

ID#	Comments Boulder Bay	Comments Taylors Mistake	Comments Hobsons Bay	Licence conditions	Additional information
18947	I feel they should be allowed to stay	I feel they should be allowed to stay as is	I feel they should stay	No extensions allowed on existing dwellings	
18951	I think they are charming and are part of the history of Christchurch. They should stay.	I think they are charming and are part of the history of Christchurch. They should stay.	I think they are charming and are part of the history of Christchurch. They should stay.	They should be kept tidy and cared for. If they fall in to disrepair there should be a register if interested purchasers who could take over ownership with conditions of suitable care.	
18955	I think they should stay.	I think they should stay.	I think they should stay.	That they are maintained in a tidy state to keep them looking great in tourist Instagrams.	The baches are iconic and should be embraced as an important vignette of our cultural history. There are fewer and fewer places in NZ where traditional baches like this can be seen. Tourists LOVE them and they give the area an indelible quality. I'd love to see more information in situ about the baches and their history. They are an attraction rather than an eyesore, much like cave houses in Spain or house boats in Amsterdam.
18956	I frequent Boulder Bay on Godley Head hikes and find the baches charming and unobtrusive. A sort of historically populist accent. No bach owner has ever been exclusive of their site, or unwelcoming or unfriendly. They should be left alone where they are.	I surf regularly at Taylors Mistake and enjoy the visual presence of the baches. Some of the baches provide public accessible stairs to a handy rip which takes one out back of the surf break. Bach owners are uniformly friendly, welcoming and non-exclusive about their sites. If the baches were removed the bay surrounds would be an exclusive settlement of the well to do and wealthy elites of CCH. The baches are a nice, populist exception.			
18963	Keep them it's part of Canterbury heritage	Keep them	Keep them	Perpetual	
18965	Yes, these batches add great aesthetic and historical value to boulder bay and it would be a travesty for them to go, we need the batches to be privately owned so they may be maintained	The batches at Taylors mistake contribute enormously to the charter, aesthetic and community of Taylors mistake. If necessary they should pay some levy or rates to the council (if they do not already) but it would be of great determinant to the area to lose them. Such things are what give new Zealand its unique character and we would not be the same without them	The batches at Hobsons bay contribute enormously to the charter, aesthetic and community of Hobsons bay. If necessary they should pay some levy or rates to the council (if they do not already) but it would be of great determinant to the area to lose them. Such things are what give new Zealand its unique character and we would not be the same without them	An expectation to upkeep the batches and the land to a reasonable standard. Contribution towards a fund for any infrastructure improvements needed for access	
18967	Keep them. They are part of our history.	Keep them. They are part of our history	Keep them. They are part of our history		Bach's are the responsibility of the owners. And most take great care of them. They are rich in history and a beautiful part of Christchurch's legacy.
18977	They are a great feature of the bay making it quite a unique character to the beach. If people are fully aware of the risks similar to when they walk along the track there are signs warning of hazards therefore it is a risk that is theirs. The heritage of these baches is great a rich of history. Access, there is public access via the walk way and is part of a bigger walking track.	They are a great feature of the bay making it quite a unique character to the beach. If people are fully aware of the risks similar to when they walk along the track there are signs warning of hazards therefore it is a risk that is theirs. The heritage of these baches is great a rich of history. Access via public land the bach owners perhaps could contribute towards the upkeep, as I believe they do in their own maintenance.	These baches are few and those still there and used then as above.	A licence, what do you have in mind? Perhaps consent to be there would be great with restrictions on developing over a certain height and not to go outside the existing footprint.	These baches are a feature of these bays and add so much to the appeal and character. The bach owners are a proactive group who look after their baches and the surrounding land and I am sure very keen to work with the council to maintain the uniqueness of the bays.
18978	I think the current baches should remain and be allowed to make repairs. So long as they are not a danger or creating pollution, they should absolutely stay - it's part of the beauty of the place!	Same as with Boulder bay comments	Same as with Boulder bay comments	The buildings are not renovated to modern styles - they retain their older look, and must keep their current size - no building extra stories or extending.	The heritage value, the uniqueness to Christchurch. Environment protection and adequate facilities for waste etc. That they become, if not already, legal and pay rates etc. as other houses in the area do.
18979	Leave them alone. They are part of history	Leave them alone they are part of history. If they paid rates then you accepted that they were there. Maybe ccc should look at operating	Leave them alone	If they pay the extortionate rates we are charged then leave them	No, they were allowed to build and stay there, now they are part of our history, this council

		within their means and do their core job fix water roads and services first			should worry about fixing the services that they are supposed to supply.
18980	Love them to stay. They give great history/character to the area.	Love them to stay. They give great history/character to the area.	Love them to stay. They give great history/character to the area.	Minimal modifications.	
18981	Yes I believe they should stay. They are a piece of our history. The bach owners support and look after the beach.	I think they should stay. As per above	I think they should stay as per above	Nil	Growing up spending my summers at Taylors mistake it was always the bach holders who formed a sense of community helping all and preformed many after hour rescues are called on help.
18982	Yes. These MUST stay. They are a part of our history our heritage etc. they are an iconic piece of the peninsular and what make Taylor's Mistake so very special and a beautiful place to be. Don't be absurd. Let them stay!!! So what if they are privately owned? I'm very pleased these people are keeping history alive.				
18983		Let them stay. They are well maintained and a lot of these homes have been in families for a very long time!		Respect of the environment	
18985	These must be protected. They are unique and it's such a great walk to get to them from Taylor's.	These also need to be protected. We have lost so much in CHCH. Let's not destroy something so important to us.	Tricky... There are some serious safety issues with 'some' of these but they are so iconic. Surely in this day we could save them even if historically.	Upkeep of property licence, Safety standards licence. Public access via tracks (i.e. not fenced in) licence. Anything that is reasonable, fair and considerate of the owners, land holders and public.	Let's keep Taylor's Mistake as it is. Simplicity can mean so much.
18987	As long as they don't interfere with public access to the beach, leave them alone.	As long as they don't interfere with public access to the beach, leave them alone. Global warming will have the final say.	As long as they don't interfere with public access to the beach, leave them alone. Global warming will have the final say.	Don't interfere with public access to the beach, Global warming will have the final say.	
18989	I feel that the baches have great heritage value and add substantially to the charm and attraction of Boulder Bay.	As at Boulder Bay, I feel that the baches at Taylor's Mistake have great heritage value and add substantially to the charm and attraction of the bay.	No comment as I'm not familiar with Hobsons Bay.	The baches must be well maintained with their own water and sewerage systems. They should not be allowed to be rebuilt as modern houses, but must retain their current style. No further buildings should be allowed. Baches should not be sold on the open market but should only be passed on within immediate family.	
18991		I think these baches are a piece of NZ history and it would be sad to see them go. Taylors mistake would not be the same without them. I know people who have had these as part of their family for many years and they pass the joy of them onto their children. Please leave them be and let them be a part of our beach community!		That they be maintained to a good standard. That the public should have access to the paths around them.	
18994	They should be able to stay if they want. Keep the land that is free now, free. Don't ruin it with houses	Let them stay if they want.	Let them stay if they want		Leave them... They are so cute
18995		I think they should stay where they are and not be bowled down because they are a huge part of the bays history. I've been involved in the surf club at Taylors since a very young age, and so was my mum. These baches are a large part of the bay's character and it would not nearly be the same without them.	Very cool wee houses and baches that again show the history of the place, they are part of the bay!	Not sure what that means but the ability to own the baches and to rent them out	They are extremely important to people, and a beautiful part of the history and character of Taylors.
18997	Love the quant heritage these contribute for all to see	I love the look and heritage they contribute. Personally I think it's wonderful for families to enjoy their family history and memories created and should be allowed to continue		Maintenance and noise	
18998	We have so much land in NZ and these beaches are part of the landscape at Taylor's Mistake. As	We have so much land in NZ and these beaches are part of the landscape at Taylor's Mistake. As	We have so much land in NZ and these beaches are part of the landscape at Taylor's Mistake. As	Management of waste and environmental protection. No major modifications, reflective materials etc. Max occupancy numbers.	No

	locals were used to them being there and they do no harm. Leave them there I say.	locals were used to them being there and they do no harm. Leave them there I say.	locals were used to them being there and they do no harm. Leave them there I say.		
18999	let them stay they have been there for so long	let them stay they have been there so long don't change the rules on them	let them stay they have been there so long don't change the rules on them	just that they are well maintained	
19000	Let them stay, an important part of our built heritage which has been so devastated in the bay suburbs.	Let them stay, an important part of our built heritage which has been so devastated in the bay suburbs.	Let them stay, an important part of our built heritage which has been so devastated in the bay suburbs.	They should be allowed to be publically sold so that all who wish to own them can enjoy them.	No
19001	These baches tell a story of our local history...when we take our touring friends on this walk we pop down and show them these houses and talk about them and the road travelled for the residents.	These provide a wonderful landscape when driving over the hill in Taylors. They again tell a story and the residents are a caring community who take the role of land keepers seriously. They look after the space.		That they retain the historical nature of the buildings.	With CHCH losing so much of its visible history through the earthquake, we should retain these buildings.
19003	Let them stay	Let Them stay	Let them stay	Reasonable repair to those able to be salvaged. Continued upkeep of baches to keep aesthetics.	
19006	I believe they should stay they create an amazing historical backdrop to the area.	I believe they should stay. They are at the core of what makes Taylors Mistake such a unique place. It is quite unbelievable that the council would want to wipe out this historical area...given that so many historical places were destroyed during the earthquake.	They have to stay		Don't destroy our history. They are central to the personality of the place
19007	I think these baches are amazing and a real draw card to keep people coming out and enjoying this area. It's a suitable walk for families of all ages and wouldn't be the same without them.	This row of baches depicts New Zealand and our love of the coast. They add to the character Taylors Mistake and it would be pointless to remove them. A community of passionate people.	Unique and irreplaceable, let them be.		
19009	owners should be able to keep their baches and improve and modify them	owners should be able to keep their baches and improve and modify them	owners should be able to keep their baches and improve and modify them	should be as near to fee simple tenure as possible, owners should be able to keep their baches and improve and modify them	Investigate providing fee simple titles to bach owners. Public access is still available along the front of the baches and behind them.
19010	Keep them, they do no harm!!	Keep them, they do no harm!!	Keep them, they do no harm!!		
19011	Provided hazards to the general public are mitigated, I believe the baches should remain indefinitely. The environment has been modified over a number of years including Maori (e.g. widespread burning of native vegetation, and extinction of native species) so what is heritage and or sacred must be considered holistically and with mutual respect of all views. Buildings in landscape are just as valid as landscape alone, and remember, this is a semi urban environment, it is not a national park.	I think they should stay, be maintained as they are, and should have an indefinite license transferable to any New Zealand citizen. The Council should be spending more time on more pressing and relevant issues rather than pandering to the vexatious views of a few moaning people across the bay.	They should stay as above	That it should be renewable indefinitely, modest in cost, and transferable to any New Zealand citizen	Have some respect for history, and the essence of Kiwi culture, leave them alone and get on with something more worthwhile CCC
19014					
19015		They add to the character of Taylors mistake would be bad idea to remove.	Also add to the unique character of Taylors mistake and should not be removed.		
19016					
19018	They add to the unique vibe of Taylors leave them!	They add to the unique vibe of Taylors leave them!	They add to the unique vibe of Taylors leave them!	No further building on the sites and the payment of higher rates	Historical significance and the decline in recreation as a result
19019	Leave them where they are. The people that want them removed are doing so out of jealousy. If necessary put some of the land rent towards	Leave them where they are. The people that want them removed are doing so out of jealousy. If necessary put some of the land rent towards	Leave them where they are. The people that want them removed are doing so out of jealousy. If necessary put some of the land rent towards	To look after the land and its flora and fauna	The baches have been in existence for a long time. They have done no harm and are historic in their own right. Incidentally I am not a bach owner or lessee but I am firmly against removing these caches

	the reserves. Allow foot paths to access public land.	the reserves. Allow foot paths to access public land.	the reserves. Allow foot paths to access public land.		
19022		These batches have been here for a very long time and make Taylor's Mistake what it is. Travellers from all over the world love to come here and their comments are always the same "It's great to see that NZ has not succumbed to corporate greed by pulling down these beautiful batches, that is what makes NZ unique from the rest of the world" We have lost so much through the natural disaster of the Christchurch earthquake do not let Christchurch lose something as special as these batches. Let us continue to be unique			The council needs to be transparent about this whole process and all information needs to be made available at all times with an independent review
19024		LEAVE IT FOR THE PUBLIC, it is not fair to sell off public land, should be left for everyone to enjoy			Should be enjoyed my
19025	People don't mind the fact that these batches are privately owned! It would be a huge loss to see them go as they add to the unique landscape.	Taylor's Mistake is beautiful and part of it are the batches. We love going for walks and looking at all the different batches. It's part of the landscape and I can't imagine it any other way. It would ruin the beauty of this place.	Same as above. Please keep in mind that there are a lot of people who would be very upset to see these batches go.		Please do consider the heritage of these batches! A lot of people from Christchurch come out for a walk from Taylor's Mistake to Godley Head and it would change so much about this beautiful place.
19026		Keep them makes Taylor's mistake better!			
19027				There should be an appropriate charge for the licence that is in-line with what would be charged for any other use of council land.	
19028	Please leave them where they are, each one represents in its own unique way and style the history and freedom of how people could live in NZ. Don't put health safety reasons above the people!	They are precious and unique, making Taylor's mistake one of my favourite beaches to go.			Safe them, don't change them.
19029	Yes, from a heritage aspect, these are iconic. They should be permitted to remain Firstly, from the perspective of natural hazards: immediately following my own home [REDACTED] being destroyed by the Feb. 11 earthquake, I was generously offered refuge in one of these beaches. I was in situ for the June earthquake, the epicentre very close. Very dramatic, but virtually no damage to these beaches. The area proved to be resilient. Storm surges? I've witnessed many. Again, no risk to life whatsoever. Secondly, Public Access: This has, in my opinion and years of visiting Taylor's mistake, not inhibited the public's ability to enjoy the beach. In reality the beach is only popular on the limited few very hot days of a hot summer. The rest of the year, virtually no one but a hand full of hardy surfers. To remove the beaches would not in real terms of benefit to the public. Thirdly, the heritage value of these beaches is priceless. They are steeped in history and are a fine representation of a time that is precious. It is obvious that their proud owners are worthy guardians. To remove this salute to the past should be unthinkable.	Yes, I am very strongly in favour of them remaining.	Essentially the same as proffered re: Taylor's Mistake	That the owners faithfully maintain them to reflect the era in which they were originally erected. They should shoulder the responsibility to keep their area free of rubbish. They should be self-sufficient and pay rates as we all do	Yes, their existence has always been an integral part of Taylor's mistake identity. A very positive one. If indeed Taylor made a 'mistake'(?), it would be a far greater mistake to remove these beaches
19030					

19031	Leave it the way it is	Leave it the way it is	Leave it the way it is		
19033		They add character to the beach, and they have no significant impact on access. I think the current occupants should be able to continue to use them as they do now.		They should be well maintained, but not developed to the extent that their character is lost.	
19034	I think they should stay. It's part of the heritage.	Again, I think they should stay. It's part of the attraction to the area and the heritage.		Allow them to be publically trades so that anyone can enjoy them. They should be available for sale too should the owners wish.	
19035	Keep these amazing baches	These ones are even better love love love them, and the awesome families that use them, they make Taylors mistake.		Keeping the place clean and tidy, no dogs.	
19036		Keep keep keep please,		To look after the amazing land	Rich people not getting their hands on them and turning them into mansions
19037	Save them! They have been there for years and they are one of the reasons Taylor's is an attraction. Locals and people of Canterbury are against the demolition and so should you! They are history, it's like demolishing the Cathedral. PLEASE SAVE THESE AMAZING HOUSES!				
19038		It should not be touched!!			
19039	Keep them! They're gorgeous and have such a great vibe! Would be such a shame to lose them!	Keep them!	Keep them!		
19040	It would be a shame to see the baches at Boulder Bay demolished. The baches are unique and add charm and character to an area that already has significant history. They should be preserved (at the cost of the Bach owners)	Please keep these charming baches at Taylors Mistake. The baches have been there longer than the homes on the opposite hill and are a welcome and familiar site to beach goers. The history of the baches and their original owners and occupiers is interesting and should be remembered. The current owners have worked to retain their charm and have strong connections to the area and surf club. If you look at any old photos of the area, the baches feature predominantly and each Bach is unique and special.	As mentioned above I wish to support retaining the baches due to their uniqueness and historical status. There can't be any other places in NZ that have something special like this. Chch has lost so much history in the past few years due to the earthquakes. It would be devastating to see these baches destroyed over bureaucracy.	Conditions around keeping baches exterior unchanged (no extensions etc.). Options to install septic tanks/connect to sewer. They should be preserved (at the cost of the Bach owners) Baches to be awarded some kind of historical significance title to protect them for future generations.	
19041		Best things in Chch , love the old batches		Sewerage	
19042		Love the baches love the people, let's keep something good for once		Keeping it tidy, looking after the place	
19043	They should be recognised as a Historic Places Trust Heritage Area	They should be recognised as a Historic Places Trust Heritage Area	They should be recognised as a Historic Places Trust Heritage Area	Negotiate licences for baches with a yearly rent/lease for the right to stay.	
19044		I do not have any direct interest in any of these baches. But I support the continued presence of existing baches. The unique NZ history they represent has value while I see little or no downside to their presence including access to public land.		Buildings should not be developed materially beyond their existing structure. The baches and bach owners should not impose any burden upon the council other than the policing/enforcement of whatever licence conditions are imposed. The Council should not adopt any responsibility for their protection from natural hazards. The baches should not be allowed to be used as permanent dwellings.	Baches of the type in these locations are a precious part of New Zealand history. Unfortunately, throughout the country many similar ones have been removed or significantly modified in favour of more substantial holiday homes and/or dwellings. It would seem unreasonable should Council be required to shoulder a burden to protect them or that the presence of these baches is permitted to meaningfully restrict enjoyment of the immediate environment by others. In this case it would seem that neither is the case to any material extent and that a relatively straight forward opportunity exists here to likely preserve some valuable Kiwiana.

