



3. 5. 2012

**REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE
LYTTELTON/MT HERBERT COMMUNITY BOARD
17 APRIL 2012**

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

1. SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT LYTTELTON MASTER PLAN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager Strategy and Planning, DDI 941-8281
Officer responsible:	Programme Manager Healthy Environment
Author:	Janine Sowerby, Senior Planner

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - (a) inform the Council of the community's response to the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan (the Plan)
 - (b) forward a recommendation to the Council on whether or not submissions on the Plan should be heard and
 - (c) provide an indication of the initial staff response to the submissions and proposed direction for finalising the Plan, in the event the Council decides not to hear the submissions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Plan was approved as a project by the Council in June 2011 to provide a vision, framework and action implementation plan to support the recovery and rebuild of the Lyttelton suburban centre, which was badly damaged in the Canterbury earthquakes.
3. Initial direction for the Plan was obtained via a series of focus groups and public workshops in late May through to early June 2011. The resulting concepts were tested through a series of community feedback presentations in July 2011, which drew 145 submissions, after which the Plan was developed. Having been approved by the Council for public notification in October, the Plan was made available for public consultation, providing the opportunity for formal submissions over a four-week period from mid November 2012. The Plan drew 197 submissions from both individuals and organisations within the community.
4. The 197 submissions were collated and analysed and the overall summary of findings is provided as **Attachment 1**. This shows that considerably more submitters expressed a liking for the draft actions (1808) than a dislike (232). Summaries of the 31 actions and other matters raised by the 67 (34%) submitters who wish to be heard, and staff comments as to how the Plan should be amended in relation to each action are provided in **Attachments 2 and 3**.
5. In general, given the high level of support, staff consider that the draft actions can be retained with some further amendments and consolidation to address the matters raised through submissions. Staff do not consider any additional actions are required.
6. On balance, due to the level of community participation in the preparation of the draft Plan, the support for the draft actions, the need for expediency in finalising the Plan and the opportunity for further engagement in the implementation stage it is recommended that hearings are not held.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7. Preparation of the Plan within the Strategy and Planning Group's budget was confirmed through the 2011/12 Annual Plan process. Funding for implementation of the Plan will be considered through the 2012/13 Annual Plan process and Long Term Plan reviews.

COUNCIL 3. 5. 2012

1 Cont'd

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

8. Yes, funding for preparation of the Plan has been provided within the Strategy and Planning Group's 2011/12 budget.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. There are no immediate legal considerations, other than having undertaken consultation in accordance with *S.82 Principles of consultation* of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). In summary, these require that, in relation to any decision or other matter:

- (a) Affected persons should have reasonable access to relevant information in a manner and format appropriate to their preferences and needs;
- (b) Affected persons should be encouraged to present their views;
- (c) Affected persons should be given clear information concerning the purpose of the consultation and the scope of the decisions to be made following consideration of the views presented;
- (d) Affected persons who wish to have their views considered should be provided with a reasonable opportunity to do so in a manner and format appropriate to their preferences and needs;
- (e) The views presented should be received with an open mind and given due consideration;
- (f) Affected persons who present their views should be provided with information concerning the decision/s and reasons for the decision/s.

The Council is to observe these principles in whatever manner it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

10. Staff have met with officials from the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) and will continue to do so to ensure that the work on the Plan is informed by and consistent with the Recovery Strategy and Recovery Plans. There is no requirement under *S. 19 Development of Recovery Plans* of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 for Recovery Plans for areas outside the CBD to be subject to public hearings.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

11. Yes, as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

12. Yes, completion of the Plan is provided for within Activity Management Plan *1.0 City and Community Long-Term Policy and Planning* updated as at 1 July 2011.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

13. Yes, as above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

14. The Plan is consistent with relevant strategies, including objectives of the Urban Development Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

15. Yes.

COUNCIL 3. 5. 2012

1 Cont'd

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

16. The Council has endeavoured to ensure the Plan encapsulates the community's vision for Lyttelton's rebuild and recovery, by:
- (a) Proceeding on a community-specific basis for master plan-related community consultation, taking into consideration the size and nature of each suburban centre.
 - (b) Flagging early and often throughout the process that there would be three phases of community consultation.
 - (c) Seeking ideas from stakeholders early in the process, including the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board, property and business owners, social and environmental interests and the community generally. Nearly 350 people participated in these focus group and public meetings in early June 2011.
 - (d) Presenting the analysis of the ideas received and starting a dialogue to test with the community whether the concepts arising reflected what they had said. At least 300 people attended these community feedback presentations. People could choose to provide feedback via the form provided, or by email or letter. People had three weeks from the presentations ending 21 July 2011 until the deadline for feedback on 12 August 2011. 145 Written submissions were received, all of which informed preparation of the Plan.
 - (e) Having ongoing meetings and dialogue with individuals and organisations from the community.
 - (f) Having the draft Plan peer reviewed by appropriately qualified local design professionals in late September 2011.
 - (g) Having the Plan considered by the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board in October 2011 prior to going to Council.
 - (h) Including in this consultation phase, in response to requests by the Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Lyttelton Community Association, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre and Project Lyttelton:
 - (i) A four-week submission period, from 19 November until 19 December 2011
 - (ii) Publicising details via newspapers, the radio, posters and local networks
 - (iii) Delivery of:
 - A cover letter explaining the process and consultation details (what, where, when and how), a summary of the Plan (including how to access it) and a submission form to all land owners within Lyttelton south to Cass Bay and Diamond Harbour;
 - A cover letter, the full Plan and a submission form to community groups; and
 - A letter only to the remaining land owners around the harbour.
- Submitters were asked to state which actions they liked, disliked and why; which actions they considered the most important; of those, which actions they considered the most urgent; and any other comments they had about any aspects of the Plan or process. They were also asked, if hearings are held, whether they wish to be heard; and, if they wish to assist with the implementation of any actions, which ones. Written submissions were also accepted via the Council's Have Your Say website, emails and letters.
- (iv) Hard copies of the summary Plan, full Plan and submission form were made widely available at all Council libraries and service centres and a variety of other locations around the Lyttelton Harbour Basin.

COUNCIL 3. 5. 2012

1 Cont'd

- (v) Two drop-in display sessions were held at the Naval Point Yacht Club and Lyttelton Club, and arranged to include timeslots of both day and evening, as well as week and weekend, which were neither too early nor too late into the submission period. Council staff were assisted at these sessions by members of the Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Lyttelton Community Association, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre and Project Lyttelton.
- (vi) Providing community members with a laminated copy of the display panels for use beyond the drop-in sessions.
- (i) Obtaining key tangata whenua values and objectives to consider in the final version of the Plan from Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (MKT).

17. The Plan drew 197 submissions from both individuals and organisations within the community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council:

- (a) Receive the overall summary of findings in the Summary of Submissions on the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan and the staff comments in relation to each action therein.
- (b) Resolve not to hear the submissions by the 67 submitters who wish to be heard.
- (c) Endorse the amendment of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan in accordance with the staff comments in relation to each action before it is presented for adoption at a later date.

BOARD CONSIDERATION

The Board was advised of amended figures in relation to the number of submitters who wished to be heard with the final tally being 70 submitters wishing to be heard, 82 submitters not wishing to be heard and 45 submitters who did not indicate either way. The total number of submissions was 197.

