

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
27288	Yes	Ensor (org)	Boat Safety Group	Option 2	<p>Updated Priority of Work</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan 1, install a pontoon on the south side of the ramp. Pontoon to be concrete as shown on plan 5. 2. Ramp extension to be built to allow for 20/30T haulout, whatever is required. The 4 lane ramp as shown in CCC options 1 + 2 should be slightly wider than the existing lane widths. 3. Include a walkway from the club ramp to the cellphone tower along the foreshore as requested by the community board. 4. Community board asked what the boat safety group could provide and do with the greatest safety benefits and the lowest cost that would benefit the most users of the community, hence plan 1. 5. Refer plan 3, breakwater is essential to make a safe harbour for all users. Breakwater pontoons should be concrete as shown on plan 5. 6. Good CCC option 1 maximum possible for cars and trailers. 7. More angle parking would be useful. 8. More angle parking along the west side of the recreation ground. Both CCC options lack parking for cars. 9. Refer plan 4, keep the historic scout building where it is for their use. 10. Refer plan 4, keep the haulout and maintenance yard where it is and then angle carparking along the south side. 11. Refer plan 2, keep the marina and rebuild over time and eventually that will help fund the maintenance of the marine structures. 12. The club members will help fund marine structures maintenance alongside the public ramp and hand launch area contributions. A car rego reader could be used like they use at the north island tunnels and toll roads to collect revenue for the area. 13. This will help provide maintenance revenue which will be greatly needed to keep this are 						Boat-Safety-Submission-Submission

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					operational to a high standard and safe. Please see attached						
27274	No	Rough		Option 2	<p>I prefer Option 2 because of its apparent greater capacity to accommodate more cars, and cars with trailers, in various areas including the Recreation Ground. I like the idea of a combined clubhouse/Coastguard building and the fact that the Coastguard will have a ramp dedicated for quick launching of its rescue craft. Starting box note there seems to be no starting box for yacht races. I can't imagine it being incorporated in the Clubhouse building (Because of its distance from the main harbour) and wonder if there shouldn't be a starting box on the waterfront near the location of the existing starting box if, indeed, that is a good location for starting races (it seems to work well to me). Trailer yacht storage In my opinion the storage compound needs to have at least the capacity of the present compound with power facilities so that owners can undertake maintenance work on their yachts within the compound. I note that there is no trailer yacht gantry and as a trailer yacht owner I think this is an essential item that needs to be included in the redevelopment. I think it would be ideal if it was in an enclosed area within the trailer yacht compound. Keeler haulout yard Every year I assist a friend with the haulout and maintenance of his small keeler and I also help with the haulout and maintenance of a Young 88 that I crew on in the Wednesday night races. Obviously, there is no keeler haulout yard shown in the development options. I can't imagine the Lyttelton keeler fleet functioning without a haulout facility and yard. My preference would be to see a haulout facility and yard associated with the inner harbour so that haulouts are not restricted to the extent they are in the present location because of southwest and northwest conditions. Furthermore, a new haulout facility could be constructed to accommodate the</p>	<p>Boat trailer parking I see a problem with the Option Two layout in that there seems to be no clear delineation between Club trailer parking, and possibly launching, and public trailer parking and launching. When racing occurs, there is a concentrated period of both launching and retrieval of trailer yachts and I think the trailer parking behind the clubhouse/Coastguard building and the launching ramp to the west of the clubhouse should be restricted, as it is at present, to Club members. Pedestrian circulation While it is good to see dedicated pedestrian ways throughout the proposed development, in my opinion the pedestrian way on the north-western side of the site would be better following the base of the cliff than traversing the edge of the rigging area, which is an area that I think should be set aside for trailer yacht parking. Floating breakwater I think this is a good idea but could perhaps be extended to the southeast in conjunction with removal of the existing small hardfill breakwater that extends southwest of the picnic area. Furthermore, it could be curved slightly to make it more sympathetic with the, albeit artificial, coastline. The original Magazine Bay Marina floating tyre</p>	<p>Old Magazine Bay Marina structure I am in favour of this structure being removed but retaining the initial part and its first "finger", especially if one or two berths could be used for short-term day use by moored keelers that may wish to berth while taking on or dropping off equipment and/or passengers or crew, etc.</p>	Yes			

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>large yachts in the Lyttelton fleet that are too big to be hauled out at the existing ramp. With a new yard, say associated with the inner harbour, it would be essential that yacht owners and their crew retain the ability to work on their yachts as they do in the existing haulout yard. Storage and rigging area below the cliff. While I think it is good to have a dedicated rigging and launching area for sailing dinghies to the southeast of the clubhouse /Coastguard building, so that there is not the confusion and problems in both Club dinghies and trailer yachts using the same launching ramp as they do at present, it seems illogical to split the dinghy rigging areas by having a rigging area below the cliff as well as a dinghy storage area below the cliff too. This will perpetuate the problem of sailing dinghies crossing the path of Club trailer yachts being launched to the west of the clubhouse/Coastguard building. In my view it would be better to use the area below the cliffs for trailer yachts and expand the rigging area to the southeast of the clubhouse/Coastguard building so that it accommodates all Club dinghy rigging and launching as well as the dinghy storage buildings/containers.</p>	<p>breakwater was, at my instigation, curved to be more sympathetic to the originally proposed straight-line breakwater proposal. (As a landscape architect I assisted in the obtaining of a Resource Consent for the original marina). My observation was that the floating tyre breakwater was reasonably effective but it was not maintained and this contributed to its demise (it was designed to be removed in sections, taken into the dry dock and water-blasted clean !" this happened for a bit initially but was not continued). Landscape feature/sculptures Rather than see sculptures or !" landscape features!" I think the two sites labelled as such would be ideal locations for somewhat open but roofed shelter structures where people could sit and relax in some shade and shelter (especially from easterly winds) and watch activity on the harbour. Existing tie-off structure I am in favour of keeping this structure for the use of Club members</p>					
26967	No	Rogers		Option 2	<p>(very difficult to read this submission - we think it says the following) Option 1 is too limited Support cars parking Doesn't recognise all of the linked sites Not comprehensive enough</p>	<p>Provides better access to any potential users of the coastal environment</p> <p>Access to the harbour is very limited.</p>	<p>Support removal</p> <p>Marina Development in the inner harbour is appropriate and sufficient?</p>				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26965	No	Ensor (p)			<p>Things for careful consideration</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 4th lane at public ramp to meet needs 2. Access to and from water safely 3. Breakwater plan & design (boat safety plan) 4. Marina at back of NPCL Club 5. Swimmers in areas where they are safe 6. Scout den site must stay and be affordable to them 7. The recreation ground & sports field needs to stay as it is at present - reasons why - reasons why 8. Car parking for trailers 9. Car parking for cars and trailers 10. Haul out yard & maintenance & wash down area for club NPCL & CTYS members & public needs to stay irrespective of what LPC do in inner harbour as that will exclude members doing their own work & repairs 11. The road access to the site 12. The option 2 the boy racer circuit 13. The large amount of space wasted in option 2 and why that doesn't work 14. The CCC Godley Quay Road and why the large no of people want it kept by CCC 15. The land road swap & why that's not a good option + fishing & viewing 16. The Coast Guard & NPCL building to close to sea shore excludes walkway on foreshore as requested by Lyttelton Community Board 17. Walkway on all N/P foreshore 18. Windsurfer area 19. Refuel of boats 20. Refuel of coast guard boat if under club building set back from public space building 21. Who owns what? 22. Who controls what? 23. Trailer yacht storage shape of area - no of boats stored at least 24. Haul out storage of boats of all types and a number have been there for 20 years. Storage of haul out equipment 25. Wash down & clean down area for NPCL CTYS & public 26. Control tower and start box area 27. Angle parking 28. No set order of items 29. Other factors 30. Maintenance 						

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26964	No	Stewart			Coast Guard structure & pier a sailing impediment Support boat safety submission Support field staying as is Historic scout den remains Leads to more car parking & trailer parking Haul out area must remain though without this and haul out slip self boat maintenance impossible Inner harbour option too space restrictive & self maintenance very difficult	Purchase of Port Co land good Trailer parking for trailer & power boats must be provided Field turn around illuminates haul out area - very bad Scout den must remain - historical + replacement cost Entry + exit road circuit should be without road parallel to field. Boy racing invitation	Support absolutely boat plan 1 Keep marina & therefore support plan 2 Build breakwater as per plan 3 The launching separation for hand launching - support 4 Support concrete pontoons as per plan 5 Support the latest summary sheet	No	Yes	Naval Point YC, sailing for 60 years in Akaroa, Lyttelton, Whangarei & Auckland & Pacific islands	
26963	No	Moffat			We support boat safety submission 1. For pontoon at public ramp 2. Extension of rock breakwater 3. Building breakwater at end of rock bund 4. Breakwater protecting old marina 5. Retain trailer and car parking	1. Move coastguard to inner harbour. Reason - weather could hamper their operations in an emergency 2. Keep public access to Godley Quay for viewing from cellphone tower to Naval Point	The old marina with new breakwater is an income source that will generate funds for further development.	Yes	No		
26937	Yes	De Lu	Spokes Canterbury						Yes		CCC-Naval-Point-Final
26935	No	Stirling	Kai Ngaru Waka Ama Club	Option 2	A: Option One is limited in a number of key elements ie: 1. Less parking 2. Less space for maneuvering waka, yachts and motor boats 3. One entrance point for all Naval Point users 4. Less rigging areas for non motorised vessels in particular Waka Ama	MOST 1. More parking, more space, better entrance flow for all vehicles due to the addition of land swap from LPC which is essential to enable option two to work. 2. Bigger breakwater 3. Rugby Club rooms position and parking there. B: LEAST; 1. Given that Waka Ama clubs are presently positioned in the best possible placement within Naval Point, to move anywhere else in the compound is substantially less in terms of access to water via the ramps, rigging areas for our Waka and storage.	Removal of most of the marina is essential because if option two is approved then the larger breakwater will restrict entrance and disembarkment of vessels from Naval Point at the western end. Kai Ngaru Waka Ama have been involved in numerous meetings with the Christchurch City Council and the project team to work together with other clubs in feeding back our requirements and expectations in the Naval Point redevelopment. We understand the pressure that the project team is working under and the	Yes	Yes	Kai Ngaru Waka Ama Club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>2. Quantity of storage for existing users !" space in both options is not big enough</p> <p>3. Safet" Travelling from storage areas for Waka Ama to new hand launching ramp involves navigating traffic in which case storage areas need to be close to ramps.</p> <p>4. Regards to the new Hand Launching ramp we need to know more about its design, how it would work plus it also needs long narrow jetty for Waka Ama to pull alongside to pick up and drop off crew.</p> <p>5. Facilities !" we would appreciate access to showers, toilets, meeting room where possible especially if these can be shared by all Waka Ama clubs thereby making it more inclusive.</p>	<p>numerous stakeholders involved but remain somewhat disappointed that our views have not been reflected in the current options and there does not appear to be enough space provided for current users. We would like to see a more detailed plan showing indicative allocations and locations for current users.</p>				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26933	No	May			<p>Personal Background</p> <p>I grew up in Diamond Harbour and have been involved in Yachting and other water activities on Lyttelton Harbour for most of my life. After a car accident 25 years ago left me a paraplegic I was able to continue sailing and represented New Zealand at three Paralympics as well as a strong involvement in disabled sailing groups throughout the country including being a member of Yachting New Zealand's Committee for Sailors with Disabilities.</p> <p>I am a member of the Naval Point club.</p> <p>Context for my submission</p> <p>After my experience with disabled sailing groups in the other major centres around New Zealand and overseas my intention is to work to provide those same opportunities for the people of Christchurch. The only major hurdle to providing that opportunity is a safe and accessible venue to access the water.</p>	<p>My preferred option is Option 2 for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The large breakwater protects the whole shore allowing for the development of facilities that will provide safe accessible access to the water. - The larger enclosed area of the option 2 breakwater will provide a protected area where people with disabilities can safely experience being on the water 			Yes	Naval Point Club	
26932	Yes	Brinsdon	Canterbury District Health Board								NavalPointDevelopment2019
26917	No	Hardwick		Option 1	I like the scouts den, and the trees around it	It doesn't have scouts den	Don't get rid of it, because people use it just fix it	Yes	Yes	Lyttelton Scouts	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26916	No	Williams		Option 2	<p>No enough protection for swimmers. Whilst I'm not a boatie I feel there is not enough protection for the boats.</p> <p>A combination of aspects of both plans would be in my mind the best option. As a Lyttelton resident there are a number of "historical" land swaps regards access that need to be resolved. Contaminated land remediation - who will pay for this - Oil Companies, there needs to be equitable access for all users. The balance between council funded facilities and commercial operators e.g. haul out. Retain toilet facilities at current NPYC site.</p>	There is more protection for both boats & swimmers	It's a bit of an eyesore - good to see it tidied up	Yes	Yes	Fit & Able	
26851	Yes	McKitterick	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited, Mobil Oil NZ Limited								Oil-Companies-Feedback-to-CCC-re-Naval-Point.pdf
26846	No	Young	Lyttelton Community Association		<p>The decision by the Christchurch City Council to invest nearly \$11 million dollars into naval Point is to be applauded.</p> <p>We realise the development options you outline in your booklet are more a less a starting point and we wish to make the following points in a constructive sense even though criticism may be felt.</p> <p>1. The necessity to reposition the Naval Point Yacht Club and combine the same with the Coastguard, in our opinion is a very sound idea, however the final say should remain with these two organisations and we would support the outcome.</p> <p>2. The need for public walking and recreational areas is paramount to any development and some</p>	<p>7. The reciting of the facilities for the Lyttelton Football Club seems a good option and our support will be for the wishes of the Club.</p> <p>8. Regarding the taking of the major part of Charlotte Jane Quay from the community from the Christchurch City Council with no consultation (about 5 years ago) it is opportune for the Council to now require the Lyttelton Port Company to hand over their land in the Naval Point Compound area as fair exchange, this way gaining ownership of this land and the shore front land leading to the Oil Wharf as discussed in item 5 of our</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>form of fishing jetty is desirable.</p> <p>3. The future of freedom camping in the area should be a matter for discussion including the Government, as Tourism is of national benefit and the costing should be apportioned equally.</p> <p>4. The total lack of haul out and repair area for boat owners is a major concern, for this area not to be included in your plan is a problem. This is a major item for any port that has recreational boating facilities.</p> <p>5. The decision of the Christchurch City Council to part with ownership of the two remaining Tank Farm Quays in exchange for some Lyttelton Port Company land in the Naval Point area needs to be questioned, whilst having some more land in the immediate area maybe desirable, we feel strongly that any land swap must include the remaining shore area from the end of Godley Quay around to the area approaching the oil Wharf. Up until recently this area has always been used for public access and whilst it may also been used by Lyttelton Port Company for some storage, it is no longer needed for that purpose. Close proximity to the fuel tanks is no argument against this acquisition especially as you will not have enough land for all developments, and as we have outlined in item 4 of our submission, these people need to be catered for and especially as the type of work they do is fairly passive environmentally.</p> <p>6. The retention of the Lyttelton Sea Scouts Den in its present position is a major requirement of our submission and unless the Sea Scouts who incidentally have had very little consultation from the Christchurch City Council, require otherwise we will hold this position.</p>	<p>submission.</p> <p>9. The total lack of a transport plan is a major failure of this proposal and whilst the other issues we have covered are still in their initial planning stages and can be modified as seen fit, a transport plan is really in our opinion, and for the residents, a necessity and has not been done. Two years ago the Lyttelton Community Association held a public meeting at which we set out to impress on the Lyttelton Port Company the need to have Godley Quay made one way downhill to near the dock and the return road for all traffic coming back to Lyttelton, brought around the back of the new marina along the old railway line and up to Sutton Quay to Norwich Quay.</p> <p>Christchurch City Council Community Board member and Councillor were present at the meeting as were Lyttelton Port Company Managers but they failed to consider the issue and the Council failed to enact it. Incidentally we have records from former Residents Groups dating from the early 1980!™s until now trying to have this done, so now you are stuck with formulating a transport plan. Good luck.</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26845	No	Duncan		Option 2	<p>My preference is for option 2 although the layout needs changing.</p> <p>I Like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The breakwater. It is essential for safe boat launching o It needs to be slightly further from the shore to enable safe manoeuvring for sailing vessels. o Potential conflicts with dinghies or traffic from the public ramp. o It needs to be done first. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The separate hand launching ramp. o The ramp needs to have a firm surface, i.e., concrete of the like and not sand. o The coastguard ramp needs to be further west to give the sailing dinghies more room to manoeuvre. - The approximate location of the proposed NPCL/Coast guard building. - The land swap idea. - Using the railway line for pedestrian, bike and emergency access. <p>I do not like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The separation of the west rigging and storage area and the hand launching ramp and rigging area. - It is a long way to pull a dinghy from one area to the other. - There is a potential conflict between moving dinghies from one area to the other and trailer yacht traffic. - The rigging and dinghy storage area needs to be extended north and the west rigging and storage area used for trailer yacht rigging and storage. - The lack of a start -box! for yacht racing. It needs to be near the proposed youth play zone on the south east sea frontage. 		<p>The Marina</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of the existing marina needs to be retained, with public access. 	Yes	Yes	<p>I have been a member at NPCL for decades.</p> <p>I am the secretary/ treasurer for the South Island Finn Association. Our members are the largest sailing dinghy class currently regularly sailing from Naval Point.</p>	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The location of the youth play zone on the SE sea frontage. - The side is too exposed and no one currently uses that area. - It needs to be near the jetty on the sheltered western end of the area where youth currently congregate. - The small size of the proposed trailer yacht storage area. It is much smaller than the current facility. - The entrance/exit of the proposed trailer storage area is wrong. It needs to be further west so they can drive straight through to the launching area without having to several tight right hand turns. <p>Other Matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There needs to be provision for haul out area for boat maintenance. - The building height restrictions need to allow for a future dry stack facility for storing boats. - I like the land swap idea. 						

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26843	Yes	Newman	Naval Point Club Lyttelton		<p>1) The permanent parking for trailer yachts (and other boats) needs to be increased significantly. this is due to the CCC reducing section sizes and increasing percentage coverage (in the new Town Plan) which means there is nowhere to park recreational trailers.</p> <p>2) The NPCL need a secure area from the public to be able to safely carry out their core activity which is providing access and organized water activities to their members.</p> <p>3) A start box is needed on the south shore to enable the race activities to continue. Please note that LPC built a marina that they expected to take 3 years to fill, but in 18 months it is fully subscribed. It shows you build a great facility it will get used.</p> <p>PLEASE REMEMBER THIS WITH THIS DEVELOPMENT I also fully support the submission by the Naval Point Club Lyttelton which I have attached</p>						NPCL-Submission-on-Naval-Point-development

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26842	Yes	Brown			<p>Neither option provides indication of how trailer yacht owners can continue to have secure on site storage for a rigged yacht.</p> <p>Option 1 does not have the separate entry and exit routes that I think are a valuable feature of Option 2</p>	<p>Neither option provides indication of how trailer yacht owners can continue to have secure on site storage for a rigged yacht.</p> <p>One of the main negatives of Naval Point is the safety aspect when a Southerly change occurs. A breakwater as proposed will mitigate the dangers however it is clearly an expensive feature. I have provided a much much cheaper options in my attached Submission document that eliminates the viability risks associated with a breakwater solution.</p>	<p>I agree with the proposal to substantially reduce this structure. It is not a suitable location for a viable marina as has been demonstrated by historical events. It is however a perfect option for casual or visiting boat docking and also the idea of using it for all manner of other recreation such as jumping/diving, fishing, picnicing etc is very commendable.</p> <p>Also -</p> <p>My son previously enjoyed secondary school sailing and sea scout activities from here.</p> <p>I regularly use it with friends to go sea kayaking.</p>	Yes	Yes	<p>Naval Point Club Lyttelton.</p> <p>Mount Pleasant Yacht Club</p>	Development-Options-For-Naval-Point-R4-Allan-Brown.pdf
26834	No	van Haandel		Option 2		it sounds as if this option is more future focussed i.e. taking the long view.		Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26833	No	Targus		Option 1	<p>Keeping the scout den! The trees surrounding the field are really positive to keeping the area layered and protected. The rugby club location would maximise the new as would the Naval Point club with coastguard. Extra ramps can only enhance the safety of water entry.</p>	<p>I like option 2 mostly because the longer breakwater would protect small boat entry in and out of ramps. However I would want to keep the scout den within the plans which may mean just taking some parking spaces away and building around us!</p> <p>I am excited to see the plans actually reaching a realistic action and look forward to making better use of a space with so much potential. As scouts we use the trees and the field with all our activities and look forward to lighter nights when we can easily access the water. I am keen to ensure that this connection of the land, sea & scouts continues and that our valuable den is kept at the heart of this development. The young people that benefit from this cannot be ignored as the plans take shape. Which includes keeping the trees even if the sacrifice car parking - of which there is way more than needed.</p>	I think for safety of the marina both in structure & environmentally the best thing is to remove it	Yes	Yes	Lyttelton Sea Scouts & Lyttelton Rugby Club.	
26831	No	Anderson		Option 2	Breakwater not big enough	I agree with option 2 but keep finger "A" for public and fence of finger B - C and put all boats in Marina on C	<p>Yes I don't want marina to go because that's the only place to take the overflow from inner harbour.</p> <p>The inner harbour is full does this mean one the Magazine Marina goes there is no where else you can tie up. There are very few swing moorings available.</p>	No	Yes	MBBHA	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26818	No	Jolliffe		Option 2	<p>1. Construction of breakwater - boat safety</p> <p>2. Scot building being retained in current position least apparent complete removal of "historic" rugby pavilion</p>	<p>Better use of ex railway corridor</p> <p>Relocation of rugby building to west field</p> <p>Boat safety options common to both options.</p> <p>While I am pleased to see the progress made with development options (which I know as an ex member of Lyttelton Community Board for several terms!) with consideration being given to water safety, sporting facilities, young folks activities etc, one option not included & I am very aware of space, is dog exercise or dog park area, which would give dog owners more options, 7 could negate all the negativity given to dogs & owners who have upset the rugby club & other sports bodies using the Rec ground. Previous boards have asked this option to be investigated.</p>		Yes	No		
26816	No	Cockburn-Campbell		Option 1	We get to keep scout den!	<p>We don't get a scout den</p> <p>I like the rotated Rec ground</p>		Yes	Yes	<p>Lyttelton Sea Scouts</p> <p>Naval Point Yacht Club</p>	
26814	No	Rouse		Option 1	<p>Support Plan 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Safety and ease of launching & retrieving boats - Scout den remaining - ease of access for their boats, not having to raise large sums of money - Size of floating platform 	<p>Support Plan 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Magazine Bay Marina is important, keep it, upgrade it & maintain it - Keep Godley Quay for public access to the waterfront 	Only boat owners & guests	No	No	But I've been sailing in the harbour many times & really	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Queuing of boats & cars to use ramp - Marina needs to be full of boats (in safety) this will aid funding re: maintenance - Plenty of parking - Keep boat maintenance area - Breakwater is too short for maximal shelter - Angled end won't work in rough conditions - Don't turn the sports field because takes too much parking space & haul out yard (boat maintenance) - Combined coast guard building doesn't seem to be necessary, who'll fund it in an ongoing way - Why is the coast guard ramp extending so far? (hazard) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The marina enhances Lyttelton - A pedestrian walkway along the water front from the club house at least to the cell phone tower <p>Plan 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support windsurfers remaining in their area / boat maintenance area remaining / scout den remaining / storage area should keep current size and shape <p>I support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plan 1 - I support the 4th lane being added to the ramp <p>Plan 3 - Breakwater enhances safety & enjoyment</p> <p>Plan 4 - Separates motor and hand launch sailing, good</p> <p>Plan 5 - Acts as breakwater for safety</p> <p>Plan 1 - Pontoon needs to be first priority. Vital for safety & to break waves in rough weather - ensures inner area is relatively calm - affects large number of people-loading & un-loading passengers (especially children) & gear, will be a breeze with this pontoon.</p>					enjoyed it.	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26812	No	Rouse			I prefer option 1 maintain the present sports ground as is, scout den to remain on current site, easy access to ramp, retain boat maintenance area, marina needs to be full of boats & protected, require maximum parking for boat trailers & vehicles.	Breakwater is too short for maximum shelter angle end won't work in rough conditions. Coast Guard buildings doesn't seem to be required here I support the following: Plan 4 - separates motor & hand launch sailing Plan 5 - Concrete pontoon to break the waves Plan 1 - Pontoon to protect loading and launching of boats on ramp. I support the fourth ramp for loading & launching.	I support plan 1 one, plan 2 - I support the magazine Bay marina, plan 3 I support the current area for wind surfers, plan 4 I support the present boat storage area in size & shape, plan 5 I support proposed breakwater & safety it provides. Why take the risk with swimmers - stay at Corsair Bay	No	No	But I have been sailing in the harbour for many years on club charge.	
26809	No	Williams		Option 2	Do not like No 1 prefer option 2 the first thing we need is a breakwater and repair marina		Bad idea!! Need developing - Keep fingers A - B - C Be big mistake to remove marina	No	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26808	Yes	Mathieson			<p>NONE - Absolute rubbish what you propose for the area.</p> <p>Our thoughts are that any redevelopment of Naval Point should start at Magazine Bay. The potential to recoup the development cost is there.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To build a Rock breakwater linking onto indigenous reefs. To retain the 100 berth marina To add floating berths to existing marina. <p>The high cliff that bounds this area needs to be sloped back to an angle that makes them earthquake safe. The cost of doing this can be shared by the stakeholders. This will pay for a part of the breakwater. This can be done under the guise of safety. Safety supersedes cultural importance. This is a time for the council to think big, do it right, do it once.</p>	<p>Take a look at the breakwaters built around NZ, many with a quarry beside. There are not enough safe berthage for CHCH boat owners. If we had the berths, the boating population would grow. There is no city in NZ with such prestige cruising. Banks Peninsula is unique with its two large harbours and amass of mini fjords all on our doorstep. Making the cliffs earthquake safe, save but one life, then we would say well done.</p> <p>Think big, and take a huge step for Christchurch.</p> <p>Spirit Wind Berth A 11</p>			Yes	<p>Magazine Bay Marina Berth Holders Assn</p> <p>Naval Point Club</p>	Mathieson-Submission.pdf
26807	No	Shanks			Plan 1 - add fourth lane to public ramp, add concrete pontoon to seaward side of ramp	Plan 2 - retain existing marina - income generating. plan 3 - support proposal to split breakwater as per plan 3, plan 4 split club ramp	Plan 5 - Breakwater - concrete screwed to seabed		Yes	Waimakariri Sailing Club and rate payer of CCC and user of facilities for launching yachts	
26806	No	Cassidy		Option 1	I like the scouts den, and the trees surrounding it. I don't live in Lyttelton, so I don't really know anywhere else in Lyttelton.	No Comment	Please don't bulldoze the scout den. It is the oldest scout den/unit in New Zealand. Also me and the rest of the scouts really like it here. I don't live in Lyttelton, and I won't be able to see my scouts friends anymore.	Yes	Yes	Lyttelton Sea Scouts	
26805	No	Bluett		Option 1	Keep the scout den, save the trees. No youth "play" zone, keep the scout den and save the trees.	save the scout den and the trees	No	Yes	Yes	Naval Point	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
										Yacht Club, Lyttelton Sea Scouts	
26804	No	Hubball			Money awarded for the Kristine Bouw's safety project nothing else. Support plan 1 - 1st priority, plan 2 - keep Marina for boats, plan 3 - boat storage and yard, plan 4 - beach for hand launch, plan 5 - for pontoon & breakwater. Support boat safety submission, no coast guard ramp, not in the right place. Keep the scout den, purchase or buy LPC land, as much trailer carparking as possible. Walkway along waterfront which community can enjoy		The marina needs to be kept at all costs	No	No	Recreational user	
26803	No	Hubball			We want the boat safety submission, no ramp for coast guards as its not safe, more car parking, happy with how the sports fields and the scout den, buy or obtain more port land, and a walk path for everyone to use. The original money requested was for Kristine Bouw's boat safety and is what it should be used for. We support plan 1, firstly, plan 2 should be for boats, plan 3 the breakwater, boats storage & haul out yard plan beach & hand launch, Plan 5 breakwater & pontoon		It needs to be kept as it is, it would be dangerous mixing boats & swimmers	No		We are just casual users	
26802	No	Taylor		Option 1	Retain scout den, leave sports ground as is, retain haul out for boat maintenance, keep a maximum car parking area, short breakwater no merit, coastguard proposed ramp intrudes into sailing area. Plan 3 split breakwater makes sense for wave protection, marina	LEAST: Loss of haul out yard, loss of access to Godley Quay, loss of scout den, circular roadway poor use of land, coast guard ramp too long, includes new land purchased from LPC	Why do you need to remove the existing marina with no replacement planned? Leave it there as per plan 2. Support plan 1 as a priority. Initially with pontoon from plan 5 - Not on marina public ramp protection, club ramp, public ramp and hand launch beach protection. Plan 5 concrete pontoon to create a safe breakwater - weight is needed!	No	Yes	Social member of Naval Point	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26801	No	Everson			Keep existing scout den, keep existing sports field. Support for plan 1, plan 2 support 4th lane on ramp. Keep existing marina. plan 3 support the building of breakwater, plan 4 - support, plan 5 use at ramp pontoons & breakwater	Oppose	Keep marina	No		Recreational user	
26800	No	Taylor		Option 1	Leave sports ground as at present, scout den as is as it works, need haul out area as a necessity for Canterbury boat maintenance. Plan 3 with split and extended protection will make launching ramps and marina safer in all weather. Plan 5 - concrete floater to be used as in plan 3 and as a concrete breakwater which would be a safer option, as weight and structure would prevent severe storm damage	Loss of haul out and scout den both of which are essential, cost of changing sports ground not economically justified. Breakwater should be straight and long to offer protection	Plan one should be priority first. There is no sound reason to remove marina, leave as plan 2, income would equal maintenance cost. Swimmers and boats don't mix (dangerous).	No	Yes	Naval Point Club Lyttelton Inc. Race officer & rescue boat organiser / operator	
26799	No	Chisnall			Keep scout den, retain field as is, support for boat safety plan	Need to buy additional LPC land, sort coast guard ramp not to be a hazard, support for plan no 1		No	Yes	NZJBA, regular boatie	
26798	No	Ensor		Option 1	Historic - should be kept (Scout Den), sports field should stay. Support for plan 1 (pontoon & marina), plan 2 support for 4th lane on ramp, keep existing marina for recreational use/public, plan 3 breakwater - support improvements, Plan 4 support, plan 5 great plan for pontoon & breakwater	Opposed	Keep it	No	No	Recreational user	
26797	No	Jackson			Keep scout den - keeping the sports field as it is now, keep the haul out yard for boat maintenance it is important, do not rotate the sports field as it takes up too much carparking. Purchase of LPC land for additional space is a great outcome. Support the boat safety submission. Support plan 1 priority, plan 2 needed for boatowners, plan 3 the breakwater - the boat storage yard and the haul out as is. Keep the wind surfers where they are. Plan 4 hand launch beach and plan 3 breakwater. Plan 5 breakwater - concrete structure will break the waves and to be used for the breakwater and pontoon			Yes	Yes	I am a recreational user	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26796	No	Cullens	Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron	Option 2	<p>What is essential?</p> <p>Of the utmost importance for Trailer Yachting is a safe place to launch and retrieve the yachts. We are poorly served by the current facilities. In southerly winds launching and retrieval is often not possible and can be down right dangerous. Last season 4 races had to be abandoned as launching was unsafe. There have several races with small fleets as some owners were not prepared to launch.</p> <p>Lyttelton is prone to changeable weather. A real worry is if there is a sudden and unexpected deterioration of the weather before yachts could be retrieved.</p> <p>Therefore the first and foremost requirement for Trailer Yachts is a breakwater to protect the launching area and reduce the size of waves there. Floating pontoons on the launching ramp allow safe access to the yacht being launched or retrieved without getting in harms way.</p> <p>Second requirement is for a storage compound where trailer yachts can be stored with their mast up and available for use.</p> <p>Activity Most racing takes place on Saturday and Wednesday from spring to autumn while winter racing is held Sunday afternoons in May and June.</p> <p>Entries for Saturday racing can get up to 17 while on fine Wednesday evening numbers can exceed 25.</p> <p>Cruising yachts are hard to get numbers for as their activity is not structured but one autumn Sunday at least 6 yachts were on the water. It looks as</p>	<p>Option 2</p> <p>The Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron supports this option.</p> <p>However</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The breakwater is too close to the slipways creating a hazard in the event of vessels being towed to the ramp area. The breakwater needs to be moved 30m further out to sea to give safe ingress from both eastern and western ends. <p>Comment: In a heavy swell the towed and towing yacht are at risk of grounding on the breakwater or the spit.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Locating dinghy rigging close to the cliff means it will create a traffic hazard with dinghies needing to cross the path of trailer yachts reversing and coming from the NPC slipway. As a matter of safety, crossing paths between towed trailers and hand trolleys should be avoided. 3. Relocating the Trailer Yacht compound to the proposed dinghy rigging area will solve this problem. It will also give a shape that will allow more efficient storage of more yachts. 4. The proposed Trailer Yacht compound is too small and makes turning in and out difficult, 	<p>The Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron (CTYS) is an incorporated society focused on supporting and facilitating Trailer Yachting in Canterbury. CTYS was formed in 1964 and enjoys a close relationship with the Naval Point Club. Our membership currently stands at 158. As these members are nearly yacht owners and numbers sailing on a trailer yacht average 3.5 it can be seen the squadron is providing services to about 500 yachtsmen.</p> <p>Trailer yachts were largely developed at Lyttelton and the squadron is a member of, and the single largest grouping within, the New Zealand Trailer Yacht Association. This body is recognised by Yachting New Zealand. Trailer yachts make up the largest sailing group at Naval Point.</p> <p>Trailer yachts are yachts that are able to be towed on a road trailer on the road. The original concept was to have a yacht that can be easily sailed by parents with their children. There are still parents and children sailing trailer yachts. One of our members who sailed from the inception of the squadron recently stopped sailing when he turned 90.</p>		Yes		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>though most went to Quail Island. Cruising sailing has been growing, often with families.</p> <p>Trailer yachts are crewed between 2 and 6 people.</p> <p>Comment on Options:</p> <p>Option 1 This option is not supported.</p> <p>The short breakwater does not protect the NPC slipway that is used by almost all Trailer Yachts. As stated above launching and retrieval in a safe environment is an essential feature. The trailer yacht storage compound is a better shape being a regular ovoid layout.</p>	<p>especially for those with extended drawbar on their trailers.</p> <p>5. The field and roading take up too much room and places an excessive weighting in favour of land based activities.</p> <p>6. There appears to be an excess of roading and car parking with a dearth of trailer parking.</p> <p>Comment: Option 1 provides trailer parking of 120 and car parking for 126. Option 2 provides trailer parking for 112 and car parking for 250</p> <p>Problem with Both Options: Not making a provision for a haulout creates a problem for the squadron. There is a gantry there which is used by members to lift their yacht off the trailer so they can work on its undersides.</p> <p>Finally: As mentioned previously any reduction of trailer yacht storage at Naval Point will seriously impact on the future of Trailer Yachting at Lyttelton. There are not alternative locations where trailer yachts can be launched and with the trend to smaller sections members may be unable to park their yachts at home.</p> <p>The opportunity to make a submission is greatly appreciated</p>	<p>Trailer yachts are used both for racing and cruising around Lyttelton harbour and the surrounding bays.</p> <p>Commodore</p> <p>Naval Point is vital to the squadron as it is the only place close to Christchurch with deep water access at all tides. it is also essential to have trailer yacht storage close to the launching area. On reason for this is if yachts had to be trailed from off the site masts would have to be lowered. This can take nearly an hour on some boats. This means for a two hour race a similar time would be spent readying the yacht for sailing at the start of the day and the for the road at the end. In addition extra manpower required for raising and lowering the mast may restrict family activity.</p> <p>The loss of any Trailer Yacht storage spaces will therefore have a devastating effect on Trailer Yachting in Canterbury. There is almost always a waiting list for space in the compound. At present there</p>				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
							are 6 yachts waiting for storage spaces. Of the 153 yachts on the squadrons register 115 have permanent slots in the storage compound.				
26795	No	Chisnall			Keep the scout den & the field the way it is. Support for the boat safety plan, support for plan option 1 - this must be a first priority, would have to buy LPC land, coast guard ramp is a hazard.	Plan 2 - keep the marina for recreational boat people like me. Plan 3 is perfect (makes the harbour safe). Plan 4 - hand launch beach is important. Plan 5 - concrete structure is great for breakwater and pontoon at the ramp					
26794	No	Jackson			Keep the scout den plus sports field as it is now, keeping the haul out yard is important for boat maintenance	Do not turn the sports field around because it takes up too much room purchase of LPC land for additional space is a great outcome.	Support boat safety submission, support plan one is our priority, plan 2 for marina for boat owners, plan 3 the breakwater & the boat storage yard and the haul out yard as it is. Keep the windsurfers and launch beach and plan 3 breakwater plan 5 is the breakwater concrete, concrete will break in waves to be used for the breakwater and pontoon, I am a recreational user as well.				
26793	No	Chisnall			Keep the scout den, keep the field the way it is, support the boat safety plan, support for plan number 1 first priority please	Would have to buy LPC land, coast guard ramp is a hazard	Plan 2 - keep marina Plan 3 is great makes it safe Plan 4 is to have a hand launch beach Plan 5 concrete structure is great for break water and ramp pontoon	No	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26792	No	Williams		Option 1	<p>Most - Retain current Scout Den (historical purposes)</p> <p>Most - Current field takes less space</p> <p>Least - Coast guard ramps potential hazard due to length</p> <p>Least - Walkway safer along foreshore between ramps - keeps people of carpark</p>	<p>Least - Boat repair yard area is missing. A valuable area for boat owners</p> <p>Least - Very limited carparking available</p> <p>Least - Where is the Scout Den?</p> <p>Least Proposed - Coastguard ramp protrudes out a long way. Potential hazard</p> <p>Least - Walkway concerns - as above</p>	<p>To propose to remove the marina doesn't make sense as owners use this facility. It provides storage for boats on the water and is an income to the boating community.</p> <p>The proposal to have swimmers near where boats are appears dangerous</p> <p>oat owner that uses this facility</p> <p>Other comments: Safety is paramount. Plan 1 with concrete pontoon is excellent and looks functional, easily accessible, safely, - proposed breakwater in Plan 3 also ultimately required I support the Boat Safety Plan (short & long term) To keep the mariner is essential as boat owners need somewhere affordable to store boats on the water. Storage yard on land also essential to a a well function boating facility. Haul out yard is required to maintenance & safety. Current wind surfing works well. Plan 4 - Hand launch & motor launch need to be kept separate - safety reasons. Plan 5 - No waves in launching area is required for safer launching of vessels. Concrete pontoon example looks excellent at ramp and for proposed breakwater</p>	No	No		
26791	No	Ensor			I support boat safety submission dated 27th June 2019. Including plans 1, 2, 3, 4, except breakwaters to be as shown on plans 3 & 5.	Boat safety must be ahead of other amenity development with the	The marina should be retained with income form berthing	No	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						highest priority being given to plan 1.	rental used for on-going maintenance				
26790	No	Ashby			No! Can do better as outlined below * I support the Boat Safety submission plus plans 1, 2, 3 and 5, and the beach concept on plan 4 although the breakwater layout in plan 3 * I support the walkway along the walkway	Christchurch / Lyttelton needs improvement for boating. keep swimmers out of the Jetty structure area for safety purposes	Do NOT remove the Marina. Develop it! The whole marina retained. I am a ratepayer and use the facilities Other comments: Pontoon on the ramp is No 1 Priority. It needs to be a heavy pontoon for wave attenuation		Yes		
26789	No	Connolly			Support boat safety submission. Keep field same as present. Keep Haul out area as is with gantry, boat storage yard for CTYS yacht as per present. I would like to support plan 1 as a priority	Plan two is needed for present, boat owners as per plan two	I would like to support plan four, I would like to support plan five for break water and pontoon at the ramp.	No	Yes	N.P.L	
26788	No	Hynds			Boat safety plans & plans 1 2 3 4 5					Other comments: Boat storage 4 yachts	
26787	No	Hynds			Boat safety plan Plan 1 Plan 2 Plan 3 Plan 4 Plan 5	Keep sports ground as is. Keep Scout Den Yacht storage				Other comments: Safe boating 4 all to enjoy	
26786	No	Brittenden			I support the boat safety submission for safe entry and exit on the water. Support plans 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, sports field should be retained as is.	Option 2 - loses too much parking space. A walkway along the waterfront would be useful for the community to enjoy		No	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26785	No	None			Support boat safety submission. Looks great Support: Plan 1 Plan 2 for fundraising / boats to maintain everything Plan 4 but Plan 5 breakwater Plan 3 is awesome breakwater to - stop debree and large waves and wind surfing area				No		
26784	No	Nicholson			Support Boat safety submission No I vote for option 3	No	The Marina should stay	Yes	Yes		
26783	No	Robinson			Support boat safety submission: Plan 1 Plan 2 Plan 3 Plan 4 Plan 5	Keep Scout Den Coast Guard Ramp needs more thought/discussion as current location is in the way of other water users	Put a break water in and allow Marina to fill up again. Can provide an income for breakwater maintenance. Other comments: Keep field as status quo Walkway - cell phone tower to club ramp good idea		Yes	Naval Point Yacht Club - Rescue Boat Driver/Crew	
26782	No	Douglas			I support the boat safety submission. Option 1 - Keep the field as is, retain scout den	Option 2 - loses too much parking space, but if LPC land is obtained this greatly increases parking space. Support Plan 1, Plan 2, Plan 3, Plan 4, Plan 5	I would like to see the Marina kept for the boat owners - upgrade and improve it	No	No		
26781	No	Edens			Support boat safety submission Option 1 - great option to relieve pressure on traffic Plan 2 - To help funding Plan 3 - Breakwater needed for safer boat handling Plan 4 - Upgraded public area	Option 2 - good to retain existing structure Option 5 - needed for decent breakwater	Would like to retain marina for public viewing and walkways Boat safety is more important regards these options considering conditions at times		Yes	Casual sailer	
26780	No	Gregor			Boat safety plan to make it safer for all users		must be kept at all costs		No		
26779	No	Waldron			Support boat safety plan, plan 1, plan 2, plan 3, plan 4, plan 5, trailer, yacht storage						

