

Taylor's Mistake Surf Life Saving Club proposed lease and licence submissions

ID #	Do you have any feedback on the proposed new lease/licence for Taylor's Mistake Surf Life Saving Club?	Name / Organisation
26848	Love the design, love the concept. Really support rebuilding this club and support this design. This club is an essential part of the Sumner/Banks Peninsula community.	Charlotte O'Sullivan
26849	Generally supportive but I have concerns about parking. Members of the Club park all over the yellow lines which blocks access to nearby properties. The building footprint encroaching into this area would make it worse if the members continue to disregard the yellow no-stopping lines.	Name redacted
26872	I think it is a fantastic idea, in fact it should be for 100 years. I was caught in a rip at the beach when I was young and would have drowned if not for club members, now my children learn surf lifesaving there. It is an awesome community club and must be granted a lease.	Kelvin Holden
26876	This would be a great facility for the essential work of the surf life saving club, looking after those enjoying the beach and the ocean.	Stuart Murray
26936	I support this proposal The location is critical for the club to provide the professional LifeGuard service at such a dangerous beach They are volunteers and it is time they were given a chance to move on.	Ken Jones
26954	I am in favour of the proposed plan. It is time to move it on to next phase. Consultations have been going on too long. Our beach safety relies on the volunteers of this wonderful surf and community. Giving young people so much knowledge and love and understanding of the ocean. Move Ahead.	Marilyn Still

27143	<p>Please find below our considerations for this proposed new/modified building.*</p> <p>Firefighting Water supplies: There are two hydrants within 135m of the proposed building. It is likely that sufficient water is available for this occupancy FW3 Water classification of approximately 50l/s from two hydrants.</p> <p>We would encourage the owner to consider the instillation of a sprinkler system in the building as part of the design for a potential crowd large (Over 100 persons) facility. This will also limit water requirements to FW2 and provide significant improvement for asset protection of the building and the community items held within it.</p> <p>This building is likely to require an evacuation scheme also.</p> <p>Vehicle access to the occupancy is adequate via Taylors Mistake Rd.</p> <p>I hope this information is of assistance for this project.</p> <p>*Copy of image attached below</p>	<p>Fire and Emergency NZ</p> <p>Bruce Irvine</p>
27189	<p>Full support for the project. Congratulations to TMSLS for getting to this stage- the building is fabulous and will future proof this critical service for years to come.</p>	<p>Kylie Boivin</p>
27221	<p>Due to the fact that Taylor's Mistake Surf Lifesaving club has been in existence for over 100 years I would suggest that a lease period of longer than 35 years should be granted. By granting a lease period greater than 35 years (for example 50 years), the club will have a longer period of guaranteed occupancy without having to renegotiate lease and resource consent processes. An extended lease period would therefore ensure that the club could develop and implement plans to mitigate economic, social and environmental changes over a longer period of time. For example, population growth and local housing development, adjustments to legislation, fluctuating physical activity patterns and evolving methods of fundraising. In conclusion, I have stated that a longer lease period would provide greater assurances that the Taylor's Mistake Surf Lifesaving Club was future proofed for the local community and club members.</p>	<p>Dean Blackwell</p>
27300	<p>What a great design, that is sympathetic to the environment and will be a great home to the Surf club for years to come. Their involvement in the community from getting youngsters into surf lifesaving to saving lives is second to none.</p>	<p>Mike Baddeley</p>
27308	<p>The club provides an essential service for the local community and needs a decent base to provide this service. I support the recommended lease option to allow the club to rebuild but think the lease should be longer given the building should last more than 35 years</p>	<p>Chris Rossiter</p>