The Board wished to comment to the Council, that it believes the resolution of the Banks Peninsula District Plan requirements relating to onsite parking, as referenced in Action B1 of the Masterplan, is one of the most urgent issues to be addressed to assist in the rebuild of the commercial area of Lyttelton.

The Board debated a number of the Actions included in the Master Plan, on which it wished to make additional recommendations attached to part (c) of the Staff Recommendation.

(M1) Movement and the waterfront

Undertake small-scale amenity improvements within the kerb of Norwich Quay in the short term to improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists while maintaining freight and vehicle movements. Consider planter boxes, small public spaces and public art in the northern parking lane to filter the traffic and noise. Identify a long term strategy for providing access to the waterfront and the Lyttelton Port of Christchurch.

Paula Smith moved, seconded Andrew Turner:

That the Board recommend to Council that it does not adopt Action M1 of the Master Plan.

When put to the meeting the motion was declared **carried** on division No.1 by 4 votes to 2, the voting being as follows:

For (4): Paula Smith, Jeremy Agar, Adrian Te Patu and Andrew Turner.
Against (2): Ann Jolliffe and Claudia Reid.

COUNCIL 3. 5. 2012

1 Cont'd

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

Draft a Heads of Agreement between the Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, the New Zealand Transport Agency, Kiwirail and the Council to agree key responsibilities and clearly set down intentions with regard to the port access road and Norwich Quay. Information on the terms of a planning agreement should be made publicly available.

Paula Smith moved, seconded Andrew Turner:

That the Board recommend to the Council that the wording "Urgently identify a long term strategy for providing public access to the inner harbour waterfront and the alternate heavy traffic access to Lyttelton Port of Christchurch." be incorporated into Action M2.

The motion was put to the meeting and was declared **carried** unanimously.

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

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.

Paula Smith moved, seconded Ann Jolliffe:

That the Board recommend to the Council that Action B3 in the Master Plan be amended to specify the use of a Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee rather than using the existing Urban Design Panel to provide pre-application advice to consent applications.

The motion was put to the meeting and was declared **carried** unanimously.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Board recommends that the Council:

- (a) Receive the overall summary of findings in the Summary of Submissions on the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan and the staff comments in relation to each action therein.
- (b) Decide not to hear the submissions by the 70 submitters who wish to be heard; and
- (c) Endorse the amendment of the Draft Lyttelton Master Plan before it is presented for adoption at a later date, subject to the following:
 - (i) That the Council does not adopt Action M1 of the Master Plan.
 - (ii) That the wording "Urgently identify a long term strategy for providing public access to the inner harbour waterfront and the alternate heavy traffic access to Lyttelton Port of Christchurch." be incorporated into Action M2 of the Master Plan.
 - (iii) That Action B3 in the Master Plan be amended to specify the use of a Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee rather than using the existing Urban Design Panel to provide pre-application advice to consent applications.

(Andrew Turner declared a conflict of interest in item (b) and withdrew from discussion and voting).

THE HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

18. In normal circumstances, the Council would consider hearing submissions on a plan of this nature in order to maintain community confidence and encourage ownership of the plan. In considering the question of whether to hold hearings staff have taken into account the following matters:
 - (a) The extent and nature of consultation undertaken to date: As noted in paragraph 14, there has been considerable opportunity for both verbal and written community input into and feedback on the Plan. Time, logistics, budget, management and venues permitting, the community consultation undertaken in Lyttelton was responsive and the most

COUNCIL 3. 5. 2012

1 Cont'd

comprehensive of all the master plans progressed to date. With 1808 likes and 232 dislikes of the actions identified to achieve the vision overall, clear majority support for the Plan is evident. The Plan anticipates further community consultation being undertaken during its implementation, to develop the detail around projects, and for actions being implemented by local organisations, either separately or in conjunction with the Council and other partner organisations.

- (b) The number and proportion of submitters wishing to be heard: Of the 197 submissions received on the Plan, 67 (34 percent) of submitters wished to be heard if hearings are held, 78 (40 percent) don't wish to be heard and 52 (26 percent) didn't say either way.
- (c) Who wished to be heard: Notable submitters wishing to be heard include Hon. Ruth Dyson MP; Lyttelton Port of Christchurch; New Zealand Transport Agency; Lyttelton Harbour Business Association; Lyttelton Community Association; Project Lyttelton; Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre; Lyttelton Environment Group; Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society; Lyttelton Historical Museum Society; Lyttelton Museum; Harbour Arts Collective; The Loons Theatre Company; Naval Point Club; local design professionals such as Roy Montgomery, Nancy Vance, Peter Rough, Mrs (Liz) Briggs and Ms Jillian Frater; particularly active individuals such as Wendy Everingham, Sarah van der Burch, Trent Hiles and Sue Stubenvoll; and the Diamond Harbour Community Association.
- (d) The number and nature of actions and submission points on which submitters wish to be heard: All (100 percent) of the 31 draft actions have been identified by submitters wishing to be heard, about which they have raised 1,086 submission points, either in support of or opposition to them (see **Attachment 2**).
- (e) The level of support (like/dislike) for the actions on which submitters wish to be heard: Submitters wishing to be heard like all of the actions more than they dislike them, with an overall ratio of 925 (85 percent) like to 161 (15 percent) dislike (see **Attachment 2**). All actions are supported by over 60 percent of the submitters. The most supported actions – those with a like/dislike ratio of greater than or equal to 90 percent: less than or equal to 10 percent, of which there are 13 – are: E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager; E5: Funding options and temporary support; M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement); N1: A new civic square; N2: Pool garden off-season access; N4: Head to Head Walkway; N5: Temporary landscapes; N6: Local landscape and heritage interpretation; N7: Interpretation of Tangata Whenua values; C3: Combined Lyttelton Library and Service Centre redevelopment; C4: New public amenities in the town centre; B1: Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments; and B4: Identify and assist retention of remaining built heritage. The five least supported actions – which still enjoy a like/dislike ratio of greater than or equal to 60 percent: less than or equal to 40 percent – are: M1: Movement and the waterfront; M4: London Street public realm enhancements and public event opportunities; M5: Parking investigations; N3: Rooftop park between, or on a combined, Lyttelton Library and Service Centre; and C2: Alternative use of a Council property on Canterbury Street.
- (f) The actions on which submitters most frequently wish to be heard: The top five actions on which submitters most frequently wish to be heard are M2: Move Port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement), with a like/dislike ratio of 46:5 (90 percent: 10 percent); M1: Movement and the waterfront, with a like/dislike ratio of 32:17 (65 percent: 35 percent); N1: A new civic square, with a like/dislike ratio of 39:4 (91 percent: 9 percent); E4: Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace, with a like/dislike ratio of 37:5 (88 percent: 12 percent); and C7: Donald St arts precinct and art in the street, with a like/dislike ratio of 34:6 (85 percent: 15 percent) (see **Attachment 2**).
- (g) Local factors that could influence the need to hold hearings: Lyttelton is a community that does not like to be over-managed and seeks active participation in decision-making. The level of community engagement by Lytteltonians was sufficiently high to impress Urbanismplus, the consultants responsible for early development of the Plan, compared to their experiences of community engagement elsewhere and they verbalised this observation on a number of occasions. High public attendance at earlier meetings and presentations has translated into a comparatively high number of submissions. The

COUNCIL 3. 5. 2012

1 Cont'd

submissions received reflect the fact that Lyttelton's longer term residents generally better appreciate its historic and current role as a working port than the residents more recently attracted by its niche lifestyle. Progressive expansion of the port and the associated use of Norwich Quay by port-related heavy traffic and exclusion of the public from the inner harbour waterfront have been issues for some time, particularly for the latter part of the community. A number of the submitters have stated in some form that failure to address these port-related issues in the Plan risks failure of the Plan per se. Despite its earthquake recovery focus, local residents have therefore been keen to harness the Plan as a means to progress resolution of these issues sooner rather than later.