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26778	No	Withall			Support boat safety submission, Plan 1 Plan 2 Plan 3 Plan 4 Plan 5	Keep Scout Den as is. As much car & trailer parking as possible plus LPC Land	Keep Godley Quay for access to public viewing areas Walkway from cell tower to Naval Point Leave wind surfers area as is now Other comments: The existing public ramp has always needed a jetty/walkway on both sides & with the proposed pontoon will make it a lot safer & more useable for all boaties		No	Christchurch City Ratepayer & Rescue Boat operator, 50 years	
26777	No	Owen			Support boat safety submission, plan 1, plan 2, plan 3, plan 4, plan 5, no coast guard ramp location not suitable	Keep scout den, as much car & trailer parking as possible plus LPC land	Keep Godley Quay for access to public viewing area walkway from cell tower to naval point ramp. Keep win surfer area as is now.		No		
26775	No	Cole			Support boat safety submission, plan 1, plan 2, plan 3, plan 4, plan 5. No coast guard ramp location not suitable	Keep scout den, as much car & trailer parking as possible plus L.P.C land	Keep Godley Quay for public viewing area		Yes		
26774	No	Ensor			Keep field existing orientation, keep scout den, support plan #1, Plan #5 - breakwater unit for ramp & breakwater	Keep the marina as an active revenue stream - build up spit, plan 3 - keep breakwater as per plan	CRAZY!! Plan 4 - All good apart from breakwater. Leave windsurf area	No	No		
26773	No	Nicholson			Prefer plan 4. Full break water with plan 3 break water with concrete pontoons and marina for boats	n/a	Don't want marina removed need marina to stay	Yes	No		
26770	Yes	Nolan	Canterbury Yachting Association	Option 2	Refer to attached Document.	Refer to attached Document.	Refer to attached Document.	Yes	Yes	Canterbury Yachting Association	CYA-Submission.pdf

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26769	Yes	Denney	waitaha paddling club	Option 2		<p>I support the breakwater for safety reasons as it reduces waves by 2/3s, which makes it easier to get in and off the water for waka paddlers, our novices and visitors, and for other users around us.</p> <p>I support the Hand Launch ramp designed for waka, dinghy and paddleboard launches, to keep us separate from powered launches from vehicle trailers. It is a good idea to keep us away from vehicles and having to wait for big boats, but there are some issues, mainly that the new launch ramp (of concrete not sand as suggested) will be public and not Naval Point club owned, and our storage will be on Naval Point club land, and we need them close to each other. I request the ramp be made wide enough for all users, and that there is a big area around it for rigging and trailers and trolleys, and a couple of washdown areas with water, and vehicle parking nearby for hand users to bring their boats, boards or waka on top of cars.</p> <p>I request a big enough area for waka storage, including under-cover/enclosed areas for equipment. The area must be secure and near our launch ramp, ie not as on the plans under the cliffs where we would have to cross the vehicle trailer access route to the club ramp on the way to the hand ramp. It is not safe to cross a</p>	<p>its good to keep a bit for public use for swimmers to jump off etc</p> <p>I request waka storage areas be secure, as we don't want expensive damage to waka or trailers, as has happened or been reported in other areas. This means that although the hand ramp will be public, we want our storage areas to be clearly within club boundaries for security. To help with this, I request that youth areas are kept away from water sport areas, and to picnic areas and playgrounds etc be kept away from clearly defined boating/club areas. As a member of Naval Point Club we want clearly defined boundaries at the point for security reasons, and to control the area on race days for waka and for boating</p>	Yes	Yes	Waitaha waka Paddling club .	naval-point-development

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						vehicle access route particularly when carrying a single waka! Also we need trailer parking by our storage so we can rig and de-rig waka to take off-side, and vehicle access by the trailer so it can be towed away. A 6 person waka is long, and its trailer for transport is even longer, plus the towing vehicle, so a good amount of parking and moving around space is necessary when waka are to be transported from Naval Point, to race in other locations such as Dunedin. For this reason I also support option 2 which has better transport access roads, and parking areas, and could allow for waka storage to be near the Hand launch ramp.					
26767	Yes	Selway		Option 2	This area has a significant role to perform in relation to providing access to water for recreation. This option offers limited access for water sports.	With the development of the area will come a greater number of water sport users and I am concerned that consideration be given to providing sufficient facilities to meet this increase in demand. The land area already struggles to meet recreational users needs due to its size so any opportunity to increase land area should be taken. Access to the water is at a premium so again, any opportunity to increase launching areas should be taken and this needs to include the ability to leave the water quickly too should weather conditions rapidly change, which does happen on occasions. The breakwater is needed and yet	Retaining what can be retained of the marina is important as it will provide a safe place for boats to tie up prior to using the ramp facilities. It will be important at times when the ramps are busy and make the whole area safer to use.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club Lyttelton. Attached to this submission are research findings from Naval Point Club Lyttelton's Members that was	Naval-Point-Club-Lyttelton-Research-Report-2015-CCC-Submission.pptx

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>at the same time it needs to be designed so as to not limit access in to and out of the harbour by creating a bottleneck. A haul out yard is essential for boating in Lyttelton as it would be unsafe to take a keel boat that requires maintenance out to sea to another port for maintenance. The haul out yard run by NPCL is an important service provided to members and non-members, it also enables DIY boat maintenance which is also essential and is a form of revenue for the club that should not be removed.</p> <p>Attached to this submission are research findings from Naval Point Club Lyttelton's Members that was completed in 2015. It provides insight in to club use, use of the area and needs by members.</p>				completed in 2015. It provides insight in to club use, use of the area and needs by members.	
26765	Yes	Greenfield		Option 2	Please see attached submission document	Please see attached submission document	Good, get rid of it, it's a hazard. Why public access? I thought this was owned and operated by NPCL?	No	Yes	NPCL	Naval-Point-submission-of-Brodie-Greenfield.docx Brodie-Greenfield.doc

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26764	No	Martin		Option 2	east - The break water is miniscule and does not protect much - only the public ramp. There is no protection even for the proposed retention of 'A pier' of the marina for use for day berthing and general public access. The yacht club is also unprotected. The weather can get very bad very quickly.	most - The breakwater protects the whole area.	Some of the marina should be kept. These should be A pier and C pier. A pier could be used as proposed in both option A and option B. There is a need for some permanent berths outside the inner harbour marina because of the very high cost of a berth there. This could be provided by keeping pier C. The day berths would also be accommodated on pier C and these would be away from the swimmers and public that would be using pier A, a safety factor. Over the years, rent has been extracted from berth holders but nothing has been reinvested back into the marina itself. Maybe if it had, the condition of the marina would be as it should be - not run down and thus, ongoing maintenance would not be an issue provided that it is done as a part of a landlords obligation to its tenants. I fully support the submission of the Berthholders Association with respect to the removal of the Marina.	No	Yes	Magazine Bay Berth Holders Association	
26763	No	Sinton		Option 1	The public slipway is too close to the hand launching area. Power boat skippers are often unaware of how to manoeuvre safely around sailing dinghies and the proposed location of the breakwaters will create a bottleneck.	The public slipway is too close to the hand launching area. The proposed breakwater location will make it very difficult to land a skiff in a southerly and the so it should be moved further out.			Yes	Naval point yacht club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26762	No	Milligan	Black Cat Cruises	Option 2	<p>Option 1 is basically taking what is already there and making it prettier. It would do the job as it has been doing so. There does not seem to be much space for Windsurf Rigging.</p> <p>Both Options 1 & 2 seem to have removed the Haulout area operated by Naval Point? Have CCC taken into consideration how yachts are now to be maintained as the current LPC slip facilities are not suitable?</p>	<p>Option 2 would have additional benefits of tidying up the playing fields and additional car parking there. This would link nicely to the marina area.</p> <p>Once again - this option has removed the current haulout facilities run by Naval Point. Unless CCC has a plan for where the yachts from Naval Point (and the new marina) are able to be maintained out of the water, this seems like a rather large oversight.</p>		No	No		
26760	No	Teal	Ms	Option 1	<p>Like - and easier project to complete in stages, scout hall remains, joint coastguard NPC building provided they have separate areas for their particular needs and shared areas, planting which could otherwise be a very bleak space with a great deal of asphalt, re-located position of pavilion although need to check prevailing winds, fishing steps, coastguard ramp</p> <p>Dislike, no indication about the following: tsunami risk, a second in/out escape route, width of roadways to accommodate two large boats coming from opposite directions, the need to collect/recycle water from wash down area, fuel storage for coastguard boats, lack of information about other significant cultural activities, eg reclamation process and HMNZS Tasman, not enough toilets and they would be better located closer to the parking area, rigging area not big enough</p> <p>Generally speaking the flow of vehicles is better although the main route through the planting area could be wider</p>	<p>Dislike re-location of pavilion- and expanded boat trailer parking which means the removal of the scout hall with no clear indication about where this long established sea scout group will have access to the sea.</p> <p>Dislike, no indication about the following: tsunami risk, a second in/out escape route, width of roadways to accommodate two large boats coming from opposite directions, the need to collect/recycle water from wash down area, fuel storage for coastguard boats, lack of information about other significant cultural activities, eg reclamation process and HMNZS Tasman</p>			Yes	Yes, previously involved with sea scout group	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26759	No	Husband		Option 2	<p>Like the most:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retaining the Sea Scouts Building 2. No change in field configuration of the Lyttelton Recreation Ground - prefer money soon on the other facilities. 3. Least cost compared to Option 2 <p>Like the least:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Breakwater too small. If money is to be spent then need to protect the set and build a good breakwater. A decent new breakwater has to be a main priority to give maximum protection 2. Hand launch beach does not appear large enough as shown 3. Coastguard ramp may hinder boats under sail as currently shown 	<p>Like the most:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Larger floating Breakwater - very important there is a good breakwater in place pro to further development. A new breakwater has to be a main priority that gives maximum protection. 2. More parking areas 3. Larger boat trailer storage <p>Like the least:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More expensive than option 1 2. Changes to the Lyttelton Recreation Grounds - this will cost a fair bit of money when preference is to spend the money on upgrading the other water access facilities. 3. No sea scouts building, this should be retained. 4. Coastguard ramp may hinder boats under sail as currently shown 	Good idea to remove the marina adjacent to Magazine Bay as it is poor state. I would rather money spent upgrading the other facilities in the area. Good idea to retain a section of the marina for public use as shown.	Yes	No		
26756	Yes	McGeorge		Option 2	See Attached File	See Attached File	See Attached File	Yes	Yes	Little Ship Club Te Ana Marina Ex Sea Scout Leader	Naval-Point-Submission-to-CCC.pdf

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26754	No	Vincent		Option 2	<p>My Say; My thoughts.</p> <p>In the section labelled -Purpose! it is stated that - Minimal work has been carried out to the wider Naval Point area in recent years! . I would observe that with the numerous communications with the Council not only was minimal work carried out, the activities engaged in were, arguably a deliberate action or inaction designed to reduce the effectiveness of the Marina and drive Marina users out to other facilities. I site the total lack of any response to my repeated inquiries for the risk analysis for the retention of the barrier for vehicle passage to the Marina.</p> <p>In the section labelled -Options overview! there are a number of point listed.</p> <p>Exception is noted with two Points; three and five. The rest are accepted in a general nature although I question the need for any additional rigging area as the existing one has never been fully utilized by other then freedom campers.</p> <p>The third point: This is obviously contrary to the first objective of -making it safer! . Swimmers and boats should never mix.</p> <p>Many boats have engines and these drive propellers. When avoiding a object or maneuvering a vessel to stop or reverse direction a propeller is the object of choice and as such moves rapidly, easily damaging a swimmer.</p> <p>Even a light vessel of one tonne enhanced by a medium wake of 300 mm will kill or maim a swimmer when pinned between a boat and a fixed structure.</p>	<p>Development options for Naval Point</p> <p>My Say; My thoughts.</p> <p>In the section labelled -Purpose! it is stated that -Minimal work has been carried out to the wider Naval Point area in recent years! . I would observe that with the numerous communications with the Council not only was minimal work carried out, the activities engaged in were, arguably a deliberate action or inaction designed to reduce the effectiveness of the Marina and drive Marina users out to other facilities. I site the total lack of any response to my repeated inquiries for the risk analysis for the retention of the barrier for vehicle passage to the Marina.</p> <p>In the section labelled -Options overview! there are a number of point listed.</p> <p>Exception is noted with two Points; three and five. The rest are accepted in a general nature although I question the need for any additional rigging area as the existing one has never been fully utilized by other then freedom campers.</p> <p>The third point: This is obviously contrary to the first objective of -making it safer! .</p>	<p>Option 2: Exception is noted with points four and five. The other points are accepted in a general sense. Points four and five: The destruction of the existing Marina facilities as proposed is just the logical end point of deliberate action and inaction to remove the marina and deprive the Berth holders.</p> <p>An alternative solution is to utilize the existing structures of the outer most pier and the existing anchor blocks of the previous breakwater to form a new floating breakwater and retain the middle portion of the marina where existing vessels could easily be retained utilizing already replaced piles and a limited number of new piles. Berth holder ownership could easily be adjusted as necessary. This leaves pier A for the proposed stated use with out swimming access. Swimmers could easily be catered for in Corsair Bay where a no propeller zone already exists. As a Marathon swimmer I do understand the need for vehicle and person separation. A further disadvantage with Option two as with Option one is the complete disadvantage of those currently being forced to relinquish the existing Marina and therefore inhibiting their</p>			The destruction of the existing Marina facilities as proposed is just the logical end point of deliberate action and inaction to remove the marina and deprive the Berth holders of their rights in law. the minimal work carried out, the activities engaged in were, arguably a deliberate action or inaction designed	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>Having occupied the Marina when there were clear signs for no swimming in the marina, I assure you there will be swimmers, and there will be vessels and there will be excessive wake.</p> <p>Further the removal of the Marina is just the logical end of the sequence of steps being made over many years to remove it to avoid any responsibility to fulfill a legal agreement extending into the near future and force evacuation and termination of berth owner rights in law.</p> <p>The fifth point: This is obviously inaccurate. A ramp already exists and in the same place as the proposed one. Response time will only be improved by securing the ramp from the effects of the weather. I have observed directly an aborted Rescue launch attempt due to adverse weather.</p> <p>Option 1: The third point -construction of a breakwater structure! is essential for any safety for any nautical activity regardless of option one or two.</p> <p>A further disadvantage with option one is the complete disadvantage of those currently being forced to relinquish the existing Marina and therefore inhibiting their use of the current existing situation.</p>	<p>Swimmers and boats should never mix. Many boats have engines and these drive propellers. When avoiding a object or maneuvering a vessel to stop or reverse direction a propeller is the object of choice and as such moves rapidly, easily damaging a swimmer. Even a light vessel of one tonne enhanced by a medium wake of 300 mm will kill or maim a swimmer when pinned between a boat and a fixed structure.</p> <p>Having occupied the Marina when there were clear signs for no swimming in the marina, I assure you there will be swimmers, and there will be vessels and there will be excessive wake.</p> <p>Further the removal of the Marina is just the logical end of the sequence of steps being made over many years to remove it to avoid any responsibility to fulfill a legal agreement extending into the near future and force evacuation and termination of berth owner rights in law.</p> <p>The fifth point: This is obviously inaccurate. A ramp already exists and in the same place as the proposed one. Response time will only be improved by securing the ramp from the effects of the weather. I have observed directly an aborted Rescue launch attempt due to adverse weather.</p>	<p>use of the current existing situation.</p>			<p>to reduce the effectiveness of the Marina and drive Marina users out to other facilities.</p>	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26753	No	Henry		Option 1	Design and provide the following for the Local Community:- A/30% more trailer sailor secure fenced storage places to park trailer sailors, typically up to 10m long over all. B/A Haul out gantry. Hand operated chains, not powered. No overhead power supply C/Fresh water cleaning facility for outboard motors. Use rainwater collection off roof. D/ Security lighting that is effective, Salvage light poles from CYS for reuse. No overhead power supply E/ Space and facilities for "freedom campers", up to 12 vans at any one time. (This will improve security on site at no cost to the Community. F/ Reestablish for users/spectators along the Charlotte Jane Quay the car parking that is over the railway line. G/ Establish the Outboard / Tractor engine shed within the storage compound. H/ Reuse the Electric operated security gate from the CYS. (no overhead power supply) I/ Provide hose pipe outlets, 1 per 15 trailer sailors in trailer storage area.	Save the proposed funding to provide an excellent, well thought out range of facilities for all users from the Local Community to enhance their wellbeing. The "Floating breakwater" is unlikely to withstand and survive a force 10 storm from the SW. Provide tree shading around the water edge for users of the picnic area. Provide navigation marks to warn all craft users of the submerged bar with a light at the point 2m above LW mark.	Agree, retain the first section for the Local community.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club The Canterbury Yacht Squadron Local rate payer Walking club	
26752	Yes	Rehu	Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke	Option 2		See attached letter			No		2019-07-26-Naval-Point-Submission.pdf -
26751	No	Janus		Option 2		we need a very good playground and skateboard ramp, Public Toilets, Water Fountains Benches to sit on		Yes			
26750	No	Janus		Option 2		We would like a really good playground, public Toilets, water Fountains Benches for people to sit	Leave the first bit of the marina for public access, should have long been removed	Yes	No		
26747	No	Warren		Option 2	Don't like the shorter breakwater	Like the sports ground orientation - much better use of space I like the longer breakwater BUT - really want the Scout den building to remain as and where it is within option 2.		Yes	Yes	Lyttelton Sea Scouts	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26746	Yes	Reardon	Coastguard Canterbury Incorporated	Option 2	<p>FOR</p> <p>i,- The site position designated for the Naval Point Marine & Rescue Centre (NPMRC) is excellent.</p> <p>ii,- The separate Coastguard ramp will work well and enhance response times to marine emergencies significantly.</p> <p>AGAINST</p> <p>i,- The proposed breakwater is too small to provide protection for anything other than the main public ramp and even that would be marginal for SW winds. Its position would serve to cramp up space for boats in the process of launching and retrieval and consequently would present a new hazard to water safety.</p> <p>ii,- The space available for traffic flow and parking space is insufficient to enable the best use of the site including for users of the sports fields.</p>	<p>FOR</p> <p>- The site position designated for the Naval Point Marine & Rescue Centre is excellent.</p> <p>- The separate Coastguard ramp will work well and enhance response times to marine emergencies significantly.</p> <p>- The proposed floating breakwater of a longer length provides for a substantially increased sheltered area from the southerly and to some extent, westerly winds. This will significantly enhance safety for all users on the water when in the process of launching and retrieval of boats, waka and windsurfers as well as swimmers in the Magazine Bay area</p> <p>- The extra space provided by the acquisition of the LPC land is vital to ensure that whole site has sufficient traffic flow and carparking !" both for marine and sports field users. The flow is substantially better and the greater area for trailer boat storage will be beneficial.</p> <p>- The re-orientation of the sports fields permits better access and more parking options for those users and connectivity with the NPMRC should that be used for after match functions.</p> <p>- Both plans provide good pedestrian access and walkways (given the presence of the notional barriers imposed following the QRA in respect of risks associated with</p>	<p>Our preference is for option 2 with the proposed floating breakwater so it makes sense to remove the existing marina which we understand is largely in disuse, a poor state of repair and is exposed to the weather making vessels moored there uninsurable.</p> <p>- Retaining the existing marina in its current state does not seem to be practical option. The reduced size as set out in option 2 would benefit from shelter given by the larger breakwater and removal of the outer portions would be necessary to enable access past the breakwater at the NW end</p>	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Marine Rescue Center Trust	Coastguard-Submission.-v2.docx

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						the fuel tank farm) as well as access to the water for other users including fishers and windsurfers.					
26745	No	Fowler		Option 2	Option 1 isn't as good as Option 2 for reasons outlined below.	Option 2 is preferred for the reasons noted in the "Have Your Say" document pg. 8, and because Option 2 provides; - larger rigging area - more parking - better sports facilities - overall better future proofing of the area and facilities for the community	Support the removal of the marina whilst retaining a section for access.	Yes	No		
26744	No	Thompson		Option 2	Like: - Location of Coastguard/NPC building and separate Coastguard launching ramp - this is a must - Dedicated public power craft and hand launching ramps Least: - Small breakwater - Smaller area due to no land swap with LPC - with all the planned upgrades taking place and the increase in the public boating community the area needs provisions for the future	Like: - Location of Coastguard/NPC building and separate Coastguard launching ramp - this is a must - Acquisition of LPC and therefore ability to rotate rugby field and have separate parking for them - Extended breakwater for additional protection - Separate parking outside the Coastguard/NPC building - allocated parking for a number of Coastguard crew is required in the event of an emergency to ensure the response is as rapid as possible - Dedicated public power craft and hand launching ramps	Agree that removal of the marina should take place	Yes	Yes	Coastguard Canterbury volunteer	
26743 (two submissions were made – now combined and	Yes	Gale (p)		Option 2	I support the recommendations/comments made by the Canterbury R-Class Squadron Additionally..... I see the development of large areas of car parking at the expense of boat storage facilities and removal of the existing haul-out yard as foolhardy when uncertainty exists surround the use of such vehicles (ie capable of towing a water craft) in the future given the impending climate changes that	I support the recommendations/comments made by the Canterbury R-Class Squadron Additionally..... I see the development of large areas of car parking at the expense of boat storage facilities and removal of the existing haul-out yard as foolhardy when uncertainty		No	Yes	Naval Point Club Canterbury R-Class Squadron	R-Class-Feedback-Option-1-Markup6.pdf - <a

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26741 now deleted)					<p>are upon us.</p> <p>The siting of the hand launch ramp in close proximity to the public ramps is extremely dangerous given hand launched craft tend to be smaller and less visible to power craft users. The hand launch ramp should be placed on the other side of the Club/coastguard building</p>	<p>exists surround the use of such vehicles (ie capable of towing a water craft) in the future given the impending climate changes that are upon us.</p> <p>Relocation of the haul-out yard to the inner harbour I see as being impractical due to the scarcity of available land in that area plus the additional premium in terms of rental costs. The existing haul-out yard should have better provisions for the catchment of rain-water run-off to allow for the containment and removal of contaminants</p> <p>This option has better storage but even more car parking area than Option 1. Worst still, there is no physical barrier between the area utilised by the Naval Point Club and the public area , so no control on the movements (and speed) of public vehicles in an area that will often be filled with large numbers of very young sailors</p> <p>The siting of the hand launch ramp in close proximity to the public ramps is extremely dangerous given hand launched craft tend to be smaller and less visible to power craft users. The hand launch ramp should be placed on the other side of the Club/coastguard building</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26742	Yes	Palmer-Hargreaves			I support the submission made by the Canterbury R-Class Squadron	I support the submission made by the Canterbury R-Class Squadron	I support the submission made by the Canterbury R-Class Squadron	Yes	Yes	Canterbury R Class Squadron, NPYC	R-Class-Feedback-Option-2-Markup5.pdf -
26739	No	Bennetts		Option 1	Both of these options will have a negative impact for sailing members at Naval Point, and in particular those who have trailer- sailer's like myself. The loss of more than 50% of the yard where these boats are currently park greatly affects the ability to day sail easily (significant time involved in rigging/ de -rigging these boats vs leaving partially rigged in a yard) This seems to be so more land based activities - multi purpose sport arena / courts etc can be accommodated. I would suggest the latter can easily be located in Christchurch, and better plans more focused on water based activities be drawn up in consultation with current users . A haul out facility needs to be retained. Location of the break water is too close to shore	Too much space allocated to landed based activities at the expense of water based activities		Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club	
26738	Yes	Collett			I support the area being revived, but I do think there are some functionality aspects of the water retrieval mechanisms that need considering. I support the attached Canterbury r class squadron feedback, attached			Yes	Yes	Canterbury r squadron. Canterbury windsports assn	RClass-Feedback-Naval-Point-Redevelopment-Feedback-12.19.pdf