19045	Yes definitely should stay they add character. And history of the Christchurch and Sumner communities were the local people can enjoy time with the natural environment around them. Children love it .take a kid fishing is certainly a part of bolder Bay atmosphere. Climb trees, catch crabs watch birds something money cannot buy In our materialistic world we live In. Yes the baches should stay they are our history of Christchurch. We have had enough of places being destroyed. Tourist love it is history and love the batches. They should stay.	Why? Take this special part of unique history away it does not make sense! There are other more important jobs to do. To remove this history memorabilia seems unfair.	Not sure about these.		I believe those who own these baches, take a personal interest in the area are caretakers of the environment around them. There have been tourist walking groups and school visits also random families and people enjoying the environment. Having Bach owners there is interesting for them with history and stories to share. Also if there is an accident there may be an owner available to help. Which proves to be valuable in time of need.
19049	Let them stay		They should stay		
19050	These beautiful little batches have been there for so long they should stay, I take visitors to Taylor's Mistake, Hobsons Bay and Boulder to see this unique group of historic batches. All have a story, the area would not be the same without them.	These beautiful little batches have been there for so long they should stay, I take visitors to Taylor's Mistake, Hobsons Bay and Boulder to see this unique group of historic batches. All have a story, the area would not be the same without them.	These beautiful little batches have been there for so long they should stay, I take visitors to Taylor's Mistake, Hobsons Bay and Boulder to see this unique group of historic batches. All have a story, the area would not be the same without them.	I believe these batches should stay with the families who have them now passed on to relatives, never sold, kept in a reasonable order and never extended.	Many of the batch owners are Surf Club members these people man the beach when the life guards are not on duty, a life guard around water is never off duty. A number of rescues have been done by batch owners. Taylor's Mistake can be a very dangerous beach there could have been more drownings over the years if the batch owners had not been there. Christchurch has more important things to deal with, leave this beautiful historic cluster of batches where they are.
19052	Must keep! Key history of Taylors Mistake	Must keep	Must keep		
19056	I think that they are iconic and important part of our history. Many day tamper have picnics and spend time down on the foreshore. It's a beautiful spot that the owners should be able to enjoy.	Hi I am lucky enough to have spent many summers at our family batch at Taylor's Mistake. My grandparents owned a batch and have since passed it on to the next generation to enjoy. My family have a great view of the beach and in many occasions when no lifeguards are around they have come to the rescue of swimmers and fisherman even para gliders in trouble. Having a phone line to call emergency services was a rare thing back in the day so we often assisted the general public. We have a passion to look after the beach and support the community Surf lifesaving club. Given the chance to stay would allow us encouragement to improve the condition of the batches as we have held off putting money in awaiting a decision for decades now. We love our family Bach and often have family gatherings which are very special to us since our grandparents passed on. Please please please let us stay.	I think they are iconic to New Zealand sadly some have not been well maintained dye to the lack of uncertainty of their future. Given the right to stay I believe these batches would be invested in to improve the look to the public. Following the quakes power was cut off to our family batch and it was red stickered which meant that we had many vandals and quite a lot of damage done. Given the right to occupy we would like to be able to put the power back on and improve the current condition which has slowly been deteriorating awaiting a decision on their future.	I think if they lose their batches they should be able to rebuild in the bay as planned many years ago. They should still be able to enjoy their family's favourite holiday and weekend spot.	Access to the sewer lines would be good if the older batches could stay.
19057	They should stay!	They should stay!	They should stay!		They should stay!
19058		I know a family who owns 2 baches in Taylor's mistake. These have been in their family for 2 generations and have a lot of sentimental value and memories attached to them. The family would love to renovate their baches but have held off due to uncertainty over whether or not they can keep them. This particular family has assisted in rescues and called emergency services when they have spotted swimmers and fishermen in trouble. At times there have been no lifeguards on duty when this family has			

		needed to intervene. They have an excellent view of the whole beach from their bach. Effectively removing these baches could cost lives.			
19059	Yes. Keep them there. They are part of what makes that area unique!	Yes. Keep them there. They are part of what makes that area unique!	Yes. Keep them there. They are part of what makes that area unique!		
19061		I feel these should be kept in the same situation they are at present.			
19066	Leave them how they are, there is no risk, it adds to the character of the area.	Leave them how they are, there is no risk, it adds to the character of the area.	Leave them how they are, there is no risk, it adds to the character of the area.		
19068	Yes, they should stay. They have and continue to be an asset for the area.	Yes, they should remain and continue to enhance the area with their historical significance and unique caricature that only Taylor's Mistake can offer.	These beaches are unfortunately in a rock fall area that maybe too difficult to remedy, having said that there are a couple that could save for historic reasons.	A standard licence agreement, with a 20 year term would provide surety for the owners and courage maintenance of the beaches.	Given that almost all of Christchurch's historic buildings have been demolished and lost due to the earthquakes it seems ridiculous to demolish more of our history, this is a unique environment and the baches provide a charm and special character that is uniquely Taylor's Mistake. I would be devastated if Council decided to remove these buildings. We are on the cusp of making the obvious decision to let them remain and in doing so provide a historic legacy that is precisely what Christchurch needs more of, history once wiped out is gone forever.
19070	I would like to see the baches retained but more formally managed.	I wants the baches to be retained		No time limit. Restriction on maximum size, egg. 60sqm or no bigger than current size Restriction on build style when repairs or rebuild becomes necessary	Think that assigning legal titles would be a good idea. Would like to all baches to have sewers as well as power and water but expect owners to be paying rates accordingly
19072	Keep them, they are no harm to anyone	Keep them, they are no harm to anyone	Keep them, they are no harm to anyone	That they should be able to on sell the beaches to new buyers	
19074	Leave the baches there we want them as part of our heritage	They look great leave them there. We don't want to live in a sterile environment with no interest or history. Christchurch has lost so much with the earthquakes why destroy any more things. Don't touch them.	Please leave them there they are part of our history	Not sure it needs to be thought through thoroughly	
19079		To me, growing up as a kid in these batches was a huge part of my childhood. My family and I still have strong connections with other batch owners and serve as a mini-community with traditions and gatherings all year round. Although these batches are a big part of my life, they bring a lot of interest and beauty to Taylors Mistake. The batches make this wee place of Christchurch unique and carries a long history behind them. In my opinion, the batches should remain to keep the unique feel and look of Taylors Mistake without the hassle of removing them, planting in their place which people may not even be able to use, and being left with a blanc scenery.			
19080	Yes. They are historic and part of the bay. They should stay.	They are part of the beach. In all ways they add to the environment and the Bach holders help on the beach and with the public. They should stay.	They are part of the bay and do no harm. Keep them.	A user based rates system to pay for services and land use.	They do no harm. They are part of the landscape and the council has way bigger problems than this.
19082					I love everything about Taylor's Mistake and it's beachside baches. I think Chch is very much lacking in true seaside residence and business and these baches are an exception. Please keep them
19085	I would like the baches to remain there as they are.	I would like the baches to remain there as they are.	Maybe they should go due to potential rock fall	No special conditions for license	These are historical baches that make the bay unique and different. They need to stay.

19087	Remain as they are, no reason to do anything with them	Remain as they are, they are historic buildings that outdate most buildings in Christchurch. We have lost enough of our heritage sites due to earthquakes, no need to lose more.	Potentially need to have something done. Obvious rock fall danger. Maybe just not allow to be lived in, but leave them for nature to deal with?	Just a standard rental agreement	Historical building need to be kept, we have lost enough
19088	Keep them! They are a part of Christchurch heritage and they pose no threat.	Keep them, same as Boulder Bay, they are a part of Christchurch heritage and they pose no threat.	Maybe they should go, they have more of a risk of being dangerous due to rock fall.	A standard licence with no special conditions.	These batches are unique, they should be able to stay they do not pose a threat, they are not a threat to anyone.
19089	I bring visitors to Christchurch to Boulder bay and it's always the cute baches that they love and admire. This is South Island heritage. It's uniquely kiwi and once they are gone they are gone forever. Please don't make the same mistake that was made after the quakes. Heritage buildings are worth preserving no matter what the cost or perceived danger.	I bring visitors to Christchurch to Boulder bay and it's always the cute baches that they love and admire. This is South Island heritage. It's uniquely kiwi and once they are gone they are gone forever. Please don't make the same mistake that was made after the quakes. Heritage buildings are worth preserving no matter what the cost or perceived danger.			
19090	I think they should be retained as is	I think they should be retained as is	I think they should be retained as is	they are given heritage status, and must be preserved in good upkeep	they retain heritage status
19091					
19092	The baches at boulder bay are the main reason people walk out the Godley head track to see and visit these kiwi icons!!	Taylor's Mistake is known for the baches, everybody knows the rotten row! Etc. as a bach owner myself...we get people daily (during the summer months) walking past asking for a look inside, totally fascinated by these little gems!	Same as above. They are iconic to Hobson's Bay! Rock fall issues should be address and made safe for owners to occupy again.	I'm not opposed to a licence, but it needs to be discussed in depth with the bach owners. Some conditions of the licence should require bach owners to keep up maintenance and continue to provide open access for members of the public to pass through the baches etc.	It's important that we are a city that has suffered so much loss and destruction of our history in the recent years and keeping these iconic baches that are loved by many is important for the city. Taylor's Mistake wouldn't be the most popular beach in the summer I'd everybody hated the baches!! We know it's an absolute privilege to own these little gems!
19097		These batches are part of Christchurch history. We have lost so much with the earth quakes in Canterbury. We have friends and clients the own these batches, they love them, many have been in their family for more than 100 years. Please let us keep our history.			
19099		They need to stay, it will never be the same without them, and they mean so much too so many people. You can't take them away. If you are worried about rising sea levels you will have to take into account all the houses near beaches like Sumner and new Brighton. LET THEM STAY WHERE THEY ARE!			
19100	Let them stay...they are iconic.	As above. ...Let them stay...they are iconic.	Again...as above...do not remove them...let them stay. ..They are iconic.	A long licence to ensure they are kept as baches. ..Not developed.	
19101	I believe they are a unique feature of the bay and the current owners should be allowed to continue ownership to occupy,	I strongly believe these are unique features that make Taylor's Mistake the place it is, and that current owners should be allowed to continue to occupy them	I believe they are a unique feature of the bay and the current owners should be allowed to continue ownership to occupy them	The licence conditions should state that the beaches are kept in habitable tidy condition however they should not be allowed to make any extensions. The owners should be allowed to make changes required for structural and sanity requirements. Maybe with some sort of reasonable ground lease to cover utilities.	I'm sick of this issue coming up all the time. These baches are part of the history and culture of the area and should be preserved.
19102	It should be the decision of the house owners, not the council. It is an absolutely iconic and special part of our cities history. If it is such a concern the council should place (if they haven't already) hazard notices on the houses so that the house owners accept potential hazards.	Where's the issue here. If they own the houses, that's that. Leave the home owners alone to their houses.	Unsure the location of Hobsons bay or whether it is still part of the Taylor's mistake area...	An acceptance notice of the potential hazards. Allowance for house repairs to maintain the history.	
19104	These baches are part of our history and should not be removed. They add to the richness and	These baches are part of our history and should not be removed. They add to the richness and	These baches are part of our history and should not be removed. They add to the richness and	That they be maintained and not left to deteriorate	

	are a positive element in the environment They visually improve the environment and are causing no harm. When they were erected they were allowed to be built on the land so why change the rules now.	are a positive element in the environment. They visually improve the environment and are causing no harm. When they were erected they were allowed to be built on the land so why change the rules now	are a positive element in the environment They visually improve the environment and are causing no harm When they were erected they were allowed to be built on the land so why change the rules now		
19105	I have been walking along there for almost 5 decades and always enjoy looking at the very picturesque batches and the colourful flowers in some of their gardens. They are part of Christchurch's precious heritage	Also very attractive and enjoyable to walk past. A precious part of Christchurch's heritage.	Some of them seem to have been damaged badly during the quakes and now look unsafe to inhabit but some of the others are fine.	That the owners do visit them and maintain them, or allow other people to take them over. I hope they stay there for many years to come. I do hope the owners of all rescuable batches are given long-term leases and encouraged to renovate their batches	Taylor's Mistake and Godley head both have public toilets for walkers, but although Boulder Bay is a very popular area for walkers and school groups to explore, there is no toilet. It would be good if CCC could install a public toilet there too.
19106	Please keep the historic places they are part of our history	Keep them	Keep them	Must stay in original Style and be tidy and no waste run offs into the ocean	Good recycling and waste and I Stay In same style no extensions
19107	Keep them! They are a part of our heritage	Keep them! They are a part of our heritage	Keep them! They are a part of our heritage		Don't let bureaucracy ruin our city. Let the Bach owners have their baches at their own risk. Sign a waiver if needed!!
19108	These batches should stay. They are an important part of the history and character of the area in which they sit. They are part of what makes Boulder Bay an interesting place.	These batches should stay. They are an important part of the history and character of the area in which they sit. They are part of what makes Taylor's Mistake an interesting place.	These batches should stay. They are an important part of the history and character of the area in which they sit. They are part of what makes Hobsons Bay an interesting place.	Long term leases are appropriate, to give owners the ability to invest in up keep. A heritage clause should be used which prevents current batches being demolished and replaced with large, intrusive structures. The batches at Torment Bay, Able Tasman, are now being replaced by huge glass and concrete structures and I would not want this to happen in any of the areas under consultation.	These batches and the people that own them add to the area, not detract from it. They should be supported to stay. So long as their rubbish and wastewater are properly managed I see no reason that they be removed. Public access is currently adequate around the area, but this should be protected from any future development changes.
19114	Yes, I don't want them there and think they should be removed and no replacements allowed	Yes, I don't want them there and think they should be removed and no replacements allowed	Yes, I don't want them there and think they should be removed and no replacements allowed	Anybody who wants to use a licensed bach should be allowed to as part of the licence to let the bach remain. Let DOC manage the rentals as they do with their huts. No exclusive private possession of public land.	If the current occupants refuse to give them up, just wait until they die and then bowl whatever is still standing. No inheritance on a private basis for future generations. Bowl anything that is already in a state that is too dangerous for public use. No ratepayer funds should go to maintain safety or access of these baches for private use.
19116	Leave them how they are	Leave them how they are	Leave them how they are		
19117	I strongly support the baches being able to stay as they add character to the area, they are so established as to be historic and as a true part of Kiwiana should be retained. They are in a confined space.	I strongly support the baches being able to stay as they add character to the area, they are so established as to be historic and as a true part of Kiwiana should be retained. They are in a confined space. They do not restrict access to other areas e.g. Boulder Bay track	I strongly support the baches being able to stay as they add character to the area, they are so established as to be historic and as a true part of Kiwiana should be retained. They are in a confined space.	Reasonable tenure to give bach owners security and the incentive to maintain the baches.	Bach owners to keep their properties in similar condition to what they are now
19118	Let's make sure baches are still here in another 100 years	Let's make sure baches are still here in another 100 years	Let's make sure baches are still here in another 100 years	Control modifications, ensure still affordable to current owners. still here in another 100 years	
19120	Part of our history and therefore should remain	they should be allowed to remain and enjoyed by generations	but these are people's homes, histories and part of the community and area	being granted a lease, Get them to pay tax	Absolutely love these and they should stay
19123	They should stay they have a great history to tell	My family has had a bach here for 50 years Baches are an iconic feature of NZ's heritage and should be preserved as part of our heritage. Too many of our heritage buildings have been lost to Christchurch from the earthquakes the baches stood throughout.	Habitable ones should stay	A reasonable time i.e. well over 25years. Assured maintenance by bach holders. No outside alterations to change the heritage nature of any bach.	
19125	I love seeing them there. I would hate for them to be taken away.	I love seeing them there. I would hate for them to be taken away.	I love seeing them there. I would hate for them to be taken away.		
19126	All beaches should remain they are part of the area and have historic meaning to all who visit	They are part of our historic heritage. Our family have been going to Taylor's since before I was born (I am now 70) we still do. The baches are Taylor's Mistake and should remain.	Remain		