- (h) The circumstances which currently justify a more streamlined approach than the hearing of submissions for the Suburban Centres Programme master plans. These include:
 - (i) Availability of resources: A Hearings Panel of elected representatives would need to be appointed. For the four draft master plans that have completed their final consultation phase, it is estimated that seven working days would be required for the holding of hearings and deliberation on the submissions, of which at least four days would be required in respect to Lyttelton. This assumes that each submitter would only have 10 minutes to verbally present their submissions, similar to the Annual Plan hearings process.

The likely timing for hearings also presents a timetabling difficulty as it clashes with the hearings schedule for the Annual Plan. There would also be implications for Council staff administering the process.

- (ii) Alignment with the Annual Plan process: In order to progress the implementation of the master plans, the Council needs to confirm its work programme and funding for 2012/13 before the end of June 2012. Failure to include implementation projects within the 2012/13 Annual Plan could cause a 12 month delay, prior to the next opportunity to programme projects in the Long Term Plan review in 2013.
 - (iii) Expediency: Finalising the master plans quickly will provide property owners and the community with more certainty over the context for the rebuild of their centre.

19. On balance, it is recommended that submissions should not be heard because:

- (a) There has been considerable opportunity for both verbal and written community input into and feedback on the Plan, from which clear majority support for the Plan is evident;
- (b) That submissions may not be heard was flagged through the various community engagement meetings by the Council, the Lyttelton Review following the deputation to the Council meeting of 27 October 2011 and the official submission form by the Council. Given the logistical constraints, any hearing of submissions would likely only provide each submitter with 10 minutes to address the main points in their written submissions.
- (c) Further community consultation is anticipated during implementation of the Plan, including with many of the notable submitters with respect to those actions in which they have a particular interest;
- (d) The minority (34 percent) of submitters who wish to be heard like all of the actions more than they dislike them, with an overall ratio of 925 (85 percent) like to 161 (15 percent) dislike and all actions supported by over 75 percent of the submitters;
- (e) Four of the top five actions that were most frequently identified by these 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 and C7: Donald St arts precinct and art in the street – are in the top five actions considered most urgent by the community (with the fifth - M1: Movement and the waterfront – in the top ten actions considered most urgent by the community);

COUNCIL 3. 5. 2012

1 Cont'd

- (f) Relevant local factors have been recognised and/or addressed in development of the Plan, or will be through the amendments proposed in Attachment 3 before the Plan is adopted by the Council at a later date. Given the high level of community engagement, the community consultation undertaken in Lyttelton was responsive and the most comprehensive of all the master plans progressed to date. Although not generated by the earthquakes, the Plan recognises that the long-standing port-related issues of particular concern to the community have the potential to be exacerbated by them and addresses them insofar as is possible within its earthquake-recovery scope through draft actions M1 and M2; and
 - (g) There are a number of circumstances which justify not hearing submissions, the most significant being that the purpose of the Plan is to facilitate the rebuild and recovery of one of the most severely earthquake-damaged suburban centres in Christchurch and one which also serves other Lyttelton Harbour communities. We are already 19 months on from the start of the series of damaging earthquakes. Funding and implementation of the Plan needs to start as soon as possible, i.e. through the 2012/13 Annual Plan, to the extent that this is possible.
20. Should the Council decide to hear submissions a Hearings Panel will need to be appointed and arrangements made for the hearing including timetabling and circulation of the officer report. Both the hearing format and officer report are likely to be similar to those regarding area plans.

STAFF COMMENTS

21. The tables in **Attachment 3** summarise the submissions on the draft actions and staff comments as to how the Plan should be amended in relation to each draft action. In general, given the high level of support for the draft actions, staff consider that they can be retained, with some further consolidation and/or refinement to address matters raised through the submissions. Staff do not consider any additional actions are required.

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.

ATTACHMENT 2

The following table summarises the actions the subject of submissions by the 70 (36%) of submitters who wish to be heard.

Action # and description	Submitters who wish to be heard that: Like (#/%)	Submitters who wish to be heard that: Dislike (#/%)	Submitters who wish to be heard: Total (#/%)
Business and economy			
E1: Funding provision for a Lyttelton Marketing and Attraction campaign	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Pete Childs, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Jim Nieman, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (31/89%).	Lisa Preisler, Project Lyttelton/Masonic Lodge/Lyttelton Gaol (Jail) Restoration trust/Neighbourhood Support, Hugh Barnes, Cliff Mason (4/11%).	35/50%
E2: London St Wifi	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Sarah van der Burch, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Kim Morton, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Hugh Barnes, Rich Humphreys, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (31/86%).	Project Lyttelton/Masonic Lodge/Lyttelton Gaol (Jail) Restoration trust/Neighbourhood Support, Daniel Brunsdon, Shane Corcoran, Cliff Mason, Jan Jeans (5/14%).	36/52%
E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunsdon, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Hugh Barnes, Rich Humphreys, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (36/92%).	Emily Sultan, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans (3/8%).	39/56%

ATTACHMENT 2 TO CLAUSE 10 COUNCIL 3.5.2012

E4: Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace	Ernest Venes, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunson, Sarah van der Burch, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Harbour Arts Collective, Trent Hiles, Gabriella Barbara, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Pete Childs, Rich Humphreys, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Helen Sellwood, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (37/90%).	Liza Rossie, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Emily Sultan, Cliff Mason, (4/10%).	41/59%
E5: Funding options and temporary support	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Wendy Everingham, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Emily Sultan, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell, Lyttelton Plunket Committee (34/100%).	(0/0%)	34/49%
Movement			
M1: Movement and the waterfront	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, Lisa Preisler, Project Lyttelton/Masonic Lodge/Lyttelton Gaol (Jail) Restoration trust/Neighbourhood Support, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Shane Corcoran, Kim Morton, NZTA, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Hugh Barnes, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans (31/63%).	Church Bay Neighbourhood Association Inc, Mrs Briggs, Michael Davies, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Project Lyttelton, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, John Walter, Rich Humphreys, Cliff Mason, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Sue Stubenvoll, Nancy Vance, Graeme Withell (18/37%).	49/70%
M2: Move port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement)	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, Lisa Preisler, Project Lyttelton/Masonic Lodge/Lyttelton Gaol (Jail) Restoration trust/Neighbourhood Support, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunson, Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, Michael Davies,	John Lyftogt, Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, NZTA, Roy Montgomery, Nancy Vance (5/10%).	52/74%