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26737	No	Marchand		Option 2	<p>There doesn't seem to be any effort to provide for the current or future berth holders.</p> <p>We feel the small breakwater would be inadequate for the effort.</p>	<p>In our opinion option two would benefit better in the direction of future proofing over the entire site.</p> <p>In addition the longer breakwater would give better protection from the South West for the marina.</p> <p>We feel the floating breakwater would be better if it was upgraded to a built up solid stone breakwater, less maintenance in the future and definitely more reliable in storm events.</p> <p>We also feel in addition to keeping Marina finger 'A' that an opportunity should be taken to keep finger 'B' and finger 'C', with these gated off for security reasons.</p> <p>We are owners of B14 and C23, our father invested in the Marina in 1988. Over the subsequent years fees have been paid, plus upgrade fees and maintenance fees, we are astonished to hear these funds were not retained for the maintenance purposes or to the benefit of the marina.</p>	<p>We fully support the submission of the Berthholders Association with respect to the removal of the Marina.</p> <p>After going through family records we have roughly calculated that dad/we have invested in excess of 100k in purchasing, leasing and maintenance fees over the past 30 years. Only to discover these funds were not used/allocated solely to the upkeep of the Marina.</p> <p>Subsequently, we are now facing losing the facility that not only us, but many many many people have invested into.</p> <p>Sitting in on the 25th of June meeting, CCC want to spend millions of \$ on the grounds and rugby fields, for the public (don't get me wrong, that is great), however they just simply what to demolish a marina facility because our fees were not responsibly used for its upkeep. Which we feel, put bluntly, fraudulently misappropriated funds.</p> <p>Many berth owners have contributed many, many, many \$ on this marina only to be threatened with being kicked out, how many people have paid fees to use the grounds or the rugby fields, these are all provided by the council for free public use, even an allocated freedom campers area, and we</p>	Yes	Yes	Our Family	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
							are the ones who have actually paid, and still paying. In our opinion the Marina Berth holders are the only ones who have personally contributed financially to this wonderful facility, only to have it stripped away by the council and on top of that the council is willing to invest many millions of dollars to provide to the public a facility which they don't/haven't contributed towards. We feel that CCC should still continue to invest in providing a marina facility, for future generations, at least it has income potential.				
26736	No	McConachie	James McConachie Builders	Option 2				Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26735	No	Toto		Option 2	Unworkable long term. It's a short term fix that will quickly become obsolete. The waterfront area is totally undervalued and misused. Why is it full of overflow carparks? Emphasise public recreational spaces that encourage water front congregation and watch the area come alive. Fill it with carparks and watch the space remain a dead zone like it currently is.	<p>The positioning of the rugby and soccer fields should be shifted South down towards the water front. It is a waste to have car parking on the edge of the water when the fields, Pavillion and recreational space can better utilise this prime area. The overflow carpark should be positioned to the North end of the fields and would ease the skinny choke point that is the current 2 lane road. Also, this would give the fields maximum sunshine hours during the autumn and winter months. The reconfiguration and sizing of the fields needs attention. The senior soccer field is way to small, especially in option 2 where the proposed field is the same size as the junior rugby field. This will create an unusable senior sized Soccer pitch. Get the affected clubs involved and clarify the right field sizing required.</p> <p>There needs to be clarity on what the new sports Pavillion will entail function wise. Many community teams and groups use these fields and just replacing the current outdated changing rooms like for like will be inadequate to meet even current usage, let alone future population growth and team/group usage. The current Pavillion plan looks minuscule in comparison to the Naval Point/Coastguard building - when just as many, if not more people use the fields.</p>	<p>The current public wharf in Magazine Bay is good for jumping and bombing off of but is pretty wobbly with rusty railing. The removal of the current marina, clearing obstacles and space for water craft is a positive.</p> <p>Local professionals - Architects in conjunction with local Iwi especially, should be consulted and used to ensure the special local characteristics and culture are captured in the new buildings. The harbour area is chock full of specialists willing to get involved, utilise them.</p> <p>The redevelopment of this area is a positive for the community but it needs and can achieve the right balance for current and future usage with a bit more thought and planning.</p>	Yes	Yes	Rugby, Soccer, Netball, Boating	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26734	Yes	Frater		Option 2	<p>Things I like least</p> <p>1. The creation of a play area near the water (as shown in option 1 and 2) as this spot is very exposed and cold. It would be better if this facility was developed closer the cliffs, possibly where the existing Naval Point clubrooms are.</p> <p>2. I do not support the allocation of space for the building of a new rugby pavilion at Naval Point, shown on the plans as -proposed Lyttelton Sports Pavilion.! As for the scouts, there would be financial and practical advantages in co-locating with Naval Point Club and the Coast guard. Every organisation probably wants -its own patch! so that it has total control over its facilities, however, this would be a waste of land and resources.</p> <p>5. The lack of provision for a haul out area for boats. This facility is necessary for boat owners in Canterbury.</p> <p>I fully support the provision of pedestrian connections along Godley Quay, Charlotte Jane Quay and the waterfront and all the proposed upgraded pedestrian routes as shown on the map. However, I would like this extended so that a pedestrian link is created to Lyttelton township. At present people walking between Naval Point and Lyttelton township must deal with tankers, many vehicles, muddy overgrown non-contiguous footpaths and areas where there are no footpaths.</p>	<p>Things I like least:</p> <p>1. The creation of a multi-sport court (option 2)!“ provision for tennis, netball and basketball already exist in Cressy Tce, at the sites of the old St Josephs school and Lyttelton West School and Lyttelton Primary school and the use of this flat land should be prioritised for marine use.</p> <p>2. The creation of a new separate facility for the Lyttelton Scout Den. The number of scouts in Lyttelton fluctuates with time, but there are definitely financial and practical advantages in co-locating the scout facilities with Naval Point Club and the Coast guard. The existing scout building has also not had any repairs since the earthquakes.</p> <p>3. I do not support the allocation of space for the building of a new rugby pavilion at Naval Point, shown on the plans as -proposed Lyttelton Sports Pavilion.! As for the scouts, there would be financial and practical advantages in co-locating with Naval Point Club and the Coast guard. Every organisation probably wants -its own patch! so that it has total control over its facilities, however, this would be a waste of land and resources.</p> <p>4. The lack of provision for a haul out area for boats. This facility is necessary for boat owners in Canterbury.</p>	Unfortunately I agree that the existing marina needs to be removed.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club	Submission-by-Jillian-Frater-to-the-Naval-Point-Development.t.docx

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>Things I like the most:</p> <p>This option includes the -addition of an emergency access route along the rail corridor, which will also be used as a pedestrian and cycle route! . At the Naval Point Club meeting with CCC, Paul Devlin said CCC wanted to know what we would -die in the ditch for! and this link is it for me. For years, I have wanted a walking and cycling link between Naval Point and Lyttelton township. This link is partially created at present with the recent development at Te Ana Marina. However, a walkway that extends east from the marina requires people to climb a series of steps to get to Norwich Quay. In written and oral submissions I made to the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan I mentioned the need for this and for improvements to Norwich Quay to provide for people cycling and walking, however, my submissions were ignored and priority was given to the passage of motor vehicles. Just because Norwich Quay is controlled by the New Zealand Transport Agency, this does not mean that the needs of the residents of Lyttelton should be ignored and priority given to heavy vehicles accessing the port. There is so much potential for access between Naval Point and Lyttelton township to be so much more</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26733	No	Weaver		Option 2	None.	<p>Naval Point & Lyttelton Port should be recognised for what they are - the South Island's largest access to the sea, and the main access for the large number of recreation water users in the Christchurch city and surrounding area. It is used not just by the local sailing community, but also by a large number of recreational fishermen, because it is the only access in the area allowing for all tides!" a fact that should not be overlooked when considering its future.</p> <p>Public access has been argued and discussed in various forms over the years, and LPC have closed down and altered access. Whilst the Health & Safety considerations which LPC have to take into account cannot be dismissed, this should not diminish the importance of Naval Point, but should, instead, highlight even more the need of preserving and upgrading this important facility. Both options 1 & 2 are a vast improvement on the current situation. Whilst option 2 is the more expensive it would, in the long term, prove to be far more beneficial. Option 1, whilst initially costing less, would create an additional financial burden should the extra land & breakwaters be deemed necessary at a later point. I am a little concerned on a couple of points;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There appears to be far less area for the permanent trailer yacht 	<p>The Marina in its present state is not really required, especially with the new facilities within the Port area.</p> <p>A small area for casual sailors passing through and seeking moorings for a couple of days would, however, be a good addition.</p>	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club, Lyttelton.	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>parking. I would suggest that, for the long term, an increase would be sought after, not a decrease. Option 2 could allow for this by decreasing some of the public parking area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plans on-line do not seem to show a separate secure area for the yacht club. This omission could adversely impact on the ability of the Yacht Club to attract events, such as regattas, which bring into the area people from around the country, benefitting Lyttelton and the wider community as well as the Yacht club. - A breakwater for all weather boat handling: short term, a -nice to have! item, but, long term, it should be seen as an essential item. Caution should be exercised, however, if considering a floating breakwater, remembering how the previous one was destroyed in a storm in October 2000. A solid breakwater will always win hands down when it comes to adverse weather events. 	<p>pleasant and safer. Such a facility would be such an asset for Lyttelton and would encourage more people to access both the marina and naval point and the businesses that will eventually exist at the marina.</p> <p>To do this however, it would be ideal if the current walking and cycling link path alongside Te Ana Marina, could continue (at a similar gradient) below Simeon Quay and emerge on the road below the Sutton Reserve. At a recent public meeting, Ken Maynard, the president of the Lyttelton Resident's Association recognised that such a path would require the moving of the port gate. He said this had been discussed with Lyttelton Port Company (LPC), but that at present the timeframe discussed for this was 10 years, but that he hoped this timeframe could be shortened. As a majority shareholder of LPC, the Council has some control over the activities of LPC, and as such should apply pressure to LPC to move its gate to provide for the extension of the walking and cycling path to Lyttelton in a much shorter timeframe. I'm sure the future businesses at Te Ana Marina will not want to wait 10 years for this to happen.</p>				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26732	No	Tan		Option 1	<p>Like most - the retained scout den, and the fact its cheaper and has fewer car parks.</p> <p>Like least - no mention of improving the walking/cycle access from Britain Terrace past Te Ana marina to the playing fields - currently this is very exposed/unpleasant when walking. Council should encourage other means of transport to the area, not be reliant on cars.</p>	<p>Like least - 400 car parks is too many, loss of the scout den, the expense, also not sure about the floating breakwater - looks like it could make life more difficult for non-motor vessels.</p>		Yes	Yes	Kids sail at Naval Point and have been with scouts.	
26729	Yes	Bowater	Canterbury Windsports Association	Option 2	<p>We like that the Windsports area is mainly left as it is.</p> <p>Don't like the position of a play zone- dangerous. Picnic area zone is actually rigging area and Rigging access/parking area is too small for use.</p> <p>Would like a wash down area 'ie outdoor shower and tap.</p> <p>Position of club house used prime foreshore- not necessary.</p> <p>Access to the NPC ramp for users such as the windsurfers and paddle boarders using the storage rigging area is not suitable.</p> <p>See attached submission</p>	<p>We like that the Windsports area is mainly left as it is.</p> <p>Don't like the position of a play zone- dangerous. Picnic area zone is actually rigging area and Rigging access/parking area is too small for use.</p> <p>Would like a wash down area 'ie outdoor shower and tap.</p> <p>Position of club house used prime foreshore- not necessary.</p> <p>Access to the NPC ramp for users such as the windsurfers and paddle boarders using the storage rigging area is not suitable.</p> <p>ee attached submission</p>	<p>It is worth keeping the small section of the marina as it gives the public some boating focus to look at when there is no active boating happening. The magazine Bay jetty should not be retained as it is in poor repair and swimmers jump from this which is dangerous as it is very shallow at times. swimmers should be encouraged to jump from the retained part of the the Marina .</p>	Yes	Yes	<p>Naval Point Club,</p> <p>Canterbury Windsports Association</p> <p>Lyttelton Volunteer Fire brigade</p>	<p>Windsports-submission-for-the-Naval-Point-Development.docx</p>

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26728	Yes	Roe	Canterbury R Class Squadron		<p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open Access to Water from current NPCL ramp <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small amount of rigging area. - Hand launch ramp close to public slipway and coastguard ramp has the potential for dangerous congestion - Powered and unpowered craft will be manoeuvring in close proximity. This has the potential to create a hazard, which would be exacerbated in difficult conditions. - The floating breakwater creates a choke point with the coastguard ramp, increasing the congestion hazard 	<p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More rigging area than option 1 <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hand launch ramp close to public slipway and coastguard ramp has the the potential for dangerous congestion - Powered and unpowered craft will be manoeuvring in close proximity. This has the potential to create a hazard, which would be exacerbated in difficult conditions. - The floating breakwater creates a choke point with the existing fixed breakwater, resulting in an increased congestion hazard at the exit to the harbour <p>Please see the attached documents for suggestions and some principles to consider when refining the design.</p>			Yes	<p>Naval Point Club Lyttelton.</p> <p>Canterbury R Class Squadron.</p>	RClass-Feedback-Naval-Point-Redevelopment-Feedback-11.19.pda>

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26727	No	Bowater	Canterbury Windsports Association	Option 2	<p>Don't like the play zone in the windsports rigging area.</p> <p>Parking area is not big enough for the windsports area.</p> <p>Would like to see another vehicle access to the whole area from the eastern end of the area as will cause problems on a busy day having cars driving through the boat parking area.</p> <p>Like the waterfront promenade, fishing steps etc.</p> <p>I think the hand launch ramp should be with the existing NPC ramp so that there is separation between the motor boats and yachts, paddle boards and waka that would be using the hand launch ramp.</p> <p>Club building should NOT be on the shore front - we have very little water access area available so use this for better access and rigging, the building should be put further back from the shore.</p>	<p>Don't like the play zone in the windsports rigging area.</p> <p>Parking area is not big enough for the windsports area.</p> <p>Would like to see another vehicle access to the whole area from the eastern end of the area as will cause problems on a busy day having cars driving through the boat parking area.</p> <p>Like the waterfront promenade, fishing steps etc.</p> <p>I think the hand launch ramp should be with the existing NPC ramp so that there is separation between the motor boats and yachts, paddle boards and waka that would be using the hand launch ramp.</p> <p>Club building should NOT be on the shore front - we have very little water access area available so use this for better access and rigging, the building should be put further back from the shore.</p>	<p>Would like the first part retained for use as a day or short term berth. Also this is a great jumping, swimming area as the water is deeper than around the Magazine Bay jetty. This whole area could be a great place to wander and swim once it has had a tidy up.</p>	Yes	Yes	<p>Canterbury Windsports Association</p> <p>Naval Point Club.</p>	
26725	Yes	Milner		Option 2	<p>I support the attached doc below by the Canterbury R class Squadron. Thanks for opportunity to submit and it is great that the CCC are looking at providing a decent facility for boating in the Christchurch area.</p>	<p>I support the attached doc below by the Canterbury R class Squadron</p>	<p>get rid of the eyesore completely</p>		No		<p>RClass-Feedback-Naval-Point-Redevelopment-Feedback-10.19.pdf</p>
26724	Yes	Worthington	Canterbury R Class Squadron		<p>Please see the attached document</p>	<p>Please see the attached document</p>					<p>RClass-Feedback-Naval-Point-Redevelopment-Feedback-9.19</p>

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26723	No	Warren	CTYS		Reduction of boat storage. Removal of haul out yard. No area for safe playground. No provision for other water based activities except boating. For example a safe swimming area and dive platform. The fixed extension of the breakwater is a good option. Too much parking.	Same as above but the floating breakwater is surely a proven failure when you see the destruction of the marina in a southerly blow. Too much parking.	No it!™s well past it!™s sell by date.	Yes	Yes	NPCL CTYS	
26722	No	Duncan	Naval Point Club Member , Sec/Treas South Island Finn Association	Option 2		I Like: - The breakwater. It is essential for safe boat launching - I It needs to be slightly further from the shore to enable safe manoeuvring for sailing vessels. - Potential conflicts with dinghies or traffic from the public ramp. - It needs to be done first. - The separate hand launching ramp. - The ramp needs to have a firm surface, i.e., concrete of the like and not sand. - The coastguard ramp needs to be further west to give the sailing dinghies more room to manoeuvre. - The approximate location of the proposed NPCL/Coast guard building. - The land swap idea. - Using the railway line for pedestrian, bike and emergency access. I do not like: - The separation of the west rigging and storage area and the hand launching ramp and rigging area. - It is a long way to pull a dinghy from one area to the other.	The Marina - Some of the existing marina needs to be retained, with public access. Other Matters - There needs to be provision for haul out area for boat maintenance. - The building height restrictions need to allow for a future dry stack facility for storing boats. - I like the land swap idea.	Yes	Yes	NPCL Member since 1979 South Island Finn Assn (Secretary /Treasurer) . Finn sailing dinghies are the most numerous senior class currently sailing from Naval Point	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a potential conflict between moving dinghies from one area to the other and trailer yacht traffic. - The rigging and dinghy storage area needs to be extended north and the west rigging and storage area used for trailer yacht rigging and storage. - The lack of a start -box! for yacht racing. It needs to be near the proposed youth play zone on the south east sea frontage. - The location of the youth play zone on the SE sea frontage. - The side is too exposed and no one currently uses that area. - It needs to be near the jetty on the sheltered western end of the area where youth currently congregate. - The small size of the proposed trailer yacht storage area. It is much smaller than the current facility. - The entrance/exit of the proposed trailer storage area is wrong. It needs to be further west so they can drive straight through to the launching area without having to several tight right hand turns. 					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26721	No	May	Canterbury Yachting and Naval Point Club Lyttelton	Option 2	<p>The aspects of Option 1 I disagree with most are:</p> <p>The reduced land area available (does not include the present LPC land)</p> <p>The very restricted ramp breakwater protection.</p>	<p>I support the acquisition of LPC land and the increased break water protection.</p> <p>My experience is as the naval Point club On Water Activities Coordinator for the past 14 years in addition to a lifetime of boating on Lyttelton harbour based around the harbour access provided from the Naval Point area.</p> <p>While I appreciate that the plans and options currently presented are a massive improvement on the past facilities, and are indicative of the facilities to be provided I would focus my comments on three main points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The planning of land access to the water (Roads, Parking and Boat preparation areas) must fit the expected increase of public use. 2. The arrangement of slipways must allow for practical and safe on water traffic management. I believe the proposals to date create some confused and potentially unsafe on water areas, particularly where the current public slipway and proposed hand launching slipways are located. 3. Some form of event and traffic management is essential. 	<p>Space for maneuvering in the safe small boat harbour created by the breakwater is very important.</p> <p>But it is a pity to lose any mooring opportunities and the potential to provide some income to support the development.</p>		Yes	<p>Naval Point Club Lyttelton</p> <p>Canterbury Yachting Association.</p> <p>Supporting the opportunity for all yachting clubs in Canterbury to have access to major event facilities.</p>	
26720	Yes	Mentink		Option 2	dislike - No breakwater, limited yacht storage, no haul-out, loss of marina berths	<p>Like breakwater</p> <p>dislike - limited yacht storage, no haul-out, loss of marina berths</p>			Yes	Naval Point club member, member of CYTS.	Naval-Point-redevelopment-submission-Geoffrey-Mentink-July2019.pdf

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26719	No	Arthur		Option 2	The element I like least of Option 1 is the reduced size of the break water.	I like the increased size of the breakwater in Option Two. I think it could be improved further with better boat access at the eastern end and an overlapping break (or two) part way along the breakwater to give improved access to and from the harbour. A larger break water would give better access and shelter to the public ramp, proposed small craft launching area, proposed Coastguard are, and Naval Point Club ramp. Improving access and shelter to make safer access in more weather conditions would be better for the Canterbury boating community in my opinion.	Only that is in a deteriorating state and and with the inner harbour marina going ahead a decrease in size would be good to see to give small and trailer craft better access to the harbour.	Yes	Yes	I am a current member of Naval Point Club. I am a past member of Canterbury Sea Kayak Network and have used a private motor boat on Lyttelton Harbour.	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26718	No	Macfarlane		Option 2	<p>It is too small to accommodate the existing uses once allowance is made for the landscaping and beatification. In particular it doesn't include sufficient space for the storage of trailer yachts. I note with concern that the space allocated for trailer yacht parking in the two versions of the proposed Naval Point Development Plan is approximately half of what is presently used. It is vital that the present area is maintained as this facility is currently used to its maximum capacity. There has been criticism that some of the boats aren't used much and that they are just being stored there but the club is actively working on this issue and those boats that aren't being used will forfeit there allocated space so that those on the waiting list can use it. The demand for trailer parking by active sailors exceeds the available space at present and the area should not be reduced by half as shown in the proposed plans. This doesn't even include the trailer yacht parking space that will be lost when the haulout area is closed and redeveloped. This area often serves those on the waiting list for the Trailer Yacht Compound. The trailer yacht compound needs to securely fenced and locked. Option 1 does not provide for a breakwater to give some protection from the southerly, which is the single most important improvement that will allow safer use of this facility, safer and also allow use on a greater number of days. The haulout presently serves keelers with the tractor and cradle system and it also serves trailer yachts with the gantry (four chain blocks on pillars with lifting strops between), which is the only way to safely lift trailer yachts. While it is being logically suggested that the keelers should be served by a site in the inner harbour I believe the gantry should remain at Naval Point as that is where it is going to be used. The development needs to allow access to all the</p>	<p>It is too small to accommodate the existing uses once allowance is made for the landscaping and beatification. In particular it doesn't include sufficient space for the storage of trailer yachts. I note with concern that the space allocated for trailer yacht parking in the two versions of the proposed Naval Point Development Plan is approximately half of what is presently used. It is vital that the present area is maintained as this facility is currently used to its maximum capacity. There has been criticism that some of the boats aren't used much and that they are just being stored there but the club is actively working on this issue and those boats that aren't being used will forfeit there allocated space so that those on the waiting list can use it. The demand for trailer parking by active sailors exceeds the available space at present and the area should not be reduced by half as shown in the proposed plans. This doesn't even include the trailer yacht parking space that will be lost when the haulout area is closed and redeveloped. This area often serves those on the waiting list for the Trailer Yacht Compound. The trailer yacht compound needs to securely fenced and locked. Option 2 does provide for a breakwater that will give some protection from the southerly, which is the single most important</p>	<p>It is very important that there is some publicly accessible berthing places for keelers and launches. At the moment there is no deep water public berthing area where people can be dropped off & picked up that has full accessibility ie ramped suitable for wheel chairs and people of restricted mobility, that leads to a floating pontoon that allows access to boats at water level. Retaining and redeveloping part of the existing marina for this purpose is needed.</p>	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Yacht Club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					forms of boating for people of all ages and all abilities.	improvement that will allow safer use of this facility, safer and also allow use on a greater number of days. It has a larger overall area but a lot of that is wasted in the sealed carriageway and associated landscaping on the west side of the active sports area. This area needs to be reconfigured to allow the trailer yacht storage area to be kept at its present size. The haulout presently serves keelers with the tractor and cradle system and it also serves trailer yachts with the gantry (four chain blocks on pillars with lifting strops between), which is the only way to safely lift trailer yachts. While it is being logically suggested that the keelers should be served by a site in the inner harbour I believe the gantry should remain at Naval Point as that is where it is going to be used. The development needs to allow access to all the forms of boating for people of all ages and all abilities.					
26717	No	Stewart		Option 2	There is no provision for a haulout area for people to maintain their own keelboats as there is currently. I think that this will be very detrimental to the keelboat fleet of Banks Peninsula and i will probably shift to the Marlborough Sounds where I can perform maintenance on my boat.	There is no provision for a haulout area for people to maintain their own keelboats as there is currently. I think that this will be very detrimental to the keelboat fleet of Banks Peninsula and I will shift to the Marlborough Sounds where I can perform maintenance on my boat.	I think they should keep the existng marina and upgrade it to provide alternative places for large boats.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26716	Yes	Kidson	Canterbury R Class Squadron		In option 1, the proposed break water will bottleneck traffic and send powerboat users right through the middle of a fleet of launching/retrieving sail boats, which often has a large proportion of youth sailors. This bottleneck will create an irresponsibly high risk to the safety of regular users of these ramps. Further opinions and potential solutions are listed and outlined in the attached documents.	The gap between the proposed break water and the existing fixed rock breakwater is far to small, the existing fixed break water extends out quite a ways under the water level, and with some of the classes that sail out of NPCL having a draft of over 2m, in rough sea conditions this will not be near enough room for incoming and outgoing traffic to operate safely. Further opinions and potential solutions are listed and outlined in the attached documents.	I am indifferent about the removal of the current marina, as it does not particularly affect me either way, but I believe that the removal of the old concrete piles from attempted marina redevelopment should be a priority, as these serve no purpose and in rough sea conditions are a hazard to users of the area. Canterbury R Class Squadron As the currently proposed changes sit now, this will effectively prevent our class from sailing in Christchurch, as no other clubs have suitable infrastructure for our class. The R Class has been active at Naval Point since the 1950s, and as much as we would like to see the club and area receive a much needed makeover, if either of the current plans go ahead as they are proposed today, this will put an end to 70 years of top level NZ sailing history. As a group we have gotten together and prepared the attached documents which outline some changes that we believe will not only allow us to continue to enjoy our great sport, but it will increase safety and decrease stress for not only all other sailors, but powerboaters and members of the public alike.		Yes		R-Class-Feedback-Option-1-Markup2.pdf -

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26715	Yes	Riley		Option 2	N/A	<p>Elements I like the most:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - pedestrian connection between Naval Point and Lyttelton / Te Ana Marina - full breakwater and improved off-water facilities - no space for freedom campers <p>Elements I like least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no consideration for haul out facility - expansion of size of Recreation Ground and parking taking precedence over much needed land for the boating community <p>See attached submission for further detail</p>	The marina is unsafe and should be removed. I support a public access on-water drop off point at Naval Point and if this can be done safely at the marina then I am supportive of this.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club Lyttelton	Development-Options-for-Naval-Point-Tim-Riley-submission.pdf
26712	No	Wellby		Option 2	Breakwater would not achieve anything. No extra land to accommodate extra users of the waterfront and facilities	The loss of the boat maintenance facility would be a major problem for the sailing community. Seems the improved access is taking too much of the space available for boat storage and maintenance. The extra land should be used to accommodate the extra people/boats.	No. In its present state it serves no useful purpose. Would be good to keep the first part as a resource for the local teenage population.	Yes	Yes	NPYC and CTYS	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26711	No	Hodgson		Option 1	<p>The historic Dampiers Bay Yacht club building, currently being used as the den for the local scout/cub groups must be preserved on this site. Lyttelton has lost far too much of it's heritage buildings/sites etc because "someone" thought something new would be better.</p> <p>The redevelopment of this area under either plan must make provision for a haulout area for displacement boats that are not trailerable. The owners of these boats need this space to conduct work on their boats that can only be done with it out of the water. Traditionally, the local yacht club provided this service as a source of income for the club . Your discussion document glibly dismisses this vital piece of boating infrastructure with the throwaway comment " the removal of the current haulout area at the site, with a new more suitable location to be identified", guess what, there isn't such a place anywhere within Lyttelton Harbour other than somewhere on this site.</p> <p>The stated aim of this redevelopment is to allow for existing use and potential growth of marine recreational activities, surely removing one makes no sense.</p> <p>Please tell me that the "proposed" breakwater in option one isn't a floating one- floating breakwaters have been tried three times in this location- they don't work, are expensive to maintain and then when the location experiences a severe southerly storm, they break up. Please don't waste my rates money on one of those, I can tell you how to construct something that will work more effectively, not impede tidal flows and will withstand the storms that occur here.</p>	NO MORE FLOATING BREAKWATERS!!!!- far too much money has been "sunk" into a concept that has been proven three times in this location not to work.	Happy to see the last of the old marina go, so long as an equal number of swing moorings are allocated in approximately the same place.	Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26710	Yes	Pritt	Canterbury R Class Skiff Squadron	Option 2	See attached feedback.	See attached feedback. Note that the floating breakwater in the current position is a major safety hazard, but the additional rigging area shown is crucial.					R-Class-Feedback-Option-1-Markup.pdf - <a
26708	Yes	Lock	Naval Point Club Lyttelton	Option 2							Submission-to-Christchurch-City-Council-on-the-Naval-Point-Development-by-Colin-Lock.docx
26707	No	Keir		Option 2	I am a trailer yacht owner. I currently keep my boat at the Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron storage area. In both options, the trailer yacht storage seems to be smaller. However, in option 1 the trailer yacht area seems the largest of the two plans. There is already a 1-year waiting list to get into this area. Any reduction in the size of this storage area is concerning as it will prevent owners from keeping their boats at the club. It is important to understand that keeping a trailer yacht by the club is a huge advantage for a trailer yacht owner. It means the owner can leave the mast up, which saves hours of work and makes weekly racing or cruising a reality.	Neither option 1 or 2 include a haul-out area. This is very concerning as this is very helpful for trailer yachts and critical for yachts in the marina. All yachts require regular maintenance it is not realistic to own a yacht in CHCH without a haulout area to complete maintenance. There must be plans for a suitable haulout area somewhere (it could be in the inner harbour), otherwise, the inner harbour marina will be a failure as boats will move away.	I have no problems with removing the marina adjacent to Magazine Bay. This is a poor location for a marina as it is exposed to strong southerlies. Unless a suitable breakwater was built around it there is no point having it there.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Yacht Club (and I support their submission). Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron.	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26706	No	Jones	Naval Point Club Member	Option 2	Option 1 provides less area for recreation and does not provide as good access as option 2	<p>I am writing in support of the Naval Point Club submission preferring option two.</p> <p>I would like to emphasise the importance of planning haulout facilities for a transition from old to new with minimal interruption to the haulout capability. Boats spending significant time in the sea need to be hauled out regularly for hull anti fouling, and when accidents happen boats may need to be hauled out to avoid them sinking. Without the availability of this facility boating will become prohibitively expensive for some and others will be driven away from the Christchurch area, emptying out the new marina. The provision of inner harbour haulout facilities has the potential to solve the environmental problem of dealing with the anti-fouling paint laden waste water blasted of boat hulls. Inner harbour facilities using a hoist could provide safe haulout and re-launch at all states of the tide and a wider range of weather conditions than at present. This could result in better utilisation of the land with more certainty about haulout and re-launch times yielding shorter times out of the water. The new haulout facilities need to be available for boat owners to carry out their own maintenance activities.</p>			Yes	Naval Point Club Member	
26705	No	Hansen		Option 2				Yes	Yes	Canterbury	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
										outboard boat club.	
26704	No	Marchand	Magazine Bay Marina License Holder	Option 2	The breakwater is not of sufficient size and the removal of the marina berths is not fair to the berth holders. There also needs to be an area retained for boat maintenance/haul out.	<p>The breakwater is of a good size to provide better shelter to the majority of the marina and also to the whole area for the yacht club and coast guard. As above, the removal of the marina berths is not fair to the berth holders and there still needs to be an area retained for boat maintenance/haul out.</p> <p>I like the extra room provided by obtaining land from the LPC and also the added roadway through the middle by rotating the playing fields.</p>	<p>The plans to remove the majority of the marina are not fair and just to the license holders who have paid tens of thousands of dollars for the license and further tens of thousands over the years in maintenance fees only to have successive councils fail in their obligations to keep it maintained. Many of the berth holders have simply given up and moved elsewhere due to the lack of maintenance and the lack of protection from the waves. Now it's proposed to only retain a small portion for public use for people that have not paid anything towards it and remove the people that have been paying for decades. That is not right! A better solution would be to retain some of the second arm of the marina for the berth holders whilst opening up the first arm to the public.</p> <p>I fully support the submission of the Magazine Bay Berth Holders Association</p>	No	Yes	Magazine Bay Berth Holders Association	
26703	Yes	Brown		Option 2	see attached	see attached	see attached	Yes	No		naval-point-submission.docx
26702	Yes	Hansen	Canterbury Outboard	Option 2	see attachment	see attachment	see attachment	Yes	Yes	Canterbury Outboard Boat Club	COBC-Naval-point-submission.pdf