27328	As relatively close adjoining property owner we fully support the issue of a lease / licence.	Taylor's Mistake Association Land Company Limited Jim Turpin
27329	Fully support CCC issuing lease/licence to this valuable volunteer community service provider	Jim Turpin (separate from submission 27328)
27330	I fully support granting of the new lease/licence for the redevelopment of the Taylor's Mistake Surf Life Saving Club. I am grateful that the Surf Life Savers and Club members, have continued to provide such a valuable, yet voluntary service, to the benefit of every visitor to Taylor's Mistake from temporary facilities.	John East
27345	I'm in favour of doing everything you can to maintain this fabulous service. Fortunately for me, as a child, they saved me when I needed them.	Victoria Baddeley
27371	I fully support the desire of TMSLC (Taylor's Mistake Surf Life Saving Club) to rebuild as submitted. The club deserves our congratulations and thanks for the tireless work that they do and the many lives that they are saved. Their plan steers a wonderful course between retaining the history of the old clubhouse, minimising negative impacts on views on local residents and the need for ongoing accommodation for the all-too-often-used need of lifesaving services by a wonderful volunteer team.	Chris Abbott
27401	I'm very much in favour of the proposed new lease/licence for Taylor's Mistake Surf Life Saving Club. We need a surf club in the bay and the new building is a vast improvement on the old one.	Jane Jones
27404	I fully support the proposed new surf club at Taylor's Mistake. The building will enhance the environment in a similar way that the new Sumner Surf Club did. It will provide a modern and well equipped life saving and emergency service facility as well as a valuable community amenity. As a resident living on the hill overlooking the current surf club I welcome the new design and is a vast improvement of the ad hoc and now abandoned old surf club.	Malcolm McClurg
27412	This looks like a fantastic design and is a much needed upgrade on the current facilities. I fully support this proposal and anything that is required to ensure the build is completed as soon as possible.	Kathryn Newbery

27415	I love the proposal!!!	Arturo Bascunan
27431	I fully support the granting of a lease and building of the new Taylors Mistake surf club. I know how important this club is to the safety, life and history of TM. The whole beach is a precious taonga and needs to be a safe place for all to visit. It is important to me that there is still adequate access to the beach for members of the public and that the materials are appropriate to the marine environment. The access to the beach appears not to be compromised by the plan. Minimal damage to dunes during construction is a must. Also, please fix the drain in the middle of the road that is full of sand from the shower. Thanks	Sally Thompson
27433	I support the use of public land including roadway for the proposed new surf club buildings. The club has provided an essential service for a long time, and has provided a training base for generations of surf lifesavers. This is a community function and therefore deserves public (Council) support.	Ian McKenzie
27442	I completely support the new lease/licence being given to Taylors Mistake Surf Club for a period of 35 years but would like to see this for a longer period if possible. This community organisation is a huge asset to the local area plus the greater Christchurch area. The work that the club does in patrolling the beach and maintain safety for the public during the summer season and beyond is a credit to the organisation. The club has been sitting in the current position for the last over 1000years without concern and should be able to continue to be in this position. Completely support this lease/License.	Tisha Bradley
27443	I would like to share my feedback on a proposal to change the lease/licence for the Taylors Mistake Surf Life Saving Club to build two new buildings to replace their earthquake damaged one. I fully support this community service having the identified venue with enhancements to benefit the wider community. As a wellness based service, you will see the benefits for youth, young adults, seniors and the family unit. The amount of life saving interventions in this specific area demonstrate the need for a modern and dynamic service base. The other security offered would be a longer term of lease to as allow ongoing growth and development, the beach and ocean will always be there, so should this service.	Craig Jamieson
27484	I support this proposal. The architectural drawings show a visually appealing clubhouse and I support the work of the life saving club in providing a safe swimming environment.	Arthur McGregor
27509	I fully support the proposed new lease/license for Taylors Mistake Surf Life Saving Club. They provide a critical service for people using Taylors Mistake beach, and need buildings that are fit for purpose. The proposed design is in keeping with the area and is visually appealing.	Simon Thomas
27510	I fully support the proposed new lease/license for Taylors Mistake Surf Life Saving Club. They need the new buildings so that they can continue to rescue people in trouble, and so that they can train their members.	Kristy Thomas