ATTACHMENT 2 TO CLAUSE 10 COUNCIL 3.5.2012

	Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Trent Hiles, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Kim Morton, Project Lyttelton, NZTA, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Pete Childs, Hugh Barnes, John Walter, Mark Gilmour, Rich Humphreys, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Joseph Burston, Lyttelton Community Association, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell, Sheldon Ramer (47/90%).		
M3: Pedestrian linkages	Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Philip Jones, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunsdon, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Kim Morton, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Pete Childs, Hugh Barnes, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (32/86%).	Ernest Venes, Brian A Rick, Cliff Mason, Roy Montgomery, Nancy Vance (5/14%).	37/53%
M4: London Street public realm enhancements and public event opportunities	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Philip Jones, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hans C Janus, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (27/73%).	Michael Davies, Sarah van der Burch, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Project Lyttelton, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Rich Humphreys, Cliff Mason, Joseph Burston, Roy Montgomery, Sue Stubenvoll (10/27%).	37/53%
M5: Parking investigations	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, Julie Riley, Mrs Briggs, Michael Davies, Shane Corcoran, NZTA, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (21/64%).	Penny Carnaby, Jillian Frater, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Trent Hiles, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Project Lyttelton, Emily Sultan, Ministry of Education, Roy Montgomery, Jan Jeans (12/36%).	33/47%
M6: Access to and from Lyttelton	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Philip Jones, Lisa Preisler, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, Michael Davies, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour	Diamond Harbour Community Association, Cliff Mason, Roy Montgomery, Pat Pritchett, Nancy Vance (5/13%).	39/56%

ATTACHMENT 2 TO CLAUSE 10 COUNCIL 3.5.2012

	Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Shane Corcoran, Project Lyttelton, NZTA, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Hugh Barnes, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Joseph Burston, Lyttelton Community Association, Jim Nieman, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (34/87%).		
Natural environment			
N1: A new civic square	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunsdon, Michael Davies, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Trent Hiles, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Kim Morton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Pete Childs, Hugh Barnes, John Walter, Emily Sultan, Rich Humphreys, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Jim Nieman, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell, Lyttelton Plunket Committee (40/91%).	Project Lyttelton/Masonic Lodge/Lyttelton Gaol (Jail) Restoration trust/Neighbourhood Support, Michael Davies, John Walter, Cliff Mason (4/9%).	44/63%
N2: Pool garden off-season access	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunsdon, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Emily Sultan, Rich Humphreys, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell, Lyttelton Plunket Committee (34/97%).	Hans C Janus (1/3%).	35/50%
N3: Rooftop park between, or on a combined, Lyttelton Library and Service Centre	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Kim Morton, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Hugh Barnes, Emily Sultan, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll (21/60%).	Jennifer Rice, Mrs Briggs, Daniel Brunsdon, Michael Davies, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hans C Janus, Rich Humphreys, Cliff Mason, Graeme Withell (14/40%).	35/50%
N4: Head to Head Walkway	Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs	Ernest Venes, Cliff Mason (2/6%).	36/52%

ATTACHMENT 2 TO CLAUSE 10 COUNCIL 3.5.2012

	Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, Michael Davies, Sarah van der Burch, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Shane Corcoran, Kim Morton, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Hugh Barnes, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Joseph Burston, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell, Lyttelton Plunket Committee (34/94%).		
N5: Temporary landscapes	Liza Rossie, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Shane Corcoran, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Emily Sultan, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Jim Nieman, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (30/94%).	Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll (2/6%).	32/46%
N6: Local landscape and heritage interpretation	Liza Rossie, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunsdon, Margaret Ricketts, Sarah van der Burch, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Shane Corcoran, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Joseph Burston, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell, Lyttelton Plunket Committee (32/94%).	Michael Davies, Cliff Mason (2/6%).	34/49%
N7: Interpretation of Tangata Whenua values	Liza Rossie, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Shane Corcoran, Kim Morton, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Emily Sultan, Rich Humphreys, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue	Michael Davies, Hans C Janus (2/6%).	35/50%

ATTACHMENT 2 TO CLAUSE 10 COUNCIL 3.5.2012

	Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell, Lyttelton Plunket Committee (33/94%).		
Community well-being/culture and heritage			
C1: Improved utilisation of the Lyttelton Recreation Centre	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Project Lyttelton/Masonic Lodge/Lyttelton Gaol (Jail) Restoration trust/Neighbourhood Support, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Kim Morton, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Hugh Barnes, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell, Sheldon Ramer (33/87%).	Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Roy Montgomery, Sue Stubenvoll (5/13%).	38/54%
C2: Alternative use of a Council property on Canterbury St	Liza Rossie, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Kim Morton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Hugh Barnes, Rich Humphreys, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Graeme Withell (26/68%).	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Philip Jones, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Trent Hiles, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Emily Sultan, Roy Montgomery, Lyttelton Plunket Committee (12/32%).	38/54%
C3: Combined Lyttelton Library and Service Centre redevelopment	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Michael Davies, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Kim Morton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Jim Nieman, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (23/92%).	Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Roy Montgomery (2/8%).	25/36%
C4: New public amenities in the town centre	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunsdon, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Kim Morton, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Emily Sultan, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (28/93%).	Roy Montgomery, Sue Stubenvoll (2/7%).	30/43%
C5: Lyttelton War Memorial Cenotaph relocation investigation and reinstatement	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Julie Riley, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Wendy Everingham, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society,	Liza Rossie, Penny Carnaby, Michael Davies, Gabriella Barbara, Hans C Janus, Emily Sultan, Roy Montgomery, Graeme Withell (8/26%).	31/44%

ATTACHMENT 2 TO CLAUSE 10 COUNCIL 3.5.2012

	Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Pete Childs, Hugh Barnes, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Seafarers' Centre, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll (23/74%).		
C6: Naval Point redevelopment	Liza Rossie, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, Kevin & Sue Guy, Michael Davies, Sarah van der Burch, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Kim Morton, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Rich Humphreys, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (30/83%).	Ernest Venes, Naval Point Club, John Cullens, Roy Montgomery, Sue Stubenvoll, Nancy Vance (6/17%).	36/52%
C7: Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street	Ernest Venes, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Harbour Arts Collective, Daniel Brunson, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Trent Hiles, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Kim Morton, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Pete Childs, Hugh Barnes, Rich Humphreys, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Roy Montgomery, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (35/85%).	Liza Rossie, Lyttelton Museum, Michael Davies, Lyttelton Historical Museum Society, Cliff Mason, Sasha Stollman (6/15%).	41/59%
C8: Performance/film venue	Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Harbour Arts Collective, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Kim Morton, Peter Rough, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Pete Childs, Hugh Barnes, Rich Humphreys, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Graeme Withell (20/87%).	Ernest Venes, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Emily Sultan (3/13%).	23/33%
C9: Emergency preparedness	John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hugh Barnes, Emily Sultan, J McFadgen, Roy Montgomery, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Jan Jeans, Graeme Withell (13/87%).	Philip Jones, Gabriella Barbara (2/13%).	15/21%
Built environment			
B1: Development-supportive Proposed Banks Peninsula District Plan (Town Centre Zone) amendments	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunson, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans	Project Lyttelton/Masonic Lodge/Lyttelton Gaol (Jail) Restoration trust/Neighbourhood Support, Gabriella Barbara, Ministry of Education (3/8%).	37/53%