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
			d Boat Club								
26701	No	Minnear		Option 2				Yes	No		
26700	Yes	Meehan		Option 2	<p>It is good that there is little alterations to the windsurfing area. Careful consideration is needed in regards to having this as a designated picnic area and playground. This could cause conflict with current users.</p> <p>Is the coast guard happy with the ramp in this option? I imagine hard to use in a southerly?</p>	<p>It is good that there is little alterations to the windsurfing area. Careful consideration is needed in regards to having this as a designated picnic area and playground. This could cause conflict with current users.</p> <p>More car parks - although this is still some distance away from where people want to park - i.e swimmers off the wharf and people accessing torpedo bay.</p> <p>The break water would be fantastic, but this would be expensive and complex to construct. It should be a nice to have rather than necessity.</p>	<p>It would be good to remove as this is a hazard to harbour users.</p> <p>If the first section is retain perhaps it could be modified to allow a small number of yachts / small boars to temporarily use i.e overnight mooring, visitng from another harbour stopping at yacht club etc.</p>	Yes	Yes	Canterbury Windsports Association	Submission-for-the-Naval-Point-Development.pdf
26699	Yes	Lilburne		Option 2	Breakwater is inadequate	Breakwater is better but needs better access. Trailer yacht storage is inadequate					submission.docx - a>
26696	No	Foate		Option 2	Parking minimal, Option 1 would be a lost opportunity to provide for the future public amenity value of this area. The short term cost advantage should not be the primary consideration in developing this facility.	Option 2 would undoubtedly provide a superior facility for all concerned - current & future. If not done at this stage the advantages of option 2 are unlikely to ever be realised.	Removing the marina is the only sensible way forward to provide safe & easy access for boaties & other recreational users of the harbour.	Yes	No		
26695	No	Lunn		Option 2	The separation of rigging and storage areas at Naval Point Yacht Club from the launching ramp for hand held vessels is unsafe. Young children will be trying to steer their yachts and avoid car and trailer traffic. I'm concerned a child will be seriously injured simply because they take a short cut and are focused on manoeuvring their trailer	The distance of the storage area/rigging area to the hand launching ramp and the safety of children moving through this area is a concern. The proximity of the hand launching area to the motorised boat ramp is a safety	No Currently the rigging and launching area are close and it is relatively safe for children to make their way down to the ramp as they don't need to go very far. The new designs put a	Yes	Yes	In the past my children have been members of the	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					rather than watching for cars. The pedestrian walkway is unpractical as its too far and possibly too difficult to negotiate, and so some children will take the short cut. The learn to sail group only have one or two supervising adults. It's therefore not practical or safe to assume that every child will be supervised as they make their way down to the water. Has the designer included input from the learn to sail coaches at Naval Point Yacht Club or visited the site during the peak season when children are moving about with their boats. If so it is not reflected in the design. Currently the rigging and launching area for Learn to Sail are close and it is relatively safe for children to make their way down to the ramp as they don't need to go very far. The new designs put a car park and moving traffic between rigging and storage area and the launching area.	concern. Boats with children learning to sail will be mixed in with motorised vessels. The obvious area for the learn to sail to launch their boats is where the Naval Point Yacht club appear to want exclusive use for launching yachts. This is also an area where people will be swimming. The car park areas and launching facilities for motorised boats and yachts seems to take precedence over boat that operate only under sail and the safety of children learning to sail. This puts children and adults launching by hand at risk if they're moving through these areas. The car park intersects the largest rigging area - again this is unsafe. Looking at this design I wonder if the person designing it has visited the site on a busy summer day in windy conditions. Their does not seem to be any appreciation of the difficulty of handling a boat that operates only under sail in and out of the launch and retrieval areas. Both the designs also seem to be lacking a safety audit in terms of car and trailer traffic, and the interaction of boat traffic on the water.	car park and moving traffic between rigging and storage area and the launching area.			Learn to Sail group.	
26691	No	Moore			I have recently moved from Auckland to Christchurch. I am a member of the Sandspit yacht club in Auckland but I'm not associated with the Naval point club. It will be great to see such prime real estate around Navel Point get utilised to its full potential. But it needs to improve all areas and not take away or handicap facilities already in place. Two main observations I've made of the existing	same points as comments in option 1		Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>facilities are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing haul out isn't great, but it's the only facility available and is necessary IMO - The ease of access for trailer yacht parking to the boat ramp is a big asset. <p>A major development of the area needs to capitalise on existing assets and improve areas that need it.</p> <p>Removing the haul out facilities with no plan for a new one should not be an option in any case. It is required for keel boats. If keelers don't have the ready facilities to be maintain, it will cause a suite of issues including reduced ability to mitigate biosecurity hazards e.g. if something like fanworm or the likes was introduced.</p> <p>Also, removing the haul for the club will just add that extra barrier for people getting involved in the sport. Yachting already seems to have a large gap in interest between youth and seniors. For the benefit of the sport, especially being the primary yacht club for Christchurch, a haul out facility must be retained.</p> <p>The same point goes for an easily accessible trailer yacht park - it seems both options reduce trailer yacht parking and moves the entry point further from the ramp. Facilities need to be improved, not made harder to use.</p> <p>Another option needs to be considered which improves the haul out facilities and yachting parking + facilities.</p> <p>What's the point of a major development if it makes things harder for the people that use the area the most.</p>						
26684	No	Monteath			I support the Naval point yacht club submission	I support the Naval point yacht club submission	I support the Naval point yacht club submission				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26680	No	Riley			For about 30 years until late 2017 I moored my yacht at various locations around Lyttelton Harbour. I support the proposed Naval Point improvements. However, rather than favouring Option 1 or 2 I would simply like to make one comment: neither includes a haulout area ("new site to be identified"). I would like to stress the importance that the future haulout NOT be a commercial enterprise. I have seen boating facilities in other parts of the world that require all haulout work on the boats be done by their staff. The result is that boating becomes a rich person's sport. It would destroy one of our most wonderful boating traditions: That you don't have to be affluent to muck about in boats. Please, preserve our great tradition of DIY boating.						
26679	No	Kennett	Naval Point	Option 2	This option does not provide enough protection due to the limited breakwater. In Northwest/South/southWest the northern end will be exposed too much. Youth and inexperienced boaties will find it dangerous to boat and person; which is the current situation. My insurance company will attest to \$1800 damage trying to launch in a Southwest. Option 1 is little improvement on the current on water infrastructure. I am not inexperienced being a certified instructor, Coastguard examiner, and hold commercial skipper tickets in NZ, UK and Australia.	This is a vast improvement over option 1 and shows a duty of care to safety which option 1 does not provide.	Yes just get on and remove it ASAP. Leaving a jetty would be nice for the public.	No	Yes	Naval Point Club.	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26678	No	Averis		Option 2	The right idea of pedestrian access and boat access however whilst it may be sufficient for now it does not allow for growth. No boat haul-out facility.	<p>Improved parking. Cars with trailers take up a lot of room and you will have trailers that have sailing dinghies on them as well as speed boats and trailer yachts so space will fill up quickly on good sailing days.</p> <p>Am concerned that there is no boat haul out facility. With the large number of moored craft both in the bays of the harbour and at the marina, an affordable and accessible haul-out facility for recreational boaties is a necessity to promote clean hulls and to protect the harbour eco-system. It believe it would be irresponsible of the council to not provide an accessible area. Such a facility could be managed by the Naval Point Yacht club in a similar way that Timaru yacht club provides a facility for its members and the public to use.</p>	I think this is a good idea.	Yes	Yes	Little Ship Club Canterbury	
26673	No	Dewe		Option 2	<p>Most - driving out of the trailer is no longer on a blind corner.</p> <p>Least - the kids still have to cross the path of traffic to get their small boats from storage to the hand ramp.</p>	<p>Most - more trailer storage space. It gets pretty cramped trying to back out boat between our neighbours.</p> <p>Least - the kids still have to cross the path of traffic to get their small boats from storage to the hand ramp.</p>	I think it's a good idea. It's currently wasted space / derelict.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26671	No	Ruddle		Option 2	<p>Most: permanent breakwater structure (not floating)</p> <p>Least: breakwater structure proposed not big enough as won't shelter all ramps (this is very important to launch/retrieve boats in Southerly weather systems); not enough car parks; not enough storage space for waka/kayaks/skis etc; rigging area too small.</p>	<p>Most: larger breakwater structure; more parking; larger rigging area; circular road access.</p> <p>Least: floating breakwater structure (will it be enough to actually reduce swell/chop onto the ramps?); not enough storage space for waka/kayaks/skis ect; need showers and additional toilet block.</p>		Yes	Yes	Te Waka Pounamu Outrigger Canoe Club, SLSNZ Southern Region, Lyttelton Surf Ski	
26669	No	Pereira		Option 2		<p>Strongly support the breakwater - will make ramp area much safer. The hand launch ramp is great if solid (concrete) and needs to be wide enough to accommodate all users and will need adequate washdown facilities and manoeuvring room. Will also need parking nearby as many small vessels e.g. canoes are transported on vehicle roof.</p> <p>Security - storage areas must be secure, as small vessels can be damaged very easily.</p> <p>Naval Point Yacht club - need defined space to control their race days etc - would be good to keep picnic areas and playgrounds away from clearly defined boating/club areas.</p> <p>Great to have a freedom camping area - but needs to be away from clearly defined sports clubs areas and their storage and need to have easy access to toilets and waste facilities and clearly defined parking spaces - needs to be fit for purpose.</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26668	Yes	Kanavata	Te Waka Pounamu Outrigger Canoe Club	Option 2	n/a	<p>: LEAST;</p> <p>1. Quantity of storage for existing users !" space in both options is not big enough</p> <p>2. Safet" Travelling from storage below cliff to new hand launching ramp involves navigating traffic</p> <p>3. Facilities !" access to showers, toilets, meeting room/s, indoor training facility option !" There are none of these. Showers and toilets are essential for a club.</p> <p>As a club we have been involved in numerous meetings with the Christchurch City Council and worked to bring together all waka clubs, including providing details of our collective needs and aspirations; this has not been reflected in the current options and there does not appear to be enough space provided for current users. We would like to see a more detailed plan showing indicative allocations and locations for current users.</p>	<p>A: Almost 20 years ago Te Waka Pounamu was formed and has a current membership of approximately 140 members and growing. Outrigger Canoe, also know as Waka ama, has a cultural importance particularly amongst the Māori community with a focus on rangatahi (youth). You will find Te Waka Pounamu catering to a vast age group starting from 6 years of age right up to 70. Our clubs paddlers are involved from a social level right up to the international stage including World Championships where medals have been brought home to Lyttelton/Whakaraupo.</p> <p>As a club we utalise 100% of Whakaraupo in many aspects. Courses we paddle are dependent on tide, wind and swell direction. Please see attached map of regularly used upper harbour waka routes.</p> <p>These routes contribute to many successes ranging from bringing other waka paddlers throughout New Zealand to compete in regatta!™s to paddlers training for national and world renowned international events.</p> <p>Based on our training and regatta usage of Whakaraupo,</p>	Yes	Yes	Te Waka Pounamu Outrigger Canoe Club	Key-paddling-routes2.jpg

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
							we ask that the Marina be retained for coaching and monitoring regatta!™s.				
26667	No	Sweetman		Option 2				Yes	No		
26666	No	Foate	Local Resident	Option 2	Option one is a poor use of the space.	Option two is a much more robust plan and better use of space and takes into account the risk profiles for the sports facilities in relation to the tanks which is good.	Needs to be removed asap! OR Redeveloped quickly not left in its current state which is an eyesore and unsafe.	Yes	No		
26665	No	Young	Te Waka Pounamu	Option 2		<p>A: LEAST;</p> <p>1. Quantity of storage for existing users !" space in both options is not big enough</p> <p>2. Safet" Travelling from storage below cliff to new hand launching ramp involves navigating traffic</p> <p>3. Facilities !" access to showers, toilets, meeting room/s, indoor training facility option !" There are none of these. Showers and toilets are essential for a club.</p> <p>As a club we have been involved in numerous meetings with the Christchurch City Council and worked to bring together all waka clubs, including providing details of our collective needs and aspirations; this has not been reflected in the current options and there does not appear to be enough space provided for current users. We would like to see a more detailed plan showing indicative</p>	We use the public part of it for our club	Yes	Yes	Te Waka Pounamu Outrigger canoe club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						allocations and locations for current users.					
26664	No	Thompson			I support the boat safety submission, plans 1 through to 5. Looking at these plans, it is paramount that plans 1 - 3 are implemented, as a minimum, otherwise history will repeat & the facilities will over time.				No		
26663	No	Stott			Support plan 1 & the boat safety submission						
26662	No	Everse					Support plan 1 & the boat safety submission				
26661	No	Whiteley			Support the boat safety submission, I vote for option 3	No	Marian should remain - I was regional harbour master approx. 10 years	Yes	No		
26660	No	Jenkinson			Plan 1 - I am in support of along with an increased break water (plan 3)	Consideration needs to be given to pedestrian walkways / recreation space. Better connectivity between these spaces & water front.	Less parking more planting / green spaces		No		
26659	No	Ashby			Support the boat safety submission Options - Plan 1 to 5	I support a walkway from the cellphone towers to the yacht club	I disagree with the proposal to remove the marina		No		
26658	Yes	Roberts	Te Waka Pounamu Outrigger Canoe Club	Option 2					Yes	Te waka pounamu outrigger canoe club	Submission.pdf

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26654	No	Larking Coates	Lyttelton Youth Programme		<p>1. There is no provision for recreational swimming for young people and their families. This is disappointing as consultation with our youth group members clearly identified a need for this. A diving platform was discussed, an area set aside for activities such as water polo, kayak polo, soccer platform. It is unclear whether the existing jetty that is currently used for jumping off (this was being used on the day of the consultation) is to remain.</p> <p>2. The play structures in both options seem to only make provision for younger children rather than our target age group. We understand that both age ranges need to be catered for but their needs are clearly very different. The provisions are also poorly placed. i.e. not connected to the sports field and activities there, and too close to high traffic areas, such as slipways and car parking areas.</p> <p>3. There is too much provision made for car parking. The placement of this is wrong. The overflow car park area would be much better utilised as more space for casual recreation, creating a natural link with the recreation ground area.</p>	<p>1. There is no provision for recreational swimming for young people and their families. This is disappointing as consultation with our youth group members clearly identified a need for this. A diving platform was discussed, an area set aside for activities such as water polo, kayak polo, soccer platform. It is unclear whether the existing jetty that is currently used for jumping off (this was being used on the day of the consultation) is to remain.</p> <p>2. The play structures in both options seem to only make provision for younger children rather than our target age group. We understand that both age ranges need to be catered for but their needs are clearly very different. The provisions are also poorly placed. i.e. not connected to the sports field and activities there, and too close to high traffic areas, such as slipways and car parking areas.</p> <p>3. There is too much provision made for car parking. The placement of this is wrong. The overflow car park area would be much better utilised as more space for casual recreation, creating a natural link with the recreation ground area.</p>			Yes	Lyttelton Youth Group members use the area for rugby, sailing, swimming, waka ama, kite surfing, dog walking, boating, fishing as well as just hanging out.	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26652	No	Gordon		Option 2	<p>However there are some items in Option 1 that could be considered alongside Option 2.</p> <p>NP access must be provided that is direct and functional for all users i.e. increase space available. Pedestrian accessway should be via the shoreline and through the tank farm via the unused rail corridor. Retain the scout building in it's current location. Locate new rugby pavilion on south side of field. Provide at least 200 water craft trailer parking plus at least 100 car parking with provision for expansion. Long term parking area (i.e. compound) for up to 100 boats on trailers must be provided, plus covered storage for smaller water craft and the NPC support craft and tractors. Proposed improvements to public ramp over due.</p>	<p>Port Co. land swap vital to provision of safe access to and from the development for all users. Safety and maneuverability of variety of size of vehicles and trailers. Up to 400 vehicle and trailer parks. Re orientation of recreation ground after haul out is operating from a more appropriate site. New breakwater to be located 30m to the south east to provide access at each end. New breakwater essential for safe launch and retrieval of water craft when water conditions unexpectedly change. Breakwater design may require space within it's length to provide additional egress points.</p>	<p>For the safety of all users of this area the Marina should be removed back to the finger on the left side of the main accessway (not the right side as proposed), so that at this junction the public access can be excluded from the mooring sites where water based craft will be coming and going which can present a safety issue. Consideration needs to be given to implementing safety barriers/fencing to prevent divers, fishers and swimmers from accessing and using the left side of the accessway and the water in and around the moorings.</p> <p>Would you like to see the first section on the left side of the marina retained for public access - Yes.</p> <p>Naval Point Club Lyttelton Coast Guard should be located in the inner harbour so that they are not using the same area of the new development as the other water craft which could lead to safety issues. Suggested location adjacent to Lyttelton Eng. This would enable CG members to use the Te Ana parking area and a usually clear path to the open harbour. Haul out should also be located in the inner harbour, in the area between the fuel wharf and the dry dock. Haul out needs to have facilities</p>	Yes	Yes		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
							suitable for maintenance and repair of trailered water craft. Haul out needs provision for waste products collection, processing and disposal to meet appropriate codes. Haul out needs a workshop and covered area for use when maintaining and repairing water craft in bad weather. Haul out must continue to operate from it's current until it can be fully operational from a new site. Landscaping should be minimal and not along the water front areas. Washdown facilities needed adjacent to all ramps. NP require a raised start box facility midway along the harbour foreshore, this could have public toilets beneath it. Space required for future sports activities should be considered for another development within the Lyttelton area.				
26651	No	Morrison		Option 2	Unless I missed seeing it, Option 1 does not seem to have any off road pedestrain/cycle access linking Naval Point to Te Ana Marina to the town. It also seems like quite a small area trying to cater to a lot of different groups.	I prefer this option much better. This would be a significant area of flat land, and really the only good area of flat land in Lyttelton. So I would like to take this opportunity to make a really important suggestion, because I cannot see there could ever be another opportunity to consider this in Lyttelton again, due to the lack of flat land available here. Could the picnic area on that point also be an off lead dog park? Or is there	No. I think once the Marina is removed more people will swim near Naval Point and Magazine Bay. Quite a lot do already but once there are no longer people living on the boats there, I would certainly be more keen to swim there. It would be good to have more seats etc in these two areas. I think Magazine Bay beach has been dog friendly and it would be really great to keep this one beach that way (if I am	Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>another area where this could be located within this parcel of land?</p> <p>The picnic area is in a windy location and I am guessing the amount of usage would be weather dependent. Dog walkers that I meet (2 on Sumner beach last week) often speak about the lack of a dog park and any flat land in Lyttelton where dogs can be let off the lead and can socialise with other dogs. Hill walks are available in Lyttelton, but not everyone is able to walk on the hills for physical and other reasons (eg they may have small children that tire easily on hill walks), and also dogs can't really have a great long run on hills - they really need a flat space to let off steam and socialise. There is no dog park within easy reach of Lyttelton (I think the closest would be Halswell Quarry which is a reasonable drive) and with Lyttelton having such a high rate of dog ownership, many dog owners are facing the difficulty of finding a flat space to walk their dogs off lead. Due to the geography of Lyttelton many residents like myself live on steep sections with a small back yard which doesn't make for a great outside area for a dog. In winter a number of Lyttelton dog owners are driving over to Sumner now that the road is open again, however the majority of beaches nearby have restrictions for dogs</p>	correct in thinking that). Dogs like to swim too!				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>and certainly this becomes even more of a problem in Summer (and parking also becomes difficult in Summer over Summer). So unless dog walkers want to pack their dog into the car and travel, they have to walk their dogs on the hills for off lead time.</p> <p>A lot of dog owners walk their dogs in all weathers, and this is why I suggest that the picnic area, if also acting as a dog park, would be more frequently utilized than if it was solely a picnic area. With such a shortage of flat land, surely we want to see it utilized as much as possible by residents and visitors to Lyttelton. Halswell Quarry acts as a picnic area as well as a dog park. It would be a fantastic asset to Lyttelton dog walkers to be able to walk their dog on a lead from the town, to Te Ana Marina, then take them off lead at Te Ana Marina, then retrace their footsteps.</p> <p>Many dogs, depending on their breed, require a walk (in our case 2 walks!) a day and so dog walkers can be seen out walking in all weathers. Dog walkers could provide much needed regular and all weather foot traffic for tenants at Te Ana Marina (which seems to have had trouble attracting tenants so you'd certainly want to think how you can ensure business viability once they are in place) and Naval Point. Certainly I like to</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>combine a dog walk with some coffee and food, and judging by the fact there are dog friendly cafes/bar/s in Lyttelton, and from the fact I've seen other dog owners and their dogs in these places, the business owners realise this is a market worth catering to. I'd love not to have to get into the car to travel to a flat space to walk our dog, and I'd love to be spending my money supporting Lyttelton businesses instead of the over in the city or Sumner. Please do think about this, I think you'll find the dog ownership rates in Lyttelton are high, and, I am sure it would even help to attract dog walkers from nearby suburbs eg Governors Bay/Diamond Harbour/Ferrymead/Heathcote/Hillsborough to Lyttelton also, ensuring good support for local businesses - especially if there is great pedestrian/cycling access from the Town to Te Ana Marina to Naval Point. Thanks so much for considering this suggestion, it would be lovely to see this development also cater to the dog owning residents in Lyttelton, and I am certain that the increased revenue to local businesses in all seasons/weather is also an important point to consider.</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26649	Yes	Jackson	Private submission but also a Naval Point Club member	Option 2	<p>Whilst it is laudable to provide access to all, you must understand this is the ONLY space that trailer yachts can use. There is no other access to the Lyttelton Harbour at low tide. If you reduce trailer yacht access where else can we go?Lack of a full breakwater makes it dangerous to use the harbour in a southerly.</p> <p>Not enough storage for trailer yachts.</p> <p>Please read my full submission. I would also like to talk to this submission.</p>	<p>Whilst it is laudable to provide access to all, you must understand this is the ONLY space that trailer yachts can use. There is no other access to the Lyttelton Harbour at low tide. If you reduce trailer yacht access where else can we go?Not enough storage for trailer yachts.</p> <p>Please read my full submission. I would also like to talk to this submission.</p>	<p>Whilst it is laudable to provide access to all, you must understand this is the ONLY space that trailer yachts can use. There is no other access to the Lyttelton Harbour at low tide. If you reduce trailer yacht access where else can we go?</p> <p>Please read my full submission. I would also like to talk to this submission.</p>		Yes	<p>Naval Point Club.</p> <p>Past Lyttelton Sea Scout leader.</p>	Naval-Point-Submission-Phil-Jackson-July-2019.pdf
26644	Yes	Simmers	Lyttelton Port Company		Comments as per our attached letter	Comments as per our attached letter	Comments as per our attached letter			Comments as per our attached letter	LPC-CCC-Naval-Point-Feedback-
26643	No	Beddie		Option 2	<p>Not enough space for growth. Doesn't have a proper breakwater.</p>	<p>The breakwater, the general layout is good. Multi-purpose buildings are good.</p> <p>Needs a haul-out area and more storage for boats. A haul-out area is essential for boat maintenance which is a safety issue for boats (without maintenance boats are at risk for anyone using them).</p> <p>Work needs to be done to measure the use of the green space (rugby park) as there is limited flat land in the area and this is the only all tide boat access area in the Christchurch region, so priority should be given to boating/marine use. The *possibility* or reducing the park should be at least considered (and any decision based on actual usage, not lobbying).</p>	Good idea.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Yacht Club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26642	No	Hiddlestone		Option 2				Yes	No		
26636	No	Irwin	member naval pt yacht club	Option 2		I support the submissions made by the naval pt yacht club.		Yes	Yes	naval pt club (trailer sailer owner)	
26625	No	Benge (p)	NA	Option 2	<p>The main concern is having a trailer yacht storage area with the same or greater storage capacity that exists now.</p> <p>Storage for trailer yachts where the mast can be left in position is important as it allows for easy use of the yacht. With out this launching and retrieving goes from a 10 minute exercise to a 40 minute exercise, and would reduce the time boats are used.</p> <p>In general having a sheltered ramp for a southerly is a fantastic aspect of both proposals.</p>	<p>The main concern is having a trailer yacht storage area with the same or greater storage capacity that exists now.</p> <p>Storage for trailer yachts where the mast can be left in position is important as it allows for easy use of the yacht. With out this launching and retrieving goes from a 10 minute exercise to a 40 minute exercise, and would reduce the time boats are used.</p> <p>In general having a sheltered ramp for a southerly is a fantastic aspect of both proposals.</p>	It is a bit of an eyesore at the moment so removing some of it is a good idea. But it would be good to leave some of it for people to swim off and fish etc.	Yes	Yes	NPYC Canterbury Windsport Assn. I am also a Trustee on The Naval Point Marine and Rescue Centre Trust which has a separate submission with myself as the contact point	
26624	No	Benge (org)	The Naval Point Marine and Rescue Centre Trust	Option 2	<p>FOR</p> <p>i,- The site position designated for the Naval Point Marine & Rescue Centre (NPMRC) is excellent.</p> <p>ii,- The separate Coastguard ramp will work well and enhance response times to marine</p>	<p>FOR</p> <p>- The site position designated for the Naval Point Marine & Rescue Centre is excellent.</p> <p>- The separate Coastguard ramp will work well and enhance response times to marine emergencies significantly.</p>	Our preference is for option 2 with the proposed floating breakwater so it makes sense to remove the existing marina which we understand is largely in disuse, a poor state of repair and is exposed to the weather	Yes	Yes	The Naval Point Marine and Rescue Centre Trust !” which has been	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>emergencies significantly.</p> <p>AGAINST</p> <p>i,- The proposed breakwater is too small to provide protection for anything other than the main public ramp and even that would be marginal for SW winds. Its position would serve to cramp up space for boats in the process of launching and retrieval and consequently would present a new hazard to water safety.</p> <p>i,- The space available for traffic flow and parking space is insufficient to enable the best use of the site including for users of the sports fields.</p>	<p>- The proposed floating breakwater of a longer length provides for a substantially increased sheltered area from the southerly and to some extent, westerly winds. This will significantly enhance safety for all users on the water when in the process of launching and retrieval of boats, waka and windsurfers as well as swimmers in the Magazine Bay area</p> <p>- The extra space provided by the acquisition of the LPC land is vital to ensure that whole site has sufficient traffic flow and carparking !" both for marine and sports field users. The flow is substantially better and the greater area for trailer boat storage will be beneficial.</p> <p>- The re-orientation of the sports fields permits better access and more parking options for those users and connectivity with the NPMRC should that be used for after match functions.</p> <p>- Both plans provide good pedestrian access and walkways (given the presence of the notional barriers imposed following the QRA in respect of risks associated with the fuel tank farm) as well as access to the water for other users including fishers and windsurfers.</p>	<p>making vessels moored there uninsurable.</p> <p>- Retaining the existing marina in its current state does not seem to be practical option. The reduced size as set out in option 2 would benefit from shelter given by the larger breakwater and removal of the outer portions would be necessary to enable access past the breakwater at the NW end</p>			<p>established to develop and operate the NPMRC for the Naval Point Club, Canterbury Coastguard and other community user groups.</p>	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26615	No	Bachop		Option 1		Might be more inclined to Op 2 if L.P.C was to donate this extra land. Also thought lessons were learnt in the past about floating break waters especially after the storm in 2000.					
26610	No	Watson	nil	Option 2	There is a requirement for improvements in the keel boat lift-out gantry facilities - With Te Ana Marina making more berths available for keel boats!" more keel boat wash down and maintenance options are urgently needed. This seems to missed out in the option 1 and 2 considerations?	There is a requirement for improvements in the keel boat lift-out gantry facilities - With Te Ana Marina making more berths available for keel boats!" more keel boat wash down and maintenance options are urgently needed. This seems to missed out in the option 1 and 2 considerations?	Break water installation is not needed. Since the 2002 storm all ramps have been usable in most weather conditions	Yes	No		
26607	No	Thompson		Option 2				Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26603	No	Parrish	Environment Canterbury		<p>Canterbury Regional Council feedback on Development options for Naval Point</p> <p>Canterbury Regional Council (CRC) appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the Development options for Naval Point.</p> <p>CRC is supportive of the development of Naval Point. Both options 1 and 2 are consistent with the direction provided in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (CRPS), in relation to enhancing access to and along the Coastal Marine Area and for the provision of appropriate activities in the Coastal Marine Area.</p> <p>Both development options include a new breakwater. Option 1 proposes a small (assumed fixed) breakwater and Option 2 a much larger floating breakwater to provide for increased safety and greater usability.</p> <p>The Regional Coastal Environment Plan for the Canterbury Region 2011 (RCEP) applies to the Coastal Marine Area and coastal hazards zones 1 and 2. The Coastal Hazards Chapter (Chapter 9) applies to the breakwater proposals and provides guidance on coastal protection structures. The plan provisions steer away from hard forms of protection if possible due to the adverse effects on people and the environment that these forms can create. This direction is consistent with Policy 26 and 27 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2011 (NZCPS) regarding protection from coastal hazard risk.</p> <p>It is hoped that an assessment of effects regarding the two breakwater options would be available in a future iteration of the development proposal. Once an option has been finalised, resource consents are likely to be required with respect to</p>						

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>the RCEP, and the Navigational Safety Bylaw 2016 will need to be adhered to once the development takes place.</p> <p>CRC staff are available to provide further assistance with consenting requirements and advice on navigation and safety if needed.</p>						

