerns with the heading of this action as it implies an assumption that access to the Port will be moved off Norwich Quay at some time in the future. There will be a public assumption this will happen. NZTA has consistently maintained that there are no plans or funding to relocate the Port access. As NZTA are responsible for the management and maintenance of Norwich Quay NZTA should be the lead agency on this particular action and not the Council. (submitter 132).

The moving of Port access off State Highway 74 (Norwich Quay) is essentially stated in the draft plan as an outcome and so may set unrealistic expectations within the community. Decisions need to follow an analysis of projected traffic flows, environmental effects and ultimately cost/benefit analysis. Relevant options must be developed and investigated by a joint working group involving key stakeholders (submitter 111).

The function of the port was commonly commented on as being of such economic significance that it must be given priority, that Norwich Quay has always been associated with port operations, that no one lives there and it has always be an industrial and commercial place thus should remain that way.

If there is a single point we wish to emphasise in this submission it is that the importance of the Port operations to the greater Canterbury region is so great that the commercial and industrial operations on the Port must take precedence, in the end, over concerns of residents who may wish to improve the social conditions of the town centre in line with a vision paralleling Sumner, or Parnell or other gentrified suburbs around the country (submitter 85).

There were a number of suggestions as to where traffic could be moved and how (in no particular order):

- Low road parallel to Norwich Quay but down low for trucks and partially enclosed or with light materials for noise reduction.
- Get trucks and port traffic off Norwich Quay at the tunnel roundabout or at the off-ramp just below.
- Reassign redundant rail tracks that are taking up space on the main area in front of town to roading.
- Agree on red route 1 portrayed in the Plan.
- Harbour traffic diverted to Shoreline Road.
- Have traffic come off the tunnel roundabout and then hug the township side of the rail line – the road could be covered with a platform similar to Federation Square in Melbourne.
- A new truck access to run alongside and below Norwich Quay should preferably include a double rail way line and be roofed in such a way as to give pedestrian access across the roof.
- Deviate traffic by using the road that crosses the rail tracks near the concrete silos, proceeding under the harbourside span of the Oxford Street bridge (lowered carriageway if required) and along the harbourside of the railway reserve to either re-cross the tracks near the LPC workshop and use the workshop access ramp or proceed to the gate and ramp at the root of Pier 7. This would leave the Oxford Street Bridge as a pedestrian route to the ferry wharf and for further access to the waterfront if this was subsequently permitted.
- There already is access for heavy vehicles (via Sutton Quay and the Pacifisca shipping area) to and from all parts of the port without having to use Norwich Quay east of Canterbury Street.
- The railway yards occupied by logs could be used for the new port access road and car parking.

Other concerns are: none of the parties giving commitment to a resolution; the length of time frame and the potential for delaying tactics; that there is no consideration of the ferry terminal; that the agreement does not apply to the ferry; little consideration given to the cost of removing heavy port traffic; significant environmental issues particularly noise and visual impacts as well as funding; that processes such as this Heads of Agreement have been unsuccessful in the past; an agreement to implement is needed and that a partnership approach between LPC, NZTA and Kiwirail is required.

It was also suggested that the Lyttelton Port of Christchurch pay for the construction of an alternate route as they are the cause and beneficiary of the traffic and have saved millions of dollars by dumping CBD rubble into the harbour; that the Heads of Agreement include the ferry service being kept at B Jetty; that the community is consulted; and that the Lyttelton Port of Christchurch plans and the Plan are reconciled.

Other comments were: that there was little point in examining changes until the changes to the State Highway access to the port has begun; that a Memorandum of Understanding in 2007 concluded the ferry terminal location should be at B Jetty but that the report was never published; that increased rail transport may reduce traffic through the town centre; that requirements by landowners and businesses can be met by a Heads of Agreement which imposes a reasonable timeframe within which the removal of heavy traffic can be achieved. A question was also raised regarding the commitments in the Council's Long Term Plan for 2012.

(M3) Pedestrian linkages

Master Plan Summary:

There are a number of pedestrian walkways in Lyttelton town centre that do not legally give public right-of-way. Understand the legal status of these routes and who maintains these. Identify laneway opportunities to connect London Street and Norwich Quay and Canterbury and Oxford Streets through urban blocks.

M3	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	66	10

This action was strongly supported and referred to as urgent, a very good idea, a real gem and excellent. Many submitters liked that it would add to the character and quirkiness of Lyttelton, benefit tourism, retail, businesses and culture as well as allow pedestrian movement.

Links will provide pedestrian movement and create interaction with public and business operators (submitter 149).

I support any work to further enhance pedestrian access around Lyttelton. It is what helps make the town unique (submitter 169).

The main suggestion was to ensure that the laneways are safe at night and well lit up. A related comment was that they should pass through areas with people or be popular because they go somewhere otherwise they will become loitering spots for tagging and robbery starting points.

Other comments were: not just investigating but also purchasing; ensuring the walkways are pedestrian only; that The Rocks in Sydney was a comparable set up; that the North/South lanes should have priority; that the walkways could become part of tourist walks and that the information is made available with geospatial co-ordinations and a permissive licence (e.g. a public domain).

Submitters who disagreed with the action cited there being no point until there was something worthwhile on Norwich Quay to link to; not the time to resolve major issues; no mention of links to Diamond Harbour; not considered immediate; that footpaths are fine; that it was a waste of time and that it would depend on private owners of land.

(M4) London Street public realm enhancements and public event opportunities

Master Plan Summary:

Investigate ways to provide public space/amenities along the street and ways to improve London Street's functionality for public events.

M4	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	50	13

There was support for this action but often on the proviso that it incorporates or enables the closure of London Street on Saturday mornings for the Lyttelton Farmers' Market which will otherwise face a resource consent cost of \$60,000.

If this [action] is subtly implying moving the Farmers' Market to London Street then YES, YES, YES. This seems so obvious to so many people – seems likely only bureaucracy is in our way. It's a win-win and should happen sooner rather than later (submitter 119).

If nothing else ever happens in Lyttelton PLEASE let us have our market in the main street of Lyttelton. This will provide many of the positive community results that more expensive projects could take years to achieve (submitter 29).

There were also a large number of submitters who identified that London Street has already been recently upgraded and there was no reason to do it again, especially if it results in further business disruption. It was also commonly commented that any enhancements to London Street need to consider the day to day function of the street as a local shopping hub for residents.

The last thing our business community needs is more disruption from another street upgrade (submitter 130).

A vast number of other suggestions were made for this action: join this action with N1 and C5; that it should be a pedestrian paradise; to insert bollards; ensure appropriate cleaning and maintenance regimes are in place; remove rules; consider impact on telecommunications; consider how Norwich Quay developments will affect this action; that a pedestrian crossing is introduced in the middle of the block and that the shared space philosophy widely used in Europe is considered.

For submitters who disliked the action, reasons cited were: that 'design' gives London Street less of a distinctive character; that it works how it is so just leave it; that London Street will be too crowded and that this is an action of minor importance.

(M5) Parking investigations

Master Plan Summary:

Identify opportunities to maximise on-street parking by provision and time management in the town centre and surrounding streets. Review car parking standards in the District Plan to support development but reduce the impact of any shortfalls in on-street parking. Encourage travel demand measures and site-specific travel plans.

M5	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	39	21

The comments on this action were mainly in the form of concerns and suggestions. A lot of attention was drawn to other transport methods which were not referred to, parking being left as it is, as well as to an investigation that has been completed by Opus Consulting.

We've managed fine without lots of parks. We walk. Need to encourage public transport/biking (submitter 147).

Reduced parking requirements (compared with Christchurch) are appropriate for Lyttelton. Many of us walk to restaurants, caf  s etc, so not necessary. (submitter 166).

Where there was support it was because current rules are unworkable and will slow down the rebuild, that onsite parking spaces are needed, all-day parkers need to be addressed, parks are needed if Lyttelton wants business and because access was difficult prior to the earthquake so this is an opportunity to fix that. There was support for investigation into parking away from the centre.

Parking prior to the earthquakes was often difficult to access (submitter 142).

Prior to the earthquakes, Lyttelton badly required a purpose built parking building to accommodate the growing attraction of the quirky port town. A space should be earmarked for such a future provision...(submitter 184).

It should be noted that there were also comments in opposition to a parking building.

Totally oppose a multi-storey parking structure in Lyttelton (submitter 90).

There were a number of concerns centred on introducing meters and parking obligations for businesses. Other comments made were that the action is too big to deal with at this time and not being important.

We do not want/need parking meters (submitter 15)!

Let's be more realistic with parking obligations for businesses so they don't prevent rebuild (submitter 49).