ATTACHMENT 2 TO CLAUSE 10 COUNCIL 3.5.2012

	C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Pete Childs, Hugh Barnes, Emily Sultan, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (34/92%).		
B2: Design and character guidance	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Jennifer Rice, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunsdon, Michael Davies, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Jim Nieman, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (33/89%).	Project Lyttelton/Masonic Lodge/Lyttelton Gaol (Jail) Restoration trust/Neighbourhood Support, Brian A Rick, Emily Sultan, Ministry of Education (4/11%).	37/53%
B3: Inclusion of local involvement in the existing Urban Design Panel	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Lyttelton Plunket Play Group, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Penny Carnaby, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Daniel Brunsdon, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Diamond Harbour Community Association, Peter Rough, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Pete Childs, Cliff Mason, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (25/78%).	Mrs Briggs, Sarah van der Burch, Wendy Everingham, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Project Lyttelton, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Ministry of Education (7/22%).	32/46%
B4: Identify and assist retention of remaining built heritage	Ernest Venes, Liza Rossie, Philip Jones, John Lyftogt, Lisa Preisler, Julie Riley, Penny Carnaby, Mrs Briggs, Jillian Frater, Russ Giddons, Sarah van der Burch, Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre, Gabriella Barbara, Brian A Rick, Project Lyttelton, Peter Rough, Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society, Hon. Ruth Dyson MP, Hans C Janus, Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, Pete Childs, Emily Sultan, Rich Humphreys, Christina Troup, J McFadgen, Lyttelton Community Association, Roy Montgomery, Seafarers' Centre, John Bickley & Gael Abraham, Sue Stubenvoll, Graeme Withell (31/97%).	Jennifer Rice (1/3%).	32/46%
Total all actions	939 (86%)	159 (14%)	1098 (100%)

ATTACHMENT 3

The following tables summarise the submissions on and staff comments as to how the Plan should be amended in relation to each draft action. While not always specified in the following tables, amendments will include amending the lead and partner agencies/organisations as appropriate, as well as other amendments throughout other parts of the Plan as appropriate as the result of submissions (eg to provide more explicit recognition of Tangata Whenua and its relationship with the area).

Business and economy		
E1: Funding provision for a Lyttelton Marketing and Attraction campaign		
Submissions:	Like: 64	Dislike: 6
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, considering it necessary for business investors (particularly in the tourism and hospitality sectors) and visitors to understand the community and its prospects in order to retain them in or attract them to Lyttelton to improve its economic prospects and make Lyttelton more self-sufficient in terms of businesses and services that meet local needs. There is strong support for this action to be led locally, and coordinated with action E2.		
Staff comment: Retain and amend lead agency/organisation to both the Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre and Lyttelton Harbour Business Association, for the following reason. Both the Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre (which the Plan identifies as the lead agency/organisation for implementation of this action) and the Lyttelton Harbour Business Association (which has expressed an interest in leading it) have merit given their respective purposes and existing activities. This action will support either existing or new marketing and attraction work these organisations are doing or proposing, although is likely to do so more effectively if they collaborate on a single marketing and attraction campaign.		
E2: London St Wifi		
Submissions:	Like: 57	Dislike: 8
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, considering it a way to attract and keep people in the town centre. Preferences included immediate or short term implementation and not just in London St (including at least the library, information centre and youth centre). It was suggested that the homepage could be used to promote Lyttelton.		
Staff comment: Retain as is, for the following reasons. The Council's capacity to implement this action in the immediate or short term will be limited by budgetary constraints, in the context of which it is not an immediate or short term priority. This does not prevent partner agencies/organisations from progressing its implementation, however, and subject to resources, it may be possible for staff to assist with any investigations started within the 2012/13 year under the ambit of case management.		
E3: Appoint a Lyttelton case manager		
Submissions:	Like: 65	Dislike: 8
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, considering it urgent, with strong support for a locally based person with local and business knowledge appointed through local consultation or recommendation.		
Staff comment: Retain and amend to reflect that the incumbent also needs some understanding of the operations and relationship between the Council and other government and non-government agencies between which he/she is expected to liaise, in addition to being a local appointment in terms of their knowledge and operation. While operation either wholly or partially from within Lyttelton is considered fundamental, this will be venue-dependent. There are a number of options as to exactly how this role is filled, eg existing Council staff (such as the local Strengthening Communities Advisor), new Council staff, Council-funded but external to Council. The availability of funding will be one of the determinants of this. The Plan's Project Leader will remain responsible for case management in Lyttelton until this decision is made.		
E4: Support for a creative hub of affordable workspace		
Submissions:	Like: 66	Dislike: 7
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, in light of the loss of affordable workspaces for both the business and creative communities. It was ranked number five on the list of most urgent actions. That both this action and action C7 identify seemingly mutually exclusive use of the Council-owned land in Donald St by the business and creative communities respectively was noted by a number of submitters. Favouring particular sectors in particular areas concerned some submitters. This area was also identified by some submitters as a possible site for the Lyttelton Farmers' Market and Lyttelton Museum.		

Staff comment: Amend to refocus this action on the investigation for and use of all vacant habitable Council-owned land and/or buildings (including in Donald St) for (1) the temporary accommodation of displaced business activities (which may include business activities of a creative, social and recreational nature) in the short term, eg through the provision of portacom, and (2) permanent use in the long term, for the following reasons. Following 22 February 2011, a significant number of the buildings in Lyttelton's town centre have either been demolished or remain uninhabitable pending repair/rebuild decisions, resulting in a significant reduction in trade. While some businesses have now reopened or are in the process of being rebuilt, many continue to operate out of temporary premises or remain closed with difficult development viabilities. The Council has the ability to contribute directly to earthquake recovery as a landowner by making any vacant habitable land and/or buildings available for temporary use to meet local needs in a similar manner to which private land is being made available for temporary landscapes and activities while plans for the future use of the land to meet local needs are made. Support for this action implies support for the use of habitable Council land and buildings to best meet community needs.

E5: Funding options and temporary support

Submissions:	Like: 63	Dislike: 1
--------------	----------	------------

Issues/themes raised: All but one of the submitters liked rather than disliked this action, although some suggested including the actual provision of funding and in conjunction with less red tape for and fees imposed on earthquake-related redevelopment.

Staff comment: Retain as is, for the following reasons. This action anticipates identifying and collating in one place, for easy circulation, details of the various funding options available to the community to assist post-earthquakes, including those of the funding which the Council already provides, eg the Christchurch Earthquake Mayoral Relief Fund. The Resource Consents & Building Policy and Building Operation Units have recently initiated improvements to their procedures and systems, etc, to streamline the resource and building consent processes in response to earthquake-related applications.

Movement

M1: Movement and the waterfront

Submissions:	Like: 64	Dislike: 22
--------------	----------	-------------

Issues/themes raised: More submitters liked than disliked this action, but reaction was more mixed. Submitters recognised how closely this action is linked with action M2 but, while many saw the merit in appropriate amenity improvements, particularly for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, some felt that improving the environment on Norwich Quay for walking, cycling and businesses and access to the waterfront is dependent on first moving the heavy vehicle traffic off it and wasteful or mischievous to spend money on temporary measures when a permanent solution is required. Some submitters also questioned the lack of reference to the Diamond Harbour Ferry terminal, its accessibility in particular.