27553	<p>A submission on the Public Consultation Process under LGA S76 to S83 and S138 over the Taylors Mistake Surf Life Saving Club Location</p> <p>Introduction By way of introduction, I agree that there is good argument to be made for the Surf Club at Taylors Mistake to remain in the Bay. This is as far as I am prepared to support the proposal now out for consultation. My primary concern on the present proposal has to do with the proposed location of a re-build pavilion and gear shed on and beyond is historic site. Specifically: Allowing continuation of what is effectively private & exclusive occupation of legal road and reserve land (Lot 7) in the face of Council Policy and general law.</p> <p>What I regard as adverse effect of an unnecessary enlarged foot print of the buildings in the coastal hazard zone and the exclusive year round occupation of what is prime real estate for relatively little return to the public good taking into account the declining voluntary nature of its life-saving activities.</p> <p>The lack of alternative suitable locations put forward for discussion</p> <p>Background The public feed-back consultation announced on 30 July 2019 about a process that has already been decided. In the granting of resource consent in early July 2018 to re-build on and beyond the historic site, the Council missed the necessary public consultation procedure which this present notification attempts to rectify.</p> <p>First, the consultation should not be solely about a voluntary organisation that has as one of its goals the provision of life-saving services at Taylors Mistake, and requires the re-build of its club rooms. It should have a wider regard as to the surrounding environment and the legal aspect of what can and cannot be done now irrespective of past history and the possible alternatives that would meet anticipated future demands both in terms of the club rooms and the public use of the beach.</p> <p>Much has changed over the 100 year life of the surf club from a very modest start with no club rooms, only a few baches, no road into the Bay and there was no residential subdivision development. As late as the 1950's the public carpark was no larger than the few parking spots immediately landward of the present club establishment.</p> <p>The present & future Now the primarily activity is a private sport club. For its relevance and occupation of public land the club provides public life-saving patrol services at weekends for about 4 months of the year. For the remaining two thirds of the year it serves no public function but still occupies prime real estate. For the club to function, the club requires the</p>	Otto Snoep
-------	---	------------

establishment of some permanent facilities and this is not disputed. What is questioned is the continued location on and beyond its historic site given that there are alternative sites that would serve the club's purposes, provide better opportunities to the expanding public population to enjoy the unique beach presently occupied by the club buildings, avoid the coastal hazard zone and at least in part resolve a number of legal issues. The resource consent process in my opinion has not given sufficient weight to other issues beyond the club's wishes.

The club's relevance as a voluntary service is not assured even in the relative short term of say 25 years in the life of the building. This is important as it is more than likely that in the future professional life-saving patrol services will need to be provided by the Council as it does in its swimming pool operations and already does at its beaches during the week days over the 8 weeks holiday summer holiday period. In those circumstances the support structures do not require extensive club room facilities. The establishments of the Taylors Mistake Surf and Life Saving Club as it exists today or with the proposed re-build, would unlikely able to remain on public land as a private club without a viable public life-saving component under the rules of the district plan. This should be born in mind going forward with this proposal. It is widely recorded that all voluntary organisations of all hues are suffering from a declining number in membership. The voluntary surf club movement is no different. A concern voiced by the Taylors Mistake Club in recent times.

Submission Details

My submission is not about appearances of the new club's facilities or their needs, as important as these may be to others. Undoubtedly the facilities proposed are a very large complex that will dominate the area. This submission is all about the location of the club rooms.

In this instance the location of the re-build has already been approved on and beyond the site of the existing club rooms by the Council via the Resource Consent issued in July 2018. Belatedly it has occurred to the Council that it is faced with restrictive obstacles over this particular location of the club rooms and now seeks an endorsement from the public of that consent approval on a legal issue that is beyond the public's capacity to influence. The Council is the owner of all of the foreshore land. Most of it is vested as legal road and the new club rooms approved in 2018 are to occupy part of that. There are legal restraints on the use or disposal of that public land. The club room activity does not meet the legal criteria for it to be available for such use. The Council should have put forward more options of possible locations for the public to exercise their preferences in the feed-back consultation.

I can think of three locations that may meet the legal criteria with some necessary adjustment. These are:

The occupation wholly on Lot 7 at a much reduced foot print, or

A consolidation of the club rooms and gear shed with the public toilet block seaward of the formal carpark, or

Location in the overflow carpark to the rear of the sealed formal park.

I sincerely believe with the exception of the last option the other two locations do not seriously distract the functionality or

convenience of their life-saving services but materially improve the recreational land use and access to the beach for the public. It will also alleviate serious traffic congestion.