There was an overall agreement that parking should be on the surrounding streets. Various locations were suggested for parking (or no parking, in no particular order):

- The corner of Norwich Quay and Canterbury Street where the Royal Hotel formerly stood.
 - The site of Shadbolt House if it is demolished.
 - Canterbury Street to Dublin Street and part of London Street.
 - Norwich Quay by the tunnel.
 - By the old museum site.
 - If Norwich Quay was cleared of heavy traffic it could be used for angle parking.
 - The parking provisions managed by NZTA along Norwich Quay.
 - A proper car park building on some of the now vacant land.
 - Parking in grassy area by Reflection Pool.
 - Serious considerations need to be given to a low rise parking building;
- possibly this would be a better use of the area suggested for a "civic square".
- A parking garage in the industrial area along Norwich Quay as it would grab vehicles before they enter the township.
 - Winchester Street is too far away.
 - Various alternative transport options were also suggested: low rise parking building; a park and ride system connecting to a larger car park in Heathcote or Woolston; or rail or shuttle that could be located so that it served Heathcote through to Sumner. It was also commented that parking could be relieved by maintaining the ferry terminal at B Jetty.

(M6) Access to and from Lyttelton

Master Plan Summary:

Investigate and identify opportunities to maximise access to and from Lyttelton for all modes of transport.

M6	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	53	6

This action was heavily commented on and strongly supported for reasons of future proofing emergencies and establishing alternative routes, addressing isolation and vulnerability as well as economical and recreational needs. The link with enabling access to health services was also identified.

Much attention was drawn to the uncertainty and lack of reference to the Diamond Harbour Ferry. Comments were predominantly about retaining the current location of the terminal at B Jetty because of its centrality to Lyttelton town but also making the terminal more welcoming through considering the amenity and design of it. Comments included that bus, ferry and walking links become integrated.

The location of the ferry terminal is a significant issue for residents of the Southern Bays (including Charteris Bay, Church Bay, Diamond Harbour, Purau and Port Levy) as well as for Lyttelton business owners and residents. Our communities all share business, social and recreational interests (submitter 193).

Access to Lyttelton from Diamond Harbour is of paramount importance, and the ferry service, its berthing, its connection to the buses, and to London Street should be a primary consideration. It is therefore essential that the terminal should remain at the eastern end of the port, the B Jetty (submitter 86).

Much attention was also drawn to the reopening of Sumner Road and Evans Pass Road. This was considered significant due to its recreational and economical value.

The closure of Sumner road has negatively impacted on the economic activity associated with local tourism, has resulted a loss of recreational areas and has decreased the resilience of the transport network. Resilience in the transport network is currently of high importance in times of high seismic activity.

In light of the above we recommend an additional action which requires the Christchurch City Council to facilitate a solution to opening the Lyttelton to Sumner via Evans Pass route as soon as possible. (submitter 111).

Re-open the Lyttelton – Sumner Road. This has a significant impact on the number of visitors that come to Lyttelton. We hardly see any cyclists any more. This was one of their key routes. Many visitors drove to Sumner via this road and alternatively many people came to Lyttelton from Sumner. During cruise ship season this was also a popular route for tourist coaches. There is also a safety issue here. Dangerous goods now drive the longer route to Christchurch via Gebbies Pass or Dyers Pass Roads over roads not suitable for that purpose (submitter 99).

Light rail and train transport options were commonly commented on. There was quite a lot of support for light rail in particular, as well as Lyttelton to central city links. It was commented that it could be a good tourism venture but it might be costly.

We strongly support the creation of a passenger rail link to Lyttelton. Infrastructure is in place and with sufficient planning the existing rail link could effectively be used for both freight and passenger services. This would enhance Lyttelton's accessibility for local people, visitors and cruise ship passengers, and would add to Lyttelton's viability as a destination (submitter 144).

Kiwirail did however make the following comment:

While we appreciate the Council's desire to provide better access to the coastline, it is likely that most (if not all) the existing land capacity we currently utilise for our operations will still be required to meet future demands. For this reason, we are keen to ensure that our operational conditions (including the rail footprint) remain largely the same as they are today (submitter 195).

Investigation into cycle ways, walking and hiking access options were also supported. It was commented that there was a notable lack of reference to public transport in general and suggested that a new section specifically dedicated to public transport linkages and relationships with other modes of transport are investigated. This would assist in identifying opportunities to maximise access to and from Lyttelton for all modes of transport.

Other comments made were: fixing the wharf for cruise ships; building bus shelters for rainy days; opening Evans Pass to walkers and cyclists as an interim measure; moving bus and ferry operations to the west end where there is more room; investigating re-introduction of the inter-island ferry; a hazard management study; possible extension of the Gondola to Lyttelton and reinforcing the link between the City and Lyttelton – the Harbour Arts Collective have proposed a "River of Arts" concept as part of their Downstream Project. The New Zealand Transport Agency is also looking at a long term strategy for route security and protection.

Other Comments

No comments.

5.3 Natural environment actions

Total Natural	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	395	47

(N1) A new civic square

Master Plan Summary:

Find a site for a civic square close to the commercial area for community gathering and relaxation which considers relocating the cenotaph (refer to action C5), provides sufficient space for an innovative playground and public toilet (refer to action C4), and possible day-lighting of a section of historic barrel drain.

N1	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	72	9

There was a lot of support for a new civic square/green space, as a focal point for people to meet, for families to bring their children and which could be used for festivals/functions.

However, some submitters questioned the proposed location. There were a range of comments to do with concern for elderly/disabled people; concern about noise and loitering if it is on the edge of the business area; whether it should be more open to the main street, but also noting that intersections are traffic dominated; the site was small and challenging for the number of proposed design features; and concern that the south facing orientation and rear shading would make the site bleak for much of the year.

Other suggested locations were: the upper and lower sections of the old gaol site; extend to the corner of London Street (the main street for social interaction) and Canterbury Street/the entire Ground site, 44 London Street; somewhere more central such as down near the waterfront across from shops; in London Street between Oxford and Canterbury; the heart of the business area in block Norwich/London/Canterbury/Oxford; existing supermarket site, or former Empire Hotel; rose garden areas on Oxford Street.

Several submitters saw the space as a possible venue for the Farmers' Market.

Supporters for the playground wanted to see greenery; outdoor areas for younger children and also challenging areas for older children; and/or interesting water features to play in. One submitter suggested the main playground be part of the gardens/pool/gaol precinct.

More public toilets are considered important.

There were mixed opinions about where the cenotaph should be located. Four submitters suggested the rose garden, to avoid closing off the street, while five thought the cenotaph should be located centrally.

Two other submitters wanted to see the memorial in a location in a reserve of its own, not placed in 'every-day space' where it would not be highlighted.

At present the memorial is in a setting which sets it apart, and allows it to be a space for contemplation...(submitter 95).

(N2) Pool garden off-season access

Master Plan Summary:

Fence the land to the north of the Norman Kirk Memorial Pool for independent free off -season use.

This park is currently only open when the pool is open. Consider redeveloping the area around the pool as a precinct.

N2	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	63	2

For those who commented, access to the pool garden was considered very important, particularly as a community meeting space, and as something which:

...could be achieved easily, cheaply and quickly, providing more valuable community recreational space (submitter 144).

Many submitters also want the swimming pool reopened as soon as possible.

(N3) Rooftop park between, or on a combined, Lyttelton Library and Service Centre

Master Plan Summary:

Investigate the ability to construct a rooftop park between, or on a combined, Lyttelton Library and Service Centre to provide a rooftop public space which enables views towards the harbour and London Street.

N3	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	48	22

Those for and against this proposal were fairly evenly balanced. Supporting points were the ability to take advantage of views and sun; the importance of landscaping and planting to provide green areas, screening and noise control.

Comments against were: some felt the money could be better spent on other projects; it was a waste of time; the site is too exposed to the wind; that it was gimmicky and did not keep with the town character; maintenance may be an issue and 'Shadbolt House' would obstruct the view.

A few submitters suggested access to the waterfront as an alternative, one citing Wellington and other harbour towns as examples of:

...magnificent links between town and harbour...(submitter 169).

The following point was raised by a submitter

The introduction of a viewing platform does not address the need for functional community spaces in Lyttelton. Part of the appeal of Lyttelton is the diversity of spaces and views available- not everything needs to be focussed on a view of the harbour. Pre earthquake London Street worked well as an inward looking space. Most locals have a view of the port, harbour and hills from their homes and don't need another space to do what can already be achieved; they do need facilities to support the community (submitter 95).

(N4) Head to Head Walkway

Master Plan Summary:

Encourage the realisation of the Adderley Head to Godley Head walkway along Norwich Quay.

N4	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	57	2

The majority of submitters support this concept. It will be important to ensure public safety and efficient port operations. The walkway will be an important recreational activity and visitor attraction and will provide educational outdoor experiences, and could include cycleways and be a link with other walkways and the Little River Rail Trail.

Agree Head to head walkway is going to boost tourist activity and health of residents (submitter 12).

(N5) Temporary landscapes

Master Plan Summary:

In discussion with landowners, Greening the Rubble and Gap Filler, find inventive temporary uses for cleared sites within the town centre.

N5	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	50	7

The majority support the idea of temporary use of vacant sites as public spaces. Several submitters suggested that this project should be community driven with minimal interference from authorities. Comments in support were: good use of space; good for morale of residents and will attract visitors; local artists need to be involved. A suggestion is to plant trees, e.g. Pohutukawas for shelter and shade and to compensate for lack of height, with the loss of buildings. One submitter commented that it could be practical for empty sections to be available for temporary accommodation to keep displaced Lyttelton residents in Lyttelton. This would help keep residents in the area while also providing income for Lyttelton.