Staff comment: Retain as is, for the following reasons. Norwich Quay currently makes for a rather bleak 'shop front' to people accessing Lyttelton from the port and Lyttelton Tunnel, particularly now that most of the heritage buildings which gave it some character have been demolished. Until such time as the port access issue is resolved, amenity improvements will improve pedestrian and cyclist safety in anticipation of realising the Head to Head Walkway and encourage higher quality redevelopment in the meantime. The latter will help ensure that redevelopment does not turn its back on Norwich Quay in response to the pedestrian linkages and public use opportunities within the block bounded by Norwich Quay and London, Canterbury and Oxford Sts proposed by action M3. The NZTA is a willing partner as long as a level freight route is maintained.

M2: Move port access off Norwich Quay (Heads of Agreement)

Submissions:	Like: 76	Dislike: 11
--------------	----------	-------------

Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, considering it as a priority first step to achieving the aims set out elsewhere in the plan, improving safety, the extent of the business district and the ambience and image of the town. It was also considered to be both the most important and most urgent action. There were a number of suggestions as to where the traffic could be moved and how. However, a number of the partner agencies expressed concern that moving port access off Norwich Quay is stated as an outcome, thereby raising people's expectations that access to the port will be moved off Norwich Quay at some point in the future when the NZTA currently has no plans or funding to relocate the port access, all of the necessary (including post-earthquake) investigations have yet to be undertaken and this outcome is not guaranteed. A number of submitters also felt accessibility of the Diamond Harbour Ferry terminal should be addressed through this action.

Staff comment: Retain (including being lead by the Council) to commit the relevant parties to the necessary investigations and a resolution, whatever that may be given the circumstances, but amend to include consideration of the future location, etc, of the Diamond Harbour Ferry terminal through the Heads of Agreement.		
M3: Pedestrian linkages		
Submissions:	Like: 66	Dislike: 10
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, considering enhanced, safe pedestrian access around Lyttelton and to Diamond Harbour, and the opportunity to make better use of land in the block bounded by Norwich Quay and London, Canterbury and Oxford Sts, a good idea, with business and tourism potential, subject to appropriate legal instruments. Detractors recognised the need for Norwich Quay to provide a draw card or thought the proposed linkages unnecessary.		
Staff comment: Retain as is, in order to expand and protect the network of accessways and spaces throughout the town centre and make better use of them through the provision of active frontages onto them.		
M4: London Street public realm enhancements and public event opportunities		
Submissions:	Like: 50	Dislike: 13
Issues/themes raised: The majority who supported this action, which focuses on pedestrian-related enhancements and the street's functionality for public events, often did so on the proviso that it incorporates or enables the closure of London St on Saturday mornings for the Lyttelton Farmers' Market, which otherwise necessitates significant compliance costs. Given the recent street upgrade, there is little appetite for public realm enhancements which result in further business disruption, however.		
Staff comment: Retain as is, for the benefits anticipated (including in conjunction with some of the other actions) and because the action as worded also permits investigation of whether and how London Street could be routinely closed on Saturday mornings to accommodate the Lyttelton Farmers' Market.		
M5: Parking investigations		
Submissions:	Like: 39	Dislike: 21
Issues/themes raised: More submitters liked than disliked this action, but the ratio of like to dislike was comparatively close. While there was support, it was largely to ensure that on-site parking requirements and off-site provision are more appropriate to local circumstances. There was overall agreement that parking should be on the streets surrounding the town centre, with various on-street parking (or no parking) locations suggested. A lot of submitters felt that transport modes other than the private car had not been adequately addressed.		
Staff comment: Amend to include a prerequisite review of the adequacy of public transport and active travel facilities to provide the missing context for the parking investigations proposed and note that this action seeks to inform the review of car parking standards in the District Plan rather than actually review them (this will occur via action B1), for clarification.		
M6: Access to and from Lyttelton		
Submissions:	Like: 53	Dislike: 6
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, particularly to future proof Lyttelton against future emergencies, but also in recognition of economic, recreational and the southern bays' needs with respect to transport; access to health services; and integrating bus, ferry and walking links. Much attention was drawn to the reopening of Sumner and Evans Pass Roads. Rail transport options were commonly commented on, with quite a lot of support for light rail in particular, as well as Lyttelton to central city links (although Kiwirail's operational needs apparently preclude such use of the existing rail infrastructure). Identifying opportunities to maximise access to and from Lyttelton for all modes of transport was also supported, the lack of reference to public transport again being noted.		
Staff comment: Retain as is, as the existing wording is considered broad enough to cover all of the above.		

Natural environment		
N1: A new civic square		
Submissions:	Like: 72	Dislike: 9
<p>Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, as a focal point for people to meet and which can be used for functions. Some submitters questioned the small size, nature, peripheral location on the edge of the business area and accessibility of the new civic square as illustrated, particularly for elderly/disabled people. Other suggested locations were the rose gardens, old goal site, or somewhere more central, such as in London St between Oxford and Canterbury Sts, the existing supermarket site or behind it, the former Empire Hotel site, or down near the waterfront.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Retain, but amend to illustrate it over the entire former Ground site and indicate that this is the preferred site, for the following reasons. Lyttelton is underprovided for in terms of useable open space. As one of the suggested alternatives was to extend the new civic square over the entire former Ground site, some of the submitters did not realise that this is what the Plan suggested anyway (albeit in text in explanation of the existing illustration, which original proposed use of the rear of the former Ground site only). Use of the whole site provides opportunities for views and distinction through terracing between a children's play area on the upper half and a hard surfaced square on the flat lower half, potentially including the cenotaph and public toilets. Of the suggested sites, relevant staff are of the opinion that this site would best achieve all of the identified objectives for a new civic square. With the help of Gapfiller and/or Greening the Rubble, the community seems to have made and accepted this site as the new civic square already.</p>		
N2: Pool garden off-season access		
Submissions:	Like: 63	Dislike: 2
<p>Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, seeing it as something which can be achieved cheaply and quickly, providing more valuable community recreational space. Many submitters also want the swimming pool reopened as quickly as possible.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Retain as is, for the reason that this is a well supported quick win that will enhance an existing open space in an area underprovided for in terms of useable open space. This action will need to be aligned with work on the pool, which is won't have a detailed engineering assessment until February 2013.</p>		
N3: Rooftop park between, or on a combined, Lyttelton Library and Service Centre		
Submissions:	Like: 48	Dislike: 22
<p>Issues/themes raised: While more submitters liked than disliked this action, the balance was more even. Those for liked the ability to take advantage of views and the sun, subject to appropriate screening, etc. Those against felt the money could be better spent on other projects, the site being too exposed to the wind, obstructed by Shadbolt House and gimmicky. One submitter also noted that part of Lyttelton's appeal is the diversity of spaces and views available – that not everything needs to be focused on a view of the harbour and that most locals have a view of the port, harbour and hills from their homes anyway. They also felt that, pre-earthquake, London St worked well as an inward looking space.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Retain as is, except for the timeframe, for the following reasons. While many residents may enjoy harbour views from their homes, this action recognises that views of the harbour from London St are currently privatised and will help to improve amenity for tourists. There is also more support for it within the community than opposition. However, as the community appears to view other actions that will redress the under provision of useable open space (eg N1 and N2) of higher priority, clarifying that this action is more a short or medium term project than an immediate one will also provide the time for decision making around the future of the Lyttelton Service Centre and a revaluation of the need for additional public open space once N1 and N2 have been implemented.</p>		
N4: Head to Head Walkway		
Submissions:	Like: 57	Dislike: 2
<p>Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, viewing it as an important recreational and visitor attraction, particularly if it is safe, provides for cyclists, etc, as well as pedestrians and is integrated with other walkways.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Retain as is, given the community support, synergy with and possible early implementation through action M1.</p>		