*Under a Local Government Official Information and Meeting Act request I obtained information that is not being shared with the public in the feed-back documentation. Such as:

The Certificate of Existing Use Right;

The details of the resource consent application by the Surf Club;

Analysis by Council of the resource application and the subsequent issue of the consent on a non- notifiable basis. It was determined that few people would be affected by the resource consent that was issued without prior consultation.

That the proposal now out for feed-back still requires a building permit is not devolved.

Nor is it made known that Council's legal advisers are yet to comment on the legal aspects of the proposal.

Sections 76 to 83 and 138 of the Local Government Act 2002 are very specific on what is required from Council in its consultation processes and procedures. The notification for this feed-back is no different.

The processes that have been adopted for this feed-back consultation are deficient in that the information provided is inadequate, selective and has already been pre-determined and may require revocation of the resource consent that was issued.

This is the second time at Taylors Mistake in as many years the Council has got ahead of itself in making a decision before properly consulting the people affected by it (S82 & S83).

I did attend the drop in feed-back consultation on 10 August 2019 and came away with disappointment in the model of the format adopted to inform the attendees. There was no information about coastal erosion or protection of the naturally defensive dune system that the Council is duty bound to enhance. There was no information on alternative sites. There was no information provided that no formal occupation agreement exists for the existing building. There was no information on the informal use of an existing carriageway; the use thereof not being secure other than it is intended to remain. I dismiss the format of the consultation of being constructive in allowing a fair and fully informed submission to be made by less informed people than I as a resident. In my opinion it does not meet the Section 83 objective and may fail Section 82 with the decision already determined by the resource consent that has been issued, and staff's recommendation for an exception to be made to allow occupation of legal road.

I shall outline those discrepancies as follows:

1. My view on the present location of the Surf Club buildings are well documented with the Council and have not changed from those held in 1983.

2. The resource consent before us to re-build the Surf Club on its present site brings those views back into sharp focus. If anything those views have hardened by my observations of the activity and vulnerability over the past years in my objection to this location and in particular the occupation of legal road.

3. It was acknowledged in the resource consent that the location of the Surf Club will continue to occupy legal road for a larger part than is presently occupied. It is accepted that this occupation does not involve formal road stopping under S342 of the Local Government Act 1974 and require the Schedule 10 procedure for notification as the licenced occupation proposed does not change the title of the underlying land.

Nonetheless the effects practically are the same and are not acceptable to me and should not be to the public.

It cannot be said that a term of 35 years qualifies as a temporary occupation under the Schedule. Neither does it satisfy S341 (3).

It can still draw the attention of the Environment Court on referral as the area that is stopped for 35 years adjoins the coastal marine area and should automatically become an Esplanade Reserve. Occupation of an Esplanade Reserve would not be available to the Club for its intended use.

4. There is no room for the exceptionality of this resource consent as suggested in the staff report for it to be considered as mitigating or legally justifiable under the requirement for the Council to fulfil its role under the Local Government Act 2002. As a core function the Council must mitigate and where possible avoid natural hazards as outlined in S11A (d) and preserve its reserves which includes roads at S11A (e).

5. In the Resource Consent analysis by staff of the consent application no account was taken or reported of the natural hazard conditions prevailing in the location that has been consented (Chapter 3 and 5 of the district plan apply).

6. No coastal engineering expert report was provided with the application by the Applicant or sought by the consenting authority to understand and approve of any mitigation works that are to be undertaken against the dynamics of certain to be coastal erosion that the structures will be subjected to in that particular location and by its very presence probably exacerbate '(he erosion effect ; the severity and changing circumstances on a daily basis that causes the erosion of the active beach profile and that can be attributed to the presence of the Surf Club structure; nor the consequential effects on the adjacent sand dunes for the protection of the hinterland and the prevention of land damage with a predicted rising sea level during the life of the building. Council's park division should be concerned about the protection of its sand dunes on the foreshore and should direct its energy and resources on the restoration of the missing dunes at the location of the existing Surf Club to provide a natural barrier against the sea.