19127	I want them to stay as they are.	I want them to stay as they are.	I want them to stay as they are.	Not freehold title. Licence to occupy.	Ignore the one household continually pushing this as an issue when the majority of people in the Sumner/Taylor's community want them to stay.
19131	They need to stay. It's what makes the bays unique and adds character.	They need to stay. It's what makes the place unique and adds character. They are special and add to the area. They are causing no problem and are a lovely place to come and bring visitors.	They need to stay. It's what makes the bays unique and adds character.	That they are only on sold to locals.	No
19132	Bach retention is absolutely key to maintain heritage values. They have been around for at least 50 years and already a part of the existing landscape. What is the point of removing them now?	Bach retention is absolutely key to maintain heritage values. They have been around for at least 50 years and already a part of the existing landscape. What is the point of removing them now?	Bach retention is absolutely key to maintain heritage values. They have been around for at least 50 years and already a part of the existing landscape. What is the point of removing them now?	Licence of 35 years - if the bach is well-maintained and structurally sound at time of licence renewal.	
19133	I think the baches are an important part of our history and beach psyche. The owners should be allowed to continue to occupy and maintain these baches. The great kiwi Bach is becoming obsolete. Why be part of the obsolescence process???	I think the baches are an important part of our history and beach psyche. The owners should be allowed to continue to occupy and maintain these baches. The great kiwi Bach is becoming obsolete. Why be part of the obsolescence process???	I think the baches are an important part of our history and beach psyche. The owners should be allowed to continue to occupy and maintain these baches. The great kiwi Bach is becoming obsolete. Why be part of the obsolescence process???	The baches should be maintained in their current state. Owners should be offered a land license to occupy.	I don't think these baches should be allowed to be replaced by big, new modern structures but they should be allowed to remain where they are for as long as they can be safely maintained and occupied
19138	That the baches should be retained. They are part of the social history of this region, and their building did not contravene regulations current at the time of construction. They add colour and interest to the peninsular.			Reasonable maintenance should be expected of the owners, as well as access by the public.	It is time that a final decision is made; this issue has been simmering for decades.
19139	They are part of the heritage and landscape of the area now, it would be a shame to see them removed.	They are part of the heritage and landscape of the area now, it would be a shame to see them removed.	They are part of the heritage and landscape of the area now, it would be a shame to see them removed.	Re modelling should be restricted to general maintenance	Existing use right should prevail.
19140	I am all for it. 100%	I was born in Sumner, Christchurch. I have spent almost my entire childhood and time at Taylor's mistake and it is like a second home to me. I had the privilege of living at the brown batch with the green tin roof. I lived there with my father and sister. My father is no longer alive and I cherish the memories shared there. I feel the privately owned baches should stay. They are one of the things that makes Taylor's mistake what it is today.	As per my statement about Taylor's mistake, Hobson's bay and its baches are embedded in the dna of Taylor's mistake.		Don't do it for money. Think with your heart for once give back to your people and respect them.
19142	Should be removed	Okay to stay consideration of rates and lease fee on land, also sanitary?	Should go	Ground lease rates and environmental considerations	
19147	Hi there, I have been a resident of Taylor's mistake for 24 years. The community is a close knit, friendly and historical group, with many generations of families having lived at Taylor's and been involved in the community. The baches are an extremely significant part of Taylor's, providing a rich history of family legacies and good times. The baches bring the colour and culture to the beach, and it would be very sad if they have to be taken away. They Have been a huge part of my childhood, and many other people's. So it should be a democratic decision as to what happens to these legendary baches.	Hi there, I have been a resident of Taylor's mistake for 24 years. The community is a close knit, friendly and historical group, with many generations of families having lived at Taylor's and been involved in the community. The baches are an extremely significant part of Taylor's, providing a rich history of family legacies and good times. The baches bring the colour and culture to the beach, and it would be very sad if they have to be taken away. They Have been a huge part of my childhood, and many other people's. So it should be a democratic decision as to what happens to these legendary baches.	The same goes for the Hobson's bay baches. These houses are not offensive to anyone, and because they are on public land doesn't mean that the general public is affected. They are beautiful homes for everyone to look at and enjoy.		SAVE THE BACHES!
19149		Personally think the land swap proposal suggested by the owners of these historic baches is a win win situation, the quaint baches should not be removed as they add to the history of the area and visually represent the times of past, they have been there for as long			

		as anyone can remember, it seems a long lasting vocal minority is getting there say again or is it envy that they don't have one themselves!			
19150	They should remain in private ownership to ensure that these heritage buildings are properly maintained for future generations. If there are baches that cannot be occupied for geotechnical reasons they should be preserved and maintained as 'unoccupy-able structures'. They are too important to lose	They should remain in private ownership to ensure that these heritage buildings are properly maintained for future generations. If there are baches that cannot be occupied for geotechnical reasons they should be preserved and maintained as 'unoccupy-able structures'. They are too important to lose	They should remain in private ownership to ensure that these heritage buildings are properly maintained for future generations. If there are baches that cannot be occupied for geotechnical reasons they should be preserved and maintained as 'unoccupy-able structures'. They are too important to lose	A decent length of license with rights of renewal is required to provide incentive for the owners to keep them maintained. If there are baches that cannot be occupied for geotechnical reasons they should be preserved and maintained as 'unoccupy-able structures'. Clauses to ensure their existing character and scale is maintained - with consequences if they are not A realistic license fee that allows existing owners to carry on owning them and not having to sell them to someone who can afford the license fee (one of the 'charms of the bach community is that it represents a whole cross section of society.	The contribution the bach owners make to the local community egg they provide long term members to the surf club (egg I am an ex Club Captain, President and now a life member). That the Taylors Mistake baches represent the most intact post World War 1 bach community left in NZ - don't let happen here what happened in Rangitoto - Auckland now regret the removal of the Rangitoto baches.
19153	These baches must stay, so long as they operate as a bach, and are kept in good condition without modification.	These baches should stay, so long as they operate as a bach, and are kept in good condition without modification. They are a piece of the bay and have been for all of my life. They add community and character. While an unspoiled, non-developed bay as is was 160 years ago would be nice, there is modern housing in place. I see no value in moving these back or in demolishing.		Maintenance of condition and form. No expansion. so long as they operate as a bach.	
19154	I'd like them to stay... they are part of Chch history.	Again, let these historic beaches stay...	Again, let these historic beaches stay...	Only license for current owners or proven descendants, not to be on sold. Regulations should cover the standard of upkeep required.... but must be well maintained. No new ones.	They should pay an annual leasehold fee.
19156	Leave baches where they are, allow bach owners in designated areas to relocate to bach zone. Leave Boulder Bay baches as is	Keep as is, allow them to be improved/maintained, install sewer line, allow rental opportunity so more people can use them. Allow to be sold if need be.	Baches in disrepair or in rockfall danger to be removed. Others allowed to stay	Sewer line, licence able to be renewed.	Sewer line important, encourage appearances to be maintained, encourage baches to be utilised more.
19157		In favour of keeping the baches at Taylor's Mistake. They make the place unique, adding a lot of character, and are part of the history there so it would be a shame to lose that.			
19161	They should stay. Historic.	They should stay. Historic.	They should stay. Historic.	Change of ownership should remain in the family.	Existing use rights.
19162	Leave them be, they are a part of our history, love seeing them There. Has no negative impact on visiting.	Absolutely want them to stay. The feel and vibe they bring is lovely, reminder of the old kiwi way. We are so swamped with modern and new and these classic Kiwi reminders show us of a slower time, with Bach holidays. They have been an integral part of Taylor's Mistake, it would look boring if they were moved off that little path. I took my 3 children 8, 12, 13 to see them & show them their place telling them the history and they loved seeing them there. Please don't shift them, offer a fee to owners to lease land if need be but please don't remove them.	No, not familiar with them.	The same as lease land conditions- a fee to be paid each year (not ridiculously expensive though)	Leave them be, they are an important part of Chch history. As long as they are kept tidy, let them stay.
19163	Without a doubt the status quo needs to remain. Why wreck something that works and is such a major part of iconic NZ?	Ditto for all the above. The baches MUST remain as they are. Please don't remove them and	The owners need to be able to get back in to them and repair them-since they were red	Leave politics out of it!	NO

	Surely the CCC has more pressing issues than trying to resolve a long standing dilemma! They won't get Brownie points for removing them-for sure!	plant ugly native bush that soon engulfs the surroundings.	zoned the vandals have done their best to wreck them. Let them stand proud again.		
19166	Yes they should be permitted to remain where they are.	Yes they should be permitted to remain where they are.	Yes they should be permitted to remain where they are.	Environmental & building alteration conditions	
19171	These baches and the stories about them are most important to keep alive. Coming upon them at the end of the coastal walk to Boulder Bay adds so much to the enjoyment of the area.	These Baches are an important part of the heritage and history of Canterbury and should be allowed to remain. It would be sacrilege to remove them. The presence of them adds greatly to the character and colourfulness of Taylors Mistake. For goodness sake let them be!	Some of these baches would appear to be beyond repair and maybe unsafe also. The ones that could be redeemed and are safe should definitely be allowed to remain.	To keep the baches in a state of good repair and to have proper outlets for waste water.	We would love to stay in a bach. If any were available for rental that would be great.
19185	I was born and brought up on the Port Hills and went to Taylors Mistake to play and swim. We then spent 6 months renting a house at Taylors Mistake in 2012 whilst our house on St Andrews Hill was having Earthquake repairs. We have often walked to Boulder Bay and feel the baches in Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay add character and history to the area. They are part of its story. So much of Christchurch's heritage and character has been recently lost by a devastating natural event and here we are actually choosing to lose more.	As above. Without the story of our past we lose an important connection. Adopted children often feel this deeply even when they have had wonderful 'Adoptive Parents'. If this History is lost there is no way back. The disconnect is permanent	Totally the same. These baches are fascinating and the ones built into caves are like a living museum. A reminder of the rigours of early settler life.	One that protects the history of these dwellings so they can't be modernised or extended. Like a grade 1 listed building. We have travelled the world extensively and seen the need to have a cross section of the eras that have influenced that locality.	
19190	I think these should stay, they are tidy and an amazing little bit of Christchurch's history. We love walking down to them and just looking around.	These baches are an iconic bit of Christchurch. How often do you pick up a photographic history of no book and these are featured. They are always neat and tidy and obviously loved by the families who are lucky enough to have access to them. They should definitely be allowed to stay as long as they are kept just as they are and in good tidy repair.	Some of these are now in a dangerous state and thoughts ones need to either be removed or if possible repaired	I think it is important that the license is long term so people have certainly, therefore keep the batches we'll maintained, also that they can't have additions etc. that would change them physically.	I think they should stay. They are an important part of Canterbury. We have lost so much of our history we cannot afford to lose anymore!!!
19193		These batches have heritage and my family's one has been there forever. The council destroying these would be a terrible thing for families who go there every year for summer holidays.			
19215	I think they should stay as Boulders bay is magic place to visit and far more interesting because for the batches. I neither have a bach anywhere or know anyone with a bach but they are of historical interest in country a little short of even slightly old dwellings!	See above keep them	Not been to hobson bay so cannot comment	Obligation to allow public to rent some of time. I think they should remain managed by the current owners but they should be available for public to rent for 25% to 40% of the year at modest rates and the proceeds after any expenses incurred should go to the council.	if owners don't agree council should buy them for public perhaps cancer society of other charities could look after them and use for their clients
19217	I would like to see the last baches in Boulder Bay remain	I would like to see all the remaining baches in Taylors Mistake remain. They are part of our history and heritage. I feel that the present owners should pay a fee per annum as they used to do in the Sumner Borough Council days which were \$1. Pound per year. Except for WW1 men who had suffered so much in the war and needed peace and quiet. The Sumner Borough felt that they had done their bit and did not need to pay. 1893-1945.			
19220	Save them stop being so dam stupid who are they hurting? We have nothing left in Christchurch so why take away what little history we have left!!!! Spend the money where it's actually needed!!!! These stupid people that kick up a fuss of nothing	It's worked absolutely fine for years get off your high horses.		Just look after the batch's and the grounds they are on and there should be no problem	