N5: Temporary landscapes		
Submissions:	Like: 50	Dislike: 7
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, noting that it was a good use of space and good for community morale. Several submitters noted that this action should be community driven, with minimal interference from authorities.		
Staff comment: Retain as is, for the following reasons. A number of temporary landscapes have already been established in Lyttelton by the community with the help of Gapfiller and/or Greening the Rubble, the most successful being the 'the new town square' on the former Ground site. These demonstrate that a lot can be achieved with a little in the way of financial input. Due to the town centre being white-zoned until recently, the master plan not being completed until mid 2012 and the inability of developers to obtain insurance, the lead-in and rebuild period for rebuilding in the Lyttelton town centre will see vacant sites remain for some time yet. The Council can contribute to the vibrancy of the town centre through the further funding of Gapfiller and/or Greening the Rubble.		
N6: Local landscape and heritage interpretation		
Submissions:	Like: 54	Dislike: 0
Issues/themes raised: All submitters liked this action, citing the range of historical associations which could be subject to such interpretation. A numbers of submitters expressed concern that there was little mention of or provision in the Plan for the Lyttelton Museum, its collections being of local, national and international significance and a tangible link to the past. Two submitters also expressed disappointment that Whakaraupo and Urumau Reserves were not specifically mentioned in the Plan, as they have historical significance, together with the Bridle Path, Stan Helm and Major Hornbrook.		
Staff comment: Retain as is, given the unanimous community support and for the reason that the existing wording (which states that "This project is also about providing for the continued operation of the Lyttelton Museum as its former building has been demolished") is broad enough to encompass the range of historical associations which could be subject to such interpretation.		
N7: Interpretation of Tangata Whenua values		
Submissions:	Like: 49	Dislike: 5
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, recognising that acknowledging Tangata Whenua values is critical to building community ownership and pride. MKT has provided various suggestions as to how the Plan should be amended to provide more explicit recognition of Tangata Whenua and its relationship with the area.		
Staff comment: Retain, given the majority community support, but amend the action and other parts of Plan as appropriate in accordance with MKT's submission. MKT should also be identified as a partner agency/organisation to ensure the action is achieved.		
Community well-being/culture and heritage		
C1: Improved utilisation of the Lyttelton Recreation Centre		
Submissions:	Like: 63	Dislike: 5
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, citing the need for suitable community meeting and recreational space to be returned to use as quickly as possible, preferably bigger (in terms of meeting space capacity) and better than before. The inability of the community to use the Lyttelton Recreation Centre for civil defence purposes in particular was noted. Use of it for a temporary theatre appears to be acceptable, providing it does not preclude use of the centre for other activities and there are plans for a permanent one in the future.		
Staff comment: Retain, given that it is one of the largest and most used community facilities in Lyttelton, but amend to reflect the fact that the Lyttelton Recreation Centre was closed during the submission period due to it not meeting the current (post-earthquakes) building code, with its detailed engineering assessment expected to be completed in December 2012. Its future is therefore currently uncertain but if it is ultimately found to be repairable, that will provide the opportunity for the reconfiguration anticipated by this action. Completion of repairs to The Loons, which are currently underway, may provide an alternative temporary theatre earlier than the reopened Lyttelton Recreation Centre can.		

C2: Alternative use of a Council property on Canterbury St		
Submissions:	Like: 54	Dislike: 8
<p>Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, contingent on it providing temporary accommodation for Plunket, the toy Library and playgroup only. Plunket itself does not consider the building to meet its needs, especially in the long term, preferring repair or rebuilding of its existing building at 8 Sumner Rd. The Canterbury District Health Board supports the combined provision of community services.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Amend to consolidate with action C7 and refocus this action on the investigation for and use of all vacant habitable Council-owned land and/or buildings (including the Council property in Canterbury St and Donald St) for (1) the temporary accommodation of displaced social, creative and recreational activities (which may include social, creative and recreational activities of a business nature) in the short term, eg through the provision of portacoms, and (2) permanent use in the long term, for the following reasons. The following Council-owned community facilities in Lyttelton are currently closed until they can be assessed and repaired or rebuilt, or permanently: Norman Kirk Memorial Pool; Lyttelton Recreation Centre; Lyttelton Museum; Grubb Cottage; Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre and public toilets; Plunket Rooms; and Lyttelton Service Centre. Following 22 February 2011, many local artists, musicians and performers have also been displaced from either these or private facilities. The Council has the ability to contribute directly to earthquake recovery as a landowner by making any vacant habitable land and/or buildings available for temporary use to meet local needs in a similar manner to which private land is being made available for temporary landscapes and activities while plans for the future use of the land to meet local needs are made. Support for this action implies support for the use of habitable Council land and buildings to best meet community needs. Plunket has apparently secured funding for operation from a portacom located on its existing site, which is owned by and leased to them by the Council, as the Plunket building won't have a detailed engineering assessment until August 2013. The Council is currently investigating use of this Canterbury St building by Council staff and the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board displaced from the Lyttelton Service Centre during the day and the community outside normal office hours. If achieved, this could provide the Lyttelton case manager with a local base to work from. As for Donald St, the extent and quirky nature of the Council-owned land and buildings there are eminently suitable for redevelopment as a spatially defined precinct for business and/or creative activities (eg arts precinct, which could also include the museum). Development of this nature should also be supported through streetscape elements (including public art, paving, etc) to define the area.</p>		
C3: Combined Lyttelton Library and Service Centre redevelopment		
Submissions:	Like: 52	Dislike: 4
<p>Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, although the Lyttelton Harbour Business Association advised that traffic considerations relating to buses for cruise ship passengers warrant a stand alone information centre.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Retain as is, given that the community agrees with the need to use remaining resources more effectively, including the reference to providing visitor information services, as this does not necessarily mean, or signal an intent to replace, the visitor information services ably provided by the existing Lyttelton Harbour Information Centre (whose building is likely to reopen in due course).</p>		
C4: New public amenities in the town centre		
Submissions:	Like: 59	Dislike: 5
<p>Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, with strong support for additional public (including disabled) toilets, with baby change facilities, that are open into the evening and well maintained. A children's play area was also supported, as it was felt more are needed.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Retain as is, given the community support for these valued community facilities, although as both of these facilities have the potential to be delivered as part of the new civic square there is the potential for consolidation of this action with action N1 in future.</p>		