Some noted that this initiative was already happening.

(N6) Local landscape and heritage interpretation

Master Plan Summary:

Create uniquely Lyttelton public spaces that give attention to the area's special history, identity and features via landscaping, public art, interpretation and signage. This action also provides for the continued operation of the Lyttelton Museum as a valued part of the Lyttelton community.

N6	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	54	0

Local landscape and heritage interpretation was highly valued by most submitters.

There was concern expressed that there was little mention of the museum in the Plan. Submitters thought the museum is an important part of the cultural life of Lyttelton, and there needs to be a dedicated Museum building.

Two submitters urged the Council to:

... do its utmost to ensure that the Lyttelton Historical Museum Society is included as a key stakeholder in the plan for the rebuilding of Lyttelton, and in future discussions for its redevelopment. (submitter 108).

A further comment from the same submitter:

The Museum's collections, which are of both national and international significance – as well as being of tremendous importance locally – are a tangible link with our past and of course an understanding of the past is vital to our future (submitter 108).

A supporter suggested that the museum be combined with the visitor centre/CCC service centre/library, however a contrasting opinion was the importance of the museum remaining separate, as the museum collections require long-term and secure location storage, in contrast to other arts activities in a proposed arts precinct.

Many submitters emphasised the importance of Lyttelton as a historic town and the need to treasure and preserve what is left.

The importance of the history of Lyttelton to overseas visitors was also noted. One submitter suggested that local landscape and heritage interpretation could be developed to provide self-guided touring in time for the next cruise ship season.

Two submitters expressed disappointment that Whakaraupo and Urumau Reserves were not specifically mentioned in the Plan. They have historic significance (together with walkways such as the Bridle Path, Stan Helm and Major Hornbrook):

In addition to their intrinsic value and the contributions they make to conservation values and the preservation of biodiversity, these reserves play an important and developing role in providing both active (running, walking, mountain biking) and passive (picnicking, a place to sit and think) recreation for the community (submitter 99).

(N7) Interpretation of Tangata Whenua values

Master Plan Summary:

In consultation with Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke and the local community, acknowledge, identify and provide opportunities to reflect Māori culture in Lyttelton. This may include opportunities to learn about sites, routes and ecology of importance through public space and building design, arts, interpretation and signage.

N7	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	49	5

Some submitters recognised the value of acknowledging Tangata Whenua values.

A more highly visible recognition of the Tangata Whenua (history and culture) would make Lyttelton a livelier place (submitter 86).

And that it is:

Critical to appreciating and building community pride and community ownership (submitter 13).

However one submitter noted that:

Like it however most of Lyttelton is iconic around first settlers. There are other areas around the bay that recognise our island heritage better than Lyttelton. (submitter 117).

And one said Rapaki is the Maori enclave for culture. In contrast, another submitter said:

The Norwich Quay area has huge cultural significance. It was the site of the first Maori settlement in the Lyttelton area & the new settlers relocated the settlement around rather near to where the CCC proposes to relocate the ferry services to. (submitter 59).

This submitter had concerns that proposed relocation of the ferry services to this area would detract from the other historical features included there.

Yet another submitter said that:

To pick out themes without considering the overall picture of the harbour basin would do the stories of the area a disservice. (submitter 95).

Other Comments

Other more general responses were made in this section as follows.

The need for green spaces on the harbour front.

Public access to the water and wharf areas is essential.

Diamond Harbour ferry link needs to be close to the present site for easy walking access to London Street. This is essential for Diamond Harbour residents.

There was support for improvements between the kerb and road boundary on Norwich Quay, providing effective port access is maintained, and safety issues regarding certain types of planting and placement of planter boxes is considered.

Underground poles and wires for phone and power all around the harbour.

Collection sites for rainwater and drinking fountains/taps in London Street.

Need for green buildings; use of solar, wind, energy, insulation; an eco-village concept.

Local residents could help to increase the natural capital of the harbour basin. Provide a well researched planting guide of local species and readily available supplies of these plants.

5.4 Community well-being/culture and heritage actions

Total Community	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	503	57

(C1) Improved utilisation of the Lyttelton Recreation Centre

Master Plan Summary:

Investigate the re-configuration of the squash courts for a multi-use community space - housing a meeting room for 30-50 people, a fitness centre and a temporary theatre.

C1	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	63	5

There is a need for suitable community meeting and recreational space to be returned to use as quickly as possible...(submitter 144).

The submitter above went on to state that the space needs to be able to cater for more than 120 people, as this had been found to be insufficient space previously.

Submitters supported using rooms in the recreation centre for meeting space. However, there were mixed feelings as to whether the recreation centre is suitable for a theatre. Some think it would be suitable as a temporary measure, providing there are plans for a permanent one in the future.

The Lyttelton Rec Centre is really important. Some more facilities for dance and yoga and kids gymnastics would be great. Lyttelton does not need a temporary theatre it needs a really good permanent, dedicated performing arts venue. Something to replace the Harbourlight theatre as the heart of the community, not just a space in the rec centre that can sometimes be used as a theatre venue. (submitter 116).

Ideally people would like a separate recreation centre and a separate theatre, and both are considered important.

(C2) Alternative use of a Council property on Canterbury Street

Master Plan Summary:

Convert the Council-owned rental property adjacent to the recreation centre to a community function. Consider its use as temporary accommodation for Plunket, the Toy Library and/or playgroup.

C2	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	54	8

A reasonable number of submitters favoured the use of this building as suggested in the Plan.

The Canterbury District Health Board stated:

We support the enhanced use of combined services centres for community services.

Accessibility is a defining feature of primary and community care and of social services, and is an essential consideration for those in pre-existing vulnerable groups and/or the worst affected suburbs. The location of health and social service agencies in the community is a benefit to the communities they support, as they provide services close to their homes that are uniquely appropriate to these communities.

A number of these service providers do not have the financial resources to pay high-end commercial rents, which is partly why they are 'pepper-potted' throughout the city. We would like to see services supported to maintain a presence in Lyttelton and to be integrated within communities and co-located with one another. The people who use these services are an important part of the community and their engagement in the community is important for their health and well-being.

The development of community hubs provide an opportunity to deliver complementary health and social services to meet community needs and are part of the Ministry of Health policy for 'better, sooner, more convenient' healthcare. The aim is to increased access to services for patients, closer to home in the community setting and have the potential to provide activities traditionally delivered in hospitals. The integration of health and social services is an integral part of the planning for the whole of Canterbury's health system.

While many of these health services (such as general practice) can stand alone physically as a businesses they should be viewed as important social services which thrive through integration, co-location and connectivity to other health and social service providers and agencies. We would like to see consideration given to the development of integrated services in the redevelopment of Lyttelton (submitter 167).

Others viewed the use of this building as a temporary solution for Plunket, but did not see it as a long term solution. Many other submitters think the building is unsuitable for Plunket and want the Plunket rooms repaired. Their comments align with Plunket themselves:

Members of the Plunket committee and playgroup have recently inspected this site, and consider it to be unsuitable as a location for small children to meet and play. Outdoor space is not available, nor is open indoor space. Access and storage for buggies is also difficult (submitter 96).

The current Plunket room site is the best long term location for Plunket (nurse, playgroup, toy library) - a safe place for children to be at play, good indoor/outdoor space. Needs to be rebuilt or repaired. Plunket is happy to help with the funding & in kind support. (submitter 134).

(C3) Combined Lyttelton Library and Service Centre redevelopment

Master Plan Summary:

Enhance the use of the combined Lyttelton Library and Service Centre (basement and back offices). Consider outreach services - youth, music, art, older adult space, visitor information services and heritage possibilities.

C3	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	52	4

The majority of submitters supported this idea.

One submitter suggested Puke Ariki in New Plymouth, as an example of what can be achieved. Another thought the:

Consider this could be a good thing in the interim, but consider the library and service centre each need more space than sharing would allow. Maintaining a visible local service centre is crucial, as is having a vibrant modern library (submitter 175).

One submitter opposed the proposal, wanting a stand-alone information centre, particularly as:

... there are traffic considerations relating to buses for cruise ship passengers which are relevant to the future position of the information centre. (submitter 144).

Another suggestion was to design a shared library/museum/gallery/archive/museum/theatre on the existing library footprint.

(C4) New public amenities in the town centre

Master Plan Summary:

Provide a new imaginative playground and a second public toilet within the town centre.

C4	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	59	5

There was strong support for additional public toilet facilities, with baby change facilities, that are open into the evening and well maintained. One suggestion was to create public disabled access toilets that can be available to people working in and visiting Lyttelton.

A few submitters supported a play area as more are needed for children.

(C5) Lyttelton War Memorial Cenotaph relocation investigation and reinstatement

Master Plan Summary:

Investigate a suitable location for the reinstated Lyttelton War Memorial cenotaph that addresses the limitations of its current location.