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26597	No	Abbott			<p>Background</p> <p>CCC recently declared a climate emergency, ergo the main risks include sea-level rise and likely a move to less polluting transport fuels including a move to active transport such as walking and cycling on health and economic grounds.</p> <p>From a cyclist and environmentalist viewpoint it is good to see that one of the headline bullets of the proposal is the -improvement of public access (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to and throughout Naval Point! . But nowhere in the proposal is there any further mention of cycling other than vague (without any supporting detail or it being marked on the map) mention in option 2, which includes -Addition of an emergency access route along the rail corridor, which will also be used as a pedestrian and cycle route.!</p> <p>I do not see the rail corridor nor this shared path on the map. Can you please point out where it is?</p> <p>And what width will this shared path be?</p> <p>Option 1</p> <p>Option 1 allows for -approximately 270 car and boat parks.!</p> <p>But there is no mention of cycle paths, cycle routes or cycle parking.</p> <p>If the speed limit is low, then the lack of cycling paths within the area is likely not an issue, but I would like to see the detail of access to/from this area please.</p>	<p>Option 2</p> <p>Option 2 allows for -approximately 400 car and boat parks.!</p> <p>But once again, there is no mention of cycle paths, cycle routes or cycle parking.</p> <p>I cannot see anything on the map showing a -rail corridor, which will also be used as a pedestrian and cycle route.!</p> <p>As above, If the speed limit is low, then the lack of cycling paths within the area is likely not an issue, but I would like to see the detail of access to/from this area please.</p> <p>As such I do not support this proposal until the design is clear.</p> <p>Both options For both options, can you please confirm the speed limit for the area? I would think 20kmh would be appropriate.</p> <p>And can you please address what you propose for cycling !" access to the area, use within the area and parking !" preferably with some way to secure cycles and keep them dry-ish?</p> <p>As to bike parks, structures concreted into the ground allowing the securing of the bike frame are</p>	<p>Other</p> <p>Thank you for the council!™s work in re-opening the Sumner Road and allowing better facilities for cyclists.</p> <p>Given the climate emergency and councillor and staff encouragement of cycling, and the frequent omission of the impact of cyclists in CCC proposals, can you please create and/or update your best-practice proposal guide so that proposals include ALL stakeholders which will include but no be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pedestrians - Cyclists - Scooter users - Cars and their drivers - Commercial vehicles and their drivers - Buses and their passengers and drivers - Residents - Businesses <p>Of course, not all stakeholders will be represented in all proposals, but a checklist will remove the apparent bias of often excluding one or more groups.</p> <p>And may I please see your best-practice guide in its current</p>				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					As such I do not support this proposal until the design is clear.	much better than flimsy bike racks securing a wheel. The racks which secure by a wheel alone allow bikes to be stolen too easily, often leaving a wheel behind. And if the bike rack is under camera surveillance even better! Can you please advise the proposed surveillance method(s)?	form if it exists, and its form after update? I will share this with other Spokes members. IF we cooperate we get better outcomes for all, and open democracy, and more efficient Council processes. Thank you. I have no comment about this proposal to remove the marina adjacent to Magazine Bay. I do want to see the first section of the marina retained for public access.				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26590	No	Wright		Option 2	I do not like having the breakwater closer in, or the reduced car parking or reduction in trailer parking.	<p>I prefer option 2 over option 1 for several reasons as listed below:</p> <p>The increases parking over option 1 is preferred. It will work best for both the rugby club and naval point club as they can both use it to host bigger events as the majority of the sailing events are held in summer and rugby events in winter.</p> <p>The wave retention being moved further out allows for a larger sheltered area for boats maneuvering to be launched or retrieved during busy times or unexpected bad weather events.</p> <p>It also gives a larger safe area for unconfident learn to sail courses (especially children) which is key to naval points purpose as how is a club supposed to grow and support the general public if they cannot entice new young members.</p> <p>Wave retention is a must for the safety of retrieval and launching of trailered boats, be it a power boat or sail boat.</p> <p>It has the bigger of the two for trailer yacht parking, and as a relatively young trailer yacht owner I would love to see the club grow and provide a good community for young people as it has for me. Reducing the amount of trailer yacht parking from it's current state would detract from this and</p>	<p>Removing the old pylons is a great idea as they are a navigational hazard, especially at night as they have no lights.</p> <p>The addition of the inner harbour marina is a much safer option for keel boats.</p>	Yes	Yes	I am a member of the canterbury trailer yacht squadron and the naval point club.	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>discourage the sport. Trailer yachting is a big part of sailing in Canterbury and it would be a loss to the community if it was limited due to a storage area for the boats.</p> <p>Also the more boats we have on the water the safer it is on the water as we all look out for each other on the harbor.</p>					
26583	No	Rodgers		Option 2	I am very concerned about the apparent considerable reduction in size of the trailer yacht storage. Currently this area is not big enough for the number of trailer yachts who wish to be there and making it smaller would be disastrous for the Christchurch trailer yachting community. Unlike trailered power boats, it is not a quick matter to launch a trailer yacht which has been trailered from off-site. The yacht needs to be rigged up before launching and derigged afterwards, both of	I am very concerned about the apparent reduction in size of the trailer yacht storage. Currently this area is not big enough for the number of trailer yachts who wish to be there and making it smaller would be disastrous for the Christchurch trailer yachting community. Unlike trailered power boats, it is not a quick matter to	If the remaining part of the marina is for public use, then the public who use it would have to cross NPC!™s parking and launching area; this can be very busy on race days, and currently is restricted to NPC members!™ vehicles and boats only. Increasing the number of cars in this area could increase	No	Yes	Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron Naval Point Club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>these procedures may take an hour or more. If I was not able to store my trailer yacht at Naval Point, it would be a major inconvenience and I would use my yacht at Naval Point much less frequently.</p> <p>There doesn't appear to be a haul-out space where trailer yachts and keelers can be worked on as at present. A haul-out area is essential for keelers and trailer yachts. The only way I have to do regular keel wire changes on my trailer yacht is using the existing gantry in the haul-out area. If this goes, I don't know how I could do this necessary safety task, and how other boat owners could do similar essential tasks.</p> <p>Dinghies which have been rigged in the NPC north rigging area will have to cross the pedestrian walkway to Magazine Bay, the trailer boat wash down area, and trailer boats launching. This would be a considerable safety hazard, with adults and children pulling their dinghies through a vehicular traffic area. And if they want to use the public hand launching ramp, they have to cross the entire car park. There doesn't seem to be any storage area for dinghy trolleys near the ramps, this is necessary to store the trolleys while the dinghies are sailing.</p> <p>There is no breakwater proposed for the NPC ramp, the Coastguard ramp and the public hand launching ramp, unlike the public trailer boat ramp. In a southerly, it can be dangerous launching and retrieving boats from these ramps, and option 1 will not help this. The Coastguard in particular need to be able to launch and retrieve their boats in any weather.</p> <p>The parking and washdown area for NPC seems smaller than at present; if so, this is not good, they</p>	<p>launch a trailer yacht which has been trailered from off-site. The yacht needs to be rigged up before launching and derigged afterwards, both of these procedures may take an hour or more. If I was not able to store my trailer yacht at Naval Point, it would be a major inconvenience and I would use my yacht at Naval Point much less frequently.</p> <p>There doesn't appear to be a haul-out space where trailer yachts and keelers can be worked on as at present. A haul-out area is essential for keelers and trailer yachts. The only way I have to do regular keel wire changes on my trailer yacht is using the existing gantry in the haul-out area. If this goes, I don't know how I could do this necessary safety task, and how other boat owners could do similar essential tasks.</p> <p>Dinghies which have been rigged in the NPC north rigging area will have to cross the pedestrian walkway to Magazine Bay, the trailer boat wash down area, and trailer boats launching. This would be a considerable safety hazard, with adults and children pulling their dinghies through a vehicular traffic area. And if they want to use the public hand launching ramp, they have to cross the entire car park. There doesn't seem to be any storage area for dinghy trolleys</p>	<p>the possible hazards on busy race days with many car and trailer yachts, children and dinghies, etc. using the area already.</p>				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>need to be at least as big as currently, to avoid more congestion than there is presently.</p> <p>All trailer yachts stored in the compound belong to NPC members and can now exit straight from the compound to the NPC yard. Under option 1, they would have to turn right out of the compound, crossing two way traffic, drive 100m or so and turn into NPC. And similarly to return the yacht to the compound after sailing. This introduces potential hazards, and would be especially awkward for trailers which have extended drawbars for launching.</p> <p>The proposed public ramp for hand launching is designated a different colour on the plans, and it appears that the proposed ramp may be made of sand from the colouration. If this is correct, there will be problems with trolleys getting bogged in the sand, (especially heavier boats like waka) and waves washing the sand away. All ramps should be of solid material such as concrete or asphalt.</p> <p>There is no start box for NPC races !" it needs to be situated where the start line can be seen and have a reasonable view of the racing area in the harbour.</p> <p>I am concerned with the climate change implications of both options, and conflict with the Christchurch City Council's Climate Change Policy. The general thrust of option 1 (and option 2) seems to reduce the area and facilities available to low greenhouse gas emitting trailer yachts and keeler yachts, such as the storage compound and haul-out area, and the removal of the NPC start box for yacht races, etc. and to increase the available area and facilities for public boaties, the vast majority of whom are power boat owners. So both options seem to be therefore promoting the</p>	<p>near the ramps, this is necessary to store the trolleys while the dinghies are sailing.</p> <p>The exit from the trailer yacht compound is better than option 1, it allows vehicles and yachts to cross directly into the parking and launching areas.</p> <p>There is no start box for NPC races !" it needs to be situated where the start line can be seen and have a reasonable view of the racing area in the harbour.</p> <p>The proposed public ramp for hand launching is designated a different colour on the plans, and it appears that the proposed ramp may be made of sand from the colouration. If this is correct, there will be problems with trolleys getting bogged in the sand, (especially heavier boats like waka) and waves washing the sand away. All ramps should be of solid material such as concrete or asphalt.</p> <p>It appears with option 2 that there is no division between the public boat trailer parking and NPC boat trailer parking. If this is the case, then any member of the public could use the NPC launching ramp, adding to congestion during race launching times. Is it the Council's intention to make NPC's facilities (ramp, washdown, parking, etc.) available to the</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>use of high greenhouse gas emission vessels over low emission vessels, such as trailer yachts, keelers and sailing dinghies. Neither of these options will do anything to reduce the Christchurch community carbon footprint, in fact, they will encourage an increase in GHG emissions. How does this fit in with the Council's climate change policy and the declared Climate Change Emergency? I would like to see the Council sticking to their climate change policy, and encouraging low emission vessels, i.e. yachts, over higher emission power boats, rather than discouraging them, as these options appear to do.</p>	<p>general public?</p> <p>I am concerned with the climate change implications of both options, and conflict with the Christchurch City Council's Climate Change Policy. The general thrust of option 2 (as with option 1) seems to be to reduce the area and facilities available to low greenhouse gas emitting trailer yachts and keeler yachts, such as the storage compound and haul-out area, and the removal of the NPC start box for yacht races, etc. and to increase the available area and facilities for public boaties, the vast majority of whom are power boat owners. So both options seem to be therefore promoting the use of high greenhouse gas emission vessels over low emission vessels, such as trailer yachts, keelers and sailing dinghies. Neither of these options will do anything to reduce the Christchurch community carbon footprint, in fact, they will encourage an increase in GHG emissions. How does this fit in with the Council's climate change policy and the declared Climate Change Emergency? I would like to see the Council sticking to their climate change policy, and encouraging low emission vessels, i.e. yachts, over higher emission power boats, rather than discouraging them, as these options appear to do.</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26573	No	Briggs		Option 1	I like option 1 because it seems achievable. It is enhancing the existing public facilities and improving both the function and the appearance of the area. It also retains the existing scout building which has heritage and functional value. This should be Stage 1, rather than Option 1. It can all be achieved without having to purchase additional land or remove existing users.	Option 2 could be considered as Stage 2 rather than Option 2. It is aspirational because it requires the purchase of additional land from the LPC as well as the removal of the hard-standing area for the yachts that are hauled out for repair and maintenance. This could take considerable time and money. If this is to be considered as a regional facility, then both pedestrian and vehicular access to the area need to be considerably improved ie the pedestrian link along the old railway track and better signage and road surfaces.	The marina was a poor design as evidenced by the storm which dislodged the breakwater of tyres and concrete, which subsequently damaged and sank many yachts. If it is removed it will allow more extensive use of this relatively sheltered part of the harbour by all recreational user.	Yes	No		
26560	Yes	Kennett		Option 2	Please see attached	Please see attached	Please see attached	No	Yes	Naval Point Club Lyttelton	Naval-Point-July-2018.docx

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26552	No	Davies		Option 1	<p>I support the submission made by the Canterbury Watersports Association emphasizing the retained use of a parking/rigging area and access ramps to the water at the current location (the current twin windsurf ramps work well and I would support their retention in the current location). During summer the current parking at the windsurf area is fully utilized and a larger parking area would be great but needs to retain direct access onto the grass rigging area.</p> <p>Key aspects that I would support are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear open grass area to rig on - Ramps or beach for water access at current location to provide unobstructed wind immediately on the water - Toilets and changing facilities <p>- Close and appropriate parking space, as 90% of windsurfing at Lyttelton is in the afternoon in the predominating North Easterly wind when it is stronger. Parking needs to be aligned into the wind as many vehicles are vans or wagons which have rear entry doors, and require close parking to enable safe access to the equipment. The current area works well being right adjacent to the grass rigging area.</p> <p>Nice to have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shaded area to store rigs on in hot weather - Water to wash gear and persons after being in salt water - 20 to 30 vehicle parking spaces are required, more during events and peak summer times. <p>I support CWA's comments: The removal of barrier gates has opened the area to free access, and this is causing some conflict in use (e.g. fishing, and freedom camping), and allowing vandalism that impedes the area's prime</p>	As per my option 1 comments	Not fussed		Yes	Canterbury Watersports Association	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB	
					<p>use - i.e. water access. A barrier system similar to the one at The Estuary Kitesurf Park is seen as a potential solution.</p> <p>The proposed picnic area is exposed and relatively windy, so not a good picnic spot, but well suited to kites and windsurfers. We suggest that this picnic area be in the public area on the waterfront by the larger youth/play area, along with the relocated public toilets. Alternatively, behind the existing trees beside the public ramp, which would be out of the wind and the danger of contact with windsports users.</p> <p>The popularity of kite and windsurf foiling is growing, with increasing numbers attracted to Naval Point for its deep and weed free water, not available on The Estuary. Naval Point is really the only suitable deep water foil launching area serving Christchurch.</p> <p>Kites require a larger rigging and launch area than windsurfers, and when the wind is up this needs to be free of people and obstruction for safety reasons. The eastern shore of this area should have public use discouraged, as this is where kite lines will be moving when launching and landing, posing a danger to all parties. We therefore suggest that the smaller play area be located away from this area, possibly closer to the sports field.</p> <p>A possible alternative launching spot is from the rocks on the SE end of the grassed rigging area, where there is deep water and cleaner wind. Both kites and windsurfers have minimal manoeuvrability when launching and at slow speeds, so being outside of the -marina! works well, although the rocks pose a hazard in gusty conditions.</p>							

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>Fishing does not mix well with windsports, as discarded hooks and lines are injuring people who use the area to rig, launch, and access the water. A walking route could be provided for fishers to access the very western edge of the this rigging area and to the rock breakwater. However, this would need some form of separation for safe access.</p> <p>Thanks for reading my submission!</p>						

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26543	No	Fisher		Option 2	I think in general this is a bit short sighted with not acquiring extra land to allow for the extra parking needed during busy times and for future growth.	<p>Generally from my perspective as a windsurfer who uses the harbour for windsurfing 4-5 times a week during summer I think the proposed plan looks quite good.</p> <p>A couple of requests I would like to be considered are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -That the rubble that was dumped on the shoreline south of the existing windsurfing ramps after the earthquakes be removed/covered. Due to the fickle nature of the wind and the increased tidal flow since the dredging of the harbour we windsurfers and kite surfers can't always make it back to the two ramps therefore requiring us to have to climb over this rubble to get ashore which is very dangerous for both body and gear with all the rebar sticking out. When this was just rocks it was a challenge but at least it was relatively safe. Terraced steps would be awesome ! - Please, please remove the freedom campers rights to use the area. I don't have anything against them personally but the severe lack of facilities means the area is not fit for this purpose and is just getting trashed, with flooded toilets, blocked sinks, excess trash etc - Install some sort of access system again. Like the barrier arms with concession cards for frequent users. Since these were removed 	I would love to see the old piles from the attempted floating breakwater/mariners removed.	Yes	Yes	Canterbury Wind sports Association	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>the area is attracting more unsavoury individuals who like to vandalise the area, drive in a dangerous manner, smash bottles etc</p> <p>I hope these points will be taken into consideration. Feel free to call me for more clarification.</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26537	No	Wormald			<p>Issues</p> <p>Storage Area - even though there is a huge increase in land area (use of the haul out yard land) there has been a big reduction in net storage area for current users - waka, surfski, dingy, windsurf, kayak. Why? The result will be a reduction in current use of the area and shrinking of the clubs.</p> <p>Access to water - the path between the storage area for hand launched craft and the hand launching ramp crosses the path of the vehicle access to the ramps. This is a huge safety concern, especially for the large number of children who use this site. Why? Has a safety audit been completed on this plan? Could you forward it to me please?</p> <p>Breakwater -this would only be required in southerly wind conditions, when 99% of users dont go out. There has been no major injury or fatality on either ramp and only minor damage to property. \$6M is alot of money to spend for very little benefit. Has there been a cost benefit anaysis completed. If so could you forward it to me please?</p>	<p>Issues</p> <p>Storage Area - even though there is a huge increase in land area (use of the haul out yard land and extra LPC land) there has been a big reduction in net storage area for current users - waka, surfski, dingy, windsurf, kayak. Why? The result will be a reduction in current use of the area and shrinking of the clubs.</p> <p>Access to water - the path between the storage area for hand launched craft and the hand launching ramp crosses the path of the vehicle access to the ramps. This is a huge safety concern, especially for the large number of children who use this site. Why? Has a safety audit been compleetd on this plan? Could you forward it to me please?</p> <p>Breakwater -this would only be required in southerly wind conditions, when 99% of users dont go out. There has been no major injury or fatality on either ramp and only minor damage to property. \$6M is alot of money to spend for very little benefit. Has there been a cost benefit anaysis completed. If so could you forward it to me please?</p>			Yes		
26532	No	Hemsley		Option 2		There is no mention of a travel hoist for those craft permanently moored. I see this as an essential addition as the current situation for bringing craft out of the water is not acceptable.		No	Yes	Naval Point Club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26528	Yes	Dinkelaar	C.W.A	Option 1	<p>As a member of the CWA and having looked at the proposed plans, I can only wonder why we don't take a page from Auckland Americas cup marine redevelopment, and in this prime opportunity, and think ahead to where windsurfing, kite boarding will be in 20 to 30 years time. with the onset of foiling becoming the norm in both disciplines, together with the possibility that future windsurfing and kite boarding events could be held from the windsurfing rigging area. And as wellington have secured an international event their is no reason we could not do the same except for facility's, I would ask if the council would consider extending the grassed area right up around the proposed feature sculpture then add steps the full length of the breakwater on the both side's around to the north eastern tip, this would suit jet skis, paddle boarders kayaks, kites swimmers and windsurfers, also from the most southern ramp along to the first tip create terrace's for the benefit of the watching public for the yachting, windsurfing, kiting which would allow easier exit and entrance to the water for windsurfers kites and benefit fishermen I would also hope the feature sculpture will not get the approval as this will only add as another obstacle to navigate our gear around.</p> <p>thank you for your consideration</p> <p>rob Dinkelaar.</p>			No	No		navel-point.rtf – came up blank. Info now inserted into Option 1 comment box

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26514	No	Macgregor		Option 2	It leaves less room for the yacht club	<p>It leaves more room for the yacht club.</p> <p>In general I think reducing the trailer boat storage is a bad idea. Trailer yachts are a huge part of canterbury yachting. They are a low cost and high return form of sailing costing 1/10th as much as keelers to run. There is not a lot of cruising ground near chch and trailer yachts suit the south island as they can be used in all of the fresh and saltwater areas with races and events throughout the south island.</p> <p>The yachts currently stored in the compound all get a lot of use and encourage new people into the sport of sailing as they are not as demanding to new comers as dingys.</p> <p>Please consider a larger compound area for npsc. It will make a big difference to the club</p>	No go for it it's a good idea	No	Yes	Naval point	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26498	Yes	Stubenvoll			Not specifically. I support Naval Point Club's submission in addition to my submission & especially their concerns over the Naval Point Marina and access by very different users without controls.	Not specifically. I support Naval Point Club's submission in addition to my submission especially facilities for larger vessels through the haul out and boat storage / repair facilities.	Yes - see my submission attached, berth holders will need to be recompensed and suitable cost effective facilities (i.e. not Te Ana) made available.		Yes	<p>NPCL - ref local & world class yachting & youth</p> <p>- RSPB (birds new Zealand) ref birds in water & Quail Island</p> <p>- Coast guard NZ and Sumner Lifeboat (Life member)</p> <p>- NZ Antarctic Soc (ref historical sites & links)</p>	Submission-Naval-Point-S-Stubenvoll.docx -

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26495	No	Sommer		Option 2		It is critical that we have a haul out yard and also critical that boat owners are allowed to perform their own work. The Auckland facilities are now so highly regulated that it is very difficult to perform your own work. Many Christchurch boat owners are 'tinkerers' first and foremost and enjoy the maintenance aspect of boat ownership. This also makes it much more affordable, and without the DIY option, many present boat owners would not be able to afford the maintenance costs. I am supportive of the haulout facility being in the Inner Harbour, but the costs that would be passed on to the boat owners needs to be considered. There is considerable sunk investment in existing haul out equipment and cradles. A straddle lift, whilst desirable may be cost prohibitive given the limited number of haul outs per year.	I support the idea of utilizing one finger of the Magazine bay jetty for public use. I would suggest that a floating pontoon is incorporated as this will make it much more usable than just retaining a finger as is.	Yes	Yes	Little Ship Club of Canterbury.	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26488	No	Williams	Naval Point Club	Option 2	<p>The expansion of the public ramp to four lanes combined with the partial breakwater would be beneficial. Consideration given for all tide access to the floating pontoons for disabled people. The existing groyne should be completed as it is an unmarked navigational hazard at high tides.</p> <p>The position of the proposed hand launch ramp is in dangerous juxtaposition to the powerboat ramp - sailing craft and powered craft should not mix. Possibly position the ramp on the western side of the proposed club/coastguard building.</p> <p>The loss of storage area for club trailer yachts and the lack of a haul-out and maintenance area is a major concern for club members. Because of security concerns, I keep my yacht at home, but have to contend with the abysmal condition of the access roads.</p>	<p>The proposed land swap potentially addresses the trailer yacht storage problem but will disadvantage the businesses that currently occupy the site. The rotation of the sports field will allow copious parking on the road behind the new pavilion, negating the requirement for the overflow parking area on the southern side. This area should be used for a re-positioned haul-out area and the storage shed combined with a new race control start box. Given the paucity of land available in the inner harbour area, this facility is necessary to service not only the club keeler fleet, but also the many other craft moored in Purau, Diamond Harbour and Cass Bay. It is obvious with a proposal to supply Wi-Fi to this area that freedom camping was to be promoted here, which is contrary to the designations for marine recreation activities in the district plan.</p> <p>The breakwater design in option 2 could be made shorter when combined with option 1 and allow easier access to shore facilities. Another possibility is to add a ramped pallsade to the existing inner eastern pier, which would provide protection to the club ramp and allow protected mooring to the yachts currently on the western inner pier. Given that there have been two storm surges in ten years with winds up to 120</p>	Remove the outer piers but retain the inner eastern pier as above. Current public usage for diving and swimming is dependent on convenient local parking under the cliff which should be retained if possible to avoid conflict with launching traffic.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>kph and waves of 2 metres, the design of the floating breakwater, and its position to attenuate the wave action is of utmost importance. It is noted on the OCEL website that they have had no experience in building such a structure!</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26482	No	Nicholl	Member of Canterbury Windsports Association	Option 2	I prefer Option 2, but my comments would apply whichever option is adopted.	<p>I'm a regular summer user of the Windsurfing rigging/launch area. I drive down to the launch area and sometimes bike down to there with my gear.</p> <p>The things that we need are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear open grass area to rig on, and for launching kites - Ramps or beach for water access - Unobstructed wind immediately on the water - Shaded area (some large sun shades with minimal poles) to store rigs under in hot weather, or some open sheds with slots for sails to slide into. - Water to wash gear and persons after being in salt water (ideally this would include a gear shower large enough to stand under whilst holding your board and sail.) - Close changing facilities for our use with at least one toilet (separate to the new public toilets. We often want to use this whilst we are wet, in wetsuits etc.) Ideally, this would also provide some sheltered viewing out of the wind, for interested family members who are watching the windsurfing - a wall on the north 	Is it possible to make the Marina safe for fishing and encourage all fisher folk to use it?	Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>east side generating some lee to the wind area to sit on benches. It could be like a bus shelter, with a change facility and toilet on the back side.</p> <p>- Close and appropriate parking space, as 90% of windsurfing at Lyttelton is in the afternoon in the predominating North Easterly wind when it is stronger. Parking needs to be aligned into the wind with the backs of the vehicles lee to the wind. This allows use of rear entry doors for unpacking equipment.</p> <p>The current area works well being right adjacent to the grass rigging area. Ideally, the parking area would be sealed, rather than loose single, with proper drainage. The parking area can currently become quite muddy after prolonged rain.</p> <p>- 20 to 30 vehicle parking spaces are required, more during events and peak summer times. Ideally, there would be a long grass verge, which would allow the maximum number of parked vehicles to back up to for gear drop off. This again would face North East to ensure car/van boots are lee to the wind. This could extend much further along the front edge of the rigging area, with space for cars to be backed in against the grass, but a lane in front for coming and going. This would leave all vehicles facing out to sea, and able to</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>accommodate much more parked vehicles.</p> <p>The removal of controlled access gates has opened the area to free access, and this is causing some conflict in use (e.g. fishing, and freedom camping), and allowing vandalism that impedes the area's prime use - i.e. water access. An effective barrier system would help to limit access to those using the area for boating/windsurfing etc.</p> <p>The proposed picnic area will be relatively windy, so not a good picnic spot, but well suited for use by kites and windsurfers. I suggest that this picnic area be in the public area on the waterfront by the larger youth/play area, along with the relocated public toilets. Alternatively, it could be placed behind the existing trees beside the public ramp, which would be out of the wind and the danger of contact with windsports users.</p> <p>The popularity of kite and windsurf foiling is growing, with increasing numbers attracted to Naval Point for its deep and weed free water, not available on The Estuary. Naval Point is really the only suitable deep water foil launching area serving Christchurch.</p> <p>Kites require a larger rigging and launch area than windsurfers, and when the wind is up this needs to be free of people and obstruction for safety reasons. The eastern shore of this area should have</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>public use discouraged, as this is where kite lines will be moving when launching and landing, posing a danger to all parties. I therefore suggest that the smaller play area be located away from this area, possibly closer to the sports field.</p> <p>A possible alternative launching spot is from the rocks on the SE end of the grassed rigging area, where there is deep water and cleaner wind. Both kites and windsurfers have minimal manoeuvrability when launching and at slow speeds, so being outside of the -marina! works well, although the rocks pose a hazard in gusty conditions. The current second windsurf launch ramp could do with some improvement and if a new one was to be built, I'd advocate for it being further along the rocky breakwater towards the end of the grassed rigging area. This would separate those getting into the water from those returning to land and exiting the water.</p> <p>Fishing does not mix well with windsports, as discarded hooks and lines are injuring people who use the area to rig, launch, and access the water. A walking route could be provided for fishers to access the very western edge of the this rigging area and to the rock breakwater. However, this would need some form of separation for safe access.</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26474	No	Kitto		Option 1	I would suggest moving the play area away from the rigging and launching of the windsurf/kitesurf area. Some form of toilet/changing for the windsurfing area without having to cross over the boat launch area would be beneficial as well as tap/wash facilities. The proposed picnic area would be a brutal place to be in the predominant NE and SW winds. Putting up wind barriers would be dangerous to launching kites and windsurfers, especially during regattas and competitions (Nationals is run there in February each year currently).	My preference is option one due to cost and impact on local areas. The rugby fields work better in their current configuration in winter times.	Good	No	Yes	CWA	
26471	No	Chambers			As a user of Navel Point for social boating I have attended one of the information sessions at the Port Talk Office. Following an explanation of the various plans on offer I support the 'Boat Safety Submission - Plans 1 thru 5' for Timber Jetty, Marina, Breakwaters, Rigging and concrete pontoons. The change that makes the least sense is the proposed location of the new Coast Guard Ramp - it appears to partition marina in the wrong place.	Maintain the Scout Den, and acquire Council land (plus Lyttelton Port Company land. However do not reorient of Lyttelton Recreation Ground.	Retain Godley Quay for access to public viewing area, and wind surfer area.	Yes	No		
26467	No	Sharland		Option 2	Like the smaller more realistic break water. Naval point club should not be responsible for the running of this key facility, as they are poorly run, narrow minded. I think a facility of this scale should be run more like a pool facility by local non biased government	Where will sea scouts/cadets go in this plan? What about boating education facilities	Get rid of it as it is dangerous, replace it maybe if budget permits	No	No		
26465	Yes	Trewin	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Neutral - please see attached feedback	Neutral - please see attached feedback	Neutral - please see attached feedback			Neutral - please see attached feedback	Heritage-NZ-Feedback-Naval-Point-Redevelopment.pdf

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26464	Yes	Godwin (org)	Magazine Bay Marina Berthholders Association [Inc]	Option 2	No Marina berths No breakwater No boat maintenance / haulout facility	Naval Point is the only area in Canterbury suitable for launching and recovering boats bigger than dinghies but both these plans attempt to crowd every sort of water sports into the same small area, to the detriment to the larger sailing boats. Most sailing boats, large and small, use club facilities; the public ramp is used primarily by power boats who require less space because they are far more maneuverable. Congestion will cause conflict, safety issues and degradation of the experience for everyone.	See Attached	No	Yes	Naval Point Club Magazine Bay Marina Berthholders Association [Inc]	Mbbha-council-submission.docx >
26462	Yes	Godwin (p)		Option 2	No marina berths No effective breakwater No boat maintenance / haulout facility Insufficient space dedicated to organised activities. Today's general public are too selfish and undisciplined not to interfere with such activities	As above except that some wave attenuation is provided for. Larger boats range over greater distances than dinghy sized boats and are therefore more likely to be caught out by unforecast severe weather, needing sheltered recovery facilities on their return. Most owners of these larger boats belong to Naval Point Club for organised activities and the Club therefore needs better consideration for space than current plans provide.	Many current marina licence holders have contributed tens of thousands of dollars over the years for the marina and have got very little in return. Many more have relocated to other sites because successive Councils have allowed the marina to deteriorate. The plans to remove the marina simply absolves the council of its responsibilities to its tenants. I fully support the submission of the Bertholders Association.	No	Yes	Magazine Bay Bertholders Association Naval Point Club	Naval-Point-Development.docx

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26461	No	Marshall			<p>My main concern is for the last 20 years I have stored my yacht in the CTYS compounded racing it every Wednesday night in the Summer. On both options the number of spaces available have been reduced by 60%. This will greatly effect those taking part in the racing if the yacht is not able to be stored on site. I have been race for the last 55 years but will have to stop if the yacht is not located at the club as keeping it rigged allows me to partake in the event. I do not want to tow the yacht down to the water every week.</p> <p>Thank you for your review of the issues.</p>	Same as above	You need to restrict access to the Naval Point launching ramp by vehicles and trailer to non club members.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point, CTYS and owner of a bach in the harbour	
26451	No	Begg	I am a member of NPC and CTYS. However this is my personal submission.	Option 2	<p>This proposed development is long overdue and we endure, in my experience, among the worst facilities in New Zealand. This holds back development of marine recreation for Canterbury and jeopardises safety. This is a marine facility and the key is the safe launching and retrieval of boats of various types and sizes from the sea. Getting this right is essential and without it all other aspects of the development are spurious. My comments are thus primarily orientated around this aspect.</p> <p>For the purposes of this exercise I suggest there are two main types of craft being launched and retrieved; those on trailers towed behind vehicles and those on hand trolleys. These two groupings should be kept separate for obvious safety reasons. However there are operational differences too. Those on towed trailers are invariably bigger and heavier and have motor propulsion (as well as being able to be sailed in the case of trailer yachts). Safe launching and retrieval in all weathers requires sheltered areas with no swell with good personnel access beside the boat during launching and retrieval. In the case of Naval Point this means the ramp must be protected by a breakwater. This is absolutely non-negotiable.</p>	<p>Option 2 is preferred as it has a breakwater over both towed trailer ramps. As stated above some form of breakwater is absolutely essential and therefore Option 2 is preferred. Option 2 also has a bigger trailer yacht storage compound which is important, and improved parking overall.</p> <p>It does not appear as though sufficient consideration has been given to traffic flows and in particular the separation of towed trailers behind vehicles and hand trolleys. These are not a good mix for safety reasons alone and built in separation is the best solution. I wonder if the NPC ramp could be developed as the hand trolley ramp at one end of the bay (away from the traffic) and an expanded 6 lane towed trailer ramp be a combined facility. Maybe this would be an improvement for Option 2.</p> <p>A wooden board walk along the</p>	<p>I think the marina should be removed. Moored boats are much better off in the Inner Harbour. In lieu of the marina, I would suggest consideration be given to a series of Board Walks / wharves along the shoreline either side of the ramps. Good examples of this are to be seen in Wellington. Board walks give good public access and also a place for boats leaving and arriving to tie up on a temporary basis to load / unload people etc. This is important and eases pressure at the ramps themselves.</p> <p>The current NPC floating pontoon is a wonderful asset and much used. Replication and extension of this type of facility is recommended.</p>	No	Yes	<p>I am a member of NPC and Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron. I am a past executive committee member of NPC and currently Vice Commodore of CTYS.</p> <p>I am also a past Commodore of Evans Bay</p>	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>However boats with motors can easily negotiate around breakwaters and relatively narrow entrances. The second group launched from hand trolleys do not have motors but are light and more easily manhandled. They don't need the same breakwater protection and prefer open water beyond the ramp to make it easier to negotiate without a motor.</p> <p>Option 1 has a reasonable looking breakwater around the public ramp but none around the NPC ramp. This is not acceptable. It begs the question as to why there needs to be these two ramps. Personally I would prefer to see one really good ramp for all towed trailer boats. It would need to be 6 (or possibly 4 lane) and have floating pontoons between the lanes. Thus 4 or 6 boats could be launched or retrieved at the same time. Adjacent wharf space is required for loading and unloading of people and their things. This loading and unloading should not be done at the ramp which is for launching and retrieval only.</p> <p>For trailer yachts, having a boat/trailer storage compound is essential. It has been shown around the country that the viability of trailer yachting is dependent on having this as part of any facility. It is good to see its inclusion but in Option 1 it is reduced in size which will doom Trailer Yachting to a similar reduction in activity.</p>	shore line is worth including. This would provide excellent public access and a place for boats to temporarily tie up when they were coming or going. Good examples of this are available in Wellington.				Yacht and Motor Boat Club in Wellington.	
26450	No	Wells			<p>General:</p> <p>1. The boat compound reduction of around 60% that is proposed in both of these plans will have considerable (negative impact) on yacht club event participation and in combination with inevitable club and compound fee rises would significantly affect club membership and pleasure boating activity at Lyttleton. This would certainly spell the end of mid-week yacht racing and regular weekend</p>	<p>General:</p> <p>1. The boat compound reduction of around 60% that is proposed in both of these plans will have considerable (negative impact) on yacht club event participation and in combination with inevitable club and compound fee rises would significantly affect club</p>		Yes		Sail as crew for CYMBC	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>participation, typically a reduction in activity renders clubs non-viable.</p> <p>2. A haul out space for trailer yachts needs to be made available.</p> <p>3. The lift-out gantry that is currently in the Keelboat haul out area does not seem to be available.</p> <p>4. An area for wash down and general maintenance with power access is needed.</p> <p>5. The shown location of the NPCL/Coastguard building tightens access / parking options and could potentially create traffic issues. Launching and parking during events when the building is rented out will cause a parking bottle neck especially if parked vehicles restrict access to the ramps.</p> <p>Option 1:</p> <p>a. Provides a wash down area which is good.</p> <p>b. Dinghy rigging area by the cliff will does not link in well with traffic flow.</p> <p>c. Traffic flow around the compound entry/exit restricts access to the NPCL ramp, especially for boats with extending drawbars.</p> <p>d. The proposed breakwater doesn't provide southerly protection for the NPCL ramp and minimal for public ramp and therefore doubt it is good value or money.</p>	<p>membership and pleasure boating activity at Lyttleton. This would certainly spell the end of mid-week yacht racing and regular weekend participation, typically a reduction in activity renders clubs non-viable.</p> <p>2. A haul out space for trailer yachts needs to be made available.</p> <p>3. The lift-out gantry that is currently in the Keelboat haul out area does not seem to be available.</p> <p>4. An area for wash down and general maintenance with power access is needed.</p> <p>5. The shown location of the NPCL/Coastguard building tightens access / parking options and could potentially create traffic issues. Launching and parking during events when the building is rented out will cause a parking bottle neck especially if parked vehicles restrict access to the ramps.</p> <p>Option 2:</p> <p>a. The breakwater is too close to the spit creating a hazard especially for towed boats. The breakwater needs to be at least 30m further out to sea to provide safe passage from both ends, very dangerous in a heavy easterly. Doubt the cost is justified.</p> <p>b. Dingy rigging area under cliff is not in a great position for traffic flow and dingy access to launching area, this area would be better utilised as boat compound area.</p> <p>c. The field and road take up too much room, this is a harbour, if</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>more playing fields are needed there is plenty of red zone land in Christchurch.</p> <p>d. Roading and car parking to trailer parking needs more thought.</p>					
26448	Yes	Duncan		Option 2	<p>I do not like the fact that there is no designated NPCL secure controlled area.</p> <p>New hand launch ramp for Waka, Kayak, Dinghys etc looks awesome.</p>	<p>I do not like the addition of a multi sport court. There are plenty of other spaces for land based activities, we should be keeping this are for water based activities and support structures.</p> <p>Do not like the lack of secure NPCL designated area, please see attached drawing of updated layout and new proposal for the shape of the breakwater.</p> <p>Good to have more car / boat parking space, as it will be a very popular area.</p> <p>Breakwater is a must have, but needs more space to get high speed sail boats in and out.</p> <p>New hand launch ramp for Waka, Kayak, Dinghys etc looks awesome.</p>	<p>It would be good to keep a portion of this for public access.</p> <p>I think that we should keep a bit more to allow larger keel boats to tie up for the day.</p>	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club Lyttelton	Naval-Point-Development-Option-3.jpg -