7. The 20 m setback on the coast advised in Chapter 5 has not been observed. There exists no fixed High Water Level Mark Spring as shown on the plans provided. This hypothetical line could vary up to 10 m either way depending on the dynamics of the beach profile, itself dependent on the state of the seas whether rough or calm over an extended period of time. Using the average between the two extremes it would place the proposed development well within the 20 m wide exclusion zone determined in Chapter 5 without even taking account of the projected sea level rise in the future. As such the development should not have been permitted. A managed retreat inland from the hazard zone at the coast seems the only responsible measure that the Council should advocate for its own good as the vested owner of the lands under consideration and to avoid any future liability over the approval. The opportunity to retreat is there without increasing the cost of a re-build. I believe a consolidation of new facilities for the club with the existing public toilet block is an obvious and safer proposition without sacrificing the functionality of the life-saving activity provided by the club. It would eliminate the traffic congestion by both pedestrian and vehicle movements at their present location that would only get worse with the enlarged facility approved.

8. There was no expert traffic management plan provided with the application for the resource consent and none sought by the Council's analyst. It was determined that no specific vehicle parking spaces be included in the development as there was no need for them.

9. I object to the separation of the Gear Shed from the Pavilion structure. The space between effectively creates the false impression that the legal road between the buildings is a private use area, amplified by the barrier across the road controlled by the Surf Club. It looks and can be assumed as a private space by recreational visitors to the Bay. This is a choke point for access to the beach.

10. As the designer of the temporary seawall and podium seaward of the Pavilion I have concerns over its retention in the resource consent. The wall was designed and built as an emergency response to an eminent destruction of the Pavilion in the late nineteen seventies storms to give time to assess the future of the building. It was agreed with the building inspector that a building permit could only be issued on that understanding because the Council could not legitimately issue a permit for the structure, it being on legal road. The existing wall, as a first line of defence against storm surge affecting the building's foundation, is 40 years old and performed well over that period. It is now past its useful life. The wall's construction was not designed as a marine structure. The materials used would not meet such specification but deemed adequate as a temporary structure to keep cost to a minimum. I consider it unwise to incorporate the existing seawall as proposed into a new building and would condemn the wall as unfit for that continued purpose.

11. It is noted in the staff report that no formal lease or other occupation agreement has been found for the existing building which is partly on legal road.

12. The 139A Existing Use Right Certificate obtained by the Club does not provide the protection the Club seeks to promote in its

proposal. The Certificate must in any event comply with the general law and is wholly dependent on the ability of the Council to issue licences for those parts of the structures that transgress onto public road. Furthermore, the new proposal would occupy more land than what the Existing Use Right Certificate covers.

13. I agree with the staff report on what structures are permitted on a road as stated in the Policy for Structures on Road 2016 and that does not include the Surf Club buildings approved in the consent. The Council is compelled to take notice of its limitations in providing licences for the structures occupying legal road. Section 80 LGA 2002 requires the Council to either accept its Policy and revoke the resource consent already granted or allow the consent at the expense of its policy. Such reversal, if it were at all possible, would have wide repercussions elsewhere in its district. The Policy for Structures on Road of course falls under the Public Places Bylaw 2018 hierarchy which itself needs to be observed under S76 (d) LGA 2002 and is restricted by the limitations imposed under the Local Government Act of 1974 that specifically deals what may take place on legal roads. I am not able to deduce from the Act that there is provision made for exceptions as the Council suggest at Paragraph 7.6 (c) in the 24 July 2019 staff report under Item 11. Neither do I believe the Council has general competence to make or alter the law other than bylaws such as The Public Places Bylaw 2018 and its Policy for Structures on Road. Refer to paragraph 4 of this submission.

14. It will not be possible for the consenting authority to issue building permits for structures that are not wholly located on land for which the Applicant does not possess title nor has a lease. It seems as yet no application for a building permit has been lodged.

15. It has not been determined in the staff report that the land in Lot 7 is a Local Purpose Playground registered under the Reserves Act. If it is registered as a reserve it would preclude leasing of the land in Lot 7 to the Club in the absence of a ministerial consent (S138 (2) (b) LGA 2002). Regardless of the land status, I object to a lease be granted over Lot 7 (S138 (1)). Instead an annual renewable licence should be offered the Club that allows control over compliance with the terms and conditions of a licence agreement. It would avoid difficulties to the Council by possible changing circumstances of the Surf Club in the future whereby it may not be able in providing effective life-saving services through a shrinking membership of young capable persons in the life of a 35 year lease period. In such event the Council might not be able to terminate the lease before expiry date and then contravene the rule in the district plan for its existence.