C5	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	46	12

Suggestions for the location were: the rose garden; the site where the Holy Trinity Church was; Canterbury Street; and a more central civic space associated with London Street.

Also noted was the need to be central, accessible, safe for the elderly, the ability to have an ANZAC service uninterrupted by cars passing through and to:

Not currently well positioned, best to move into a location that can help to build pride and respect for fallen soldiers (submitter 13).

Re-landscaping rather than relocation was another opinion though:

I am opposed to the relocation of the Lyttelton Cenotaph to the proposed site. At present the memorial is in a setting which sets it apart, and allows it to be a space for contemplation rather than it being involved in the day to day bustle of the commercial centre of the town. The current problem of a lack of space at ANZAC Day services could easily be minimised by re-landscaping the existing reserve... (submitter 95).

Four submitters thought the RSA should be consulted and advice taken from them about the location. One also said:

We do not believe the proposed new position for the cenotaph is appropriate. A hillside site is not ideal for elderly people attending events there, and the sacred nature of the cenotaph is not an ideal fit for a play-park. We believe that additional advice should be taken from the RSA on the correct actions to be taken around the removal and repositioning of the cenotaph, and we would support their position as the lead organisation in this regard (submitter 144).

(C6) Naval Point redevelopment

Master Plan Summary:

Establish a working agreement with Lyttelton Port of Christchurch to provide pedestrian access along the harbour edge and seek funding for short term, quick win recreational development opportunities such as tree planting and footpath improvements. Undertake a separate Naval Point planning exercise in consultation with the groups that use the area to address land and facility redevelopment opportunities.

C6	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	52	6

There was a lot of support for the Naval Point improvements, particularly the more comprehensive redevelopment, which many say it is urgently needed and long overdue. Safety is stated as being a key issue:

at the present time the state of the area is a disgrace compared to other cities and towns, which is the joke of NZ boating circles, as it has been pointed out to me on many occasions by out of town visitors. The pressure on the two boat ramps is extreme on most sat and sun, with long queues, which leads to dangerous and

silly practices on the public ramp. There is a real danger of loss of life if something is not done as the ramps are exposed to southerly blows which could see families trying to retrieve boats in 30 knot winds, the council must back this proposal as not to do so would be slap in the face of all fun loving kiwis...(submitter 81).

The break water would be the most important item that is NEED & NEEDED NOW. The number of young sailors put at risk due to weather changes is unbelievable (unpredicted weather worse than forecast.) (submitter 136).

Several submitters noted that the area is used by the people of Canterbury, not just Lyttelton, as this is the only Christchurch sea access for trailer boats.

It has the potential to be a community based asset for Lyttelton and a drawcard attracting recreational water sports participants from the whole of the greater Christchurch area (and beyond) (submitter 95).

In essence, I think there needs to be close cooperation between the NPCL and planning of Naval Point and the inner harbour for boating activities. (submitter 135).

Additional comments made were: not too formalised; plantings on the seaward side of the tank farm such as Rata or Pohutukawa would screen the ugliest part of the harbour; it would be a new walking experience for people; park space for the west in all day sun; need boat storage area for trailer yachts and haul out.

Four submitters see it as desirable to keep the Diamond Harbour Ferry terminal at B jetty.

Those of us that use the ferry need DIRECT access (i.e. no more than 400m) from the shops and services of the town (submitter 127).

There was also some concern that the Naval Point redevelopment is overriding/distracting from the topic of ferry access, which is seen as a significant issue to be resolved.

(C7) Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street

Master Plan Summary:

Create an informal area (possibly a shared space) for static and temporary displays of art with a cultural/entertainment focus in Donald Street. Look for other opportunities in Lyttelton's public realm (in streets and visible areas of parks) for public art.

C7	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	55	7

There was very strong support for this concept, as Donald Street is viewed as the cultural heart of Lyttelton.

I believe the arts build on the culture of Lyttelton and are essential to the revitalisation of Lyttelton's economic and cultural life. (submitter 106).

Several submitters wanted to see more distribution of art throughout the town, because Lyttelton is a small town anyway and it would be better to allow sculpture/art distribution to organically develop.

The relatively compact nature of the town lends itself to these art spaces and venues being distributed throughout the town too. Encourage exploring and linking of events so people don't just congregate in one area. Then there is also

more chance of people discovering what may currently be more isolated businesses, spaces etc (submitter 118).

I support the development of a creative precinct centred around Donald Street, although I'd like to see public art works throughout Lyttelton - a kind of 'sculpture park' - with strong references to our history. It could be accompanied by a self-guided walk guide (submitter 129).

Fifteen submitters wanted to see C7, C8, and E4 brought back together to create one dynamic centre for the arts, incorporating work spaces, exhibition spaces, education spaces and performance spaces.

These same submitters also would like to see the Harbour Arts Collective research community feedback and conduct feasibility studies.

Five other submitters thought that heritage should be the primary focus of the area, including the Museum rebuilt on its former site, while two others also emphasised the priority of preserving and making available the museum collections.

A couple of submitters thought that Lyttelton should focus on being a port town (rather than arty), and creating a sculpture park type concept was following an existing trend common in many other New Zealand towns, and is therefore not unique or authentic to Lyttelton.

(C8) Performance/film venue

Master Summary Plan:

Support the community in its endeavours to find a community multi-use/black box theatre venue for large meetings, performances and film showings (with a capacity of around 300 persons).

C8	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	51	7

The majority of submitters supported one large multipurpose performance and film venue, centrally placed. The initiative would be beneficial for local residents and tourists, the greater creative community in Christchurch and the region as a whole. All businesses in Lyttelton would benefit (cafes for example). Also it would be very important for community togetherness.

Eight submitters supported funds going towards re-opening The Loons on Canterbury Street as soon as possible, one noting that the cost would be less than a new performance space. One submitter thought that two spaces may be underutilised and suggested that:

...the creation of an additional performance space might better be left to private enterprise if indeed there is a market for this (submitter 144).

Submitter 56 suggested Lyttelton needs more than cafe and craft and suggested that discussions should be held with CPIT on creating a Circo Arts and/or other performing art campus in Lyttelton. For full discussion of this concept this submitter has written a public transport and infrastructure blog "NZ in Transit", main relevant article "Should the Circus Come to Lyttelton?"

(C9) Emergency preparedness

Master Summary Plan:

A community development project supported by the Council whereby the Lyttelton community strengthens the emergency planning that is currently occurring in order to build local resilience in the face of future disasters. Identify vulnerabilities and develop a corresponding community emergency action plan.

C9	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	39	3

Points raised with respect to this action highlight that:

Lyttelton should be self sufficient in food and services, as it is vulnerable to isolation in an emergency.

Lyttelton has a Time Bank which supports local sustainability - this and other local existing community structures should be supported.

There is a need to develop a community action plan.

There is no Civil Defence centre now the recreation centre is closed.

Other Comments

The Lyttelton Historical Museum Society provided a detailed submission containing in depth background information on the importance of the museum.

On the matter of Community Wellbeing and the various C1-C6 proposals (excluding C5 which I have dealt with under N1 above) I think that many of these actions plus the parking action signalled under M5 would be better contained in a single development which took in the parcels of land currently occupied by the Plunket Rooms/Toy Library, the adjoining pocket park on Sumner Road (which never, let us be honest, gets used) the old Council stables and the existing Lyttelton Museum building and yard. A parking building could occupy the volumes currently occupied by the museum and yard and perhaps the first two levels of the stables. This would in principle create a level platform from Sumner Road through to Norwich Quay on top of which a museum, as first priority, plus other community facilities could be built (submitter 177).

Grubb Cottage could assist in realising some of the C1-C7 aspirations.

Enhance the historically significant sites around Norwich Quay/Oxford Street.

There is an opportunity to join up several concepts in line with international trends - a joint library/museum/gallery/archive museum/theatre- to be designed on the existing library footprint.

Another opportunity for shared infrastructure to consider is the joining up of the cultural and civic activities in Lyttelton...

There are both economic and cultural reasons for looking at a combined model. The financial benefits are clear. It just doesn't make sense to pay five or more time for services, land and infrastructure that could be shared.

There are however social and cultural reasons for doing this as well. There is a growing acceptance that the traditional physical boundaries between: a museum, library, story, music, debate, art, archives, sound and vision, in public civic space and place really doesn't make a lot of sense. If you take a people centric view of cultural experience then you would do something different... In small niche places like Lyttelton a joined up approach would be provide a

cultural/civic commons and heart for the people of Lyttelton and for all those who visit and want to understand more of Lyttelton and the import part it plays in Aotearoa's early European history as well as Maori.

While it will be important for Lyttelton to reflect our own unique community there are several joined up models in NZ from which we can draw some inspiration. Puke Ariki in New Plymouth has a well deserved international reputation but closer to home, and more relevant in scale, is the proposed Kaiapoi multi-purpose centre (submitter 84).

A drop in centre for teenagers and youth was suggested.

Another suggestion was cameras installed in the main street to prevent tagging and deviant behaviour.