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26447	No	Baddeley		Option 2		<p>The ability to increase the public area for water sports. I moved to christchurch because of its watersports and enhancing this aspect will be a bonus in many ways. It's certainly a facility which will attract young dynamic individuals to move to christchurch.</p> <p>Windsurfing, kayaking, kite surfing, paddle boarding are growing sports which do very little environmental damage compared to jet skis, and motor boats.</p> <p>Very little noise and no pollution.</p>		Yes	Yes	Christchurch watersports association	
26446	No	BEC		Option 1	<p>As a kitesurfer, the location of the picnic area scares me. This will be typically the only place exposed to clean winds where users will rig and launch their kites, and this does not mix well with kids and non users nearby. Luckily once the wind is strong enough, it would spoil any attempt at having a picnic, so this would be self-limiting. But in any case, picnic/play area should be set further back for the wellbeing of everyone.</p> <p>At the moment, the access ramps present a major risk, with a long rockwall downwind of the ramps. A wrong gust or wind shift can easily turn into a major nightmare. The risk of a kite that luffs and powers up again near those rocks is the main reason why only a few people dare to go out there. It is inherently dangerous.</p> <p>An other option that could be beneficial to all users would be to have a floating platform near the end of the rocky spit on the SW side of that picnic area where kitesurfers could setup and launch their kites from, away from non users, and into some</p>	<p>The proposed breakwater extends further out, and would therefore become the place where windsurfers/kitesurfers end up if/when the wind dies off and they cannot make it back to the ramps upwind. Arguably that floating breakwater if suitably designed would be a safer option than the abandoned piles of the current marina, which are extremely dangerous for kites subject to luffing in the unstable winds behind the point. But the location of that breakwater would mean that there would be increased boat traffic near that critical zone where kitesurfers enter and exit the water in already difficult wind conditions.</p>	<p>Piles downwind of the grassy area are a very obvious hazard for kitesurfers that end up downwind of their starting point. Being typically quite sheltered from the wind, this could be considered as an acceptable exit. Dropping the kite in the water, packing down and swimming to the shore wouldn't be a bad option, actually much less scary than the current ramps, but the presence of all those piles prevents this option.</p>				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					cleaner winds, with the safety of not having rocky obstacles downwind of them. Alternatively, if that rocky SW spit wasn't that rocky, or had pebbles or a smoother surface, (and being free of fishermen) it could well become the preferred entry point to the water. It is further out into cleaner winds, and with less obstacles downwind in an easterly wind, it'd be much safer than the existing ramps. It would be a great improvement to not have the piles of the marina in that area.						
26445	No	Staiger		Option 1	It would be great if there was some area set aside for rigging kitesurfing gear and launching your kite safely. The point is probably the best area to do this but not if it™s turned into a picnic area for families. Lots of people like to use this area for kitesurfing access to the harbour as there are currently very limited locations to safely launch from.		Best to remove the Marina altogether	No	Yes	Canterbury Windsports Association, CWA	
26444	No	Husband		Option 2	<p>The breakwater is too small. It offers no protection to the greater marina area from wind from the south around to the west. The breakwater should extend right across the marina as in option 2.</p> <p>The proposed coastguard building occupies prime space on the water front and should be located back from the shore. This would provide the opportunity for the hand launching beach to be larger and accommodate greater numbers of smaller boats.</p> <p>The coastguard ramp is right in the middle of the bay and will hinder boating movements.</p>	<p>The length of the breakwater is excellent as it provides great shelter however it needs a gap at the mid point and then an overlap at the gap so that boats can exit and enter at that location as well..</p> <p>The coastguard building occupies prime space on the water front and should be located back from the shore.</p> <p>The adjusted sports field appears too large and has taken parking space and therefore more parking needs to be constructed. Option 1 is better in this regard as money can be saved by not adjusting the car park to the south of the sports field.</p> <p>The coastguard ramp is right in the middle of the bay and will hinder boating movements.</p>	If part of the marina could be retained it would be useful. However if the full length breakwater of option 2 is constructed then it makes sense to remove the marina.	Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26442	No	Husband	Private boat user	Option 2	<p>Option 1 the breakwater is not long enough to give full protection to the two ramps.</p> <p>The recreation grounds and sea scouts den should remain in their present position.</p> <p>Proposed NPC building does not need to go adjacent to the foreshore. The area between the two ramps should remain for sea/land activities for the general public.</p> <p>Hand launching beach to be larger than indicated on concept plans.</p> <p>Coastguard ramp will hinder boats under sail in in there movements around this area.</p>	<p>The breakwater should be of sufficient length to give maximum protect from and including the existing marina to the public ramp, from the West to South adverse weather sectors, it should be outside the existing marina and have an overlapping gap in the center for boats to pass through along with boat access at each end. The recreation grounds and sea scouts den should remain in their present position. Securing the LPC land is critical. Car and boat parking areas to be designed to allow for a system of charging ramp users to help fund maintenance costs. Car and boat areas to be designed to allow for maximum legal length combinations of vehicle and trailer boat units to manoeuver. Proposed NPC building does not need to go adjacent to the foreshore. The area between the two ramps should remain for sea/land activities for the general public. Hand launching beach to be larger than indicated on concept plans. Coastguard ramp will hinder boats under sail in in there movements around this area.</p>	<p>The marina should stay and be protected by the breakwater then upgraded as there is strong interest from boaties to have a marina here. Fees would then help fund and contribute to ongoing maintenance costs.</p>		No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26441	No	Gieseg	Private Submission	Option 2	<p>The breakwater as draw in option one is very limited and provides little protect from the Southerly storms.</p> <p>However, it does retain the size of the storage yard for the trailer yachts of which there is 120 boat stored at Naval point. See below problems with option 2</p>	<p>The break water proposal would greatly enhance the safety of boat launching during the rose of southerly winds.</p> <p>However the proposal would kill off important features of the current layout.</p> <p>1) It is essential that the NPLC retains control of its area as well as the CG. There needs to be clear fencing and control gates separating public from club area.</p> <p>2) Far to much space is given to none water based activity. The sport grounds, non boat parking and play grounds are excessive. This area do0es not need playgrounds, it!™s a marine launch and service area. There should be no campervan parking. Once again they are not marine based usage.</p> <p>3) The loss in size of the trailer yacht yards is a serious blow to the survival and continuation of trailer yacht usage at naval point. This group of boaties are the heaviest user and constant users of the area. There is a considerable wait list for sailors wonting to store their yachts in a semi ready to sail state in this yard. Currently there is 120 boat trailed in the yard. This needs to be extended to at least 300. Counting the crews on these boats there is a large number of people dependent on the storage provide with these yards. The majority of the users cannot store there boats anywhere else. These yards are essential for the</p>	The removal of the marina wharf will improve access to the NPCL boat launching ramp.	No	No	<p>I am a member of</p> <p>Naval point club Lyttleton</p> <p>Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron</p> <p>Operational Crew Member with Canterbury Coast Guard</p>	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>continued use of Naval point as a marine boating centre.</p> <p>4) The loss of the haul out area and space for servicing the large yachts (over 30ft) is extremely serious and short sighted. The success of the marina in the inner harbour is dependent on the boats owners ability to have them hauled out and serviced and cleaned. This space must be either retained at naval point or new provided at the new inner harbour marina.</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26431	Yes	Eddy	Te Waka Pounamu Outrigger Canoe Club	Option 2	N/A - don't like at all.	<p>LEAST;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantity of storage for existing users !" space in both options is not big enough 2. Safet" Travelling from storage below cliff to new hand launching ramp involves navigating traffic 3. Facilities !" access to showers, toilets, meeting room/s, indoor training facility option !" There are none of these. Showers and toilets are essential for a club. <p>As a club we have been involved in numerous meetings with the Christchurch City Council and worked to bring together all waka clubs, including providing details of our collective needs and aspirations; this has not been reflected in the current options and there does not appear to be enough space provided for current users. We would like to see a more detailed plan showing indicative allocations and locations for current users.</p>	<p>Almost 20 years ago Te Waka Pounamu was formed and has a current membership of approximately 140 members and growing. Outrigger Canoe, also know as Waka ama, has a cultural importance particularly amongst the Māori community with a focus on rangatahi (youth). You will find Te Waka Pounamu catering to a vast age group starting from 6 years of age right up to 70. Our clubs paddlers are involved from a social level right up to the international stage including World Championships where medals have been brought home to Lyttelton/ Whakaraupo. As a club we utalise 100% of Whakaraupo in many aspects. Courses we paddle are dependent on tide, wind and swell direction. Please see attached map of regularly used upper harbour waka routes. These routes contribute to many successes ranging from bringing other waka paddlers throughout New Zealand to compete in regatta!™s to paddlers training for national and world renowned international events. Based on our training and regatta usage of Whakaraupo, we ask that the Marina be retained for coaching and montoring regattas</p>	Yes	Yes	Te Waka Pounamu Outrigger Canoe Club	Key-paddling-routes.jpg

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26429	No	Allen			<p>This submission discusses both options combining what is considered good working ideas from both Option 1 and 2.</p> <p>A modified plan should then be developed incorporating the good features from both and any others that arise after consultation.</p> <p>Good ideas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hand Launching Beach / ramp 2. The berthing pontoons should be straight and at least 25 Metres long. (The bend makes launching and retrieving difficult.) 3. Wash down area, 4. Scout den to remain on existing site. 5. The walking path should extend along the whole shoreline and be only intersected at launching ramps. (There should be no buildings within 200 metres of the foreshore.) 6. Windsurfer riggings and launching areas are excellent but the play area may be a potential danger. 7. Re location of Rugby building to South boundary of recreation grounds. This could be a shared club house with both the NPCL and CoastGuard 8. L.P.C. land swap essential. 9. Provision for more trailer parks of suitable size and location essential. With the improved facilities there could be a demand for up to 200 spaces on a good day. (see survey done by R.A. Allen March 2016 to March 2017.) 	<p>Proposed Combined Coastguard and NPCL building.</p> <p>The siting of the building has a potential for disaster and will result in the maximum of traffic conflict.</p> <p>I will discuss this proposal separately. The location creates several serious safety problems both on and off the water.</p> <p>The proposed ramp for the Coast Guard makes it difficult in many conditions difficult for vessels to tie up or release at the club floater or launch or retrieve at the hand launching beach.</p> <p>The building is in the wrong location and should be at least 200 metres from the foreshore and at the end of a roadway in so doing reduces congestion and the resulting traffic conflicts.</p> <p>The proposed location places it in the busiest part of the boat manoeuvring area competing with: launching boats, cars, trailers, hand launched vessels and pedestrians all contesting for space.</p> <p>On days the building is hired out to private functions there will be an increase in the number of vehicles people in and already overcrowded space.</p> <p>1. Large vessels being launched by</p>	<p>Charging for Parking Areas and access to the slipways:</p> <p>There should be no restrictions on where people can park. Club members and the general public and there should no free for access to the whole area (no charge or fixed barrier or fencing restrictions). Before the last marina company put up barriers there were no incidents and public and NPCL members respected the collective needs. The general public did not encroach on the Club area. many club members launched at the public ramps. This worked very well. (The changes introduced by the Marina Company were revenue based and were restrictive.) The club parking is generally only crowded on Saturdays. The public slip can be crowded, and the club facilities not fully used. On Waitangi Weekend 2017, 345 boats used the public slip and 48 the club. There was no parking left at the public slip and people drove away, some to Purau. The club car park had plenty of unused space (R.A. Allen Survey 2016-2017).</p> <p>Naval Point was the only slipway in New Zealand I could find which had restricted parking access and a fee charged. A charge however was</p>	Yes	Yes		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>10. The should be only one rigging area for hand launched vessels. This should be close to the hand launching beach and people launching should not cross roadways for safety reasons. This facility needs careful planning.</p> <p>Ideas which should be modified or removed:</p> <p>1. Remove youth playground. This whole foreshore area has been used by families since the reclamation was finished in the 1920's/ People park facing to the sea, enjoying the view or supervising children fishing.</p> <p>2. No trees should be planted on the foreshore restricting the view.</p> <p>3. The multisport area is not required. This sort of activity is not a feature in the area and would occupy scarce space. The most common land-based activity was informal, walking, e.g. With children or dogs (see R.A. Allen's Survey.)</p> <p>4. Provision for a haul out area for maintenance on larger craft essential. There is no provision on the options for this essential facility.</p> <p>5. Provision for showers and toilets is needed.</p> <p>6. The breakwater proposed in option 2 is the only basic design which will protect all ramps modifications may be necessary.</p> <p>7. This breakwater should be located 30 metres further to the S.W. This increases the gap between the rock breakwater by the public ramp and only minor work would need to be carried out on this structure to make it safe for navigation. It would also make the northern gap navigable and provide a larger space for manoeuvring.</p> <p>8. The proposed roading plan of the whole area is very badly designed and should be abandoned entirely. The principal on which such a plan should be developed is to have the minimum of roadway and the maximum of parking. Someone with skill and the relevant planning experience in traffic and</p>	<p>powerful vehicles</p> <p>2. Small trolley launched boats. (if the rigging area by the cliff is developed these small boats will be crossing the roads and using the ramp reserved for big boats.)</p> <p>3. people who are guests at a private function at the club house. These people have no interest in boating and will even park or block access to the ramp. (This has happened at the existing facility.)</p> <p>Considering the foreshore side of the building:</p> <p>1. It interferes with the walkway</p> <p>2. The slip for the sole use of the Coastguard is dangerously close to the small boat launching ramp and the NPLC floater. This will be used to a large degree by inexperienced sailors. To sail onto the ramp will require a certain degree of skill and most can manage in reasonable conditions. In adverse conditions many could crash onto the coastguard slip. The outcome may be serious. Experienced yachtsmen could explain.</p> <p>3. The proposed ramp for the Coast Guard makes it difficult in many conditions difficult for vessels to tie up or release at the club floater. It</p>	<p>made for the use of the slip, but this was collected by a variety of means at the slip itself.</p> <p>Please do not charge access to Parking areas. Leave access open and use the systems adopted successfully in most places in New Zealand. Do not introduce unnecessary bureaucratic controls.</p> <p>Interested Parties:</p> <p>It is realized that there are many groups who are interested in the area and want to do the best for their activity. During the planning I hope the greatest number are catered for and perhaps not some of the traditional minor players and consideration for the changing nature of modern recreation activities be taken into account.</p> <p>Some interested groups have inflated their membership up to 100%. The membership does not match the audited income recorded on official annual financial reports.</p> <p>NAVAL Point is unique in Canterbury as it is the only all tides access for trailer craft. Some groups want access e.g. but the swimmers already have access to Corsair Bay restricted solely for their use. To be</p>				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>marina parking spaces should be employed.</p> <p>9. The trailer yacht compound is too small, and the design does not make maximum use of space. The present CYTY compound was done by an experienced clever person. Those responsible for any new design should take careful note of the layout and dimensions. These are very critical. There is no evidence of this in the proposals.</p> <p>10. The whole area around the NPCL ramp is poorly designed and should be scrapped. The proposed design would result in traffic congestion and a potential scene of serious accidents. Foot traffic, towing vehicles, car traffic, pedestrian and hand launching are contesting for the use of a very small area. It is not designed for the launching of larger trailer vessels. I would not be able to launch my yacht at the ramp or park it. I need a parking space of 16.8 metres, a space of 15.2 metres to turn out of the park and a turning circle radius 6.2 metres at the ramp. (Plans and Photographs of these needs are available.) I would be forced to use the public amenities.</p>	<p>adds to on water congestion.</p> <p>The building should not be sited on the foreshore and the Coastguard vessel should be moored in the Inner harbour. Getting to an incident in open waters would be much faster that where the proposed facility is sited.</p>	<p>swimming around yachts is very dangerous as the skipper's view is restricted. Similarly, Rugby, Tennis and Netball for example land-based activities have alternative access to relatively close other venues those launching boats do not.</p>				
26423	No	Brown	Department of Conservation		<p>Penguins will need to be considered in any development. Ideally there will be an area designed for penguin nesting with netting fencing around it to keep dogs out and penguins in. The aim would be to enhance penguin numbers.</p>	<p>Penguins will need to be considered in any development. Ideally there will be an area designed for penguin nesting with netting fencing around it to keep dogs out and penguins in. The aim would be to enhance penguin numbers.</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26422	No	Rooney					Any other comments? Object to any development of this area until the road access is delt with Godley Quay is not able to cope with large amounts of traffic the Voelas Road intersection is getting very dangerous		No		
26404	Yes	Bastin		Option 2	See attached concept option 3 Two submissions made with same attachment. Comments varied slightly so here are the comments from alternate submission. The larger area is a great advantage as more parking options. The club area needs to be separated from the public. Clever gate options could allow for a more secure area when large regattas are held and size reduced for normal club days. A means of resources being shared by the multiple clubs in the area would make total sense. The potential for the club to have an area for public access eg food and drink as a commercial operation may help offset fund requirements. I like the idea of rotating the playing field. A staged development proposal would make sense. If the ramps are staying where they are then stage one on water development, stage 2 club move, stage 3 car park and ground work. This could allow for planning on other stages to still continue while work can start on decided stages. The priority for all people that use the area is to get on and off the water safely. Work on this bit and get it moving first. The rest can still be in planning stage.	See attached option 3. The area of option 2 gives the best potential to develop. Sorry drawing not as professional as the CCC one but gives an idea. Main drawing points NPCL Club House has public and private access. Public & NPCL ramps as previous. NPCL ramp floater has rising ramp for wheelchair access. Grass area for rigging and ramp one for NPCL and small area for public. Trailer Yacht compound along cliff but with road and walking between it and the cliff. Start box and toilet block near the old Coast Guard building. NPCL confined area with one access point beside sports ground but lots of room for public parking.		Yes	Yes	NPCL	NPCLorig-2.jpg

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26403	No	Davies		Option 1	I fully, and enthusiastically support the development (in both options) of a purpose built facility for Coastguard Canterbury and the Naval Point Club.	<p>The proposed removal of the Lyttelton Sea Scouts' Hall. It is concerning to note that again the proposals for the redevelopment of the Naval Point area suggest the demolition of the facilities belonging to the Scout Association of New Zealand (operated by the Lyttelton Sea Scout Group). In most proposals (if not all) since the 1990s the first draft of plans for this area have included demolishing this building. The Lyttelton Sea Scout Group have a purpose built facility which they wish to retain. It is unacceptable to suggest that it needs to be demolished without provision of a replacement, purpose built stand alone facility for the Group. The Lyttelton Sea Scout Group is ideally located at present with access to the slipways to launch vessels on trailers or trolleys and with access to the Lyttelton Recreation Ground without crossing any road or busy car park areas.</p> <p>The Group is active several nights a week and many weekends in both summer and winter. To attempt to share a multi use facility would restrict the operation of the group. The presence of a smaller building in the area that is available for community use has proved valuable to the wider Lyttelton, and boating community. The Hall has been used by other community groups and for youth windsurfing</p>	<p>The removal of the current structure is long overdue. It has been deteriorating, with little maintenance, since before the storm of 2000 that destroyed the partially built floating breakwater.</p> <p>Development in the broader area should leave the option of building a new marina in the vicinity. The number, and type of berths available in the Te Ana Marina will in time become insufficient for demand.</p> <p>The removal of the dilapidated on water sections of the marina must be expanded to include the removal and disposal of the broken polystyrene filled breakwater and walkway sections that are currently dumped on the waste ground/yard space to the west of the recreation ground (some are now buried forming a scrub covered mound). These are an eyesore, a health and safety risk for those who climb on them and a source of a large amount of marine pollution as they are broken up by vandals and the filling is dispersed by the wind.</p> <p>The Lyttelton Sea Scout Group has been serving Lyttelton, and especially its youth since 1909, often making do with poor facilities and always relying on</p>	Yes	Yes	<p>Life Member of Coastguard Canterbury.</p> <p>Scouts New Zealand Sea Scout Leader-active with Lyttelton Sea Scouts from 1990-1998 and 2005 to 2014, currently in Auckland, but planning to return in time.</p>	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>training camps - in preference to Naval Point Club's facilities due to the fact that it is separate and provides a controlled space that can be maintained as suitable for youth while the yacht club bar is in operation. The operation of a Scout Group's programme in the same facility as a licenced bar would be unsuitable.</p> <p>The Lyttelton Sea Scout Group needs to retain suitable space to store and maintain its vessels, camping and other outdoor equipment (plus indoor training aids and games equipment). The Scout camping equipment has proved to be invaluable to the community! During the 2011 earthquakes it was the Lyttelton Sea Scout Group that supplied a significant proportion of the kitchen equipment used to establish and run the welfare centre in Lyttelton. The quality of the setup that was possible at short notice as drew compliments from the Royal New Zealand Navy team that used it to prepare meals for many in Lyttelton.</p>	<p>voluntary efforts to reduce the Group's ability to operate for the good of the community by removing its base when the Group has put up with operating in the potholed wasteland that Naval Point has been for decades would be to do the Scout Group and the town an injustice.</p>				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26401	No	Moore	Little Ship Club of Canterbury	Option 2	<p>I would like to support the Naval Point Club Submission. They cover off many of the issues that concern me in regards to the development proposal.</p> <p>I represent the members of the Little Ship Club of Canterbury. With over 1000 people in the Canterbury area interested in cruising, we are concerned about the lack of a haul-out yard. This is essential for safe boating in the Canterbury region and provision for this must be included in the plan in some way, shape or form.</p> <p>To be honest - literally ANYTHING you do to the Naval Point area will be an improvement! I like both options, but considering that this is Christchurch's only all tide, recreational access to the ocean, we need something that is going to stand the test of time. Therefore I think Option two is the better more future-proof option.</p>		<p>I think this is a good idea. The current marina is an eye-sore and is not protected from the Southerly. There would need to be some thought and consideration go in to the relocation of the people who live aboard in the marina.</p> <p>Some boat owners in Corsair Bay use the slipway next to the marina - out the back of the yacht club. While this is a slipway it is often crowded with swimmers and people jumping off the pier. These activities need to be separated.</p>	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club Lyttelton. Little Ship Club of Canterbury	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26399	No	Millar	Secretary, Governors Bay Community Association	Option 2		<p>Access for the future Option 2 preferred as it provides greater access for local residents with the extended space and boat/trailer parking. Christchurch and Canterbury have very limited access to safe boat launching and retrieval. Option 2 would significantly increase these. We appreciate this will cost more but will provide better outcomes in the long term.</p> <p>Safety Option 2 also provides for safer use of the boat ramps in Southerly weather from the extended floating breakwater.</p> <p>Pollution avoidance We would also like to ask for a haul out area to clean boats be made available to reduce anti-fouling pollution entering the harbour. This would contribute to the implementation of the Whaka-Ora Healthy Harbour Plan. We ask that you provide a special purpose bounded area to carry out basic boat repair and maintenance activities. There is a need to ensure wash-down wastewater and other facility liquids and solids can be contained and disposed of appropriately.</p>	No Where boats are repaired and maintained there is potential to affect the surround coast. Harm can be caused by practices and wastes generated. These include toxic paint chips, paint residues and other solid and liquid wastes. These potentially contain heavy metals, acids, oils, hydrocarbon and marine pest species and importantly anti fouling paints. All lead to contamination of storm-water entering the harbour.	No	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26396	Yes	Bowater	Naval Point Club	Option 2	<p>The positioning of the hand launching ramp will become very congested on the water with having 4 access ramps within a small confine.</p> <p>The alignment of the dingy ramp needs to align with the predominant wind direction.</p> <p>Lack of grassed rigging area for multiple users of the hand launch ramp.</p> <p>Dislike the position of club house building, not good use of shore front area.</p> <p>Like the retention of the sports fields as is.</p> <p>See submission for rest</p>	<p>Don't like the sports field layout.</p> <p>Don't like the position of clubhouse building and coast guard ramp.</p> <p>Like the extended breakwater.</p> <p>Dislike the enclosure and congestion that could be created by single access through the breakwater .</p> <p>see submission for rest</p>	<p>Think it is a good idea to remove, - would be useful to keep a day jetty for boats visiting from around the harbour.</p> <p>This derelict marina and boats use up a lot of prime water space that could be used for active users, we don't need a floating cemetery!</p>	Yes	Yes	<p>Naval Point Club,</p> <p>Canterbury Windsports Association</p> <p>Lyttelton Volunteer Fire brigade</p>	Naval-Point-Development-Submission.docx
26395	No	Bryant	NPYC	Option 2	<p>It doesn't address the current issues of congestion launching boats - the public ramp in particular is a total free-for all, and is just an accident waiting to happen, as there is not enough space for vehicle / hand launching, nor sail vs power-boats. Trying to sail a dinghy in amongst all of the jet skis and power users (who are unaware that power gives way to sail), is a nightmare on a fine evening or weekend afternoon. In addition, the scout building is in a poor state of repair, and the local group has never had the funds necessary for proper maintenance during my time as a scout parent (the last 8 years). The local sea scouts do, however, have a requirement for an indoor space to meet, and somewhere to store their boats (currently 2 cutters and a sunburst and associated sailing / camping gear), and as they are the only co-ed outdoors-orientated youth organisation in Lyttelton, they are a valuable part of the community.</p>	<p>its a more strategic option, and provides for better long term usage of the area, and offers improved safety around launching boats.</p>	<p>I support the Naval Point club submission regarding the marina</p>		Yes	Naval Point	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26377	No	Prince		Option 2	I like that is more affordable and caters to a wide range of ocean activities however I cannot see where the haul out yard would go. A haul out yard is a significant resource to Canterbury yacht community. A lot of yachties are "mums and dads" and cannot afford to sail their yacht elsewhere for repairs. We work on our own boats, learning off each other which is another wonderful thing about the community.	<p>The reason i chose number 2 over 1 as i think it future proofs the development for increase use - two entrances and adequate parking for a variety of water activities and regattas etc. Two entrances would also make it safer in the event of evacuation or emergency services gaining access.</p> <p>I am not concerned with the sporting oval and changes as there are plenty of fields in Canterbury. However there is no haul out yard so the boating community would like to know how this fits into the scheme. We need a haul out yard as we are middle class families whom love sailing - we also have many upcoming kids, teens and women sailors and removing the haul out yard will kill sailing in canterbury.</p>	upgrade the marina and make it useful for more boats	Yes	Yes	Naval point yacht club, small ships of canterbury, trailer squadron and Tug Boat	
26375	No	Prince		Option 1	My worry is the loss of the haul out facility and lack of storage facility for the yachting community. I believe both options will destroy the close knitted yachting community and massively reduce the numbers of participants in local sailing events. Not having a well priced affordable Haul out area for yachting enthusiasts to work on their boats will send people away from the much loved sport. New Zealand currently produces some of the best sailors in the world and if the correct facilities aren't provided this will destroy the sport. Well priced boat and trailer storage should be a high priority for the council.	Continuing on from my points addressed in option 1. I do like the sea wall added in option 2. This would provide a well needed protection for leaving the launching area. Lyttelton is well positioned to host large national regattas that bring would bring staying visitors from all over the world. This could be a great boost to the local economy.	I believe the marina should be restored to a healthy condition. Leasing out the pens could be a great income earner and it should be made available for visiting yachts when hosting national regattas.	No	Yes	Naval Point Yacht Club, Trailer Squadron of Canterbury	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26368	No	Guy		Option 2	there is no protection for the boat ramps from the south / southwest winds and wave action	generally a vast improvement to the area that has been needed for years	remove the marina as it is a eye sore and unsafe for vessels using the boat ramps.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club	
26363	No	Dromgool	Resident	Option 2	I do like this option	Great option. Not sure about the floating breakwater after the old floating marina got destroyed in a storm. My idea would be to include power boats in the trailer storage area. Maybe have a swipe key access and rent out space so people in lyttelton with no garage could store a boat off the street.	Remove it. It's dangerous at the moment	Yes	No		
26345	No	Davies		Option 2		Plenty of pedestrian walkways		Yes	No		
26344	No	Colyer		Option 2	Short sighted	- If this work is to be carried out, then best to do option 2, bigger, bolder, better - It also has more room for future development - Like the pedestrian / cycle route	Excellent to see the very important harbour/city amenity to get the upgrade which will become another popular area for citizens to enjoy. Will also be able to suggest out of town visitors check it out when visiting Lyttelton		No		
26341	No	Streeb		Option 1	I support the NPC proposal	I support the NPC proposal	I support the NPC proposal				

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26340	No	McDrury		Option 2	I like the fact that the area is getting a facelift to make it more user-friendly for recreational purposes, but strongly feel that the lack of a haul-out area for recreational yachts is a shortcoming. I feel this facility could be placed away from the new public area by the existing jetty location, and this would allow many yachties who have relocated their yachts to Christchurch to be able to maintain the boats locally, continuing to work and support the local community. I support the Naval Point submission on these grounds, and feel that lack of a haul-out facility does not cater fully for community needs, and is short-term thinking that will create a problem elsewhere. It would be a much more thorough approach to deal with the issue now in a manageable way.	I like the fact that the area is getting a facelift to make it more user-friendly for recreational purposes, but strongly feel that the lack of a haul-out area for recreational yachts is a shortcoming. I feel this facility could be placed away from the new public area by the existing jetty location, and this would allow many yachties who have relocated their yachts to Christchurch to be able to maintain the boats locally, continuing to work and support the local community. I support the Naval Point submission on these grounds, and feel that lack of a haul-out facility does not cater fully for community needs, and is short-term thinking that will create a problem elsewhere. It would be a much more thorough approach to deal with the issue now in a manageable way.	Removal of the existing piles and marina is a good idea, however please ensure that this is done in a mindful way. There are long-term residents who live aboard yachts at the marina and cannot afford to move into the new facility. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the work and relocation of these craft is done respectfully.	Yes	Yes	Little Ship Company of Lyttelton	
26328	No	Armiger		Option 2		I like the removal of the stagnant boat repair / storage area, it's an eyesore driving in Footpath between the dry dock and Naval point yacht club needs finishing, I have to walk my dog on the road	Can part of it be kept for public access for diving and fishing off?	Yes	No		
26324	Yes	Burney			Congratulations on your drafting of plans for the future development of Naval Point. I attended both the public (Tue 2nd July) and specific Naval Point yacht club (Wed 3rd July) meetings and appreciate the problems you have in trying to accommodate such a variety of needs within such	Access to / from the Trailer compound. The drawings indicate the relocation of the gate way to / from the storage compound. The proposed new location will require (impossible) sharp turns for cars /				Member of Naval Point Yacht Club	IMG-20190711-0001.jpg