C5: Lyttelton War Memorial Cenotaph relocation investigation and reinstatement		
Submissions:	Like: 46	Dislike: 12
<p>Issues/themes raised: More submitters liked than disliked this action, although the ratio of like to dislike was closer. Several suggestions of alternative locations to that originally illustrated (as part of the new civic square on the former Ground site) were offered, with the general view being that a new site would need to be central, accessible, safe for the elderly and allow for passing traffic to be stopped during the ANZAC Day service. Others did not consider it necessary to relocate the cenotaph - objecting to an alternative location in the heart of Lyttelton which might be physically or emotionally unsuitable – preferring the existing site, subject to re-landscaping it. They also considered that the RSA should take the lead in the decision making on this issue.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Retain as is, given community support for identifying a suitable site, be that the current one revamped or a new site. The Council is currently looking for undercover storage to protect the damaged cenotaph material, preferably in Lyttelton, in recognition of the possibility of it being restored elsewhere.</p>		
C6: Naval Point redevelopment		
Submissions:	Like: 52	Dislike: 6
<p>Issues/themes raised: More submitters liked than disliked this action, due to its current lack of plantings and rundown appearance. Comments included the use of good native plantings to mitigate the negative impacts of the port and to create a pleasant walking environment. Some would prefer to see the more comprehensive redevelopment occur sooner rather than later due to Naval Point being the only available ramp within Christchurch for trailer boats (i.e. it is a Canterbury wide facility) but well below the standards expected of NZ cities, including having safety issues at the boats ramps. Others considered this action to draw attention away from the more significant issue of the Diamond Harbour Ferry terminal location, which a number of submitters wished to ensure is retained at B jetty for its convenient access to the township and services.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Retain as is, given the community support for this action and its synergy with the Head to Head Walkway, acknowledging that the amenity improvements proposed in the short term are intended to support higher priority actions within the town centre and that the more comprehensive redevelopment will require separate planning and implementation over a longer term.</p>		
C7: Donald Street arts precinct and art in the street		
Submissions:	Like: 55	Dislike: 7
<p>Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, with Donald Street seen as the cultural heart of Lyttelton. Other submitters thought that heritage should be the primary focus of this area, including with the rebuild of the museum, or that Lyttelton should focus on what makes it a unique destination (i.e. being a port town rather than arty). That both this action and action E4 identify seemingly mutually exclusive use of the Council-owned land in Donald St by the creative and business communities respectively was noted by a number of submitters. A group of fifteen submitters considered that this action should be combined with E4 and C8 and that the Harbour Arts Collective should lead the community research and feasibility studies for multi-purpose use of the Council-owned land and buildings in Donald St. With respect to art in the street, some submitters advocated for it to be located throughout the township and for its placement to occur more organically.</p>		
<p>Staff comment: Delete and consolidate with amended action C2 as explained above with respect to C2.</p>		
C8: Performance/film venue		
Submissions:	Like: 51	Dislike: 7
<p>Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, with the majority of submitters supporting one large multi-purpose performance and film venue, centrally located. They considered such a venue would be an asset to not just the local community but to wider Christchurch area and tourists as well. However, other submitters (including The Loons, which suggested a new Loons-specific action) felt it would be more beneficial to direct funds towards the re-opening of The Loons on Canterbury Street, as this would be cheaper and two performance spaces may be underutilised. It was felt the establishment of an additional performance space might be better left to market forces.</p>		

Staff comment: Amend to refocus this action on (1) continued support for reopening of The Loons in the short term if needed and (2) support for the establishment of a new 'black box' performance/film venue in the long term, for the following reasons. Lyttelton's arts scene and performance venues have sustained significant damage. Buildings demolished or closed indefinitely and people or organisations displaced as a result of the earthquakes include the Harbourlight Theatre, various bars, the Crater Arts Collective and numerous local artists, musicians and other performers. The Harbourlight Theatre is unlikely to be rebuilt. Among other things the community has identified the need for more gathering places, temporary and permanent performance space to provide employment for Lyttelton performers, a replacement performance/film venue, making the most of what heritage fabric remains, then building anew, keeping Lyttelton's special character and more community facilities. It makes sense to get the existing remaining performance venue reopened before investing in a new one and for the new one to be a 'black box' (experimental) theatre, being a low-cost, multi-purpose venue with flexible staging and moveable seating which can accommodate a range of performances - from small-scale, intimate events through to large scale productions. This new theatre would be logically located in the proposed arts precinct. The Loons has operated successfully in the presence of the Harbourlight Theatre in the past, has a different capacity (currently 99, aiming for 150, compared to the proposed 300 for a new venue) and has historical significance unique to and valued by Lyttelton that the proposed theatre does not have. The Loons has already received a \$250,000 grant towards the cost of its repair and is likely to reopen in the near future, whereas the timeframe to establish a new black box theatre is significantly longer (possibly years away).

C9: Emergency preparedness

Submissions:	Like: 39	Dislike: 3
--------------	----------	------------

Issues/themes raised: More submitters liked than disliked this action although it attracted less attention overall than the other actions. Most submitters agreed that, due to Lyttelton's isolated location and closure of the Lyttelton Recreation Centre (from which civil defence operated), there is a need to develop a community action plan and be self sufficient in food and services should another emergency arise. They also felt existing initiatives such as the time bank should be supported.

Staff comment: Retain as is, for the following reasons. While the comparatively less attention this action received suggests that some people may feel, based on their experiences immediately after the 22 February 2011 earthquake in particular that Lyttelton's emergency preparedness is sufficient, the situation has changed since then. For example, Lyttelton is now and may be without the Lyttelton Recreation Centre from which civil defence operated for some time. It is perhaps for this reason that those who did comment on this action overwhelmingly support it.

Built environment

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

Submissions:	Like: 64	Dislike: 4
--------------	----------	------------

Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, with strong support for easing the on-site car parking requirements for businesses in particular. Submitters also felt the lack of clear urban design guidance is holding up business redevelopment. Lyttelton Port of Christchurch is concerned that the District Plan amendments do not result in 'reverse sensitivity' with respect to port operations, however.

Staff comment: Retain as is, as the amendments proposed are still necessary despite the improvements that the Resource Consents & Building Policy Unit has recently initiated to their procedures and systems, etc, to streamline the resource consent process for earthquake-related applications.

B2: Design and character guidance

Submissions:	Like: 65	Dislike: 5
--------------	----------	------------

Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action and were in favour of design guidelines which encourage the consistent scale and built form of the Lyttelton town centre, while not being overly prescriptive. Submitters stressed the importance of Lyttelton maintaining its quirky, creative style, while celebrating and respecting its heritage building and not losing the unique nature of design to bland, generic, concrete box structures.

Staff comment: Retain, as a post-earthquake update is required, but amend to include application to public realm street treatments, etc (i.e. identify the 'how' for the 'what' identified in actions N6 and N7).

B3: Inclusion of local involvement in the existing Urban Design Panel		
Submissions:	Like: 55	Dislike: 3
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, however beyond the numbers for and against is a desire by many people to establish their own design panel, rather than have local representation on the existing Urban Design Panel.		
Staff comment: Retain, for the reason that it does not preclude a separate design advisory panel established by the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board and for the following reason, in the event separate design advisory panels prove unworkable for any reason. The Board resolved in mid December 2011 to proceed with establishing the Lyttelton Urban Design Advisory Committee and to review its value and operation at the time of a report to the Council around June 2012 reviewing the Urban Design Panel. On 14 February 2012, the Board asked staff to clarify the required process to establish an urban design committee for Lyttelton that would have an officially recognised status. The report to the Council on the Urban Design Panel is likely to cover off any issues regarding the establishment of separate design panels by community boards.		
B4: Identify and assist retention of remaining built heritage		
Submissions:	Like: 63	Dislike: 3
Issues/themes raised: Many more submitters liked than disliked this action, especially for the Lyttelton's historic retaining walls, and subject to doing so safely.		
Staff comment: Retain, given the extent to which heritage buildings and features have and will continue to contribute to the NZHPT-registered Lyttelton Township Historic Area.		