5.5 Built environment actions

Total Built	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	247	15

(B1) Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments

Master Plan Summary:

Seek changes to the Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan rules (via an Order in Council or other means) within the Town Centre Zone to enable development of a type and form that is beneficial to Lyttelton as a whole. Changes may include: rule bonuses; reducing restrictive standards such as those related to on-site parking; and clear urban design guidance.

B1	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	64	4

Restrictions that are preventing businesses from reopening were the main concern presented in the responses in respect of this action. Submitters commented that the regulations on car parking and clear urban design guidance are holding up the redevelopment of business in Lyttelton.

There is very strong support for easing the restrictions for on-site business parking. Such restrictions are slowing the reopening of businesses such as the supermarket and Freemans which are essential to the Lyttelton community. Alternative parking plans like underground parking and constructing a new car park were suggested. Alternatives to parking were also brought up, including improved pedestrian, cycling and public transport options, rather than focusing on parking restrictions.

A number of submitters commented on having locals on the Urban Design Panel and would prefer that the design was handled by people who understand the community of Lyttelton and how they want the town to be designed.

A concern was that that Lyttelton should not have Christchurch city regulations.

Lyttelton Port of Christchurch commented on the possibility of 'reverse sensitivity' with regard to planning rules and redevelopment.

'Set backs' were supported by a few submitters.

(B2) Design and character guidance

Master Plan Summary:

Update the existing Design Guidelines— Lyttelton (Appendix X of the Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan). Use the opportunity to make any editorial corrections, insert the latest urban design and architectural thinking, and give consideration to a redevelopment addendum. Run a design expo for the community to show examples of buildings (both contemporary and historic, local and international) and gather opinion about preferred rebuilding styles for Lyttelton and a workshop for property and business owners.

B2	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	65	5

Submitters stressed the importance of Lyttelton maintaining its quirky, creative style. Many commented on involving the Lyttelton community and businesses in the design process in order to hold on to Lyttelton's unique environment. There was overall concern about the guidelines restricting Lyttelton's character.

...as long as the guidance is based on principles widely valued in the Lyttelton community – authenticity, heritage, environmentally friendly, sustainability etc. This is Lyttelton with its own authentic character (submitter 105).

There was a lot of support for celebrating and respecting heritage buildings; replica historic buildings were opposed.

A significant number of people raised concern about the buildings being more environmentally friendly and sustainable.

There were a large number of statements about the possibility of Lyttelton losing the unique nature of design to bland, generic, concrete box structures.

I strongly support a Lyttelton look and feel when it comes to design guidelines for the rebuilt. Cheap, generic, boxed concrete buildings would be the worst that can happen (submitter 106).

Some supported a design expo.

Lyttelton Port of Christchurch was again concerned about noise issues and the possibility of trouble in the long term in relation to 'reverse sensitivity' if regulations for building are loosened or lifted for the rebuild.

One submitter suggested that owners should decide on building design.

(B3) Inclusion of local involvement in the existing Urban Design Panel

Master Plan Summary:

Provide for the inclusion of appropriately qualified local design professionals in the already established Christchurch Urban Design Panel to provide local input into town centre redevelopment and rebuilding, preferably at the pre-application assessment and advice stage. This does not preclude a design advisory panel established by the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board.

B3	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	55	3

There was strong support for the local people of Lyttelton to be involved in the Urban Design Panel and rebuilding process. It was widely agreed that in order for Lyttelton to maintain its unique character, a local, or at least locals on the design panel, is essential.

Establish our own urban design panel with local people to ensure the rebuild is sympathetic to Lyttelton values (submitter 130).

An Akaroa style panel was suggested by one submitter over an Urban Design Panel, there being a lot of talent available locally.

(B4) Identify and assist retention of remaining built heritage

Master Plan Summary:

Identify wholly or partially remaining protected and notable buildings, objects and sites, investigate their current status and likely future, and provide assistance to restore/retain them where possible.

This covers funding for the restoration of red scoria retaining walls.

B4	Like	Don't like
Number of responses	63	3

There was significant support for rebuilding the retaining walls - many submitters commented that this was the most important heritage structure to save and rebuild.

I think the retention of the remaining heritage is vital to preserve Lyttelton's unique character...(submitter 36).

It was widely agreed that safety was an important factor in saving heritage buildings.

There was overall support for retaining what is left of Lyttelton's heritage buildings. A very small number of people commented that heritage buildings and the scoria walls are ugly and too expensive to maintain.

Other Comments

One submitter commented on affordable accommodation in Lyttelton, i.e. flats above and behind shops.

Agreement to shops having separate frontages, to keep Lyttelton's character.

A comment about using the materials of the pre-earthquake landscape was made, in order to maintain Lyttelton's character.

A submitter suggested that sunlight in London Street needs to be balanced by shelter from verandas on most buildings.

Submissions on Section 6 of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan

6. The process from here

6.1 Lyttelton Master Plan actions

This section is discussed in section 4 Master Plan process.

6.2 Implementation Plan

No comments.

6.3 The process from here

No comments.

Specific text change suggestions

These specific text change suggestions were made for the Plan.

Suggestion 1

7.3 Goal 9: Responsive planning

Page 21 of the Draft Master Plan provides a summary of recommendations in the Lyttelton Recovery Plan. We note the suggestion in relation to Infrastructure and Transport for „an assessment of the environmental effects of proposed reclamation using demolition rubble“. LPC advises that this work was completed prior to consents being issued in June 2011. The Assessment of Environmental Effects (2011) and subsequent environmental assessment reports (e.g. Contaminant Monitoring of Reclamation Activities, Cawthron October 2011) are available on LPC's website. (submitter 111).

Suggestion 2

Before listing the things that really matter to us there are quite a few things in the Master Plan that need to be amended because they are factually incorrect.

3.3 Lyttelton's Earthquake damage:

All the cruise ships have bypassed Lyttelton for the 2011-12 season except three small vessels that will dock in January and February.

The Lyttelton Farmers Market is based in Lyttelton Main School Grounds and not the Grassy. The Grassy Market is an arts/crafts and bric a brac market. Both markets operate on Saturday morning.

Leisure and Recreation – Norman Kirk Memorial Pool should be in red

Culture/heritage and Arts – Crater Arts Collective does not exist any more. Wunderbar should be red.

Active Community – Community Trust should be Community House. Not sure if there is still a Neighbourhood Support Trust. Don't think Lyttelton Harbour Network exists. The Lyttelton Farmers Market is part of Project Lyttelton.

Education/information – the Bay Harbour News is not a community organisation. The Lyttelton Information and Resource Centre Trust operates the Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre and should be in red.

Environment The Lyttelton Community Garden is another Project Lyttelton activity. There is also the Lyttelton Harbour Issues Group.

Govt Assistance/emergency services. The Time Bank is another Project Lyttelton initiative. Add Lyttelton Civil Defence. I have never heard of Lyttelton Community Water.

Religious – Lyttelton Union Church should not be red. (submitter 99).

Quantitative analysis of specific questions

Submitters were asked a number of closed questions on the official submission form: the actions they liked and didn't like; which actions they thought were the most important and most urgent; whether they would like to be heard or not at a hearing; and which actions they would like to assist with implementing. The discussion below presents the findings to these questions.

The total number of likes and dislikes for each action

The number of submitters who stated they liked or disliked particular actions in the Plan was collated. The 63 submitters who used the official submission form selected appropriate *like* or *dislike* options relative to each action from the Plan on the form. Many others provided *like* or *dislike* responses in their own free form submission. All responses were combined for analysis.

These results cannot be treated as a representative sample of the Lyttelton (or Christchurch) population as the sample was not randomly selected. The results though represent what were the most *liked* or *disliked* actions by the submitters to the Plan.

Overall like	1808
Overall dislike	232

Economy and business likes and dislikes	
Total likes	315
Total dislikes	30
E1 Like	64
E1 Dislike	6
E2 Like	57
E2 Dislike	8
E3 Like	65
E3 Dislike	8
E4 Like	66
E4 Dislike	7
E5 Like	63
E5 Dislike	1

Movement likes and dislikes	
Total likes	348
Total dislikes	83
M1 Like	64
M1 Dislike	22
M2 Like	76
M2 Dislike	11
M3 Like	66
M3 Dislike	10
M4 Like	50
M4 Dislike	13
M5 Like	39
M5 Dislike	21

M6 Like	53
M6 Dislike	6

Natural environment likes and dislikes	
Total likes	395
Total dislikes	47
N1 Like	72
N1 Dislike	9
N2 Like	63
N2 Dislike	2
N3 Like	48
N3 Dislike	22
N4 Like	57
N4 Dislike	2
N5 Like	50
N5 Dislike	7
N6 Like	54
N6 Dislike	0
N7 Like	49
N7 Dislike	5

Community wellbeing/culture and heritage likes and dislikes

Total likes	503
Total dislikes	57
C1 Like	63
C1 Dislike	5
C2 Like	54
C2 Dislike	8
C3 Like	52
C3 Dislike	4
C4 Like	59
C4 Dislike	5
C5 Like	46
C5 Dislike	12
C6 Like	52
C6 Dislike	6
C7 Like	55
C7 Dislike	7
C8 Like	51
C8 Dislike	7
C9 Like	39
C9 Dislike	3