19224	<p>The baches at Boulder Bay appear to have little impact on the use of the space and provide a lovely historical element to the experience. I believe the bach owners provide some stewardship and help maintain the area. I have a bach at [REDACTED], and pay council rates. However, the council land around our property is pretty much ignored as part of the council maintenance and we and our neighbours spend a significant amount of time, money and energy weeding and maintaining these spaces. I would not trust CCC to care enough for Boulder Bay if left in their hands</p>	<p>I love the baches along the row. I understand the legal issues and the 'residents' argument to remove them, for their own gratification and needs. However, I feel if the baches are kept to a high standard and enhance the bay, they should remain. I think CCC or other governing bodies should be vigilant (if this is the case) in making sure these standards are maintained and owners and baches should be removed if not kept to this standard. Again, the stewardship of many of these families keeps the bay safe for visitors, and I know the surf life saving club benefits from their presence. I think the concept of renting spaces is interesting and perhaps a chance for an organisation to buy or own a bach and rent it out rather than the individuals having to do this.</p>	<p>Hobsons Bay baches tend to be in a harsher environment and I am concerned about how these baches look and how dangerous they are. If there was some way of making them safe and maintaining them to a higher standard, I would support this.</p>	<p>Rubbish collection, waters supply and sewage charges</p> <p>Maintenance and quality of structure are very important. They need to look good and enhance the space not detract. Owning a seaside property is expensive and requires a lot of maintenance. They will need to be com</p> <p>They should all conform to safety standards and consent issues</p> <p>Yes charge a fee. I pay significant rates on my property although I get limited CCC services so I would like to see fellow bach owners also contribute. However, they would need to have some form of dispensation built in as they are liable for loss or changes that we don't face as land owners.</p>	<p>You can't look past the value of the heritage and history of this place. It is a very special place and I have never in all my life heard one person (other than 'the resident') complain at all about the baches preventing them from using the beach. Most people love the feel of the beach community and the baches (especially Rotten Row) enhance the experience. I understand the world has changed and things need to be tightened up but there is room in this world for some heart and soul as well as regulation. Why not take the lead and make some important ground breaking ways to accommodate the rules, the people and the history? Take a modern collaborative approach and show the whole country how community and council can work together. I know the process of consultation is part of this but perhaps the solution could be so too.</p>
19225	<p>The baches should remain for historic and aesthetic reasons. In my opinion any impact on wildlife would be insignificant compared to the impact of visiting day walkers and their dogs. This bay is very accessible now, and one of the most popular walks in Christchurch. One of the main reasons people go there is to see the baches.</p>	<p>The baches should remain for historic and aesthetic reasons. They provide local colour and attract visitors. In my opinion they also have a positive impact on the continuing strength of the surf club movement in the bay.</p>	<p>Those baches that are deemed safe should be restored and kept for historic and aesthetic reasons.</p>	<p>Short term holiday use, not permanent living. Long licence periods to encourage maintenance. The ability to transfer licences to encourage maintenance</p>	<p>Council must consider the impact removal would have on the strength of the surf club in the Bay. The first surf club was formed by early bach builders and virtually all current life members of the club are bach holders. Their continued involvement in the bay supports the club. The baches are often used for holidays by club families providing a future supply of members passionate about the bay & lifesaving. Christchurch has lost so many historic buildings since 2011 that we must think carefully before removing any more. These baches are iconic of early NZ holidaymakers.</p>
19226	<p>I am strictly against any privately owned baches on public land. Why any private person would be allowed to "own" a development on public land without paying rates/charges for waste-water etc. Considering them "heritage" sounds ridiculous to me compared to buildings like the Cathedral, the Timeball or the Isaac Theatre Royal! Not only destroying the view of an otherwise beautiful coastline, they INTERFERE with the real residents of these beaches - the penguins...</p> <p>Just imagine the possibilities (eco-tourism is growing!!!!) of an "Oamaru-style penguin-parade" in the near future as Boulder Bay is easier accessible than Harris Bay (we are currently accompanying walks starting from Taylors Mistake!) and a colony could be developed by transferring chicks from nearby colonies that are expanding anyway. The penguin population is spreading along the coastline and demand for nest-sites is growing. The only predator-proof site currently is Harris Bay. This development could significantly improve the conservation status of the white-flipped penguin, which only exists here. We are getting more and more juveniles and adults into care each year. How wonderful would it be to have an established site in cooperation with</p>	<p>These baches are just a "pain" to look at and considering them "heritage" is just wrong. They are high risk for potential rockfalls and do not pay any rates/fees to the CCC. In the past there have been owners that chased away nesting penguins under their sheds and called in bird rescue to collect the chicks. If that had happened under my watch (we are doing the rehabilitation since 2010 in Christchurch) I would have contacted the CCC and DoC for an investigation.</p>	<p>There should not be any restrictions to accessing public land at all times...</p>	<p>If you are really considering giving out licences to the owners of "illegal" baches they should pay rates/fees and the agreement should expire when the original owner dies. These "buildings" are not complying with any code and are a danger in themselves.</p>	<p>Is there any chance of moving them away from PUBLIC LAND or moving them to an area that is less sensitive to nature such as nesting penguins along the coast?</p>

	DoC and the yet-to be set up new White-flipped Penguin Trust.				
19230	But leave the baches as they are.	As above-Maybe a token rent, but leave them as they are.	Tidy them up and same as above. Leave them.	Don't complicate things! Tidy them up Maybe the current owners should pay a 'rental' charge to the CCC.	Taylor's Mistake is iconic NZ because of those baches. Remove them and remove something unique.
19243	The wildlife is one important part of the experience when walking the track to Godley Head. I often include the penguin colony at Harris Bay, especially when with visitors and friends. We had a truly memorable visit last December as we not only saw chicks being tagged/banded, there were orca close in. At a guess, the orca were hoping to find a penguin to eat. However, the site at Harris Bay is quite inaccessible, so I would like to see a penguin colony at Boulder Bay. Such a colony could add significantly to, what is already a wonderful walk. And I am sure that many more people would see and value the penguins than is possible at present. It would be one extra reason to walk the track. Thus I encourage CCC to allow some baches to remain, but remove some so that a penguin colony could be established at Boulder Bay.	I think that the baches add to the experience when visiting Taylor's Mistake. Also, some have historical value, and more could be made of that through signage etc. So, assuming they are safe to occupy, I would prefer them to remain.			Alternative uses for the areas. For example, I have mentioned penguins, i.e., some of the existing baches make it difficult for some wildlife to establish in the bays. Also, are some baches at a greater risk from a rise in the sea-level? I noticed that heritage value is mentioned in the CCC docs, so I am wondering if some baches have a higher risk, i.e., are more likely to be inundated by water.
19244	I am in favour of the privately owned baches at Boulder Bay staying. These baches are part of our history and add to the character of the area. We have lost so many heritage buildings in the earthquakes we should not lose anymore.	I am in favour of the privately owned baches at Taylor's Mistake staying. These baches are part of our history and add to the character of the area. We have lost so many heritage buildings in the earthquakes, we should not lose anymore.	As I said above, I am in favour of the privately owned baches at Hobsons Bay staying. These baches are part of our history and add to the character of the area. We have lost so many heritage buildings in the earthquakes we should not lose anymore.	I think reasonable length of time should be given. With the right of renewal.	These baches are an important part of Canterbury's Heritage and should be kept.
19247	They are a historic landmark, would be really sad to see them go	They are a historic landmark, would be really sad to see them go	They are a historic landmark, would be really sad to see them go	Keep them similar to original state but upgraded and well maintained	
19254	Same as Taylor's.	As Taylor's Mistake baches are the only ones I have had stayed in, I am only going to comment in this section as I reckon it's the same answer for all of them. It is a complicated answer I guess for the council to allow anyone to stay on public land with a private bach, but some of these baches would probably have more history than most buildings that we have left in Christchurch. I can't really see why they can't stay while they are kept well, as I have never seen anyone being offended having them there.	As Taylor's Mistake baches are the only ones I have had stayed in, I am only going to comment in this section as I reckon it's the same answer for all of them. It is a complicated answer I guess for the council to allow anyone to stay on public land with a private bach, but some of these baches would probably have more history than most buildings that we have left in Christchurch. I can't really see why they can't stay while they are kept well, as I have never seen anyone being offended having them there.	Keep it tidy.	
19268	I would like the baches to stay as they are with private ownership.	I would like the baches to stay as they are with private ownership.	I would like the baches to stay as they are with private ownership.	Able to rent them out to those who would like to stay in them.	
19269	The historical value of the baches is immeasurable and preserving history should not be overlooked. The baches should be allowed to remain. They bring culture, history, and community to the local area. The bach keepers are fantastic caretakers of the land and surrounding environment. Environmental protection is held highly with bach keepers.	The historical value of the baches is immeasurable and preserving history should not be overlooked. The baches should be allowed to remain. They bring culture, history, and community to the local area. The bach keepers are fantastic caretakers of the land and surrounding environment. Environmental protection is held highly with bach keepers.	The historical value of the baches is immeasurable and preserving history should not be overlooked. The baches should be allowed to remain. They bring culture, history, and community to the local area. The bach keepers are fantastic caretakers of the land and surrounding environment. Environmental protection is held highly with bach keepers.	Since no more new baches are allowed to be established (for a number of decades) they should not be licenced. This would be a waste of everyone's time, energy resources and creating work where it is simply not required.	Since the baches were established long before national, regional and district policies, I believe the baches should be exempt from such policies as they are guarded by history. The baches have long complied to all new policies and the owners should be left in peace to live their lives as they see fit.
19274	All the baches currently there should be retained and kept there. They are part our history please do not allow them to be destroyed.	All the baches currently there should be retained and kept there. They are part our history please do not allow them to be destroyed.	All the baches currently there should be retained and kept there. They are part our history please do not allow them to be destroyed.	All the baches currently there should be retained and kept there. They are part our history please do not allow them to be destroyed.	No new developments or extensions. All the baches need to be preserved.
19276	I think it would be a shame to remove these baches as they seem to add character to these	I think it would be a shame to remove these baches as they seem to add character to these	I think it would be a shame to remove these baches as they seem to add character to these	Public access to the land as it currently stands. Free access to the beach and hill side tracks etc.	

	areas. If there is a significant risk of natural hazard to the owners or if granting licences will see a significant restriction to public access to the area then I would consider movement to another area nearby but not demolition. Many of these baches are important in terms of heritage. Why not preserve that.	areas. If there is a significant risk of natural hazard to the owners or if granting licences will see a significant restriction to public access to the area then I would consider movement to another area nearby but not demolition. Many of these baches are important in terms of heritage. Why not preserve that.	areas. If there is a significant risk of natural hazard to the owners or if granting licences will see a significant restriction to public access to the area then I would consider movement to another area nearby but not demolition. Many of these baches are important in terms of heritage. Why not preserve that.	should be maintained for the public use. There should be no way that owners could close off or profit from this type of public access.	
19282	I think the baches should be allowed to stay they have been there for many years and are part of our history. After losing so many heritage buildings in the earthquakes we need to preserve any remaining historic/heritage buildings.	Same as above they are part and parcel of Taylor's Mistake and need to be preserved.	Same as above definitely part of our history.	No set term or set term with right of renewal. Allow alcohol on premises A realistic yearly lease Able to be on-sold	
19286	I think they should be allowed to stay on	I think they should be allowed to stay on	They should be removed as most are in a state of disrepair and hazardous, also at risk of further damage from high tides and rising sea levels.	The bach and its surrounds to be kept tidy, and also safe for passers-by. Condition that they are kept tidy and well maintained and a suitable licence fee is paid. The licence should be up to 35 years and transferable to family members or friends, not saleable on the open market. Should they fall into disrepair, become unsightly or a health and safety hazard there should be a clause allowing revocation of the licence. - licence fee and rates payable to ensure and fund essential services such as rubbish collection -up to 35 years in order to encourage investment in maintenance - licence can only	
19287	The Boulder Bay baches are a part of Christchurch history and should be preserved. As a keen walker I have visited Boulder Bay many times since my childhood and take great delight in the uniqueness of the baches and how they enhance the environment.	Please keep the baches at Taylor's Mistake. They are an important part of Banks Peninsula history. As a Lyttelton person who lived through the earthquakes and their ensuing aftermath including house reconstruction, the land stability issues and associated risk is the personal responsibility of those who choose to occupy these baches. All of NZ is at risk of earthquake issues, and this should not be used as an excuse to remove baches.	Please keep the baches at Hobson's Bay. They are an important part of Christchurch history and like all the other baches celebrate the Kiwi perspective of a place to get away that epitomizes the number eight wire approach of Aotearoa.		
19290	I think that the baches should remain, I think they hold a lot of historical significance and as long as they are maintained well and within the style of the heritage they represent they should remain as they add to the landscape and interest of the area	I think the baches should remain in the location that they are in ,	I think these ones need more maintenance, these are some of my favourites as they are so odd	I think it is reasonable that the bach owners pay an annual fee to occupy council land, it would be great if the income generated could go back into the immediate area providing further picnic grounds, seats on the walkway etc. for all to enjoy the area. I think another condition of the license be that the upkeep on the baches is maintained and the look and feel of the current structures is maintained. I think they should be allowed to rent them out for short term lease so that the owners can generate some income to enable them to maintain the property to a high standard. I am not in favour of them moving however I would not be strongly opposed if due to a major weather incident they had to relocate. I think as long as they are well maintained in the style of a typical kiwi bach they are fine. I would not like to see any of them replaced with modern looking buildings. Replicas of the past are fine.	I think the heritage and cultural significance should be upheld. I would like to see some colourful information boards educating people on the history of the baches to be erected in the picnic area. I think the baches at Hobson bay show particular interest and hope they can remain

19295	Let them keep their baches. The baches have been and are part of the history and landscape, they make the area unique. I remember being so fascinated when I first stumbled upon the baches in Boulder Bay!	Let them keep their baches. The baches have been and are part of the history and landscape, they make the area unique.	Let them keep their baches. The baches have been and are part of the history and landscape, they make the area unique.	They actively keep the land maintained and enhance the landscape where possible. Ensure bach heritage character is maintained and the local environmental protected.	These belong to people and should not be taken away lightly. They have heritage value and if removed, the area will lose its character.
19298	The baches should stay in the hands of the present owners as are part of the history and charm of the area. However restrictions need to be considered to ensure they are not replaced with new structures, or development, but preserved to maintain their current cultural and heritage qualities.	The baches should stay in the hands of the present owners as are part of the history and charm of the area. However restrictions need to be considered to ensure they are not replaced with new structures, or development, but preserved to maintain their current cultural and heritage qualities.	The baches should stay in the hands of the present owners as are part of the history and charm of the area.	The present baches integrity is preserved, possibly as heritage buildings. However restrictions need to be considered to ensure they are not replaced with new structures, or development, but preserved to maintain their current cultural and heritage qualities.	Development by the way of new buildings or structures should not be allowed to happen.
19302	Baches are part of our heritage and history of the area The birdlife would be decreased if the bach owners were not around to protect the seals and birds. Dogs would end up off leashes and cause carnage.	Once again they are historic, they provide interest and are colourful. The effect on our local surf clubs is evident by the relationship that all the bach owners have had over the years with Surf Lifesaving, saving people's lives and putting out bush fires.	Deemed also to be historic and should be restored	short term holiday use not really for permanent living The licencing would encourage maintenance of the baches and in turn keep be protectors of the land	The surf club would suffer as a consequence of the removal the club was formed by early Bach holders and almost all current life members or the club have had associations with the baches. The owners are always prepared to help with emergencies and many have saved people from drowning and helped bandage people up who have fallen off the rocks or off their mountain bikes. I hate to think of the impact of the removal of them, the devastation to the landscape and issue of keeping out bach clean. The bach holders are in effect the guardians of the bay!
19303	I consider that all the baches should stay in situ, as long as the risk from natural hazards can be appropriately mitigated. Their heritage value, in particular, is worth preserving. The baches impact on the public's ability to access and enjoy the coast is de minimis.	I consider that all the baches should stay in situ, as long as the risk from natural hazards can be appropriately mitigated. Their heritage value, in particular, is worth preserving. The baches impact on the public's ability to access and enjoy the coast is de minimis.	I consider that all the baches should stay in situ, as long as the risk from natural hazards can be appropriately mitigated. Their heritage value, in particular, is worth preserving. The baches impact on the public's ability to access and enjoy the coast is de minimis.	That the tenure be long, the rent justified and that licence holders can rent their baches out. In return, the licensee be obliged to maintain their baches heritage character. \$allow for from renting would allow for this and enable the public to enjoy a bach holiday. This includes prohibiting activities that would adversely affect this character. As long as the risk from natural hazards can be appropriately mitigated.	How can the CCC, the bach holders and community can all benefit by a portion of the bach holders licence fee being used to maintain and enhance the desired values on the ~79ha owned by the Taylors Mistake Association, for all to enjoy. There's potentially a win-win situation here.
19304		Keep them			
19305	The baches should stay as they are. They provide so much history and haven't caused any issues at all. All the baches should remain. They are a highlight to anyone visiting Christchurch, and are one of the few historic sites still standing since the earthquakes. The culture and heritage behind them goes on for hundreds of years, and taking them away from the people strips them of this.				I think that arguing they are a safety risk is ignorant, or if it is such a big deal then the owners should sign a consent form saying any damage caused by rockfall etc. is at the expense of the owners.
19306		They should be kept. So much history and love behind each bach. They give Taylors character			
19307	Keep them!	Keep them!	Keep them!		Let the owners keep them there, all have such amazing history and lovely to walk past on the beach
19308	Keep them there	Keep them there	Keep them there	That they're allowed to be kept there until the baches fall over themselves	That they should be allowed to keep their beloved baches there
19309					
19310		Keep the baches! The historical significance and what it means to the people is why it's so important. Obviously land vs Bach ownership is important but bottom line is the land is for the people, and it should be used as it has for so long.			