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB	
					<p>a small and geographically restrictive area.</p> <p>I'm a yachting enthusiast and user of Lyttelton for sailing of some 40 years experience and currently co-own a 7.80 metre yacht; All Fired Up .The yacht is stored in the Trailer yacht storage compound.</p> <p>We sail regularly throughout the Sept to June year and currently hold the Wed night twilight trophy (10 races) and Sunday Series (8 races) along with some 6 other trophies which is a reflection of how many times we use our boat and the facilities. Our boat is stored in the compound area and we have sailed the boat Saturdays, Sundays and Wed nights approx 45 to 50 times last season and would consider ourselves regular users of this harbour area</p> <p>Generally we are happy with the facilities provided at the moment but with the need to close our club rooms the new planned development of the area offers a chance to improve these facilities for a wider and increasingly growing number of people</p> <p>Matters that I'd like considered :-</p> <p>1) Breakwater. This is the top priority for yacht users. We need improved weather protection for launching and retrieving of boats from the Naval Point Yacht club jetty areas from (in particular) the southerly westerly winds. Currently the old jetty areas to the west provide some protection from the south westerly winds but there have been several times when launching and retrieving has been dangerous and damaging. With the removal of these old broken down jetties the weather will drive straight in and prevent launching or if you're already out on the water, one hell of a job getting your boat back onto the trailer.</p>	<p>boats and trailers with an overall length of 25 to 30 metres to get out of the compound onto the roadway then again sharp turns to get into the parking area and down to the launch area.</p> <p>Cars towing trailer boats can't perform the turns shown. They are too tight</p> <p>Where the existing gates allow cars/boat to go straight through the gateway and straight across the road into the launching area.</p> <p>If you were to revert to this access way it would :-</p> <p>a) make it possible to get your boat out of the compound</p> <p>b) eliminate stoppages of traffic as the boats are manoeuvred onto the roadway then into the parking area</p> <p>c) remove unnecessary traffic movement of our cars/ boats along the roadway.</p> <p>d) eliminate costs in shutting of a gate way and opening another along with its electronic actuators.</p> <p>It would also allow more storage space in the compound as boats have easier access to their parking</p>					Member of Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>The outline of the location of the proposed breakwater in general is great but could be improved.</p> <p>a) To its eastern end a great problem would arise in sailing in and not bottoming out on the submerged rocks protruding out from the Picnic area</p> <p>b) Access though this entry is too restrictive to the number and wide category of boats that will use this channel.</p> <p>c) the lack of adequate weather protection from its western end.</p> <p>Could you consider rather than one long continuous breakwater that you provide a series of offset open sawtooth sections with breaks along its length to allow boats to pass through it.</p> <p>And extend it!™s western end with a !~ flick on the end. Similar to that shown on the eastern end to provide weather protection from the sou!™westerlies.</p> <p>These changes would make it far more accessible for all users but still give weather protection to the whole bay.</p> <p>Refer to copy of your plan attached with suggested improvements marked on it</p> <p>Trailer boat storage. The areas shown on both your plans indicate a reduction in total and usable area . Currently there are 135 boats stored in the area with a regular waiting list of 6 . This situation is monitored by one of our members to ensure boats are being used and unused boats removed.</p>	<p>lots and room to negotiate turns without impeding the general traffic flow.</p> <p>Access to this storage space and manoeuvring within the compound has not been an issue . Why incur costs where expenditure is not required ?</p> <p>Naval Point Yacht Club jetty. We would continue to use this jetty if the existing gateway is maintained as it provides direct access to our compound and would give these bigger boats and trailers a direct line between their compound and the water without obstructing or blocking the general road or yacht club parking areas.</p> <p>Haulout Yard. There is no provision for a haul out yard and gantry crane which we use at least once a year for maintenance.</p> <p>Trailer Compound. The configuration of the compound in your option A is better as there is far less waste space in the middle. It would appear to be similar to the layout we have had for several years and has proven to be acceptable. We can manoeuvre boats in our own area with out disrupting the general public</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>The proposed area represents a reduction in area that would only provide storage for some 100 boats.</p> <p>One of the drivers of improving the overall use of the area as a whole is to increase the public use of it. With the compound already too small how can we encourage more boats IF there is not sufficient storage space.</p> <p>It is impracticable to consider dis-masting and re-masting if you bring your boat through the tunnel each time. Our boat takes 2 hours to dis-mast and a further 2 hours to re-mast. If we had to do this twice each week we wouldn't sail so often. This storage compound is an important integral part of sailing at Lyttelton and to further increase the use for boats, storage of boats with their masts upright already is essential.</p> <p>Refer to copy of your plan attached with suggested improvements marked on it.</p> <p>The establishment of Te Ana Marina proved that when you offer the capacity, more boats will come. Several of the boats in Te Ana have returned from Nelson, Picton etc and are now making more use of the area.</p> <p>It is essential that we at least maintain a boat storage area for at a minimum the same number of parks as now exists.</p>	<p>Naval Point / Coast Guard Club Rooms. The proposed location of these club rooms is OK and its location close to where our boat users pre-register for racing then access the water then get together after a days racing to chat and have a beer.</p> <p>Parking area safety. Could you consider ensuring that some degree of safety is maintained in the area so that the public are not too exposed to the danger from boats being manoeuvred in the area. It is preferable that there is no general vehicle access by the public to park at the expense of boats and trailers. Currently there is a barrier arm that provides vehicular access to the area by only club members and the area is generally barriered off.</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26313	No	Parratt		Option 1	<p>1. Boat safety is a priority</p> <p>2. Proposed breakwater is permanent and therefore will require little or no ongoing maintenance</p> <p>3. Incorporate the additional L.P.C land for the carpark mention in option 2</p>	<p>1. History has proved that earlier floating arrangements for a breakwater (or similar) have failed due to local weather * sea conditions</p> <p>2. There are on-going maintenance costs involved with floating breakwaters.</p> <p>3. Research into a anchoring system for a floating breakwater would be required, due to,</p> <p>a, water depth</p> <p>b, sea bed materials is not much heavier than sea water hence anchor system would be well buried, adding to maintenance.</p>		Yes	No		
26309	No	George		Option 2	Break water is of limited effect, shortage of land	<p>There is an opportunity to develop the existing Magazine Bay ramp once the NPC clubhouse is demolished. This would mean this ramp could possibly be used for club waka, canoes and kayaks through providing access via a boardwalk built on the old club house piles and the existing pathway . This would mean four ramps in total. This ramp, if developed, could possibly be suitable for some sailing dinghy launching as the prevailing NE breeze would not be blocked by the now demolished club house.</p> <p>Secondly to improve haul out facilities, a facility could be developed in the inner harbour in</p>	I have submitted on this already.	No	Yes	I am a NPC member who has been a dinghy sailor, competed in and helped facilitate a good number of National Regattas at NPC over 40 years. I am also a	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>proximity to the marina, close to the dry dock. Such a facility should include a trailer yacht gantry. The club currently has a big investment in equipment that can be relocated. The facility needs to capture all environmentally damaging output from the haul out.</p> <p>Thirdly, provide trailer boat parking for approximately 110 long term parked trailer boats that are in a secure setting in a manner that provides safe access and exit from the NPC ramp. To facilitate use of the foot print, club members can be expected to return their trailers to the park after launching. Such movement has to be planned for.</p> <p>Fourthly we will need fresh water wash down hose facilities preferably at the top of ramps so parking for this has to be included in the layout.</p> <p>Fifthly, the NPC/ Coast guard building should be moved SE to be SE of the hand launching ramp as the current location of the hand launching ramp will mean sailing dinghies are in very close proximity to power boats being launched at the public ramp. This will be a safety issue. Thanks for reading this and I am looking forward to the next step.</p>			recreational kayaker who paddles from NPC and a current trailer yacht owner who stores our family boat at the Canterbury Trailer Yacht Compound at Naval Point.		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26274	No	Ye		Option 2				No	Yes		
26273	No	Woods		Option 2		The breakwater is the biggest concern for me. I'm assuming both option 1 and option 2's breakwaters are floating. The question raises that if they were destroyed in a storm 20 years ago. What the chances of it happening again. A rock breakwater seems like the best option. Understandably option 2 can't have a rock breakwater as it would be far too expensive, but option 1 could possibly be rock. The wharves on the Jetty need to be floating and wider. There are issues on the busy days when trying to climb up and manoeuvring around people. Also hoping that the whole car park will be sealed. The gravel is awful. As a someone who had been using this facility for yachts, powerboats and currently my jetski. I believe this should have been done years ago. Please make this happen.	It needs to go. That's what Te Ana is there for.	Yes	No		
26271	Yes	Galloway		Option 2	Please refer to my submission document	Please refer to my submission document	It should be removed entirely and a new more appropriate structure put in its place. ie a floating jetty the same design as the existing NPCL floater.	No	Yes	Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron, NPCL, Mount Pleasant Yacht Club.	Naval-Point-Submission-Document.docx -
26269	No	Ensor		Option 2		The construction of the breakwater is paramount	To have a workable breakwater presumably the outer marina will have to go	Yes	Yes	NPCL	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26267	No	Brierley		Option 1				Yes	Yes	Naval Point	
26265	No	Hitchcock		Option 2	No breakwater to provide protection when launching/retrieving on the Naval Point ramps. Reduced size of the Canterbury Trailer yacht squadron lock up area is not good. This should be at least the same size as the current compound. The current compound is already oversubscribed.	Breakwater is excellent and provides a significant increase in safety when launching/retrieving yachts. Reduced size of the Canterbury Trailer yacht squadron lock up area is not good. This should be at least the same size as the current compound. The current compound is already oversubscribed.	Please remove it. There is no purpose to it, and it is a hazard when departing or returning to shore.	No	Yes	Naval Point Yacht Club and Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron	
26263	Yes	Batchelor				Any option that makes provision for the future is preferred. 1. Heritage Building. I would like to see a site for the old Lyttelton Rowing Club building which is a heritage item and which is proudly displayed as such on the front of the Lyttelton Museum web page (http://www.lytteltonmuseum.co.nz/about) and the bill boards at the Te Ana Marina. It was also used by Sea Scouts at one time and also as a club room for the Dampier Bay Maritime Club. LPC was encouraged to retain the building as heritage feature with displays telling the story of the port and in particular recreational boating. They rejected that and sadly removed it from the Te Ana Marina area and it is currently sitting in their storage area. It could and I believe should be part of the Lyttelton maritime scene in some capacity. Maybe it could still be used to tell the boating story of	The marina is dangerous to moor yachts and yachts cannot be insured on the marina. So yes it should be removed.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club. Te Ana Marina Association.	Support-for-Rowing-Club-building.docx - Download File

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>Lyttelton as part of the walk from the Te Ana Marina through to Naval Point and on to the Torpedo Boat museum. I have attached a draft proposal for the building that was put to LPC in 2017.</p> <p>2. Haulout area. I do not see a haul out area for keel boats on either plan and this is an important feature needed for the annual maintenance of these boats.</p> <p>3. Walking / cycling access. Please make this promenade development link with the Te Ana Marina, Lyttelton Township and the Torpedo Boat Museum as an integrated approach rather than an isolated development.</p>					
26260	No	Dixon		Option 2	Parking issues not enough boat storage for trailer yachts or parking while on the water. Breakwater not affective for MPCL ramp and coastguard. I like the dinghy and rigging area in the middle.	Trailer yacht storage area is to small. There is no separation from club and public activities. Dinghy rigging/ramp looks good heaps of area. Breakwater affective for all ramps. is thair a entry point from the eastern side as it looks kinda tight?		Yes	Yes	NPCL	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26257	No	Whitworth			<p>Although I am a Waimak resident, I do have interests in what you are proposing. I am a Naval Point Club member and I am a customer of the Te Ana marina.</p> <p>I think the removal of the haul out facilities is a bad idea. At the club presentation, you said that a new location hadn't been determined yet, which really means you're not giving it any serious thought, especially when you followed it up by saying that and you didn't see it as something that CCC should necessarily be involved in. Marlborough don't see it that way, since they provide travel lift, wash down and hard standing.</p> <p>The reduction in trailer yacht yard capacity, by over 50%., also is a bad idea. I'm not sure how much you understand about sailing and trailer sailing in particular. People don't have trailer yachts to sit on their drive and take to the water, every time they want to go sailing. Most people have them as a low cost alternative to a moored or berthed yacht and leave them rigged and ready to go. This is not laziness, this is how the real world works. I suggest you talk to other councils and marina facilities to gain a better understanding on this matter.</p> <p>My opinion is that you are concentrating more on the fluffy elements of water use, rather than the "hard elements" i.e. sailing and boating. You seem to want to convert Naval Point into all things to all people facility, without even considering the effects on the existing users, except of course the sports fields. Both plans are shoehorning far too much into a restricted area. At your presentation, you were asked if you had any projections for increase in use and you said no, adding that you know it will be full the day that you complete the project. In other words, you are going to wreck the place, so it's no use for everyone, rather than what</p>	<p>Although I am a Waimak resident, I do have interests in what you are proposing. I am a Naval Point Club member and I am a customer of the Te Ana marina.</p> <p>I think the removal of the haul out facilities is a bad idea. At the club presentation, you said that a new location hadn't been determined yet, which really means you're not giving it any serious thought, especially when you followed it up by saying that and you didn't see it as something that CCC should necessarily be involved in. Marlborough don't see it that way, since they provide travel lift, wash down and hard standing.</p> <p>The reduction in trailer yacht yard capacity, by over 50%., also is a bad idea. I'm not sure how much you understand about sailing and trailer sailing in particular. People don't have trailer yachts to sit on their drive and take to the water, every time they want to go sailing. Most people have them as a low cost alternative to a moored or berthed yacht and leave them rigged and ready to go. This is not laziness, this is how the real world works. I suggest you talk to other councils and marina facilities to gain a better understanding on this matter.</p> <p>My opinion is that you are concentrating more on the fluffy</p>	Remove it, but keep the jetty idea for short term tying alongside. Would be good for the kids to have something to fish off too.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Boat Club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>some people perceive as an elite group of current users.</p> <p>I know sailing is in decline in NZ, especially keel boats and your proposals will contribute that decline. Rugby is in decline too, yet the sports fields are sacrosanct, for some reason. You are adding space for car parking, yet you don't think it would be reasonable to relocate the fields to the other side of the tunnel, or further around the bays? If everyone drives there, what's the problem? Sports fields do not need to be next to the water.</p> <p>I have just signed up for two years at the Te Ana marina and I will be back to Waikawa, if there are no useful haul out facilities in Lyttelton by then and the existing ones are removed. There are many other boat owners who feel the same and some that will just give up their boats. Take a look around the marina, it's not Auckland. There aren't \$1M motor yachts everywhere. Many boats are old and of very little value. If their owners can't have a facility to work on their own boats, they will walk away. You will then have a half full \$10M marina.</p>	<p>elements of water use, rather than the "hard elements" i.e. sailing and boating. You seem to want to convert Naval Point into all things to all people facility, without even considering the effects on the existing users, except of course the sports fields. Both plans are shoe-horning far too much into a restricted area. At your presentation, you were asked if you had any projections for increase in use and you said no, adding that you know it will be full the day that you complete the project. In other words, you are going to wreck the place, so it's no use for everyone, rather than what some people perceive as an elite group of current users.</p> <p>I know sailing is in decline in NZ, especially keel boats and your proposals will contribute that decline. Rugby is in decline too, yet the sports fields are sacrosanct, for some reason. You are adding space for car parking, yet you don't think it would be reasonable to relocate the fields to the other side of the tunnel, or further around the bays? If everyone drives there, what's the problem? Sports fields do not need to be next to the water.</p> <p>I have just signed up for two years at the Te Ana marina and I will be back to Waikawa, if there are no useful haul out facilities in</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						Lyttelton by then and the existing ones are removed. There are many other boat owners who feel the same and some that will just give up their boats. Take a look around the marina, it's not Auckland. There aren't \$1M motor yachts everywhere. Many boats are old and of very little value. If their owners can't have a facility to work on their own boats, they will walk away. You will then have a half full \$10M marina.					
26255	No	Thorpe	-	Option 2		This option would allow for greater ease movement, safety and enjoyment of the area into the future. Changes are well overdue.		Yes	No		
26254	Yes	Seychell		Option 2	Most liked - Fewer parking spaces made available. Least liked - Non-continuous pedestrian promenade around the waterfront . No provision for dog friendly areas.	Most liked - Acquisition of more land for public access. Clean up of old floating marina disposal area beside oval. Least liked - Non-continuous pedestrian promenade around the waterfront. Additional acquired land is taken up by parking (significant lost opportunity to increase 'green' footprint in an otherwise industrial area. Removal of mature trees along the oval boundary. No provision for dog friendly areas.	I support the proposal to remove the marina whilst retaining public access to the first section. Consider focusing fishing effort in this area rather than along foreshore areas where there are penguins nesting.	Yes	No		Naval-Point-redvelopment-18-07-19.pdf -

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26253	No	Hawkins			<p>I do not support either option. Option 1 is a retrograde step. The proposed breakwater offers very limited protection for the public ramp and coast guard ramp, and absolutely no protection for the NPCL ramp. The breakwater would not protect the facilities from a Southerly storm like that which destroyed the marina.</p> <p>Egress from compound restricts access to NPCL ramp.</p> <p>The trailer yacht compound is too small at 60% less than current. There is a constant waiting list for compound spaces as it is.</p> <p>NO provision for haul out and gantry for boat maintenance. Currently this facility is in regular use.</p>	<p>I cannot vote for option 2 as the breakwater creates a maritime hazard. The breakwater is too close to the spit. It needs to be moved further south.</p> <p>The trailer yacht compound is too small at 60% less than current. There is a constant waiting list for compound spaces as it is.</p> <p>NO provision for haul out and gantry for boat maintenance. Currently this facility is in regular use.</p> <p>NPCL ramp is restricted by the rigging area by cliffs. The rigging area needs to be removed.</p>	The old marina needs to be removed except for leaving one pier for casual boats. This is a good proposal	Yes	Yes	Member of NPCL and the Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron.	
26252	No	Dawson		Option 2	Breakwater shown would be ineffective (especially in a Southerly) and not worth doing at all	<p>Breakwater preferred, to shelter the whole marina and launching areas.</p> <p>Breakwater would be better if 2 separate sections, offset in the middle to allow boats to enter/exit the marina at this point. This would help separate yachts from power boats, making it safer and less congested.</p> <p>A floating concrete pier is a must on the harbour side of the public ramp to act as a breakwater and to allow boats to park while retrieving trailers. This needs to be a stable platform for public safety and to prevent damage to vessels.</p> <p>Better parking layout.</p>		Yes	Yes	Waimakariri Sailing Club (as visiting sailor)	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26250	No	Henry			Undecided I'm not sure if this relates to Option One or Two I heard that CCC intends to reduce the Yacht Club boat storage area by nearly half. This would be a mistake, as reduced boat storage would mean fewer boats could launch from Lyttelton. The reason for Naval Point is largely to facilitate boats using the water, so anything that makes this more difficult would be a step backwards.	Undecided I'm not sure if this relates to Option One or Two I heard that CCC intends to reduce the Yacht Club boat storage area by nearly half. This would be a mistake, as reduced boat storage would mean fewer boats could launch from Lyttelton. The reason for Naval Point is largely to facilitate boats using the water, so anything that makes this more difficult would be a step backwards.	Its a good idea	Yes	No		
26244	No	Rondel	Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron	Option 2	Breakwater too short nowhere near enough trailer parking for trailer yacht storage	Good length breakwater but far too close to land Nowhere near enough parking for trailer yacht storage - lack of storage will have a detrimental effect on TY participation.	Removal a good idea -	Yes	No		
26243	No	Vanarendonk	Ctys	Option 2	Small amount of boat storage breakwater not protecting club ramp. Not enough parking while on the water.	Not enough boat storage. I do like the breakwater although maybe tight at the eastern end. I like the small craft ramp/area. But would like yacht club and public areas to be separated.	Bit of an eyesore!	Yes	Yes	CTYS	
26242	No	Dixon	Ctys	Option 2	Limited car/trailer park storage and usage club events would have space issues breakwater in ineffective for club ramp small boat rigging launching area looks good perhaps not needed on west cliffside yet to see any security options	Still not enough room for trailer yacht storage better wash down parking option I like the dinghy/small boat area/ramp breakwater effective eastern end may be tight with increased traffic and boats drawing depth (breakwater could be moved south?) The npcl club should be separate to public ramp and parking security hasn't been mentioned		Yes	Yes	Npcl, ctys	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26241	No	Russell			<p>A compound reduction of at least 60% that is proposed in both of these plans has a considerable negative impact on NPCL members and our ability to store and use boats.</p> <p>Option 1:</p> <p>Ã· Provides a wash down area which is good.</p> <p>Ã· Dinghy rigging area by the cliff will create a traffic hazard as dinghies going to a safe ramp will be going against traffic flow.</p> <p>Ã· Egress from the compound restricts easy access to the NPCL ramp, especially for boats with extension drawbars.</p> <p>Ã· The proposed breakwater provides limited effective southerly protection for the public ramp and none for the NPCL ramp.</p> <p>A space that allows for wash down and general maintenance with power access is required.</p> <p>Ã· The proposed location of the NPCL/Coastguard building restricts parking options and could potentially create a traffic safety hazard. Launching and parking during events when the building is rented out will create a major parking bottle neck. If parked vehicles restrict access to the ramps a major safety hazard could ensue.</p>	<p>A compound reduction of at least 60% that is proposed in both of these plans has a considerable negative impact on NPCL members and our ability to store and use boats.</p> <p>The breakwater is too close to the spit creating a hazard in the event of vessels being towed into the ramp area. The breakwater needs to be moved 30m further out to sea to provide safe egress from both ends.</p> <p>Comment: In a heavy easterly swell the towed boat and towing boat would be at risk of grounding on the breakwater or the spit.</p> <p>Ã· The NPCL ramp should be restricted to use by trailerable craft. (Yachts and Powerboats) and the rigging area by the cliff removed.</p> <p>Comment: Opposing traffic issue highlighted in General comments.</p> <p>Suggestion: Could the area under the cliff be designated to the trailer yacht compound?</p> <p>Ã· The field and road take up too much room and place an excessive weighting on land based activities.</p> <p>Ã· There appears to be an excess of roading and car parking with a dearth of trailer parking.</p>		No	Yes	NPCL	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>Comment: Option one provides trailer parking for 120 and car parking for 126, Option two provides trailer parking for 112 and car parking for 250.</p> <p>A space that allows for wash down and general maintenance with power access is required.</p> <p>Â The proposed location of the NPCL/Coastguard building restricts parking options and could potentially create a traffic safety hazard. Launching and parking during events when the building is rented out will create a major parking bottle neck. If parked vehicles restrict access to the ramps a major safety hazard could ensue.</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26240	No	Kempthorne		Option 1	<p>The solid breakwater.</p> <p>The combined parking (weekend rugby will not clash so much with summer boating)</p> <p>The breakwaters seem to constipate boating and will make negotiating the ramps difficult</p> <p>Is the hand launch ramp exposed to southerly wash?</p> <p>One of the biggest concerns about this and option 2 are the cost. Why is it not user pays? I regularly go to Marlborough Marinas and use their spectacular facilities, and never resent paying for the use because the toilets are clean, the ramps well maintained and functional, the parking flows well, and the lighting and wash down areas can be used well anytime of day/night. I would fully support a "toll" for use that would firstly recoup the cost, but also pay for a high level of quality and maintenance. Being able to own, launch and use a boat is a privilege, not an entitlement or right. Christchurch shouldn't foot the bill, especially in the context of bigger city wide issues (water, stormwater, recycling etc).</p>	<p>The floating breakwater has been tried, and failed (spectacularly on one occasion) time and time again. If this was a fixed break water, then I would be much more in favour of option 2.</p> <p>One of the biggest concerns about this and option 1 are the cost. Why is it not user pays? I regularly go to Marlborough Marinas and use their spectacular facilities, and never resent paying for the use because the toilets are clean, the ramps well maintained and functional, the parking flows well, and the lighting and wash down areas can be used well anytime of day/night. I would fully support a "toll" for use that would firstly recoup the cost, but also pay for a high level of quality and maintenance. Being able to own, launch and use a boat is a privilege, not an entitlement or right. Christchurch shouldn't foot the bill, especially in the context of bigger city wide issues (water, stormwater, recycling etc).</p>	Absolutely, it is not safe. The new inner harbour marina is a spectacular improvement. An inner harbour ramp for southerly retrievals would be a great addition also, but unlikely to ever gain traction.	No	No		
26237	No	Kennedy		Option 2	<p>The elimination of the haul out yard is terrible. Where are these boats to go?</p>	<p>There still appears to be a reduction in space for trailer yachts and haul out. Where is the space for the existing gantry that we yacht owners use? Please do not reduce the services and space we already have</p>		Yes	Yes	Naval point	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26234	No	Robertson		Option 1	<p>Both options result in a reduction of the CTYS compound by 60%. This will have a considerable negative impact on the club, which almost always has a waiting list for this space. Any changes must at the very least retain the current facilities.</p> <p>If the haulout space for Keel Boats is removed, the CYTS will no longer be able to use the gantry. This is crucial for servicing and maintenance on trailer yachts.</p> <p>Space for wash down and general maintenance, with power needs to be available.</p> <p>Provides a wash-down area which is good.</p> <p>Exit from proposed CTYS compound is restricted to access NPCL ramp, especially for larger boats with extended draw bars.</p> <p>Proposed breakwater doesn't provide adequate protection for either ramps in a southerly wind. Serious safety concern.</p> <p>Appears to be geared towards more car parking than trailer parking.</p> <p>Dinghy rigging area under cliff will mean crossing the path of NPCL ramp traffic. Could some overflow from CTYS compound be put at the cliff area?</p>	<p>Both options result in a reduction of the CTYS compound by 60%. This will have a considerable negative impact on the club, which almost always has a waiting list for this space. Any changes must at the very least retain the current facilities.</p> <p>If the haulout space for Keel Boats is removed, the CYTS will no longer be able to use the gantry. This is crucial for servicing and maintenance on trailer yachts.</p> <p>Space for wash down and general maintenance, with power needs to be available.</p> <p>Floating breakwater is too close and should be moved out. We've only just gotten rid of the piles and the space to manoeuvre is too small in proposal.</p> <p>Appears to be geared towards more car parking than trailer parking.</p> <p>Dinghy rigging area under cliff will mean crossing the path of NPCL ramp traffic. Could some overflow from CTYS compound be put at the cliff area?</p>		Yes	Yes	<p>Naval Point Yacht Club</p> <p>Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron</p>	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26233	No	Wallis	Private keeler owner with boat moored in Purau	Option 1	<p>I DO NOT LIKE option one or option 2. They both do not provide any area for haul out for keelers.</p> <p>You have gone to all the trouble of building the new Te Ana marina to encourage more keelers / launches to Lyttleton and now you are planning on getting rid of the haul out area to service them. This is counter productive and will reduce the boat service industry since we will now need to take our boats to Picton for maintenance.</p> <p>There is also no provision for boats not moored at Te Ana to fill water tanks or pick up friend or family to take them out to enjoy a day in the harbor.</p>	See above.	Perhaps this could be turned into a jetty for keeler / launch owners not moored in Te Ana to fill water tanks, load provisions, pick up / drop off friends and family.	Yes	Yes	Keeler owner moored in Purau	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26230	No	Strachan	Npvc	Option 2	<p>A compound reduction of at least 60% that is proposed in both of these plans has a considerable negative impact on our membership.</p> <p>The gantry that is currently in the Keelboat haul out area would no longer be available.</p> <p>Â· A space that allows for wash down and general maintenance with power access is required.</p> <p>Â· The proposed location of the NPCL/Coastguard building restricts parking options and could potentially create a traffic safety hazard. Launching and parking during events when the building is rented out will create a major parking bottle neck. If parked vehicles restrict access to the ramps a major safety hazard could ensue.</p> <p>Â· Provides a wash down area which is good.</p> <p>Â· Dinghy rigging area by the cliff will create a traffic hazard as dinghies going to a safe ramp will be going against traffic flow.</p> <p>Â· Egress from the compound restricts easy access to the NPCL ramp, especially for boats with extension drawbars.</p> <p>Â· The proposed breakwater provides limited effective southerly protection for the public ramp and none for the NPCL ramp.</p>	<p>The breakwater is too close to the spit creating a hazard in the event of vessels being towed into the ramp area. The breakwater needs to be moved 30m further out to sea to provide safe egress from both ends.</p> <p>In a heavy easterly swell the towed boat and towing boat would be at risk of grounding on the breakwater or the spit.</p> <p>Â· The NPCL ramp should be restricted to use by trailerable craft. (Yachts and Powerboats) and the rigging area by the cliff removed.</p> <p>Could the area under the cliff be designated to the trailer yacht compound?</p> <p>Â· The field and road take up too much room and place an excessive weighting on land based activities.</p> <p>Â· There appears to be an excess of roading and car parking with a dearth of trailer parking.</p>	<p>There is opportunity to put a decent break water and build another marina as Te Ana is full already. Christchurch is New Zealand 2nd biggest city with one marina. Wellington has 4 marinas. Seaview is council owned and has over 60 live a boards it is at 95% capacity there trailer Yacht compound is full with a waiting list. They generate a great income and attract more businesses. Please do not be short sighted. The time move ahead is now.</p>	Yes	Yes	Naval point yacht club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26226	No	Mcclay	Cubs	Option 1	The cub den provides many generations of children with life skills and amazing outdoor opportunities such as building huts, cooking on a fire, tramping, camping, sailing, kayaking, trapping, first aid, swimming, climbing, camping on Quail island. These are things many children would otherwise never do. There is no cost to council the building was built and maintained by cubs and the community. It should not be taken away.	We know from the playgroup / plunket rooms what happens when council say they will provide an alternative the resource is simply lost . This is a terrible loss as cubs and playgroup are run by community volunteers and enrich our children!™s lives beyond measure. The cub den was built by the community on the understanding it would be available to future generations			Yes	Cubs	
26212	No	Jack	Lyttelton Mountain Bike Club	Option 2		Improved cycle access					
26211	No	Bundy				Alter path to Torpedo Boat Museum. Boardwalk over rocky shoreline making level access to front door. Many visitors unable to see museum due to present steep accessway. New path would also serve Magazine Bay Beach			Yes	The Thornycroft Torpedo Boat Museum	
26210	No	Gay		Option 1	There are too many undetermined costs associated with option 2, and little information about the 'other land' the Council may dispose of and what would be done with it. Option 1 is calculable, sensible, adds value + not as wasteful	Too many 'to be determined' parts off this plan as far as costs + implications are concerned. No need to re-orientate playing grounds as still same fields etc - just seems like a waste of money & resources	Seems sensible as so few are currently getting value / use from it. Hopefully some cost effective moorings can be found for the few existing users.		No		
26206	No	Merriam		Option 2	less aspirational	acquiring the extra land allows for better design including the access and additional pedestrian and cycling corridor.		Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26205	No	Norris	Ex Leader and Member Lyttelton Sea Scouts		I am disturbed to see the plans with no allocation or allowance for the continuation of the Lyttelton Sea Scouts within the Naval Point area. I was involved in the construction of the current facilities and they are owned freehold by the Scout assn. Whilst the land is leased I feel it would be a great injustice to not include the Scouts in future plans.			Yes	Yes	Lyttelton Sea Scouts	
26201	No	McBride		Option 2	I would like to see the Sea Scouts retain their building -possibly relocate?	I like the car parking for the sports fields along this side -however - what will be the freedom camping provision be? because they will probably just fill these up and sport participators will not be able to park.		No	No		
26199	No	Hodgson	n/a	Option 1	Less expense ... less chance of budget blowout and cost cutting. Community groups such as rugby and sea scouts are less disadvantaged. With these groups who bears the costs of relocating?? Will the sea scouts have to pay to rebuilt their own facilities? What type of breakwater ... floating as in option 2?	The last floating breakwater was a total disaster. Why is it even back on the table? The cost of option 2 is a concern given the bigger scope.	No	Yes	No		
26197	No	Hodgson	Resident	Option 1	Please keep our Children!™s scout den.			Yes	Yes	My son is enrolled at Cubs.. they use the area weekly.	
26193	No	Jackson		Option 1	Option is simpler and cheaper and so therefore more likely to proceed! The area desperately needs investment. The floating breakwater from option 2 could be incorporated in this scheme. We are recreational boaties and use the area regularly. Facilities at Waikawa provide an excellent benchmark.	Access is better. Car parking provision appears very generous. Caution is required purchasing the LPC land as it is likely to be very contaminated (as with all land in this area).	It's a hazard and in poor condition and should be removed.	No	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26191	No	Homewood		Option 1				Yes	No		
26190	No	Hallatt		Option 1	There is nothing about improving the environment - it is an opportunity to support the Healthy Harbour initiative with planting of reed beds etc. to filter run off. Other structural components could help this.	Putting aside more land/water for nature would be the only way I would support more land requisition.	no	Yes	No		
26188	No	Goldsborough		Option 2				Yes	No		
26187	No	Buxton		Option 1	Opens up the waterfront without costing lots of extra money			Yes	No		
26186	No	Vant	She Universe	Option 1				Yes	No		
26185	No	nelson	none	Option 2				No	No		
26183	No	Burzynska		Option 2		Best pedestrian access.		Yes	No		
26182	No	Hurl	Lyttelton Volunteer Fire Brigade		Fixed gym outdoor gym equipment / stations	Fixed outdoor gym equipment / stations		Yes			
26177	No	Herbert		Option 1	Cubs den is historic & should be retained, please consider upgrading windsurf ramps	<p>1. Floating breakwater - the last one is still in bits all over the place!</p> <p>2. Lose a lot to only achieve more carparks</p> <p>3. I do like the walking path from Te Ana - why can't this go into option 1?</p>	<p>Please leave magazine Bay wharf for jumping - super sheltered swimming spot. Also please keep Magazine Bay dog friendly! - Lyttelton is a dog town! General Comments:</p> <p>I have mixed feelings about this development. Some of the ruggedness is charming. We're not wanting flash urban development where there is historic treasures like the scout den or the old wharf. But there is a lot to tidy up that could be done. And facilities are a bit dire. Please also think about the penguins! Let people know about them and make some</p>	Yes	Yes	Canterbury Windsurf / Former cub	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
							nice, safe places for them to roost.				
26169	No	Wylaars	Lyttelton Sea Scouts	Option 1	I prefer this option as it has a place for the Lyttelton Sea Scouts Den. This den was built by the community for Lyttelton children to participated in an international movement on their local harbour. Lyttelton Sea Scouts recently celebrated its centenary and has a proud history of providing children with a place to learn and grow and have awesome adventures. With boats and a purpose built den - we can offer many more generations that option.	Apart from not having a place for the den, I am concerned that there isn't a bigger focus on walking/ biking options to ensure that we do our bit for alternative transport into the future. I would like to see the car parking used for a more spacious promenade that has continuous walking connections to the town.	Not really :)	Yes	Yes	Lyttelton Sea Scouts	
26166	No	Pearcy		Option 1	I like how we still have the cub den. I like that you can run out and play in the trees and rec ground. We can go down to the water easily		I like jumping off the wharf		Yes	Lyttelton Sea Cubs / Scouts	
26164	No	Targus		Option 1	Because it has the Scout den	Because it does not have the Scout den	I like fishing off the jeti	Yes	Yes	Cubs General comments: Cubs and scouts den	
26163	No	None		Option 1	I would like the cub den to remain please and keep the trees	If you cut the trees down their won't be be the rope cors and their might not be cubs eny more.	Don't take it we like fish there and their is boat acses	Yes	Yes	Lyttelton General Comments Just don't take it away	
26162	No	Garing		Option 1	That we still have the original Scout/Cub Den. I also enjoy playing in the trees. p.s. Please keep the trees that aren't diseased		I think it's fine where it is, I also love jumping of the warf	Yes	Yes	Lyttelton Sea Club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26161	No	None		Option 1	I like the cub den	I would miss the tree	I like the wharf	Yes	Yes	Lyttelton Cub	
26160	No	McClay		Option 1	I vote we ceep the cub den, ceep trees, trees, trees, trees, den, den, den	Whast of time, it is a rip off, no, no, no	Just don't remove them. Keep everything		Yes	Lyttelton Cub	
26159	No	None		Option 1	I'M a cub and I like the cub den. I like playing in the field near the den	We would miss the den and the trees	Please don't remove it because we like it. We love fishing		Yes	Lyttelton Cubs	
26158	No	None		Option 1	Because it has the cubs den and the trees	Because it doesn't have the cubs den Keep the cubs den	Leave lot's for fishing	Yes	Yes	Cubs - Lyttelton	
26157	No	Bruce		Option 1	I like option one because we get to keep our Scout den.	I don't like option two because it meen we will have no scout den	Please leave lots for of the marina for fishing. Once caught a fish while fishing off the marina and I would love to have that opportunity again. Thank you for letting us have a opportunity to have a say in this	Yes	Yes	I am a cub General Comments	
26156	No	Goldsworthy-Scott		Option 1	The reason I love option 1 is because there's the Scout Den	The reason I hat option number 2 is there's no Cub Den	But it needs more fishing space. Please leave some fishing space at the marina, please keep the trees next to the cub/scout den. Also the Lyttelton sea scouts den has so much history	Yes	Yes	I am a cub	
26155	No	None		Option 1	Because we like biking here the Rec Ground, I want cub den	it is terrible	Please, please, please	Yes	Yes	Yes I am a adorable cub	
26154	No	None		Option 1	Option 1 Rules Option 1 rules	Option 2 sucks Option 2 sucks			Yes	Lyttelton Sea Scouts General comments: It so fun coming here looking at	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
										the sea view	
26153	No	Rees		Option 1	That our cub den will stand here in Lyttelton. We like to play on the Rec ground, the rope course and at cubs we learn skills to survive in the wild, help others, and make friends. Which is great fun every week. I look forward to it every week.	I don't like option 2 because there is no cub den in the plan. Thank You. p.s. I am a very cute, adorable and fierce cub.	I will be sad to see the Jetty go because I enjoy jumping off it in the summer.	Yes	Yes	Lyttelton Scout / Cub Den	
26152	No	Dann		Option 1	Option 1 is the best		I like jumping of the wharf		Yes	Lyttelton Club	
26150	No	Hope		Option 2				Yes	No		
26146	No	Cox		Option 2		The slipway needs to be wider than stated, there also needs to be a haulout area for boaties doing repairs in the Lyttelton area. Also, the Rowing Club heritage building could be used in this development as it is an early building from the port area currently under threat of demolition. Why not try to save what little we have left?	Some parts of it should remain and a decent loading and off lading area for families getting on boats should be established other than the small jetty next to the ramp.	Yes	No		
26142	No	Taylor	Grounds well	Option 2	1- Landscape/ feature on end of breakwater- Hazardous to any kite surf / kiting activities on harbour 2 - Pedestrian access to magazine bay needs to around behind storage & rigging area. At weekends lots of club activities will hinder public access along that proposed path.	1- Landscape/ feature on end of breakwater- Hazardous to any kite surf / kiting activities on harbour 2 - Pedestrian access to magazine bay needs to around behind storage & rigging area. At weekends lots of club activities will hinder public access along that proposed path.		Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club Lyttelton. (NPCL) Canterbury Windsports Assn. (CWA) Standup Paddle boarding Nz. (SUPnz).	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26130	Yes	Riley	Naval Point Club Lyttelton	Option 2	<p>Items liked least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed breakwater provides no shelter to NPCL and hand launching ramp and limited shelter to the upgraded public ramp - Not acquiring 1.2 ha of additional land is a lost opportunity, and will make it difficult to deliver a facility that is workable for the expected demand 	<p>Items liked most:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of an extended breakwater - Acquiring 1.2 ha of additional land - Enhanced access to Naval Point via a circular access route - Pedestrian access to Naval Point along rail corridor - Upgrading of existing public ramp - Provision of a hand launching ramp - Proposed NPCL/Coastguard building <p>See attached submission for further detail including important considerations noted by NPCL</p>	See attached submission for comments about the marina	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Club Lyttelton	NPCL-Submission-on-Naval-Point-development-options.pdf
26129	No	Harkess		Option 2		The advantages the upgrade provides by utilising the area to increase space and capacity. I particularly like the proposed upgrade to the recreational area for option 2. A pedestrian walkway will promote a healthy lifestyle and encourage people to enjoy the area. You should also make it a combined cycle pathway.		Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26123	No	Murdoch		Option 2	<p>Lack of protection for launching and retrieving vessels.</p> <p>Will be more congested with traffic movements in the area</p> <p>Does not allow growth in aquatic activities and only caters for users already utilising the desolate wasteland which is currently there and uninviting</p>	<p>The superior breakwater which will provide good protection when launching and retrieving vessels.</p> <p>Better circulation for vehicles gained through the inclusion of the additional port company land.</p> <p>More useable Sport fields (not something I would personally be interested in, but for the community)</p> <p>More likely to meet any increase of use of the area which is likely to happen as this is more than a local community facility and will be servicing all of Canterbury given this is the only all tide boating facility in the region.</p> <p>Yes a more costly project, but once the breakwater is established, I think it will be easier to get funding and community works undertaken in terms of this project, with the clubs, and water users most likely to get enthused when works start to happen.</p>	<p>The current structure is in a poor state of repair, and hardly useable. In addition you cannot source insurance for a vessel that is to be berthed in this area, so it only attracts a small number of vessels.</p> <p>It may be better to be removed, retaining a small amount of the structure for use as it currently is, for youth swimming etc.</p>	Yes	Yes	NPCL and board member for the NPMRCT. Also have a boat in Te Ana marina.	
26122	No	Dabinett		Option 1				Yes	Yes	Our kids use the area for Cubs.	
26117	No	Dopleach		Option 1	<p>Left to Right:</p> <p>- Landscape Feature / Sculpture - save your money, and instead make an inviting area for youth to gather & jump from a height into the water as they do now. This area is nice and warm in the summer due to the cliff angle & current building, which</p>	<p>Most of the same comments as above for shared elements.</p> <p>Hand Launching Rigging Area - This is a much better shape & size than is seen on Option 1. It would be good to have a secure rack on the</p>	<p>Where will those who live in this area move to? The LPC marina is far too expensive, which has put a lot of pressure on the available buoys. And who wants to live on a buoy - a marina is much better so you</p>	Yes		The Junior Sailors all go to the public access part of	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>extends the season for wharf jumping. As the building is being removed, building something to catch the sun and block the NE winds to replace this function that the building used to have would be good. A stepped seating area facing West that extends to the south of the Jetty would assure this cozy swimming / jumping / party spot would be preserved.</p> <p>- Storage Rigging area - Leave this area without any new trees. Trees cause eddies that make it difficult to set up and handle sailboats while on land, especially in the standard NE conditions. Leave existing vegetation, but don't plant new ones in this area.</p> <p>- The Storage area doesn't appear to be fenced off - this is required for safe storage of dinghy sailboats. It would be good to have kayak storage included in this area as well, so kayakers don't have to be able to lift their kayaks on a car in order to go paddling.</p> <p>Hand launching area - Note that the hand launching area used by both kayakers and junior sailors will be the one closest to the storage area. Hand launched dinghy sailors start at 8 years old, and I wouldn't expect them to drag their boats too far to launch, such as to the Hand Launching ramp on the map. I also don't see a wash down area in the hand launching area, which render it less useful to hand launched boats of any sort, and therefore less likely to be used than launch areas near the washdown areas. There was mention of sand in the proposed hand launching area. Non-slip rubber could be better than cement, but sand would be horrible. Sand ruins wheels, gets on everything and is hard to clean off, and dragging a trolley through sand is a miserable experience (think of pushing a loaded wheel barrow through</p>	<p>back of the Public Loo (Which is also a much better shape & size on this option), so junior sailors can rig & launch from here without having to drag their boats all the way from the other storage location. Same for kayaks. Again, careful with trees in this area so they don't cause dangerous eddies when rigging & launching. Smooth wind is much better in this area for this purpose.</p> <p>Rec Ground Parking - This is a mess & a waste of space & concrete. The end of the new car park isn't open for entry, forcing a separate access road on that side?! Why is there a strip of grass on the west side that won't be used for anything? It is rare that this much parking is required for the Rec Ground - it would be much better to combine the boating parking with the Rec Ground overflow as this would provide more parking, and the timing for most activities in that area are different - boating is heavier in the summer, rugby is heavier in the winter - one parking lot to serve them both, more overall grass area, and less concrete overall.</p> <p>The Pavillion is facing East, which will only be warm in the morning. This would be fine for summer sports, but Rugby is a winter sport, so those watching the games would be in the shade and freezing for no reason - it would be a better</p>	<p>can walk off your boat to shore instead of having to take a dingy and find a place to park it.</p>			<p>the Marina/Jetty to jump into the water after their sailing sessions. It's also popular in the summer evenings to go down to this area to jump off the jetty.</p>	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>sand - not fun!)</p> <p>- Public toilet - this needs to be larger than it is shown on the map as it will be used by a wide variety of people. It would be best to include showers (even if cold water) and a changing area, as well as enough toilets to cover needs on busy weekends.</p> <p>- I like the floating tie off structure on the public motor boat launch. This is much better than the current non-floating structure which feels very unsafe to use.</p> <p>- The "Picnic Area" is very windy & cold and unlikely to be used for eating for the vast majority of the year. This area is useful for windsurfer set up, dog walking & fishing and little else due to the exposed conditions. I wouldn't bother putting a Youth Play Zone here, as it's too cold to be of interest to small people who easily get cold.</p> <p>There is another Youth / Play Zone on the shore - this will also be very windy, so only likely to be used for very active sports in the summer when the cool temperatures may be welcome. Better to cater for fishermen in this area as they are the only ones who happily brave the cold wind. This is also the area where the start / finish signals are for trailer sailor racing. They will need to be accommodated, and they don't like to sit in that horrible wind, so some shelter would be welcomed.</p> <p>- Overflow car park - This appears to be grass on the map. It shouldn't be grass as the Boy Racers will destroy it very quickly there. This would be a good area for the Freedom Campers. They bring</p>	<p>design to have the building facing North or West as it is now. Since West is no longer acceptable for the Oil Tankers, then North would be the preferred option.</p> <p>The Scout hut is missing on this plan - this is a mistake.</p> <p>Rec Ground Trees - The trees that protect the Rec Grounds from SW & NE winds (these wrap inland here to come almost from the South by the time you are on the grass, which is why the wind break trees are so important) are missing, and those that are on the plan are spaced too far apart to be of any use for wind breaks or sun traps. They would be a nuisance in regard to wind, shade & leaves, without the benefit of shelter. This configuration would also render the Rec Grounds almost unusable as a Paragliding Landing Zone, as the shortened E-W length, along with added spaced trees would turn what is currently a safe landing zone into a tree & wind eddy hazard area. This is an important landing zone on this side of the hills, as there are no other flat areas to land before heading across the harbour (if you have enough altitude). Removing this would mean that top landing would be the only option for Paragliders, which makes this site much more dangerous to fly, and limits the wind conditions where</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB	
					<p>their own shelter (campers) and don't mind the wind. A shower / toilet block with water filling station would be appreciated in this area. There should be an entrance to the main road on this end, with a speed hump to slow Boy Racers and stop them from driving it as a circuit.</p> <p>- Sports field - South End - The trees here don't look to be the current trees. It is important that these trees are maintained, as they are the wind block that make the Rec Ground such a nice place to be in all seasons. The moment you walk through past the Scout Hut, you are into the cold wind and out of the warm sun. Removing these trees would be a large mistake, and could run the risk of turning the entire Rec Ground into an area as miserable as the "Picnic Area" out on the point. If the Sports Pavillion is moved here, make sure there is a berm on both sides to block the wind and catch the sun where the trees may have had to have been removed for the building phase, and for maintenance requirements for the building (you won't want trees up against the building, but you don't want to build wind tunnels either. The "Multi-Sport Court" is on the wrong side of the trees. As they are shown this court would always be in the shade & wind. Wrap the trees on the south side, and open the north side to make this an inviting space. I like that the Scout hut is being saved, and is gaining parking space around it. Hopefully they can keep their trees too, as they are important to the activities that are run for the children on Scout nights. They also have a number of storage sheds that don't appear on this map - they will likely still need these sheds!</p>	flights are possible or recommended.						
26101	No	Hall	Naval Point Club Lyttelton	Option 2	Not enough breakwater	The breakwater needs to have more access points for the number of yachts coming and going on busy days		Yes	Yes	Naval Point club		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26097	No	George	Naval Point Club. Also independent sea kayaker	Option 2	Less land area to work with and less breakwater protection.	<p>The exit out from any ramp past the NE corner of the breakwater to the harbour proper is a potential water traffic choke point. It is possibly a hazard on peak summer days with power boat use, waka ama, kayak and sailing craft all converging here. To reduce this hazard, the NW corner of the breakwater needs to be sufficiently open to allow predominantly sailing craft to enter and exit. This means two good exit and entry points will be available.</p> <p>We currently have a Trailer Yacht Compound with secure storage of boats on trailers with masts up. This facilitates our use of the harbour and Banks Peninsula as it reduces rigging and derigging time by an hour. I am asking for a similar secure facility with similar area be incorporated in the plans with gantry facilities. (The Trailer Yacht gantry is currently in the Haul Out Yard).</p> <p>Due to the movement of boats with masts all cabling in the area needs to be underground - no overhead cables.</p> <p>Because we have waited scores of years for the council to provide respectable access to the harbour for boat/ waka users for the region, I would argue against increasing the land area for the grassed recreation (rugby / soccer) ground.</p>	Remove it to give improved access for sailing craft, wakas etc to the NPC ramp.	Yes	Yes	I am a NPC member. I do not have a keel boat moored there, but I can see the use of a truncated marina arm (Jetty/) for enjoyment by swimmers, wharf divers/ jumpers etc. in proximity to Magazine Bay plus some visiting yachts and the remainder of the yacht owners tied up there.	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
						<p>There will be an increase in Canterbury water recreation and sport users of Lyttelton Harbour once a decent facility is created.</p> <p>Do not create a sandy beach. There are existing sandy beaches close by. Keep the waka/ kayak / small sailing craft ramp for that purpose only. Most of these craft are launched by wheeled trolleys. Sand impedes use of these trolleys.</p> <p>The coastguard will need a clear line of sight NE from the proposed location. Some novice boat users will be lulled into a false sense of security by the calm conditions behind the breakwater and once they clear the breakwater, the sea state can rapidly change in fresh NE and Southerly conditions. The Coast Guard need to be able to see what is happening. Should there be two sets of toilet facilities?? one near the public ramp and parking and one near the Coast Guard / NPC building. Summertime demand for these facilities will be busy and this will give flexibility to the public and club members.</p>					
26096	Yes	Jackson	Learn2Sail	Option 2	Please see my attached document, a comprehensive report has been written	Please see my attached document, a comprehensive report has been written	Please see my attached document, a comprehensive report has been written	No	Yes	Naval Point Club	Naval-Point.docx