Built environment likes and dislikes

Total likes	247
Total dislikes	15
B1 Like	64
B1 Dislike	4
B2 Like	65
B2 Dislike	5
B3 Like	55
B3 Dislike	3
B4 Like	63
B4 Dislike	3

Action	Like in rank order
M2	76
N1	72
E4	66
E3	65
M3	66
B1	64
B2	64
E1	64
M1	64
B4	63
E5	63
N2	63
C1	62
C4	59
E2	57
N4	57
B3	55
C7	55
N6	54
C2	54
M6	53
C3	52
C6	52
C8	51
M4	50
N5	50
N7	49
N3	48
C5	46
M5	39
C9	39

Action	Dislike rank order
M1	22
N3	22
M5	21
M4	13
C5	12
M2	11
M3	10
N1	9
E2	8
E3	8
C2	8
C7	7
E4	7
N5	7
C8	7
E1	6
C6	6
M6	6
C1	6
B2	6
C4	5
N7	5
B1	4
C3	4
C9	3
B3	3
B4	3
N2	2
N4	2
E5	1
N6	0

The nature and ranking of the most important actions identified

These tables represent the most important actions identified by submitters to the Plan. The numbers are the count of submitters who selected each of these actions as *important* on the official submission form provided to submitters. The *Most important actions: number per action* table shows the number of submitters who thought each action was important, the *Most important actions: overall ranking from most to least important* table shows a rank order of most important actions.

The discussion on the next page provides the reasoning on why the top 10 actions (12 discussed because three scored 10) were considered important.

Most important actions: number per action

Economy and business	
E1	5
E2	3
E3	15
E4	14
E5	12
Movement	
M1	24
M2	33
M3	7
M4	12
M5	6
M6	8
Natural environment	
N1	21
N2	5
N3	4
N4	5
N5	6
N6	10
N7	4
Community well being/culture and heritage	
C1	7
C2	3
C3	4
C4	4
C5	3
C6	9
C7	19
C8	10
C9	5

Built environment	
B1	11
B2	10
B3	5
B4	8

Most important actions: overall ranking from most to least important

Action	Important in rank order
M2	33
M1	24
N1	21
C7	19
E3	15
E4	14
M4	12
E5	12
B1	11
N6	10
C8	10
B2	10
C6	9
M6	8
B4	8
M3	7
C1	7
M5	6
N5	6
E1	5
N2	5
N4	5
C9	5
B3	5
N3	4
N7	4
C3	4
C4	4
E2	3
C2	3
C5	3

M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement) was considered important because it would allow the public to access the port and would allow business to move into this area. This would make the town more appealing to locals and visitors by increasing safety and enjoyment for pedestrians and others. It was stated by some submitters that this action needs to be successful to allow other actions happen.

M1: Movement and the waterfront was strongly linked to M2 (above), as submitters thought it was important to get access to the waterfront. It was thought that this would revitalise the area. Getting access was important for submitters, so that it could be enjoyed for many reasons, walking, cycling and socialising were mentioned. Some submitters stated that there is need for a long term, rather than a short term plan.

N1: A new civic square was considered important because it would provide a communal meeting space for the town. A place for people and families to meet was considered important because this is currently lacking. Activities that could be held were festivals, events and the Farmers' Market.

C7: Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street was important to submitters because it would create a focal point for art, with a number of different mediums being able to occur. It seems important to have a place where local artists can undertake their particular art form and support the creative community that already resides in and visits Lyttelton.

E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager was considered important to create one point of contact between the community and authorities. This would mean that the case manager could take issues from the community to the appropriate level of organisations and get things done more quickly. This role would also hopefully make things clearer for people and remove confusion. Some thought it was important that a local person got this role.

E4: Support for a creative hub of affordable work space was considered important because a lot of the affordable commercial space that was lost in the earthquakes was used for creative pursuits and the rebuild of that space is fundamental to getting people back into business. It is not only the cost that was lost in terms of spaces but the size of spaces was also important. This initiative will also bring back vibrancy.

M4: London Street public realm enhancements and public event opportunities was considered important because events like the Farmers' Market will give people a reason to visit Lyttelton. This will make people want to spend time in the area and will assist business.

E5: Funding options and temporary support was not commented on in great detail, but support for business was appreciated in terms of lower fees and analysis of the funding options was suggested to ensure that goals proposed are achievable.

B1: Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments was considered important so development met the needs of the local population and was appropriate for Lyttelton, which may be different to the Christchurch CBD.

N6: Local landscape and heritage interpretation was considered important because of the local and international significance of Lyttelton's heritage. A number of submitters stated that it is important they we don't lose a link to and understanding of our past. This is also important for tourists, such as cruise ship visitors, so they can understand Lyttelton when they wander around.

C8: Performance/film venue was considered important so that there is one large central performance venue. There was comment made that it is important to have one good space, which lead some to state that it is important to get The Loons back operating as soon as possible, while others stated that it is important to replace the Harbour Light.

B2: Design and character guidance is considered important to a quality Lyttelton style being created rather than a cheap boring box style. It was also stated that it is important to include the community and build in sustainable building principles. Allowing creativity to flourish is also important.

The nature and total number of the most urgent actions identified

These tables represent the most urgent actions identified by submitters to the Plan. The numbers are the count of submitters who selected each of these actions as *urgent* on the official submission form provided to submitters. The *Most urgent actions: number per action* table shows the number of submitters who thought each action was urgent, the *Most urgent actions: overall ranking from most to least urgent* table shows a rank order of most urgent actions.

The discussion on the next page provides the reasoning on why the top 10 actions were considered urgent.

Most urgent actions: number per action

Urgent actions	
Economy and business	
E1	4
E2	2
E3	9
E4	10
E5	9
Movement	
M1	7
M2	20
M3	0
M4	4
M5	3
M6	5
Natural environment	
N1	13
N2	3
N3	2
N4	1
N5	2
N6	4
N7	1
Community well being/culture and heritage	
C1	5
C2	1
C3	2
C4	4
C5	1
C6	2
C7	11
C8	8
C9	3

Built environment	
B1	11
B2	6
B3	0
B4	5

Most urgent actions: overall ranking from most to least urgent

Action	Urgent actions in rank order
M2	20
N1	13
C7	11
B1	11
E4	10
E3	9
E5	9
C8	8
M1	7
B2	6
M6	5
C1	5
B4	5
E1	4
M4	4
N6	4
C4	4
M5	3
N2	3
C9	3
E2	2
N3	2
N5	2
C3	2
C6	2
N4	1
N7	1
C2	1
C5	1
M3	0
B3	0

M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement) was considered urgent by some because this action needs to happen before other actions can be successful. Some stated directly that getting trucks off Norwich Quay was a first priority, and others stated that if this doesn't happen then the plan won't be successful. Some stated that the earthquakes had created an opportunity that had to be taken now and this action was overdue, with it having been talked about in previous years.

N1: A new civic square was considered urgent so that people could have a place to congregate, particularly in the current earthquake times when it is particularly important to have a space that people can go to for support, communal events and relaxation.

C7: Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street is urgent because it will not only support the local arts sector, but also the hospitality and tourism sectors. It was also seen as urgent by a number of submitters to foster the local arts community. The need for affordable creative space was also identified.

B1: Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments was considered urgent to maintain the quality of built form that is rebuilt in Lyttelton. Not being held back by Christchurch regulations was also identified. Urgency was needed so that business was not hampered.

E4: Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace was considered urgent because a lot of affordable creative space had been lost in the earthquakes.

E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager was considered urgent so re-build and recovery issues can be coordinated immediately through a 'one stop shop' and be a single point of contact. This would 'get things moving'.

E5: Funding options and temporary support was considered urgent to get business back operating. Some saw this as simply removing red tape around consenting and not continuing to apply old processes in the current situation.

C8: Performance/film venue did not have many specific comments made as to why this is urgent. One stated that this action will help rebuild people, not just the town.

M1: Movement and the waterfront in terms of urgency was discussed as a once in a lifetime opportunity because of all the changes that will take place due to rebuilding after the earthquakes.

B2: Design and character guidance was not specifically discussed as to urgency, but it is implied that it needs to be in place before rebuilding occurs.