19311					
19312	They should stay	They should stay	They should stay	They can do whatever with their houses	It's these people's lives
19313		So unique and historical that it would be a shame to change this by moving or demolishing the baches		Structurally sound, earthquake-proofed	
19314		They should stay they are history			
19315		I think they should stay as they are a real but if Christchurch history. The owners are always friendly and I feel they are a valuable feature to the vibe of Taylor's mistake and the landscape.			
19316		Definitely keep them. So many families memories were made there			All owners will have their own special memories of these baches. Hard work put into them to keep them looking how they do
19317	They should remain there	I think they should stay			
19319	I think they are a beautiful and iconic part of Taylors Mistake and should be allowed to stay as they are.	I think they are a beautiful and iconic part of Taylors Mistake and should be allowed to stay as they are.	I think they are a beautiful and iconic part of Taylors Mistake and should be allowed to stay as they are.	None	No
19320					
19321		I feel like these baches make this area feel more friendly habitated and seem to settle into the surroundings nicely. Having stayed on one of these with my family as a gift of away time during stress I can say it has bought us some lovely memories and was the thing that has bought us back not to stay but to walk around Godley heads and feel safe at Taylor's beach. it makes it feel family friendly			As long as they are kept sound safe and clean and tidy I think they should stay
19322		Keep the baches!! they are super cute and give the place character			
19323					
19324	The baches should be permitted to stay as is where is.	The baches should be permitted to stay as is where is.	The baches should be permitted to stay as is where is.	Certainty of the lengths of the licences. Price, should be low enough for the people, but high enough for Leanne	But what else is the council going to do with the land? May as well let private patches use it lol.
19325					
19327	They should not be permitted	They should not be permitted	They should not be permitted	I agree with Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga's preliminary view that the baches should remain for the lifespan of the current owners and then be demolished.	
19329		They should remain due to family's hard work at maintaining the batches at their own costs. They have become people's investments and family get always that should stay to be enjoyed and passed on.			
19331		You'd have to be crazy to get them removed!!!			
19332		I have a friend from primary school whose family owned a bach passed down through their family which was very special. I have fond memories of visiting it with them as a child and love to see the bach whenever I am in Taylor's Mistake now.		There should be no license fee, they should not be hireable to the public. I think that the license should be able to be issued for 35 years + and be able to passed onto different family members and not sold on the public market	
19333					

19336				<p>The powers the Council has in relation to roads are those contained within Section 319 of the Local Government Act 1974. These powers cannot be added to, diminished or deleted without an amendment to the Act. The existing powers do not confer a right to lease or licence road and in the absence of such power the Council has no authority to implement the recommendations of the Environment Court or the Historic Places Trust. Section 342 of the Act confers certain powers upon the Council should it proceed to and succeed in having the road stopped but this brings its own set of problems given the land would automatically become esplanade reserve subject to the Reserves Act 1977.</p> <p>As I see it there is a possible way to save some of the baches but not all, unless the Council promotes a Local Act of parliament to remedy the situation. Even then there would be potential conflict for the government in denying access to the foreshore.</p> <p>I would be available to discuss this matter with you and a possible partial solution should you so wish. I might add that my views are held by many solicitors.</p> <p>It may be preferable to obtain an independent review of this question before proceeding further. One of New Zealand's experts on roads is Duncan Laing of Simpson Grierson in Wellington and I believe any views that he may express would be upheld by any court.</p>	<p>In the 1970s licences were issued but subsequently cancelled in approximately 1983 acting on the advice of the Councils then solicitors Weston Ward and Lascelles. The advice found that the Council had no legal authority to permit the permanent alienation of legal road for the use of baches. There has been no subsequent change to the Local Government Act that alters this view. The advice received at that time still stands and is the crux to the issue facing not only the Christchurch City Council but many other local authorities throughout New Zealand. There are many similar instances of baches occupying legal but unformed road around New Zealand's coastline and the same problem is encountered by those authorities given that the Local Government Act does not empower them to grant licences and permanently alienate road. Had they been able to do so this problem would have been resolved many years ago.</p> <p>There are solutions to the Taylor's Mistake problem but to issue licences without a change to the legislation is premature and illegal.</p> <p>The Council needs to sort this problem once and for all but the path they are embarking upon is not the answer and will always be open to legal challenge to the courts in the absence of Statutory Authority to issue licences over road.</p>
19337	Keep the batches. They are historical and an important part of the Taylors mistake community.	They should be allowed to remain privately owned	Keep them		
19338	It my strong conviction they should all be allowed to stay in private ownership for the very very long term.	It my strong conviction they should all be allowed to stay in private ownership for the very very long term.	It my strong conviction they should all be allowed to stay in private ownership for the very long term subject to a number that may have already deteriorated beyond practical occupation.	Retention of Heritage features. Long term tenure. Taking all things into consideration, a fair annual fee(s). Please see attachments emailed to Tessa Zant today and that form part of this submission.	Quite a lot really. Please see attachments emailed to Tessa Zant today and that form part of this submission.
19339					
19341	I loved exploring boulder bay when I was a kid and still enjoy walking to it now. The batches enhance the character of the existing beach.	When I stepped into one of these baches, I was amazed by the rich history of it. This particular bach was originally a train carriage and has been looked after and maintained lovingly down the generations. The Taylors mistake scenery would look quite dull without these batches and all the special history would be lost.			
19342		They should stay - they're iconic!			
19344	They should stay, they are of value to people.	They should stay.	They should stay. Maybe suggest that people have them on air b and b or something so the public can use them as well?	Maybe suggest that people have them on air b and b or something so the public can use them as well?	I don't think that the council has the right to take these batches off people, when they have been in some people's families for decades and are of sentimental value to them.
19345	That they should remain and consideration given to the families and generations that have a connection to this place. They only add to the landscape and without them it would be a	That they should remain and consideration given to the families and generations that have a connection to this place. They only add to the landscape and without them it would be a	That they should remain and consideration given to the families and generations that have a connection to this place. They only add to the landscape and without them it would be a	That public (pedestrian) access to the beach remains	The social importance of these buildings, their relationship to the surf life saving club, how they play a role in maintaining the built heritage

	pretty empty landscape, devoid of any evidence of human occupation, history or existence. More effort should be put into retaining, restoring and improving the longevity of these import places and if they aren't already heritage listed that this should be a priority.	pretty empty landscape, devoid of any evidence of human occupation, history or existence. More effort should be put into retaining, restoring and improving the longevity of these import places and if they aren't already heritage listed that this should be a priority.	pretty empty landscape, devoid of any evidence of human occupation, history or existence. More effort should be put into retaining, restoring and improving the longevity of these import places and if they aren't already heritage listed that this should be a priority.		of this area. The architectural significance of these structures.
19347		I would like to see the baches remain where they are and for the owners to receive licenses for the paper road		I believe the owners should receive a license for the paper road	These baches are iconic to the area they do not hinder public access and they offer custodianship relationship to the area - planting, litter collection, after-hours rescues, safety of 'eyes on the beach' etc.).
19348	I am unaware of any significant issue with these are see little point in the change from the status quo	am unaware of any significant issue with these are see little point in the change from the status quo		That public access around is maintained. That the external form is to be maintained (no allowance to build a new building on the old footprint)	The city has a number of locations where there are 'paper roads' that are unable to be developed (due to topography), unlikely to be developed (due to accessing areas that are not able to be developed) and are not suitable (due to changes in usage (cars vs horse). Many of these are historic anomalies due to the way that the city was designed (in an office in London). If it was not for many of the adjacent land owners (or, in this case, occupiers) this land will be unmaintained. Whilst the occupation of this land may not be strictly legal (in terms of land ownership). The overall impact of the curation of the private owners/occupiers/users seems minimal. I am unaware of any situation (this included) where public access is blocked
19349	I see no reason at all for these to be messed with. They are part of the landscape and should stay that way. Of course there is no need to build any more there, but just leave them alone. They are a part of the character. They have no more risk than Brighton and Sumner who have people living in them all the time	I see no reason at all for these to be messed with. They are part of the landscape and should stay that way. Of course there is no need to build any more there, but just leave them alone. They are a part of the character. They have no more risk than Brighton and Sumner who have people living in them all the time	I see no reason at all for these to be messed with. They are part of the landscape and should stay that way. Of course there is no need to build any more there, but just leave them alone. They are a part of the character. They have no more risk than Brighton and Sumner who have people living in them all the time	No extensions beyond existing footprint is a no brainer. Let them enhance tho if they want to and paint and tidy up	Surely the Council can focus on things that are more important than meddling in an issue that doesn't need to be an issue
19352	YES/ leave them alone. Their heritage value is priceless. We have lost so much and need to retain pockets like this.	YES/ leave them alone. Their heritage value is priceless. We have lost so much and need to retain pockets like this.	YES/ leave them alone. Their heritage value is priceless. We have lost so much and need to retain pockets like this.	NIL	The council needs to focus on more important issues like how to reactivate our city rather than revisiting something that is not effecting anyone
19354	Those which baches should get to keep them! It's no one's business but theirs!!	No issue with them, leave them as they are	No issue with them, leave them as they are		These are people's homes, they don't need to be taken from them
19357	Keep the baches.	Keep the baches.	Keep the baches.		The heritage.
19358	These are iconic and should remain. They are part of the cultural narrative of this area and many of them I believe are historic. They are well cared for and unbelievably survived the many earthquakes. I would not like to see them moved or demolished.	Again many of these are part of the cultural narrative of the area and are also historic. With so many of our heritage buildings being damaged these survived. They are well kept and add to the character of the area. The bach owners are kaitiakitanga, custodians of the land and many times during the summer have stopped fires from spreading and taking out all the properties of the houses on the hill, including this year. Lots of the bach families have long associations with the surf club and are life guards and continue to be involved today. The bach owners are a committed, responsible community who take part in sustainability projects each year including clean-ups and planting.	Many of the points above can attribute to the Hobson Bay Area as well. There are many who wish to repair the state some of them are in but have their hands tied up in red tape. It would be fabulous to see these restored.	Implementation of a sewer line. If the baches are going to taxed or licences then they should have the ability to rent the baches.	
19360	Yes, please do leave them. They are an asset to your coastline - a reminder of our history.	Absolutely, do not touch. I take visitors to see the baches from all around the world - they are	Absolutely, do not touch. I take visitors to see the baches from all around the world - they are		Just leave them alone. It infuriates me to think that the Council is wasting time and our money

		unique and an ABSOLUTE ASSET to Christchurch. They are so historic and precious	unique and an ABSOLUTE ASSET to Christchurch. They are so historic and precious		on something that is so precious to us all. Please note I am not a bach owner and enjoy the sight of these dwelling hugely.
19362		KEEP THEM!!!! So cute and so much character. We don't want terrible commercial buildings ruining such a lovely and untouched place			
19363	Yes the baches provide a valuable recreation resource which was identified back in 1986 with many parties. The baches must be retained for their heritage and cultural significance. Establishing status and licensing or leasing agreements is necessary to provide certainly for these structures. Bolder Bay baches provide a unique destination or way point on a very popular costal walking track similar to the old defence structures on Godley Heads.	as for answer above in addition these baches provide a unique back drop to the bay and represent the evolvement of the bach from 1907 to the 1970's when the last significant alterations occurred. The baches in Taylors Mistake also provide a significant contribution to the social activities in summer with many residents and bach holders coming together. The baches also provide the Taylors Mistake surf club with local members or support recruitment and retention of members by many baches made available to club members to stay in over the summer holidays. This allows the club to maintain surf patrols as well as provide a significant contribution to beach safety outside patrol hours.	Many of the baches at Hobson bay have deteriorated beyond repair. Baches 58, 59 and 60 as well as the end bach on old defence structure and on the hill above Moki Point are sound and should be retained for the same reasons as noted above. The baches in the middle of the bay are at risk of rock fall and would need to be removed. Whare Moki is the most historic of all the baches and I would like to see this bach restored but not occupied and maintained by the community.	Very limited conditions to alter or rebuild these structures. Decks should be allowed but limited in size and a like for like approach for alterations. Licences should allow long term certainty of tenure. Baches should not be allowed to be errantly occupied for more than two years at a time.	I hope a vocal minority do not dominate the debate on baches. Why has a survey of beach uses and walkers not been conducted as these people would provide a greater level of relevant input than many people in Chch who have never been 1 or more of these bays?
19367	They part of what this Bay is about. Leave them alone.	Same as above. They are what Taylors is all about. They have been there long enough now and don't effect anybody who uses the bay. Over the years I have seen the owners help people with first aid and many sea rescues. They are part of the Heritage and special charm of the bay.	In good order they are fine. VERY few of the public use this bay.	To keep the bach and surroundings clean and tidy and in good order. Charge a small rental, if you have to.	You tell me? What's the major problem?
19372	Should remain and given licence to occupy	Should remain and be given licence to occupy	Should remain and be given licence to occupy	Rental should be set at fair market rental. Should not impede public access	
19373		They're so beautiful and add so much to Taylor's mistake. They've been there so long that it wouldn't feel the same without them. They add character, liveliness and a friendly feel to the beach. They don't disrupt or take away from the space experience people get from the beach, only add some cool stories and something to talk about on the walk.			They've been there so long - before the land was declared to be owned by the council. They have so much character and have some amazing stories behind them - some of the carriage ones were literally pushed over the hill by the men who built them. Moving them would be a mistake.
19381	Retain the baches and permit owners to maintain them as required on the exterior but only to the extent that they retain the historic/current style. Permit interior changes as required to facilitate modern living. They are historic buildings and part of our Canterbury heritage. Do not permit replacement unless the style is consistent with the original historic style (approval required from historic places Trust.	Retain the baches and permit owners to maintain them as required on the exterior but only to the extent that they retain the historic/current style. Permit interior changes as required to facilitate modern living. They are historic buildings and part of our Canterbury heritage. Do not permit replacement unless the style is consistent with the original historic style (approval required from historic places Trust.	Retain the baches. They are historic buildings and part of our Canterbury heritage.	Permit owners to maintain them as required on the exterior but only to the extent that they retain the historic/current style. Permit interior changes as required to facilitate modern living. Do not permit replacement unless the style is consistent with the original historic style (approval required from historic places Trust.	
19382	Yes, I would like them to continue in private ownership and be maintained in perpetuity, because of their strong heritage value. They give great character to the area and are historically significant.	Yes, I would like them to continue in private ownership and be maintained in perpetuity, because of their strong heritage value. They give great character to the area and are historically significant.	Yes, I would like them to continue in private ownership and be maintained in perpetuity, because of their strong heritage value. They give great character to the area and are historically significant.	Maximum possible duration. Cost recovery fee only. Temporary duration (e.g. as holiday houses). Requirement for upkeep and preservation of amenity values. Not OK to sell on the open market but may be transferred to family members. If there are no family members to transfer to, then the dwelling should be transferred to CCC ownership and used as a holiday rental available to the public.	The baches are a beautiful anomaly and should be valued as such, not removed. Council has an important role in encouraging preservation and appreciation of our heritage assets.