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26092	No	Garrett		Option 2		<p>The only deficiency with option 2 relates to the Scout building. I think it is vital this building should be reinstated as part of the development. If this is left as an open ended decision there is a real risk it will not happen.</p> <p>There are a keen group of cubs and scouts in Lyttelton at the moment (50, with a waiting list), my 8 year old son Euan being one of them. I have been extremely impressed at how the volunteer parents who run the cubs and scouts are able to get these kids so enthusiastic about their weekly meetings. Every Wednesday Euan comes home with a new idea or skill, and sometimes even a badge. The activities they undertake are physical, social, and relevant. They also extend beyond the Scout building and out to the Port Hills and the harbour, which is exactly the type of access this development proposal is hoping to extend to the general public.</p>	<p>I would expect that losing the Scout building would result in the demise of the Scout group, as resourcing another building would be very difficult. Moving somewhere else that is already built would also be difficult as there is a requirement for somewhere to store the boats and kayaks the group has, close enough to the water for them to be useable.</p> <p>The Scouts don't need anything flash, but they need something. I would like to see that there is a specific place on the proposal outlined in option 2 for a physical location for the Cubs Scouts, and I wondered whether an addition to the sports pavilion would be possible.</p>	Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26091	No	Konstantinov		Option 1	<p>All members of my family are heavy users of NPC and Lyttelton Harbour. Main activities are windsurfing, SUP, trailer yacht sailing, swimming & playing on the beach of the Magazine bay. So, here is my feedback for both options. NOT ordered according to importance.</p> <p>1. [Both options] Public overnight camping should be banned (removed) or made paid and managed by cleaners, admins, security, etc.. Last year, campers abused the area and public toilet so much: bad smell, rubbish everywhere, dirty toilet water overflow direct to the rigging area, etc. Cases of robbery has become more frequent too.</p> <p>2. [Both options] Windsurfing rigging area / Picnic area should be connected by footpath with the rigging area, where the public toilet is proposed. The footpath means: some road marking indicating footpath crossing the 4 lane public ramp (so drivers care and pay attention a bit) AND no fences to walk around. It is especially important for kids being on the playgrounds detached from the public toilet.</p> <p>3. [Both options] Shift public ramp wash down area to north a bit (10-15m?) OR put it on the right from rigging area with the proposed public toilet. Continue the south-east corner green sections and attached north-side parking spaces straight until the access to the windsurf rigging area. It will take some space from parking area, but it can be compensated by taking some space from the west side of the overflow carpark area and maybe reusing south-east corner for parking instead of the plain grass. There are multiple benefits of this change: 1) wash down area becomes more shaded from the wind, 2) front water line becomes like a continuous park for pedestrians / users, 3) water from washed boats does not go to pedestrians, 4)</p>	<p>1. [Option 2] If I compare option 1 and 2, I can see the sport fields are about the same, but there is a lot more parking further from the cost instead. I do not remember the parking was a problem even at busy summer times. Adding more parking at the substantial cost is a waste, in my opinion.</p> <p>2. [Option 2] I VERY MUCH do NOT like the proposed floating breakwater. It becomes major problem for sailing (non-powered) small boats and inexperienced windsurfers and kids learning to sail and windsurf. If it is put the only exit to / from the water would be on the east side. NE-E wind blows most of the days (which is very much liked by sailing boats and windsurfers) and is largely hidden close to the ramps. As a result it would be impossible for small sailing boats and windsurfers to go back to the NPC or hand launching ramps. It means if there is no a power boat assisting the return (the case most of the time), sailing and windsurfing from the NPC and public ramps becomes impossible. The breakwater also requires a lot of money. If it is put for the purpose to guard from the southerly swell, put the short breakwater line instead, like in the option 1.</p>	I do not use it. If it is removed it is better	No	Yes	NPC and CWA	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>excess water does not flood the parking in the windsurfing rigging access area (like it happens now sometimes), 5) prolonged green area closer to the ramps will surf as overflow rigging area for small boats, kayaks, windsurfer, SUPers, etc. at busy summer times, 6) there are a lot more people having a rest near wash down and rigging areas than on the south-east corner, so use the south-east corner for parking (overflow parking) instead.</p> <p>4. [Option 1] the proposed breakwater line is an obstacle for non-powered boats and less experienced windsurfers, but I guess it is put there to guard the ramp from southerly swell, but is it really needed? Anyway, at least I hope that the breakwater line will be floating and will follow the tides, otherwise it will hide the view completely at low tide, which is not safe if you watch somebody training on the water. Non-floating is NO go. If the floating one is put, consider to make the it as a wide walking path. Depending on how high the structure is, add some steps down to the water on both sides of the breakwater.</p> <p>5. [Both options] make public toilet facilities big enough to accommodate busy times of a year.</p> <p>6. [Both options] make Magazine Bay easier accessible for pedestrians from the NPC side. Currently it is a walk over the hill through the hole in the fence, which is hard and unsafe, especially with little kids. And we use this path a lot.</p> <p>7. [Both options] I like the proposed public ramp for hand launching.</p> <p>8. [Both options] I VERY MUCH like that existing ramps for windsurfing are retained.</p> <p>9. [Both options] I like that marina piles are</p>	<p>3. [Option 2] I do not like that this option requires a lot more money and as a result will require a lot more time to put in place. I would prefer the area to be improved sooner than later. Hopefully in 2020 winter season?</p>					

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
					<p>removed.</p> <p>10. [Both options] I like a lot the addition of playgrounds.</p> <p>11. [Option 1 and partially option 2] I suggest to add some parking spots in the front of the NPC rigging/storage area. I can see some of it is added for the option 2.</p>						

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26089	No	Rees	Mrs	Option 1	Option 1 does not impact on the scouts den which is an important resource for the children in our community especially at a time when digital technology is taking over. At cubs children learn to appreciate the outdoors, learn to look after their community and the environment (and put that into practice rather than just talking about it). They learn key lifeskills like safety in and around water but also basic survival skills such as building shelters. Working in groups to complete challenges the cub sessions also build on their social skills which in return grows their confidence.	I appreciate that the road and more parking is more convenient but not convinced it's essential especially given the fact that the key users of the area have alternate peak times of usage (ie rugby in the winter, boaties in the summer). Also wondered if it's an option to retain the cub den in this scenario by not having the road go straight through but having it turning into SCAT trailer parking. That way only a number of parking bays are compromised. Also would it be possible to retain public access to the end of the tip towards the harbour entry (tank farm)?	Would be great if the jetty could be retained - great spot for the family to hang out.	Yes	Yes	Lyttelton Sea Scouts	
26084	No	Rees	lyttelton sea scouts	Option 1	it has got a cubs den in it. I enjoy learning about safety out doors and survival like how to make a fire and a shelter and traps to get your food.	i like that you are cleaning out all the rubbish. i dont like that there is too much rugby and parking space.	no.	Yes	Yes	lyttelton sea scouts	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26082	No	McLachlan		Option 2		<p>I largely support the NPCL submission and their priorities. I particularly like the double car access to the area (although would rather the second entry is by the current coast guard building). I think the walking access via the disused railway line is essential. Given the pressure on future land use, I would like the council to consider other Port Co land for possible car parking etc. The section North of the playing fields (currently has rock storage) and the damaged fuel tank at the cliff corner could be options. It seems unfortunate that the fuel companies have been allowed to redevelop tanks that subsequently prevent use of the roads nearby for parking etc. A vary inefficient outcome.</p>	<p>I agree with the proposal to largely remove the existing marina. I would prefer for the remainder to be open access, and to have some room for occasional use by boating public.</p> <p>Active dinghy sailer, keelboat sailer form new marina, swimmer, kayaker, and live locally so walk and bike through/past this are regularly.</p>	Yes	Yes	<p>Member of NPCL.</p> <p>Previously on Sea Scout committee.</p>	
26079	No	Shaw		Option 2	<p>you have to look at the big picture this is still a small a way to improve and will end up growing out of</p>	<p>this will make it safer with the bigger brakewater area and will give a lot of more space with the bigger boats that will use it more and will endup with better tie off points for retrieving boats and this needs to be a bigger area</p> <p>At the summer months it is well used with Freedom camper and it does make it hard to get parking and they leave a lot of mess</p>	<p>all the area is in unsafe condishion this aera should be all able to be accessed buy the public but if there is a cost of use that will work with the extra cost that has to be need to get the site sorted</p>	Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26077	No	Folter	Mr	Option 2	Making the marina smaller to on finger is good. NPCL dose not have control or full use of area around the club.	Break water plan is good and I think the most important bit. A lot more discussion is needed on break water. Haul-out yard is gone being a keel-boat owner need this for maintenance. Think the LPC has a piece of land by cattle wharf which would work. Travel lift over there as well.	Think this is a good plan.	No	Yes		
26075	No	Roland	N/A	Option 2		More parking is important, so the space will be used.		Yes	No		
26074	No	Coote		Option 2	The large area that remains as LPC land means there is less space for the public and the aesthetic value of the new changes will be undermined by the 'mess' of LPC work.	This option maximises the space for the public, which is great.		No	No		
26072	No	Hall	1949		Where is the haulout area ?	Where is the haulout area ?		Yes	No		
26070	No	McElwee		Option 1	I like that It retains the scout den.						
26056	No	Baker		Option 2		Either option MUST retain the Scout facility in the area. Option 2 looks like it has potentially an unnecessary amount of parking?? The area definitely needs to be future proofed by acquisition of the land to assist development in the future.	I think its a good idea - no pint having redundant areas and Corsair Bay area is well used by the public. So would the Marina area if allowed access.	Yes	No		
26051	No	Atkinson	NPCL sailor	Option 2	Not sheltered enough for southerly dinghy launching	I like the way it is very sheltered for sailing dinghy launching	Likely removal best option		Yes	NPCL sailor	
26048	No	Tayler	www.epochnutrition.co.nz	Option 2	Not adventurous enough	This is the playground of Canterbury and about time this forgotten area has had some investment.			Yes	Fit and Abel - Swimming	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26047	No	Olliver	COWSA	Option 1	This is the best for swimmers by keeping traffic away from the bays.	The floating breakwater will create a greater volume of boat traffic through Corsair and Magazine Bays. This is a swimming route and popular swimming area. Swimmers and boats do not mix. Most serious accidents that open water swimmers experience are with the propellers of boats.	No		No		
26038	No	Healey		Option 1	I like the position of the scout den near the playing fields. The design has some nice grassed areas for public use.	The extra safety aspects are good and the additional land allows better use of the available space which could be important in the future if use increases.	Where will the current boats go? We need more mooring boat storage facilities than either option seems to provide.	Yes	No		
26032	No	Beddie		Option 2	Too limiting for future growth - this will just create new problems in a few years and result in frustration and also more money being (eventually) spent.	This is a far better plan for the long term, and future proofs the layout for growth.	Good idea.	Yes	Yes	Naval Point Yacht Club	
26028	No	Rookes		Option 2		Space and ease of use with good weather protection with break water		Yes	No		
26019	No	Swinard	redact details	Option 2	Only a couple of aspects concern me and I'm not overly familiar with the needs of the boating and sport community so can only comment on a few aspects. As long as I can still access Magazine Bay for a swim with the dogs, and a paddle board, I'm happy. Keen to keep the jetty for people to jump off too, it is a highly valued fun activity for the local young people especially. Both options: Ideally make the area a no jet ski zone for environmental protection.	- Walk/ cycle access. I like that it looks like bikes can use the old railway corridor on this plan. It's already a shortcut I take to Magazine Bay and the walking track. And I like that in this plan there are better pedestrian routes too. However wo	No comment. Just please keep a bit for jumping off and having fun. And ramp access for non-motorised water sports like paddle boarding and kayaking.	Yes	No		
26012	No	Gibbons		Option 2	Not a sustainable solution and limits future development	Option2 reflects the most optimal long term solution and best rerun on investment over the life of the development.	It's not fit for purpose and should be removed	No	Yes	Regular user of boat ramp and former member of NPC	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
26010	No	Percasky		Option 1	If option 1 still delivers all the outcomes the community needs it makes sense to save the council money. This upgrade can not come soon enough!	it is very hard to make a choice without indicative pricing of both options. if option 2 was only 10% more expensive I would prefer option 2 (for example)		Yes	No		
26007	No	Rookes		Option 2	If the funding for option 2 is going to be a problem, then go for this option. The reality is that what is there now is a disgrace to the city. Look at what the likes of Picton and Waikawa have done. Make it pay per use to fund it.	Do it properly so go with the best option as long as the floating breakwater works. Make it pay per use to fund it	Get rid of it. Its in the way and a disgrace to look at. Also a health and safety risk!	Yes	No	I was a member of NPC, but it is such a terrible environment we left.	
26002	No	Low			It appears that parking space provided will lead to conflict between user groups during peak summer periods. Public hand launching area will not last long without better protection from Southerly .	Circular traffic flow excellent idea - Extended break water essential for long term survival of new foreshore structures	- Retention of small section for public use good idea - Rest of marina is past " best by date"	Yes	Yes	NPC (Waitaha Paddling Club)	
25996	No	Anderson	Plant and Food Research	Option 2	A breakwater is very important. Why floating and not a solid barrier? No plan should go ahead without a haul-out facility included, planned for and budgeted for. The current facility uses the boat-ramp and needs to be in close proximity. There are many recreational users who need this facility to maintain boats to safe standards and to avoid bio-security issues such. Any haul-out options need to be affordable for boat owners and should be operated by the naval point club i.e. not a commercial entity.	Definite preference to Option 1 as it appears to provide more protection to boat ramp. No plan should go ahead without a haul-out facility included, planned for and budgeted for. The current facility uses the boat-ramp and needs to be in close proximity. There are many recreational users who need this facility to maintain boats to safe standards and to avoid bio-security issues such. Any haul-out options need to be affordable for boat owners and should be operated by the naval point club i.e. not a commercial entity.	No comments. It is a navigational hazard in its current state and would require a fixed breakwater to make it usable and safe.	Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
25992	No	Cox		Option 2	It's a halfway job this option, the purposed breakwater wouldn't stop the NW wind which is the biggest issue here when launching a boat.	The Washdown area is a bottleneck currently I would expand it to at least a two boat system, also where is a floating jetty to allow for passengers to safely get on to launched boats? People with families often use the current smaller ramp system which again is a bottle next getting off and on to retrieve trailers etc. Decent walkways or a cycle lane down to the ramp also.	I am against it, the cost of the un marina and the regulations have killed off a number of local boaties. With the floating breakwater why would you not allow some smaller boats for swing moorings in this area, there is a lack of "SAFE" moorings within Lyttelton and the newly created marina tripled the costs of mooring near the Port thus removing a lot of older boaties that don't have the physicality top row out to other moorings in Cass or Corsaire bays which are unprotected.	Yes	No	Naval point	
25987	No	Forbes		Option 2	Actually prefer this option but with the expansion of small boat berthing if poss. Reduce the 'private marina' area.	Least liked: expansion of yet more car parks Most liked: more berthing areas for people wanting to do a 1/2 day or full day trip from DH to Lyttelton by small boat. It's more cost effective and productive than driving around.	As per about... more public access to this section would be great as currently it's not accessible and that is frustrating - especially if we want to park up for 1/2 day.	Yes	No		
25978	No	McLaren		Option 1	I think it has everything for now and the future of the marina.	I don't like option 2 as I feel it will only cater for a short period of time and will need more work in a smaller period of time than option 1. Which is not economically viable. Option 1 will cost more in the short term, but will have better outcomes and plan for the future and climate.	No.	Yes	No		
25977	Yes	Nicholls	Fenwick Consultants	Option 2	Its really only building a new building. Not achieving enough to be worth doing anything.	The breakwater and increased parking make it possible for better/safer events to be held. A chance for Boating to grow.	Its an eye sore. Het it gone.	No	Yes	NPCL	Screenshot-20190605-160614.png
25976	No	Stoliarova		Option 2				Yes	No		

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
25975	No	Hickman		Option 2				Yes	No		
25974	No	Petrache		Option 2	<p>Very positive plan long overdue.</p> <p>This option does not make necessary allowances for future population and popularity growth.</p> <p>Where is the haulout yard ???????</p> <p>Where keel boat owners maintain their boats out of the water ????</p>	<p>Best option</p> <p>The combined building incorporating the Coastguard and the NPYC must be similar floor area.</p> <p>Again where is the haulout area ?????</p> <p>If your encouraging water sports then keel boat owners have to clean their boats whilst out of the water</p>	Best removed	Yes	Yes	Small and big boat sailing Also regularly use the haul out to clean our boars	
25963	No	McGregor		Option 2	I think the fixed breakwater is a better option than the floating breakwater. This will help reduce costs and be more effective - the floating breakwater was proved useless in the October 2000 storm.	I support option 2 due to the increased space and land. I particularly like that there is more small boat rigging space next to the hand-launched slipway, which will reduce the need for young people to cross the parking area so frequently. I also like the improved access to Lyttelton along the rail corridor. However, I feel there is room to make even more spaces pedestrian-friendly and green, rather than simply adding more car parking.		Yes	No		
25953	No	Prestidge		Option 2	<p>Option1 is a good start but Option 2 is better. The breakwater placement in option 1 is poorly placed and won't provide shelter in a southerly wind / swell. The floating tie ups at the public ramp need to be longer.</p> <p>If Option 2 fails due to funding then Option 1 with the Option 2 breakwater would be good.</p>	Like the larger breakwater as will provide shelter to the whole area from southerly conditions. The tie ups at the public ramp need to be longer to accomodate more boats on busy days.	Need more information to make an informed decision. Removing the piles has been a great move.	Yes	Yes	Canterbury Outboard Boat Club	

Submission ID	Attachments	Last name	organisation	In general do you prefer	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 1 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about elements of Option 2 you like the most/least?	Do you have any comments about this proposal to remove the marina?	Would you like to see the first section of the marina retained for public access?	member of any club/organisation that uses this site?	If yes please list	The combined file size must not be larger than 10MB
25936	No	Hutching	yacht owner	Option 1	like - cheaper and caters to the majority of interests. Parking is not a problem for people prepared to walk 5-10 mins from several locations	unnecessarily expensive. Caters to a more exclusive group at Naval Point Club who have perfectly adequate facilities currently which they are free to upgrade. The interests of this group would dominate when the vast majority of users are non-club members	it serves as a spillover tie-up facility, it would be preferable to upgrade as much as possible and make it more accessible to the public	Yes	No		
25928	No	Hodgson		Option 1	Fishing platform?	Fishing platform?	Fishing platform?				