Submitters

Submitter details

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
1	Althea Kallas		Yes		
2	Rowena Odering		Didn't say		
3	Mrs N Turner		No	E3, E4, E5, M3, M6, N2, N3, N6, C2, C3, C4, C8, C9, B2, B3, B4,	
4	Alan Phillips		No	E1, E3, M1, M2, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C8, B2,	
5	Robin Lock		No	E3, M1, N2, N7, C6, B2,	
6	Felicite Jardinie		No	E3, E4, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N7, C1, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3,	
7	Peter Houghey		No	M2, M5,	M1,
8	Martin Meehan		No	M1, M2, M3, C6,	
9	David Sanders		No		
10	Malcolm Leitch		No		
11	Robyn Dodds		No	E1, E2, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N5, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	E3,
12	Joy McLeod		No		
13	Omar Seychell		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, M1, M3, M6, N1, N2, N4, N6, N7, C1, C4, C5, C6, C7, B2, B3, B4,	
14	Russell Silbertson		No	E1, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N4, N6, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5,	E2, E3, N3, N5, N7, B1,
15	Mrs M Mackrell		Didn't say	E3, E4, E5, M2, N3, N4, N6, C1, C2, C3, C5, C6, C7, C9, B2, B3, B4,	E1, M1, M4, M5, N1, N2, N7, C4, C8,
16	Nathan Connolly		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M4, M6, N1, N2, N4, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M3, M5, N3, N5, C7,
17	Craig Minehan		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C5, C6, C7, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M1, M2, N3, C4, C8,

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
18	Simon Milner	Environment Canterbury	Didn't say		
19	Jeremy Agar		Didn't say		
20	Mary-Rose Leversedge		Didn't say		
21	Mark Watson		No		
22	Robin Shrimpton		Didn't say		
23	Anonymous #1		Didn't say	M1, M2, M3, N1, N2, N3, N4, N6, N7, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M4, N3, N5,
24	Anonymous #2		Didn't say	M1,	
25	Dallas Duffield		Didn't say	E2, E3, E4, M1, C4, C5, C7, C8, B2, B3, B4,	M2, C6,
26	Melva van Hoof		Didn't say		
27	Betty & David Purdue		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, N1, N2, N3, N5, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	
28	John Rimington		No		M3,
29	Ann Stanaway	Lyttelton Well Womens Group	No	E3, E5, M4, N5,	M5,
30	K Willson		No	E4, M2, N1, C4, C6, B2,	C5, B4,
31	Dr Peter Kempthorne		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, M2, M3, M4, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M1, M5, C6,
32	Ernest Venes		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, C1, C3, C4, C5, C7, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M3, N4, C2, C6, C8,
33	Mrs N Coop		No		M1, M2, M3, M6,

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
34	Stephen O'Neill		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, N1, N3, N4, N5, C1, C2, C4, C5, C8, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M5,
35	Jan Moore		No	M2,	
36	Nicola Davies-Kelly		No	E3, E4, M2, N5, C1, C2, C7, C8, B4,	
37	Peter Jackson		No		
38	Adrienne Jackson		Didn't say		
39	Karen Young		No	E1, E2, E5, M2, M6, N1, B1,	
40	Colin Rossie		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N2, N4, N5, N6, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	N1, N3,
41	Liza Rossie		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, B1, B2, B3, B4,	E4, C2, C5, C7,
42	Sue-Ellen Sandilands		Didn't say		
43	Jennifer Rice		Yes	E3, E5, M1, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N4, C1, C3, C4, B1, B2,	N3, C2, B4,
44	Doug Illingworth		No	E3, M2, N4, C5, C9, B1,	M5,
45	Ian Jackson		No	E1, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N6, N7, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, B1, B2, B3, B4,	C1,
46	Lisa York-Jones	Lyttelton Plunket Play Group	Yes	E5, M1, M2, M5, N1, N2, C4, C5, C6, C7, B1, B2, B4,	E4,
47	Philip Jones		Yes	E1, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, B1, B2, B3, B4,	C2, C9,
48	Yan Flint		No	E1, E2, E5, M1, M3, M5, M6, N4, C4, C6, B1, B2, B3, B4,	E4, M2,
49	Annemarie Mora		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
50	David Stove		Didn't say		
51	Michael Rossouw	Jack Tar Sailing Co. Ltd	No		
52	Anna-Louise Warren		No		
53	Ron Dubin		Didn't say		
54	Sheldon Ramer		No		
55	Gunther Hammer		No		
56	David Welch		No		
57	Mark Watson		No		
58	Sarah Pritchett		No		
59	L Butcher		No		
60	Stephen Hanrahan		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	
61	Liz Sutton		Didn't say		
62	Marcia Bryant		No		
63	John Allen		Didn't say		
64	Maria Moran		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	
65	John Lyftogt		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M2,
66	R & P Manger		No		
67	John Rimington	Church Bay Neighbourhood Association Inc.	Yes		M1,
68	Lisa Preisler		Yes	E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M6, N1, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	E1,
69	John Thrupp	Bells Pharmacy Lyttelton Ltd	No	E4, M3, N1, C1, C4, C5, C8, B4,	N1, C4, C7,

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
70	Ray Sleeman	Tourism & Leisure Group Limited	Didn't say		
71	Tony Airs	Lyttelton Museum	Yes		C7,
72	Mrs Patricia Laird		Didn't say	N2, C4,	M2,
73	Ian Scott	Lyttelton Bakery	Didn't say	E1, E5, M1, M6, N1, N7, C1, C9, B1, B4,	
74	Julie Riley		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, N1, N3, N4, N6, N7, C1, C2, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B4,	
75	Jo Hay		Didn't say		
76	Bettina Evans		Didn't say		
77	Gerard Timings		Didn't say		
78	John Cleaver	Project Lyttelton, Masonic Lodge, Lyttelton Gaol (Jail) Restoration Trust, Neighbourhood Support	Yes	M1, M2, C1,	E1, E2, N1, B1, B2,
79	Kris Herbert		Yes		
80	Jeremy Wheeler		No		
81	Kevin & Sue Guy		Yes		
82	Lynley Aldridge		Didn't say		
83	Paul Pritchett		Didn't say		
84	Penny Carnaby		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, N1, N2, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M5, C5,

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
85	Alison Ross	Lyttelton Environment Group	Yes		
86	Patricia Smart		No		
87	Coral Kay		No		M2,
88	Celia Allison & George Moran		No	M2, M3, M5, N1, N2, N4, C5, C8, B1, B2,	N3, B3,
89	Mrs Briggs		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, B1, B2, B4,	M1, N3, B3,
90	Jillian Frater		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M5,
91	Jamie Fergus		Didn't say		
92	Russell Lienert		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C5, C6, C8,	
93	Trent Hiles	Harbour Arts Collective	Yes	B1, B2, B3, B4,	
94	Michael Davies	Lyttelton Sea Scouts	Didn't say		
95	Michael Davies		Yes		
96	Lyttelton Plunket Committee	Lyttelton Plunket Committee	Didn't say		
97	Sarah van der Burch		Yes		
98	Wendy Everingham		Yes		
99	Wendy Everingham	Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre	Yes		
100	Russ Giddons		No	EE1, , E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, B1, B2, B3, B4,	
101	Eric Livingstone		No		
102	Ross May	Naval Point Club	Yes		

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
103	Jean Tompkins		Didn't say		
104	Daniel Brunson		Yes	E3, E4, M2, M3, N1, N2, N6, C4, C7, B1, B2, B3,	E2, N3,
105	G Swinard		No	N2, B2, B4,	
106	Frank Spiewack		No	E2, E3, M3, M4,	
107	Sue Barr		No		
108	Margaret Ricketts		Yes	N6,	
109	David Bundy		Didn't say		
110	Benjamin Wolpert		No	E1, M1, M2, M3, N1, N3, N4, C4, C6, C7, C8, B1, B2, B3, B4,	E2,
111	Peter Davie	Lyttelton Port of Christchurch	Yes		
112	K. A. Beentjes		Didn't say		M1, M2, M3, M6,
113	Trent Hiles		Yes		
114	Jennifer Kenix		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3,	
115	Elfie Spiewack		Didn't say	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1,	
116	Judith Koehler		No	E1, E3, M1, M2, M3, N1, N3, N5, N6, C1, C2, C3, C7, C8, B2, B4,	C6,
117	Gabriella Barbara		Yes	E1, E2, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, N1, N2, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8, B2, B3, B4,	N3, C5, C9, B1,
118	Lisa Patterson		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	
119	Brian A Rick		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E5, M1, M2, M4, M6, N1, N2, N3, N5, C1, C3, C4, C7, C8, B3, B4,	M3, B2,

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
120	Richard Suggate	Diamond Harbour Community Association	Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M2, M3, M4, N1, N2, N3, N4, C1, C9, B1, B2, B3,	M1, M5, M6,
121	Shane Corcoran		Yes		
122	Kate Anastasiou	The Loons Theatre Company	Yes		
123	John Cullens		Yes		
124	Baden Norris	Lyttelton Historical Museum Society	Yes		
125	Helen Greenfield		No	E1, E2, M1, M2, M3, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B4,	
126	Wendy Everingham	Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre	Yes		
127	Vicki Newbegin		No		
128	Linda Jean Kenix		Didn't say	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3,	
129	Kim Morton		Yes	E2, M1, M2, M3, N1, N3, N4, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8,	
130	Wendy Everingham	Project Lyttelton	Yes		M1, M4, M5, N3,
131	Herewini Banks		Didn't say		
132	Teresa Minogue	NZ Transport Agency	Yes	M1, M6,	M2,
133	Jamie Fergus		Didn't say	E4, C7, C8,	
134	Bridget O'Dempsey	Lyttelton Plunket	No	E2, E5, M1, M3, N1, N2, C1, C2, B1,	
135	Peter Rough		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	N3,
136	James Ensor		Didn't say		
137	Vince Flynn		No		