19392					<p>We have had a family Bach on Rotten Row for what seems like forever and I am 50 next month.</p> <p>My grandparents were Ernie and Mabel Eastwick and were very well known all over Taylor's Mistake. My grandmother use to walk over the hill with her 2 sons in a pram. Her youngest son was my father Noel Eastwick who is 80 this December and her eldest son Ken Eastwick who is now 82.</p> <p>As my father and uncle got older they were members of the Surf Club for many years as were my cousins.</p> <p>My father informs me that my great grandfather had a family Bach over there also and a newer Bach was partially rebuilt and renovated 60 odd years ago for which a council building permit was obtained.</p> <p>All our family and friends have very very fond memories of our Bach and my brother and I and my 2 cousins spent every Christmas Holidays over there with my grandparents and what a fun time we had. My husband and I now spend a lot of time over there with our 2 teenage daughters as does my brother and cousins and their families.</p> <p>Our Bach has never not featured in my life and it is my "Happy Place" and we feel so lucky and fortunate to have it. My teenage girls now take their friends over there and feel very very privileged to have it as well.</p> <p>We will put up a real fight to keep them and were only over there last week and we walked to Boulder Bay and my girls swam afterwards and sat on our Balcony thinking how lucky we are.</p> <p>LONG MAY IT CONTINUE</p> <p>They are such a huge part of our history not just in Canterbury but NZ and feature in many Tourism Books of NZ.</p> <p>In today's (Monday's) press newspaper I totally disagree with the letter from Dan O'Sullivan of North New Brighton on the council buying the baches and renting them out to the public for everybody to use. If he had a Bach over there especially one like ours that has been in the family for many years he would not be talking such rubbish (In a few words section) page 13</p>
19395	let them stay if they are not creating a problem	<p>We lost so many heritage buildings in the 2011 earthquakes and in some way or other these baches NEED to be retained. The baches look wonderful as back drop to the beach with their variety of cover and their mix of old buildings... during school holidays years ago I used to stay in old seaside bungalows like these.....not flash but a wonderful holiday.</p> <p>Experience .These baches are a reminder of a</p>		<p>the baches need to be maintained to a reasonable standard ...not over the top but maintained and tidy in a pleasantly informal way.....Some of the buildings are well maintained their casual gardens in good order and they look beautiful.</p> <p>If the owners are not maintaining their baches then their licence to occupy should be cancelled... (they should do up and sell) To</p>	<p>An urban design goal is to: create spaces and places for people....these beaches add a nice touch of character to the beach.</p> <p>.....Surely they do not in any way detract from how surfies and others use the beach!</p> <p>These baches sit nicely at the base of the slope... they could not be moved or relocated;they could look better but the houses have mix of pastel colours reminiscent of an Italian scene and from a heritage and character point of view I think that they NEED to be retained.</p>

		period in our history...THIS IS THE WAY THINGS WEREcheap ,simple fun		encourage maintenance the licences need to be for more than 1 year (3 or 5 and why not?)	PS: to the best of my knowledge I do not know any of the ownersI just like the visual impact the baches have.
19402	Nope	Land owners should get to keep the batches	Land owners should get to keep the batches		
19404	They should stay	Don't build more but keep the present ones		That they stay clean and fit with surrounding environment. Nothing crazy	
19409	yeah do it	Keep them!!!!			Keep the baches!!!!
19410	I would like to see the batches remain - they are part of our history and they give a real pioneer feel to the place. The owners also take pride in the beaches and keep them clean.	I would like them to be able to remain.	I would like them to be able to remain.		I would like them to stay.
19415	no	no	no	A licence to occupy may not be legal in the first instance.	The council must be seen to be fair as well as being fair. On one hand I acknowledge the heritage values of the existing baches and the fact that they have largely been held within various families for generations. They should not be sold to anyone if they are allowed to continue to exist on their current location. I have serious reservation regarding the council setting a precedence in that if the baches are retained on road reserve/open public space others will argue they should be granted the same right or dispensation. There are also questions regarding if the council has the legal right to grant a license to occupy the baches. There is the principle of alienation of members of the public from open public space. Similar issues are currently impacting Akaroa and other parts of Christchurch with regard to excluding members of the public from what was once open public space. As I see it the council has allowed in several instances open public space to become privatised for the betterment and benefit of individuals and businesses without going through due process and due diligence. I urge caution and very careful consideration of the matter prior to making a decision since it will have a lasting impact.
19416	That they be removed	That they be removed	That they be removed	That a fixed period of time is imposed for the building to remain and then removed - say 10 years	
19417	Keep these baches as they are in private ownership	Keep these baches as they are in private ownership	Keep these baches as they are in private ownership	Let them be rented out.	
19418	Absolutely keep these batches. Important part of the area's history.	Absolutely keep these batches. Important part of the area's history.	Absolutely keep these batches. Important part of the area's history.	Let them be rented out	What a waste of money going through this process. There are more important things happening in the city.
19419	Licence should be granted	Licence should be granted	Licence should be granted	The licence fee should not be limited to a time frame, to bring stability to the bay and so their maintenance can be done with confidence about their future.	They absolutely should stay. They add character, history, community to the bay. They are a quirk of history, obviously do not follow current land rules but Christchurch has lost so much history, maintaining it where possible is important. Though not everyone gets to own one, the number of people I hear saying exclaiming 'ohh look at that one!' 'That one used to be a train carriage!' 'How sweet that one is', photographing the baches and discussing their

					character - they seem to make visitors happy and add cheer.
19420	The baches make boulder bay distinct from all the other bays on the peninsula. I hope they can all stay, especially the most historic ones - not only for the ongoing enjoyment of tourists and visitors, but for the ongoing survival of the boulder bay community.	The baches make Taylors mistake bay distinct from all the other bays on the peninsula. I hope they can all stay, not only for the ongoing enjoyment of tourists and visitors, but for the ongoing survival of the Taylors mistake bach community.	The baches make hobsons bay distinct from all the other bays on the peninsula. There are still cave baches, which I'm not sure exist anywhere else in nz now. I hope they can all stay, especially the most historic ones - not only for the ongoing enjoyment of tourists and visitors, but for the ongoing survival of the hobsons bay community.	That the historic structures are maintained for the enjoyment of all, and that due consideration is given to the needs of the families and community who caretake these heritage treasures.	That Christchurch has lost so much heritage, and that it would be a shame to lose any of the remaining historic baches. regarding that the baches are 'privately owned' - 'privately owned' structures exist elsewhere on our public land (garages, buildings in hagley park etc.) - they do so under the conditions of a lease - I support offering a lease to all of these remaining baches so that they may stay where they are now. They are all designed specifically for their sites, which is why the collection is so diverse - shifting them would make them far less relevant as historical icons.
19422	I love them, please leave them there	I love them, please leave them there	I love them, please leave them there	that it is long enough and fair enough that the bach families will invest in keeping the baches and surrounding area in great condition	yes - the bach families look after the area - they keep the surf lifesaving club going, and they do all sorts of good other things like keeping the beach safe and tidy and saving lives after the patrollers have gone home. Find a way to legalise the structures on the paper road so the baches and their families can stay.
19425	The batches are very important and should remain because of the heritage value they bring to quake damaged chch. So much of our heritage buildings were lost due to the eq we suffered. I strongly believe that these baches should remain as they are historically interesting to both locals and tourists.	The batches are very important and should remain because of the heritage value they bring to quake damaged chch. So much of our heritage buildings were lost due to the eq we suffered. I strongly believe that these baches should remain as they are historically interesting to both locals and tourists.	The batches are very important and should remain because of the heritage value they bring to quake damaged chch. So much of our heritage buildings were lost due to the eq we suffered. I strongly believe that these baches should remain as they are historically interesting to both locals and tourists.	Right of renewal if fixed term. No other restrictions should be required	They are part of chch colourful landscape and should remain for futures generations to enjoy
19426	A license should be issued in perpetuity or the road stopped as per Banks Peninsula Community Board Decision BKCB/2018/00103.	A license should be issued in perpetuity or the road stopped as per Banks Peninsula Community Board Decision BKCB/2018/00103.	A license should be issued in perpetuity or the road stopped as per Banks Peninsula Community Board Decision BKCB/2018/00103.	A reasonable yearly fee considering; the custodial role of bach owners maintaining baches and the area around (including maintaining walking track in front of row, picking up rubbish, glass off beach, putting out fires etc.), the contribution bach owners make to the Taylors Mistake community, bach owners support of the TMSLC, that the bach owners permit unrestricted public access to their property to a very large number of people (mountain bikers on Anaconda track, walkers to/from Boulder Bay who walk behind row, paraponters, walkers/hikers that use the valley, Boulder Bay classic run, Orienteering events), baches have no land value and there would be no rubbish collection etc. i.e. value of license fee not comparable to rates paid typically.	A license should not be limited to a certain period of time i.e. 99 years or life of current owner. Heritage value only increases with time and the contribution bach owners make to the Taylors Mistake community and area is not conditional. A license should be issued in perpetuity or the road stopped as per Banks Peninsula Community Board Decision BKCB/2018/00103.
19427	These batches provide an interactive heritage site for both locals and tourists young and old. They are a visual display of the history of the baches. They should remain for future generations to enjoy. I believe that it is important to keep the privately owned baches, it allows the opportunity for our locals to pass on and share historical information to tourists and others	These batches provide an interactive heritage site for both locals and tourists young and old. They are a visual display of the history of the baches. They should remain for future generations to enjoy. I believe that it is important to keep the privately owned baches, it allows the opportunity for our locals to pass on and share historical information to tourists and others	These batches provide an interactive heritage site for both locals and tourists young and old. They are a visual display of the history of the batches. They should remain for future generations to enjoy. I believe that it is important to keep the privately owned baches, it allows the opportunity for our locals to pass on and share historical information to tourists and others	Automatic right of renewal. No other restrictions should apply	
19428	We should keep theses batches these are historic to our city and we have lost enough in the earth quake without losing this as well	We should keep theses batches these are historic to our city and we have lost enough in the earth quake without losing this as well	We should keep theses batches these are historic to our city and we have lost enough in the earth quake without losing this as well	We should keep theses batches these are historic to our city and we have lost enough in the earth quake without losing this as well	We should keep theses batches these are historic to our city and we have lost enough in the earth quake without losing this as well

19429	We should keep these batches these are historic to our city and we have lost enough in the earth quake without losing this as well	We should keep these batches these are historic to our city and we have lost enough in the earth quake without losing this as well	We should keep these batches these are historic to our city and we have lost enough in the earth quake without losing this as well	We should keep these batches these are historic to our city and we have lost enough in the earth quake without losing this as well	We should keep these batches these are historic to our city and we have lost enough in the earth quake without losing this as well
19430	I would like to see them retained. Having them there makes Boulder Bay more interesting.	I see no problem with them being retained, provided they stay as holiday accommodation and do not increase in size. The bach people look after the beach and the land in the bay. Also they add interest to the bay.	The most interesting of the baches, those under the rock will probably have to go. The others can remain.	The baches should not increase in size. They should not be able to fence off parts of the beach, (applies to Hobson's Bay) they should be for holiday accommodation.	
19431	They should be kept where they are	They should be kept where they are	They should be kept where they are	They should be open for the public to rent and stay in	No
19454	Please keep the batches	remain the status quo	batches should be as is	to remain as is	The batches should remain
19454	Please retain them all in private ownership	Please retain them all in private ownership	Please retain those of them not too badly impaired in private ownership	Longest term possible and with retention of heritage values	In a nutshell our members from the baches have over the last 100 years been the basis of our Clubs continuing ability to provide effective public life saving services. We want this to continue. This is a pro forma submission that we will elaborate on if you have a hearing.
19455	In all cases... The baches add a lot of colour and variety to the Coastal environment. Much of the coast is devoid of buildings - a good thing. If we were starting afresh, I could agree to no Baches, but now that they are there, and have been there for well over 100 years I think that they should stay. They are unique and attract many visitors from Chch, NZ and internationally	As above	As above. Hobsons Bay contains one of the oldest Baches in the country. It is of great national historical importance. Once a Bach is gone, it won't be possible to bring it back.	Reasonable rate - in comparison to other NZ baches. Clear responsibility for health and safety - including tree maintenance, toilets. - security of tenure - safety (I am happy for any or all of my family to visit and stay with the protection of the large macrocarpa trees behind our Bach that were planted some 60 years ago by my father-in-law and tended - with much protest at the time by my wife, Janet, and her brother, Ian) - fair and reasonable cost (we as Bach owners will research other similar situations in NZ - clear enunciation of the rights & responsibilities of CCC as landowner, and Bach owners.	Will think it over, and raise when I present in person. Baches have existed in the wider Taylors Mistake area for over 100 years. We "own" Rosy Morn, Bach 2 at Boulder Bay. By "own" I mean that we are guardians for future generations. Apart from some of the 1990s and 2000s (approximately) this has been our family Bach since 1957. My father-in-law's initials, MD, are engraved on the main entrance path along with the year. The inside of the bach has and will be kept as best as possible as a 1960s time capsule. The presence of these Baches adds a colour and depth to the bays that isn't found anywhere else in NZ to my knowledge. My wife, Janet has researched and published 3 booklets so far on these Baches and has plans to publish one or two more. Many walkers - from Chch, the rest of NZ, and overseas - visit, to see both the wonderful natural environment and the remaining Baches that offer an intriguing glimpse into a past way of life. A painting of the Boulder Bay Baches graced the cover of the Christchurch Phone Directory within the last 20 years. The baches have survived the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence and - so far - uncertain CCC policies. If the baches are no longer allowed, they will never return to their current state, and another slice of Canterbury history will be destroyed! But not by natural causes... I am happy to expand on my submission. I ask to be heard please. To paraphrase a polarising US politician let's keep Taylors Mistake, Boulder Bay and Hobsons Bay great i.e. as little unchanged as possible! Please acknowledge receipt and accept this submission for consideration.

<p>19456</p>	<p>Some submitters will continue to assert that we are "squatters" and that the baches were established illegally, without many sort of approval from either the Sumner Borough Council (as the initial controlling authority) or the Christchurch City Council (as the successor controlling authority) It has been proven beyond doubt that this assertion is false-see my evidence given to the Environment Court. Bach 6 was purchased by my late father Lance Robertson in 1939, and has since provided a treasured haven for four generations of my family, and friends of the family. We would be devastated if our bach and the other baches at Boulder Bay were to be removed. The bach does not impede public access, and the bach owners frequently provide various forms of assistance to walkers, fishermen, kayakers and other visitors. Please refer to my Environment Court evidence for details of the issue of the initial bach licence by the Sumner Borough Council, the issue by the Christchurch City Council in the 1950's of a building permit for the construction of a new bach, and a subsequent approach by the Council's Municipal Electricity Department offering to install an electricity supply to Boulder Bay at no cost to the bach owners. There seems to be growing public acceptance that the baches are an integral part of Christchurch's history.</p> <p>PENGUIN COLONY This was originally conceived as a Turning Point 2000 project, and has since been pursued by Dr Chris Challies. The proposal was considered in some detail by Commissioner Neville Marquet (see pages 23 and 24 of his report) and subsequently by the Environment Court (see clauses 174-185 of Decision C50/2002) We (as the owners of Bach 6) and the other bach owners at Boulder Bay concur with the Court's conclusions regarding this project.</p> <p>PUBLIC TOILET There is a proven and increasing need for a public toilet at or close to Boulder Bay. From time to time the bach owners are approached by desperate members of the public asking to use their private facilities. Such facilities are regularly broken into when the bach owners are absent-in my own case I have had to repair the toilet door and replace the lock on numerous occasions. On other occasions, I have had to remove faeces from behind the bach, when someone has squatted out of sight. The need for a public toilet was recognised in the attached 2002 report by the Council's Parks Manager, in which he recommended that the construction of a toilet proceed on the site recommended, the sum of \$33,226 having already been provided for such a facility in the</p>			<p>It therefore follows that I consider that it would be reasonable for all bach owners to be offered a suitable licence. While I am happy for the detailed licence conditions to be negotiated on our behalf by representatives of the Taylors Mistake Association (Inc.) I consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the licence period should be long term, with a right of renewal, to encourage bach owners to maintain the baches to a good standard -the licences should enable the baches to be sold on the open market, or transferred to other parties such as family members -the Council should be able to take the perceived natural hazard risk into account when issuing or reviewing licences -the licences should require the heritage character of the baches to be preserved, with the baches to be maintained to a good standard. The bach owners at Boulder Bay have carried out extensive planting and landscape enhancement over the years, and we would certainly be more than happy to continue doing this. -the licences should restrict use of the baches to temporary or holiday use. I suggest that a suitable definition in this respect could be framed using part of the wording of clause 3(1)(c) of the Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, which provides (inter alia) "that these regulations shall not apply with respect to any house which between the 1st day of April and the last day of November in every year is not occupied or is occupied only occasionally for periods not exceeding one month at any one time" -While we are happy to continue allowing friends to use the bach for holidays, we would be unwilling to make it available for renting by general members of the public. There is always quite a bit of work involved in letting and maintaining any rental property, particularly short term rentals, and because of the difficult (foot only) access to Boulder Bay the corresponding need to inspect the bach after each rental period and change linen etc. would place an unreasonable burden on bach owners. I suspect that the Council's own Property staff would not be keen to undertake this responsibility! -the licence fee should be set at a reasonable rate calculated to cover the Council's administration costs, and taking into account that (unlike Taylors Mistake) there is no road access to Boulder Bay, the water supply to the bay was installed and is maintained by the bach owners themselves, at their own cost, and that there is no sewerage or rubbish collection (the bach owners having to make their own arrangements and take their rubbish home with them) 	<p>On behalf of the Robertson family (the owners of Bach 6 at Boulder Bay) I wish to offer the following comments and information in relation to the discussion document which has been issued by the Council in respect of the baches at Taylors Mistake, Hobsons Bay and Boulder Bay. I note that comments on this document close on Sunday 21 October 2018.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION AND ATTACHMENTS This is a topic which has been closely examined by the Council for over thirty years, at enormous cost to all the parties involved. While the decision to recommence consultation from the beginning is understandable, there is a great deal of information available via previous Environment Court decisions and other sources which in my opinion should be taken into account. While my comments below mostly address the specific questions asked in the consultation document, I have also taken the liberty of addressing some other related topics.</p> <p>You already have copies of Environment Court decisions C50/2002 and C40/2003. The following additional documents are attached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Council Decision 165D, incorporating the report and recommendations of Commissioner Neville Marquet (this was the subject of the later references to the Environment Court) -My evidence given before the Environment Court, dated 10 July 2001 -2002 report by the Parks Manager to the Parks, Gardens and Waterways Committee recommending the provision of a public toilet at Boulder Bay, and a copy of the Committee's decision on that report <p>Inexplicably, the Committee instead decided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the decision to construct a composting toilet at Boulder Bay, Godley Head Farm Park be deferred pending full consultation with all user groups on the need for a toilet block at that site 2. That a request be made for the 2001/02 budget allocation of \$33,226 for the Godley Head toilets to be rolled over to 2002/03 pending the outcome of the consultation process above <p>I understand that no further consultation has since been taken by staff pursuant to this resolution. Nevertheless, the need for a public toilet at Boulder Bay itself remains. The nearest facilities are adjacent to the car park at the top of Godley Head, a steep uphill climb of at least 45 minutes from Boulder Bay.</p>
--------------	--	--	--	---	---

