

# Analysis of feedback – Deciding the future of baches at Taylors Mistake, Hobsons Bay and Boulder Bay

October 2018

A Discussion Document was released for public feedback from 3 – 23 October 2018.

225 people participated, 214 provided feedback, and 11 were blank.

People who provided feedback lived in the following locations:

- 186 Christchurch / Banks Peninsula
- 7 wider Canterbury
- 15 rest of New Zealand
- 3 international
- 2 unknown

Question: Do you have any comments about the future of privately owned baches on public land in Boulder Bay?

168 comments

- 155 support retention of the baches (some gave multiple reasons)
  - No reason given (54)
  - Heritage (84)
  - Character (45)
  - Custodianship of bach owners (6)
  - Access not impeded (4)
- 7 support retention / partial retention with caveats
  - Hazards – mitigate or buildings not occupied (3)
  - Public bach management (2)
  - Maintain public access (2)
  - Penguin colony
- 5 support removal of the baches
  - No reason given (4)
  - Penguins
- 1 unclear response

Question: Do you have any comments about the future of privately owned baches on public land in Taylors Mistake?

200 comments

- 188 support retention of baches
  - No reason given (71)
  - Heritage (77)
  - Character (70)
  - Family history (17)
  - Custodianship (11)
  - Visitor attraction (9)
  - Access not impeded (4)
- 7 support retention / partial retention with caveats (some gave multiple reasons)
  - Hazards – mitigate or buildings not occupied (5)
  - Maintain public access
  - Removal of non-heritage
  - Public bach management
- 5 support removal of baches
  - No reason given (3)
  - Public access
  - Hazards
- One did not support either retention or removal

Question: Do you have any comments about the privately owned baches on public land in Hobsons Bay?

148 comments

- 112 support long term retention
  - No reason given (52)
  - Heritage (49)
  - Character (37)
  - Visitor attraction (5)
  - Family history (2)
  - Access not impeded (2)
  - Custodianship (1)
- 22 some stay some go / no occupation some gave multiple reasons)
  - Hazards (14)
  - Deterioration (8)
  - Maintain public access
  - Public bach management
- 9 supported removal
  - Public access
  - Hazards (2)
- 5 unfamiliar with the area

Question: If a licence is offered to any or all of the baches, what licence conditions do you consider to be important?

146 comments

- 2 challenge legality of licence
- 7 no conditions / no licence needed
- 9 non-specific comments
- 128 propose the following licence conditions
  - Maintenance
    - Keep bach tidy (47)
    - Look after surrounding environment (15)
  - Development restrictions
    - No significant change to structure (34)
    - No new buildings (5)
  - Duration
    - Long licence (19)
    - Automatic right of renewal (14)
    - Perpetual (4)
    - Single licence then removal (3)
    - Short licence
  - Licence fee
    - Generally support a fee (27)
    - Monies raised for local projects (3)
    - No fee
  - Rental
    - Allow (12)
    - DOC / CCC managed (3)
    - Don't allow
    - Make compulsory
  - Ownership
    - Stay within family (not sold) (10)
    - Sold on open market (7)
    - Sold to locals only (2)
  - Maintain public access (11)
  - Wastewater provision (11)
  - Holiday use only (8)
  - Hazards mitigated / accepted (8)
  - Other (6)

Question: Is there any additional information you think needs to be considered when deciding the future of the privately owned baches?

- 116 comments
- Generally comments supporting bach retention or suggested licence conditions
- Specific information requested included (in order of popularity):
  - Look at other examples in NZ
  - Legality of decision
  - Implications of removal
  - Existing use rights
  - Potential use / owned by charities
  - Who pays for risk mitigation
  - Investigate fee simple titles
  - Gift of land
  - Baches pre-date policy
  - Independent review
  - Better public information
  - Length of process unacceptable
  - Public toilet in Boulder Bay
  - Tourist benefits
  - Penguins
  - Alternative uses of the area
  - Custodianship
  - Surf club viability
  - Their uniqueness in the city