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
138	Erik Barnes		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B2, B3, B4,	
139	Ian Galletly		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M2, M4, N1, N2, N3, N5, N6, C1, C2, C4, C6, C8, B1, B2, B3,	M1, M3, M5, N4, N7, C3, C5, C7, B4,
140	Iain Knewstubb	Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society	Yes	E1, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M6, N6, C5, C7, B4,	
141	Hon. Ruth Dyson	Member of Parliament, Port Hills	Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M2, M3, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M1, M4, C1, C2,
142	Jo Morrison		No	M2, M5, M6, N3, N5, N6, C3,	M1, C9,
143	Hans C Janus		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N4, N5, N6, C1, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8, B1, B2, B3, B4,	N2, N3, N7, C5,
144	Ray Blake	Lyttelton Harbour Business Association	Yes		
145	Rowena MacGill		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M2, M3, N1, N2, N3, N4, C1, C3, C4, C6, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M4, M5, N1,
146	Janet Taylor		No	E1, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C2, C3, C4, B4,	E2, M1, C7, B1, B2,
147	Juliet Neill		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C6, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	E5, M1, M2, M3, M5, C8,
148	Tara Ross		No	E2, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N5, C1, C2, C3, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	E1, E3,
149	Pete Childs		Yes	E1, E4, M2, M3, N1, C5, C7, C8, B1, B3, B4,	
150	Hugh Barnes		Yes	E2, E3, M1, M2, M3, M6, N1, N3, N4, C1, C2, C5, C7, C8, C9, B1,	E1,
151	Ali Watersong		Didn't say		
152	Susan Kooy		Didn't say		
153	Breeze Robertson		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M2, M3, M4, C1, C7, B3,	M1, M5, C8,

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
154	Elizabeth McKelvey		No	M1, N5,	N1, N3, C5,
155	Kate Hicks		No	E1, E2, E3, E4, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	
156	Carina Duke	Royal NZ Foundation of the Blind	No		
157	Elizabeth Baritempa		Didn't say		
158	Toni Jones		Didn't say		
159	John Walter		Yes	M2, N1,	M1, N1,
160	Emily Sultan		Yes	E5, N1, N2, N3, N5, N7, C4, C9, B1, B4,	E3, E4, M5, C2, C5, C8, B2,
161	Jodi Rees		No	E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, N1, N2, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3,	
162	Mark Gilmond		Yes		
163	Rich Humphreys		Yes	E2, E3, E4, M2, N1, N2, N7, C2, C6, C7, C8, B4,	M1, M4, N3,
164	Cliff Mason		Yes		
165	Helen Hobson		Didn't say		
166	Christina Troup		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, B1, B2, B3, B4,	
167	Canterbury District Health Board	Canterbury District Health Board	Didn't say	E1, M6, C2, C3, C9, B1,	
168	Sasha Stollman		Yes		
169	Graeme Withell		Didn't say	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M1, N3, C5,
170	J McFadgen	Himalaya Design	Yes		

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
171	Bill Baritompa		Didn't say	E1, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C7, C8,	M5,
172	Joseph Burston		Yes		
173	Kate Randell	Ministry of Education	Yes		
174	Helen Sellwood		Yes		
175	Ken Maynard	Lyttelton Community Association	Yes		
176	Graeme McCarrison	Chorus Ltd	Didn't say		
177	Roy Montgomery		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, N2, N4, N5, N6, N7, C7, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N3, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6,
178	Richard Suggate	Diamond Harbour Community Association	Yes		
179	Jim Nieman		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N5, N7, C1, C2, C3, B1, B2,	
180	Ellen Ramer	Purau Residents Association	No		
181	Flora McGregor	Seafarers Centre, 10a Norwich Quay	Yes	E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, N7, C1, C2, C4, C5, B1, B2, B4,	
182	Tracey Adams		Didn't say	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N6, N7, C1, C4, C5, C6, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M4, N5, C2, C3, C7,
183	Deborah Coupland		Didn't say		
184	Reuben Romany		Didn't say	E1, E3, E4, M2, B1, B2, B3, B4,	N3, C5,
185	Stephen Mateer		No	M3, M6, N2, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, B1, B4,	E1, E3, E4, M4, N1, N3, B2, B3,
186	John Bickley & Gael Abraham		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M4, M5, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	E3, M4,

Number	Name	Organisation	Wants to be heard?	Actions like	Actions dislike
187	Hineata McGregor		Yes	E1, E3, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, B1,	E2, E4, M3, M4, M5, N3,
188	S Brown		No	E1, E2, E3, M3, N2, N6, C3, C6, B4,	M1, M5, N3, C1,
189	Jan Jeans		Yes	E1, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9,	E2, E3, M5, N5,
190	Kerry G Donnelly		Didn't say	E1, E4, E5, M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C6, C7, C8, C9, B1, B2, B3, B4,	E2, E3, C5,
191	Sue Stubenvoll		Yes	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, M2, M3, M4, M5, M6, N1, N2, N3, N4, N5, N6, N7, C1, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, B1, B2, B3, B4,	M1, M4, N5, C1, C4, C6,
192	Pat Pritchett		Yes		M6,
193	Nancy Vance		Yes		
194	Jane McCulla		Didn't say		
195	Pam Butler	KiwiRail	Didn't say		

Total number and percentage of submitters who want to be heard

Those who want to be heard or not	Number	Percentage
Do want to be heard	67	34%
Don't want to be heard	78	40%
Don't say	52	26%

Submitters who want to be involved in implementation of each action

These tables identify the submitters who want to assist with the implementation of certain actions.

Action	Name	Organisation	Number
Economy and business			
E1	Wendy Everingham	Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre	126
E2	Shane Corcoran		121
	Hugh Barnes		150
E3			
E4	Trent Hiles		113
E5	Lisa York-Jones	Lyttelton Plunket Play Group	46
Movement			
M1	Iain Knewstubb	Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society	140
M2	Reuben Romany		184
M3	Daniel Brunsdon		104
	Reuben Romany		184
M4	Ian Jackson		45
M5	Daniel Brunsdon		104
	Reuben Romany		184
M6	Sheldon Ramer		54
Natural environment			
N1	Ian Jackson		45
	Peter Rough		135
	Emily Sultan		160
N2	Daniel Brunsdon		104
	Emily Sultan		160
N3	Ian Jackson		45
	Emily Sultan		160
N4	Stephen O'Neill		34
	Peter Davie	Lyttelton Port of Christchurch	111
	Rowena MacGill		145
	Emily Sultan		160
N5	Emily Sultan		160
N6	Liza Rossie		41
	Emily Sultan		160
N7	Emily Sultan		160
Community wellbeing/culture and heritage			
C1	Bridget O'Dempsey	Lyttelton Plunket	134
	Emily Sultan		160
C2	Annemarie Mora		49
	Baden Norris	Lyttelton Historical Museum Society	124
	Emily Sultan		160
	Sasha Stollman		168
	Helen Sellwood		174
C3	Baden Norris	Lyttelton Historical Museum Society	124
	Emily Sultan		160

Action	Name	Organisation	Number
C3 (cont.)	Sasha Stollman		168
	Helen Sellwood		174
C4	Baden Norris	Lyttelton Historical Museum Society	124
	Bridget O'Dempsey	Lyttelton Plunket	134
	Emily Sultan		160
	Sasha Stollman		168
	Helen Sellwood		174
C5	Emily Sultan		160
C6	Ian Jackson		45
	Annemarie Mora		49
	Ross May	Naval Point Club	102
	John Cullens		123
	Peter Rough		135
	Emily Sultan		160
C7	Stephen O'Neill		34
	Liza Rossie		41
	Annemarie Mora		49
	Frank Spiewack		106
	Trent Hiles		113
	Jennifer Kenix		114
	Baden Norris	Lyttelton Historical Museum Society	124
	Kim Morton		129
	Breeze Robertson		153
	Emily Sultan		160
	Sasha Stollman		168
	Helen Sellwood		174
	Kerry G Donnelly		190
C8	Stephen O'Neill		34
	Brian A Rick		119
	Emily Sultan		160
C9	Jo Morrison		142
	Emily Sultan		160
	Roy Montgomery		177
Built environment			
B1	Daniel Brunsdon		104
	Emily Sultan		160
B2	Emily Sultan		160
B3	Emily Sultan		160
B4	Emily Sultan		160



Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit

A Lincoln University Research Centre.
New Zealand's specialist land-based university.

Key Contacts

[Teresa Cunningham](#)
Ph: (643) 321 8280,
Email: teresa.cunningham@lincoln.ac.nz

[Patrick O'Neill](#)
Email: patrick.oneill@lincoln.ac.nz

[Professor Caroline Saunders](#)
Email: caroline.saunders@lincoln.ac.nz

[Professor Paul Dalziel](#)
Email: paul.dalziel@lincoln.ac.nz

www.lincoln.ac.nz/aeru