	2001/02 Parks and Waterways Capital Programme.				
19465	<p>The baches in Boulder bay have become an integral part of the landscape and are an important cultural, historical and architectural taonga. Individually they are of varying architectural quality but generally are of a small scale/ low impact visually and relate well to each other, the landscape and surrounding environment.</p> <p>Their key value architecturally and historically is as a collective or group of settlements. The baches form an important record of small scale vernacular architecture of a time before current building consents and regulations. The bach settlements as a whole would benefit from listing with NZ Heritage and classification as heritage items or a heritage zone with the CCC.</p> <p>The buildings are unique in that the public can walk past and through them and therefore their presence does not detract from the public enjoyment of the area.</p> <p>As a local, I feel it would be a serious loss to the sense of place and identity of Boulder Bay to remove these baches.</p> <p>As members of the public we can walk around the foreshore and sit in front of the baches and enjoy the general ambience. This is unique in NZ.</p> <p>ChCh has lost a lot of heritage post-earthquake and so every effort should be made to retain and protect the Baches of Boulder Bay, Taylors Mistake and Hobsons Bay as working buildings; private ownership and guardianship plays an important role in this. I do not/ have not had or aim to have any private ownership of any of these buildings but enjoy them as part of the landscape and appreciate their role in the sense of place and history of the area.</p>	Same comments as above apply.	Same comments as above apply.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some conditions or design code for alterations or building work, to maintain the existing small scale, material and colour palette and relationship to other buildings. - Maintain visual permeability through and between the baches particularly at boulder 	<p>Signage may be required eventually for tourists to protect Bach owners privacy, and state Some rules around rubbish, toileting etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider public toilet at boulder bay, positioned discretely. - Some identification or acknowledgement of iwi/ tangata whenua in the area
19466	The baches have been there for years, The baches aren't in the way, and The place will look like a dump, from the public if the bach occupants weren't there to clean up.	They have been there for years, Most bach families have been associated with the surf club as competitors or social supporters and patrolling the beach on patrol hours and after hours, Our bach has a building permit.	The baches have been part of the bay for years, If they weren't there to look at while walking along the bay it would be a plain old beach	They are kept tidy	
19538					<p>My view is that the baches should stay as is I think they are crucial in this land where we are still learning to understand, live, and build in relationship to the land. The implicit assumption of the Resource Management Act, of a recoverable unmodified state of nature, is a nonsense, there is barely a millimetre of the country that has not been burnt, dug over, sprayed or bulldozed. Rolling back the remnant traces of pre car occupation of the land has been near complete, the unoccupied public zone at the water's edge prevails across coastal and inland waterways, yet it is the edges that were first occupied and it is those edges that are so popular when we travel, be it the cafe on</p>

					the dock of European fishing villages or the floating markets of Asia. Just as the preservation of unbuilt coasts are important, so is the antithesis, the preservation of those few exemplars of humans building shelter in close relationship with the sea's edge. The former aid our understanding and assist in preserving our natural landscape, flora and fauna, the latter aids our understanding and appreciation the way in which the close proximity of unruly nature and rudimentary shelter have done much to shape our national characteristic of self-reliance and individuality.
19553	<p>Council to purchase all privately owned baches at fair market value.</p> <p>Remove all rubbish</p> <p>Any building with heritage value repair / maintain and rent out to the public for short term stays - (days not weeks)</p>	<p>Council to purchase all privately owned baches at fair market value</p> <p>Remove all "Rotten Row" and landscape gateway to beach and track to Boulder Bay</p> <p>Any building with heritage value repair / maintain & relocate to surf club building side (not beach front)</p> <p>Rent out to the public for short term stays - (days not weeks)</p>	<p>Council to purchase all privately owned baches at fair market value</p> <p>Remove all rubbish</p> <p>Any building with heritage value repair / maintain and rent out to the public for short term stays (days not weeks)</p>	<p>Licences - crazy idea</p> <p>- ignores public interest</p>	<p>Drop in session - Woolston. This comprehensive presentation with excellent support staff must tour all suburbs. A rethink is desperately required of how to involve the public - notification?</p> <p>Of many days throughout the year there would be more people at Taylors Mistake - sea, beach, tracks than there would be in the Botanical Gardens & Art Gallery put together</p>
19568					<p>For the record I am a Sumner resident who regularly uses the area for walking, swimming and biking. I am in favour of the baches being retained. They were built there many years ago by people passionate about the area and continue to add colour and a sense of history to the peninsula. In my opinion removing these baches would detract from the area. The bach "owners" are custodians as well and help keep the area tidy.</p>
19570		<p>As a Joint Owner of a Bach in so called Rotten Row (No 36) I am very much in favour of the Status Quo with the exception of allowing the Baches to connect to the Sewer.</p> <p>Most of the Baches in the row have been in the same families for many many years. My father purchased our bach in about 1950 and in 1963 The Christchurch City Council issued a Building Permit (which we still have) allowing us to demolish the old bach and rebuild a new one. Prior to 1950 we shared a family bach (No 42) which started with my grandfather purchasing an old Cowshed which later was expanded into a bach and my understanding is the Boundary Fence was shifted from the front and moved to the back of the shed to allow easy access to the Beach. This was in the Mid/Late 1800's.</p> <p>My earliest recollection of staying at my grandparents Bach is in the late 1940's when the Army handed back the baches to the owners and repairs had to be made to the Roof because of Bullet Holes.</p> <p>There was no water or electricity and rain water was collected in tanks. Drinking water could be obtained from a Hand Pump in the car park.</p> <p>All the people I have spoken with believe the Baches enhance Taylors Mistake and certainly are not doing any harm and are well maintained</p>		<p>Although they maybe on Public Land they are Privately owned and any suggestion of the being taken over for Public use is Ridiculous. Obviously a lot of people are jealous of not owing a bach but surely this applies to many situations where Property of any description has been handed down the family chain.</p> <p>This matter has been going on for many years and I can only hope Common Sense will prevail and the Baches are licensed to stay long term with a Reasonable Licence Fee equivalent to Rate Charges.</p>	

		<p>by their owners. I would lastly mention that for many years the Bach Owners and their families were the backbone of the Taylors Mistake Surf Club and still very much support it.</p>			
19632	<p>Well it was Queens Chain once now that has changed. The public are not denied access to this land as there are tracks right around the for shore. Huge historic value as these old stone huts are strong examples of colonial history.</p>	<p>Again no access is denied, some people are jealous that they don't have one, so they moan. The bach owners give public access to the valley they own, preserve what little colonial we have in NZ</p>	<p>The baches in Hobson Bay are tucked tight into the cliff no public would ever walk there, as the beach is the only way to access the area. Whare Moki is a Cave House is of national interest</p>	<p>We had a licence pre 1985 for eighty years! 1. Connect to sewers, (pipe already there) 2. Must be in a tidy state of repair 3. If lost, baches can only be result in bach zone at the rear of beach 4. Baches to stay in family names. 5. Maybe a public day, for inspection 6. Bach owners, would give public access to valley.</p>	<p>1. The Surf Club saves many people a year, mainly bach owners (Life Guards), kids, ply after hour rescues all done by bach owners. 2. Club could fail if baches go 3. Bach owners look after blue penguins that nest under baches 4. NZ colonial history is very space, we must preserve it. If this was Maori history, it would be hand off</p>
19647	<p>The baches in Boulder Bay are in a line around the bay close to the beach. These and the land around them give the impression it is a private enclave, which it is not. The only improvement available for public use is a narrow pathway close to the front of the baches. Apart from the lack of amenities for visitors there are obvious problems with public access and wastewater disposal. Council needs to address these.</p> <p>With the upgrading of the very popular Taylors Mistake to Godley Head walkway (by DOC) the numbers of day walkers visiting Boulder Bay have greatly increased. The bay is c.45 minute walk from Taylors Mistake. Recognising this council should consider landscaping a part of the bay for use by day visitors. The most suitable place for this would be the relatively flat land on either side of the lower valley. There are two baches there, #s 6 and 7, of which #6 is seaward of the larger area of suitable land. It is two storied several metres from high tide mark with the pathway passing close to the front wall and under its second story balcony. It is clearly an obstruction to passage and therefore should be removed. As there are multiple issues in Boulder Bay they could be considered together in an integrated way.</p> <p>If some of the baches are to be licensed Council will need to decide on how their wastewater would be treated. At present some of the baches release it directly to the coastal marine area, and two have long-drop toilets (including #6). Since the baches are close to the sea it is unlikely that soak pits would meet the terms of Ngai Tahu's advice.</p>	<p>Taylors Mistake beach is an attractive and popular area for outdoor recreation close to Christchurch. The numbers visiting the bay have increased substantially in recent years as the urban population has increased and become more affluent and mobile. This is most noticeable during summer weekends when the bay is sometimes crowded beyond capacity. Council has fallen behind in catering for this demand which seems likely to continue to increase. A review of the present and future recreational and amenity needs in the bay would quickly show that to increase public space it would be necessary to encroach on the bach areas. They bound the bay on both sides.</p> <p>To reach an equitable resolution in this case council should have a series of landscape plans prepared and submit these for public submission. The plans would show how public use of the bay could be enhanced with all, some, or none of the baches remaining. This way council would end up with a result that was defensible.</p>	<p>The baches in the main bay have a history of damage from rockfall and sea inundation which council well knows. There are council signs at both ends of the beach that warn the public of 'DANGER, Falling Rocks' and 'DANGER, Falling hazard, High cliffs, Keep to walking track'. These signs predate the earthquakes. Despite this the owners have maintained their interest in the baches and council have allowed them to stay. As they are clearly unsafe to use they should be removed. The geotechnical assessments support this outcome.</p> <p>The group of baches on the rock outcrop at the southern end of Hobsons Bay occupy sites that could potentially be developed to provide public amenities with better access from Taylors Mistake to Hobsons Bay. If these baches are to remain council should ensure that wastewater disposal meets minimum standards.</p>	<p>Council already have a draft 'Deed of licence for occupation of legal road' that has been vetted by independent lawyers and the bach owners. If it contains conditions of direct interest to the public these should be listed in any review document for comment. The following matters of relevance to the public could be considered in the interim.</p> <p>* Disposal of wastewater. All of the baches appear to be disposing of their wastewater to soak pits on public land or directly or indirectly to the coastal marine area. In their 2008 submission to council Ngai Tahu listed conditions for wastewater treatment that they believe would protect the environment and water quality. Despite this and earlier advice council have continued to ignore this issue. Council should require all baches to have formal and verifiable wastewater disposal arrangements if they remain. Some of the baches could be connected to the Christchurch sewerage system but others would find this difficult or impossible.</p> <p>* Licence fee. The bach owners have not paid any fees, rates or other moneys for their occupation of public land since their last licence expired on 31st March 1986. In 2009 council obtained a registered valuer's estimate that year round use of the land was worth c.\$5000 /bach. This was 2.5% of the nominal value of the land. Council discounted this to \$3000 and the bach owners countered with an offer of \$800 /bach. Apparently no agreement was met. It is reasonable for the public to expect the bach owners to pay for the use of the land at a commercial rate which estimates suggest would be in the range \$3-5000 /bach/year.</p> <p>* Term of licence. The demand for outdoor recreational opportunities at local beaches has been increasing, and this trend is likely to continue into the future. As the need for additional space and amenities grows council may have to recover some of the land the baches are on for public use. In this case it</p>	<p>This submission treats the future of the baches as a matter of public use of a public asset. Council's approach.</p> <p>The bach "problem" is complex and long standing. If council is to reach an equitable and lasting solution it will need to be more proactive and address the real issues and present the real options. The public have been subjected to propaganda about the baches for many years and as a result are generally ill-informed. The public deserve better information, and this is what council should endeavour to provide. Needed is an informative document about the wider bach issues along with lists of options from which submitters can choose. This way the public are more likely to engage in a meaningful way, which presumably is what council wants.</p> <p>For example, here is my understanding of two aspects central to the bach issue. The public are entitled to know the true situation because it is their land that is involved.</p> <p>* Ownership of the land. The land involved (legal road/Queen's chain) is owned by 'the people' and managed on our behalf by the local body, i.e. the CCC. In this case council's primary responsibility is to the general public and not the factional interests that have dominated proceedings in the past.</p> <p>* Legal status of the baches. Any decisions made about the use of the land should be consistent with the relevant laws and by-laws. It is doubtful whether habitable buildings are a permitted use of legal road and able to be licensed. Council has independent legal advice that there is 'doubt' about their 'ability at law to grant this licence.' The subject was the TM baches. Council needs to say where it gets its authority to license the baches if it intends to do so.</p> <p>* Baches that should be removed. The review is not about whether all the baches stay or go but rather about which ones should be removed and which remain, and under what conditions. Listed here are the two situations in which council would clearly be justified in removing baches.</p>

				<p>would be wise to keep the terms of any licences to a minimum without an automatic right of renewal. This would allow council to respond in a timely manner. The licences could be renewed if the land was not needed for another purpose.</p> <p>Compensation. It is possible that the owners of baches that are removed might expect compensation for their loss at ratepayers' expense. Under the circumstances this would seem unreasonable. The owners have had free and unrestricted use of the sites for the last 32 years. At \$3000 /year that would be worth nearly \$100 000 in 2018 dollar equivalent.</p>	<p>* Hindrance to public access. Baches that affect public access or impede the public's recreational use of the coastline should be removed. This would include the groups of baches that were unscheduled in the City Plan following the 2002 Environment Court decision. They were prohibited activities intended for removal as part of the TM Bach Zone development. This did not happen. The case for their removal in 2002 still applies.</p> <p>* Risk of rockfall/cliff collapse. Some of the baches backed by bluffs are at risk of damage from rock fall and/or cliff collapse. This infers that occupants and visitors could be placing themselves in danger. Council should decide the fate of these baches on the basis of the best geotechnical and risk assessment information they have.</p> <p>Competing uses for the land. In the review council will have to consider not only access and safety but also the provision of space for passive recreation and public amenities. The baches were built on prime sites around the coast at a time when there was little other use for these places, and they have remained there in modified forms to the present. Public use of the coastline for outdoor recreation has increased substantially in the last few decades, and this trend is continuing. As a result council now face an increasing demand for public space that can only be filled in places by taking back some of the land the baches are on. It is their responsibility to make the appropriate assessments, and where there are competing claims choose the combination that would give the greatest public benefit.</p> <p>Supplementary issues. A range of issues have been raised by the bach owners over the years in attempts to improve the chances of the baches remaining. Some of these appear ill founded and more distractions than useful contributions. Examples:</p> <p>* Land swap. The bach owners own a c.70 ha block of land in the valley behind Taylors Mistake through their shareholdings in the TM Land Co. Ltd. They offered to gift it to council in exchange for the land on which the baches stand. To do this council would have to stop the road which would then automatically become Esplanade Reserve under the Reserves Act. It is unlikely that habitable buildings are a permitted use on Esplanade Reserves. In the discussion document it mentions exchanging the 70 ha block 'for the new bach zone'. As the proposed TM Bach Zone was to be on land already owned by the TML Co. Ltd. it is not clear what exchange was being proposed other than the one described above. If council are in discussions about the future of this land they should familiarise its self with the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>conditions in the subdivision consent and ensure they have been met.</p> <p>* Heritage value. The claimed heritage value of the baches appears to be more nostalgic than a realistic assessment of their present state. The owners have upgraded, modified, and in cases extended their baches over the years seemingly without regard for any historic value they might have had. An assessment by council staff in 2007 found that 'work had been done on most' of the baches in 'The Row' 'over the past few years.' Even the small green bach (#34) which was acknowledged as the most historic in 'The Row' was not retained in its original form. It was stripped and rebuilt in 2007 with only its facade kept. A targeted assessment is needed to determine which, if any, of the baches have sufficient heritage value to be retained.</p> <p>* Existing use rights. Existing use rights provide for the continuation of lawful existing land use that is adversely affected by a plan change. It is difficult to see how the baches could be considered a lawful use of the land in this case. None of the baches have had legal tenure (eg. a licence) since 31st March 1986 when their expiring licences required them to be removed. Some have since been scheduled in the City Plan which is empowering rather than a formal agreement by council that the baches could stay (as some have claimed). The unscheduled baches are a 'prohibited activity' and were to be removed.</p> <p>Disclaimer. I have made this submission to represent the public's interest. I am not associated with any of the main factions concerned with the bach issue, but know people in both. My personal interest is the establishment of a penguin colony and 'parade' at Boulder Bay which conflicts with several of the baches. I have not included this here but could make a supplementary submission if council want to consider it along with the future of the baches in Boulder Bay.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Attachment Submission 19338

Filed on line by (redacted) 18/10/2018 and referred to therein and forming part of it.

My family are the bachholder of (redacted) and I am:

☒ (redacted)

☒ (redacted)

☒ (redacted)

But I make this submission for the Bach and as an individual.

While some of my later comments will appear critical of the process we are once again going through, to my mind going through unnecessarily, I do accept we are where we are and I have no alternative but to get on with it. And my comments are in the main born of what I see as undue haste foisted on CCC Officers to present before they have had the opportunity to familiarise themselves fully of the history of this long running saga with its important facts and lessons, all being things that can't be ignored now.

I must add though that as far as I'm concerned my contacts with Council Officers during the City Plan Process and more recently in a smaller group in relation to this process, as nearly always helpful with regards those things we have touched upon, and with a keenness to listen without in some cases always agreeing. I will refer to the CCC online information that undoubtably will be the dominant source of Public knowledge for their considerations and submissions and comment on what to my mind I will term in the main as "misleading by omission".

And no doubt my comments will appear to you as all the "misleading" bits being to the disadvantage of myself and the TMA, as indeed they are, but there is no question of me trying to introduce them at this time to provide bias as they are important facts that stand on their own and there are no offsetting counter facts existing to claim that they too have been omitted. No doubt someone will let me know and convince me if there are!

I won't know if these misleading bits affects Public submitters or not until or unless I have an opportunity to see all submissions. But I can envisage some incorrect conclusions against the baches remaining being made and submission lodged against as a result that might otherwise not have been. I guess we will see.

Regardless though I feel moved to make these comments now:

☒ First for the record,

☒ Second for the Officers who may not be aware of some of the things I have to say, and

☒ Third, and to mind most importantly, for the Elected Councillors who too may not be aware of some of these important facts which as I've said, can't be ignored, and by doing so hopefully help them with their coming considerations.

Now my comments by the online Section Headings.

Background

1. Not a biggie but important when the Public are visualizing in the minds eye. The opening para cites "45 baches currently occupying public land - 19 at Taylors Mistake, 17 at Hobsons Bay and 9 at Boulder Bay". This is incorrect, the numbers are 27 at Taylors Mistake, 9 at Hobsons Bay and 9 at Boulder Bay. As a consequence a couple of visualisations later on are labelled incorrectly and the correct Hobsons Bay visualisations are completely distorted by the "fish eye" lens take of them.

Key points in the history of the baches"

2. 1890-1945 section. Should have included "1911 Licence Fees commence".

While a drill down on "Background" will show a reference to this, it's the Key points that will stick in the Publics minds when they prepare submissions.

And why is it a Key point, well it's the proof to the Public that bacholders were not considered "squatters" as far back as 1911 and as evidenced by their continuing presence over the following 107 years and confirmed by subsequent Mediation and Environment Court Hearings in the 1990's and early 2000's.

It should also dispel any Publics thoughts of bachholders not paying or willing to pay anything ever.

3. 1890-1945 section. Should have included:

"1916 bachholders instrumental in the formation of the Taylors Mistake Surf Life Saving Club".

As highly significant and relevant in the Heritage/Community/PublicCommunityService considerations of Planning, it should have been there to allow the Public to take it into consideration.

Please see a separate section expanding on this later.

4. 1945-1968 section. It's my view it should have also included

"1945 CCC starts issuing Rates Demands in addition to Licence Fees".

Once again, and without even tying this to the provision of electricity and water services, a very Key point and further recognition for the Public of bacholders not being squatters and not, not willing to pay their way.

5. 1980's section. Well actually you won't find that section there but it should have been as it encompasses a very important Planning Event with significant flow on to the 1990's and in particular to what shows there now as "Taylors Mistake Land Company proposes land swap".

And I'd have suggested this section should have included something like the following:

"1986 CCC indicate support and encouragement for TMA to relocate all baches to a new site in reasonably close vicinity if one could be procured".

"1989 TMA enter into contract to purchase approx. 73ha for all baches to relocate to part of."

"1989 CCC support TMA application to establish a 40 Bach Zone on its own land".

"1989 TMA Application declined but held open for Appeal pending revision".

The very important implication of this is that TMA did not buy the land to effect a swap or to offer it as a "bribe" to stay where they are which has been claimed from time to time in the past.

6. 1990's section.

Should have started with something like:

“1991. Appeal set aside when mutually agreed to go into Mediation”

“1991/1992 Ngai Tahu, Historic Places Trust and Department of Conservation also involved in Mediation”.

(This dispels the false impression later that Ngai Tahu weren't consulted until 2007/09 and introduces to the Public that HPT and DOC were involved and very important parts of the process). “1992 Mediation results in Taylors Mistake Land Company agreeing to gift surplus 70ha of land to CCC.”

Delete “Taylors Mistake Land Company proposes land swap”.

Please see a separate section expanding on the Land and Gift aspect later on.

Maps of bach areas and relevant zones within the district plan

7. The middle map labelled “Map of bach locations and 70 hectares of land offered” is incorrectly labelled “70 hectares offered as land swap”. It was not a swap which has a completely different connotation to the actual agreeing to gift.

For the Publics fuller information I believe it was remiss of CCC not to note appropriately land already owned by CCC which effectively surrounds the TMA land apart from the lets say the 10% boundary with DOC that is facing Godley Head.

Licence considerations

8. I now refer to the very last item:

“Should the Council charge a licence fee and how should it be calculated?”

“Any bach management or administration costs incurred by the Council could be compensated for by a fee or some other mechanism. The ‘gift’ of 70 ha in the upper Taylors Valley may influence this decision. In 2010 there was a significant difference between the Council’s proposed fee and the bach owners’ proposed fee”.

At least the “gift” aspect is recognised although I suspect from whats gone before this is said here more tongue in cheek.

Let me inform you quite categorically that our gift had no influence at all in our assessment of what a fair Licence Fee would be, not then, not now, and it will not later when the time comes.

The fact of the matter is that as it says the fee is to cover “bach management or administration costs incurred by the Council” whereas the fee proposed by the CCC Officers has nothing to do with this and is based on another completely different and arguably unsubstantiated market calculation basis put up by their Valuers, Simes dated 5/3/2009. Simes even mentioned that that valuation wasn't “to spec” but CCC used it anyway.

Having said that I/we have enough historical background information (both Land Valuation Department and CCC) and current research analysis to, if need be, assess a fee along the lines CCC used, that will result in a fee very much closer to our original proposal that will also be shown to be fair, assessed with Goodwill and in Good Faith and should at the same time satisfy public perceptions.

Not mentioned in the online presentation is the question of “Outgoings” (or Rates Equivalent) which was a subject of earlier licence considerations. I/we have similar information and research on this that should produce a similar outcome.

With more time and less haste this bit could have been presented to the Public in a more informative and correct manner.

Further comments on the Land and the Gift.

9. I trust my previous comments have put to rest any thoughts that the TMA land was bought with the intent of “bribing” or “swapping” as it was bought with CCC encouragement for all baches to relocate.

10. There was only a surplus 70ha because the vendor was adamant it was all or nothing.

11. In the event both the Commissioner Marquet for CCC Decision 165D in 1988 and Judge Smith for Environment Court C50/2002 found that it was a real gift with value to the City that had no bearing on their decisions that most baches could stay. In relation to C50/2002, CCC's Legal Counsel,

Ed Wyllie, acknowledged this in Evidence during the proceedings.

12. This subsequent reopening of the TM Bach issue has though bought forward suggestions from the Officers that they and the Elected Councillors weren't sure they wanted to accept the gift because of, amongst other things, its attendant annual costs of maintenance.

13. This apparently so even though it was included with their own land as part of the CCC's, elaborate “Awaroa/Godley Head Coastal Park – a development concept” in 2003, albeit funds for this is now many years away as EQ “fix its” correctly take priority.

14. For my part then and reflecting a growing feeling in TMA, I will be suggesting we take the Gift off the table with the intent of TMA maintaining it for the long term use and benefit of the Public.

One way or the other, the Public will still get to use it.

Further comments on the Taylors Mistake Surf Life Saving Club

15. The Community and Community Service aspect of the TM Baches.

* Entwined in the beginning

* Inseparable since

* Still proudly supportive 100 plus years later

16. Bach holders in general have through the generations been the backbone of the Life-Savings Club administrative and beach patrolling duties. An important and vital service providing for amongst other things, the “sustainable management of amenity values”.

17. The inaugural committee of the Club in 1916 shows that the President, Secretary, Treasurer and Club Captain were all bach holders.

The 2018 committee shows the President and Treasurer are both bach holders, with the Club Captain the daughter of a previous bachholder. The role of Secretary has been discontinued, for the meantime at least, as the Club like so many other under pressure volunteer organisations has had to find funding to make paid appointments.

18. Not surprisingly the Taylors Mistake members on very first committee with the formation of the Canterbury Surf Lifesaving Association in 1917 were both bach holders.

The Local Association does not operate anymore but an alternative sub-committee of SLSNZ for local Club Presidents does. Our current President is a bachholder and on that sub-committee.

19. The Clubs history shows that it might not have survived without this bachholder involvement.

For the nearly 103 years of the Clubs existence, (100 for secretary), bachholders have been:

President 52 plus closely associated 9 = 61 59% of the time

Secretary 40 plus closely associated 22 = 62 62% of the time

Treasurer 87 plus closely associated 16 = 103 100% of the time

Club Captain 48 plus closely associated 10 = 58 57% of the time

All voluntary, all willingly given, no intermittent rushes just to advance a cause from time to time.

20. And statistics from the records for the years we have show Taylors Mistake is Canterbury's and one of New Zealand's most dangerous beaches.

Rescues 1950 to 2018 1,624 Average per year 24 last 10 years 183 Average per year 18

Preventative Assistancess

1992 to 2018 15,673 Average per year 581 last 10 years 10,167 Average per year 1,017

The need for the TM Surf Life Saving Club is evident then, as is the need for a close pool of volunteers because Taylors doesn't have the sizable hinterland of other Clubs from which to draw volunteers, and being at the end of the road, no through traffic for added attraction/exposure.

So the captive already "over the hill" and at "end of the road" with nowhere else to go Bachholders has been, is now and will be in the future, vital to the Club delivering it's pretty important Community Services.

Some comments on Public Access and Use.

21. I'm attaching an attachment to this attachment labelled "TM 2001 beach scenes and inaugural SLSC Committee" that will be of interest to Councillors in their considerations on Public Access and where the Public go when they go to the beach. I used these in my Evidence to the 2001

Environment Court Hearing.

The car park layout has of course changed (now probably fewer space for parking), but the points I was making then and believe are still relevant now, are that when the Public go to the Bay:

1. They don't picnic in the car park and perimeters, and
2. They congregate on the sand towards the center of the Bay close to the patrolled areas and our SLS Club and not to the perimeters where the baches are, and
3. This is true whether it's an "overflow" day or a relatively "normal" day as one or other of the scenes depict.

I think its fair to say that at previous Hearing etc the consensus on practicalities was that even if the "14" and all the Hobsons Bay and the Boulder Bay baches were to go it would make next to no difference to where the Public would go. There was an big element of sacrifice with the "14" to reach compromise as to perception at Mediation.

It's easy to gather the impression from "bach only" photo's including this CCC online thing and other historic presentations, that without the baches, TM is reasonably undeveloped. No-one can view the Bay that way when the proper takes including the residential hillside are shown as in these 2001 photo's.

The attachment to this attachment also just happens to include a picture of the Original/Inaugural Committee of Surf Life Saving Canterbury 1917 which while you can't see it here, on the copy I have it shows the printed names of bacholders A Barrett on the far left and F Hobson on the far right. Bachholders to this day are still on the "equivalent" organization. That's continual Regional Community Service for over 100years.

Some comments on Hazards and Risks.

22. When considering those things associated with risks from rockfall, cliff collapse and long-term sea-level rises, remember we live everyday amongst hazardous and life threatening situations.

For example:

a. Most notably, every day millions of the Public choose to drive on or walk across NZ roads with its attendant and ever-present life-threatening Hazards.

But the Regulators let common sense prevail and with minimum regulation let people and the Public make personal choices of risk and get on with it. b. Closer to home every year we let many 10's of 1,000's of the Public walk the tracks above and below the steep sea side cliffs to Boulder Bay and Godley Heads.

They face exactly the same Hazards attributed to the Boulder Bay Baches (in aggregate, (people times time exposed) hugely more) but common sense prevails and without regulation the Public are allowed to make personal choices of risk and get on with using the tracks.

c. And from my Surf Life Saving point of view, when the Public take to the surf (and other bodies of water as well) and that's maybe 30-50,000 each year at Taylors, they face potential Hazards every time but common sense prevails and without regulation the Public are allowed to make personal choices of risk and get on with venturing into surf.

The Public don't purposely put themselves or others at risk although they will, and should be allowed to, assess a comfortable risk level they can live with and take responsibility for.

The TM bachholders who may face some Hazards, albeit the exposure to them is miniscule in comparison to the examples above, deserve the same fair, consistent, practical and common-sense considerations.

That's it for now then, and if this should go to a Hearing I'll look forward to presenting, elaborating and fielding any questions that may come my way.

Images Submission 19338