16. As a matter of concern, the impervious (gross) area of the re-build approved is almost twice the area of effective occupation by the Club than its precursor and almost six times the area used in its temporary facilities without an obvious diminution of its patrol effectiveness. It is a fallacy to use net footprint figures for comparisons as were provided in the Application. It does not represent the actual effect on the land use foregone by the public. Neither is it appropriate to provide facilities that allow for commercial activities on the premises such as the proposed private functions on public land. A commercial component to a lease in any case would draw the attention for the need of a competitive tender process to determine the lessee in the first instance.

<p>17. There is no stormwater collection or disposal provided in the Application or demanded in the resource consent. The enlarged impervious areas of the re-build and paved areas will considerably add to the localised flooding that already exist. This would largely affect visiting public pedestrians and those from the local community accessing the beach who do not benefit from the raised floor levels of the pavilion.</p> <p>18. The traffic management at this highly congested area around the surf club at weekends is already woefully inadequate and is a public nuisance for access to the private properties owners north of the surf club. The resource consent makes no attempt to alleviate this.</p> <p>19. From a personal perspective and one that applies to my fellow residents north of the surf club, I cannot be assured that the present informal carriageway for vehicular access over Lot 7 to our properties is secured or can be secured legally. Accessibility in the future over the carriageway without a restricted formal easement created in favour of these properties on their land title is not guaranteed into the future. Alternatively a designated road diversion that has been created in the title over Lot 8 could similarly apply over Lot 7 to provide the legal assurance over the access I seek and could be considered if that is legally possible by withdrawing the playground reserve status over Lot 7. I see this as a pragmatic solution to save Council from forming a sealed road over the legal road seaward of the club rooms. Environmentally it would also be more sensitive. I refer the Council to a letter on file PL/CP/A /25 of 29 June 2000 by Mr Peter Eman in which such a mechanics was discussed as an option. This solution in no way relieves the Council from not observing its Bylaw and Structures on Road Policy to the letter with respect the approved re-build from encroaching on legal road and affecting our entitlement as of right.</p> <p>20. The staff recommendation should be returned to the affected parties in the local community and account for any concerns expressed by the wider community from the feed-back process, chaired by Council staff, to reach a consensus with the Surf Club of what is legally possible and appropriate before you make your recommendation to the full Council for a decision. The best methodology to reach that consensus would be a collaborative approach to produce a development plan that encompasses the legal restraints on the location; hazard considerations; traffic management and the least area of land the Surf Club needs to occupy to perform its life saving function, bearing in mind that the extent of the foot print of the buildings has a direct adverse effect on the recreational use of the public land that will be forgone to cater for basically a private occupation.</p> <p>21. So far all that has been presented to the Council is the Surf Club's optimum plan prepared in isolation of any community input. Their wish-list is a good starting point from which to proceed in the preparation of an agreeable development plan whereby the local community and public have to live with for years to come.</p> <p>22. With the apparent short comings in the resource consent it could hardly be expected that the present proposal will be the final outcome without a consensus from the community directly affected by it.</p>	
--	--

	<p>In summary:</p> <p>My bottom line is a disagreement over the proposed location of the Surf Club on public land in Taylors Mistake.</p>	
27554	I fully support the rebuild of the Taylor's Mistake Surf Life Saving Club on the proposed lease. The club provides an essential public service and new facilities are urgently required!	Jan Kupec
27555	Please go ahead with the proposal to offer lease and licence. The surf club and its volunteers offer an incredibly valuable community service at the beach.	Melanda Slemint
27557	I support the proposal. This is a key facility for Taylor's from both a safety and community use perspective. The only caveats I would put on this is making sure the building is designed for sea level rise resiliency and landscaping should be done using locally appropriate Eco sourced native plants with weed control undertaken as part of the project.	Gabriel Ross
27558	I support the two new buildings totally and a new lease should be granted. This surf club has and is a great asset to Taylor's Mistake and without it lives will be lost.	Donna McLean
27562	<p>I am a life member of the Taylor's Mistake S.L.S.C. and fully support the building of the new club house. The club does a fantastic job of keeping the public safe in the challenging environment that is applicable to Te Onepoto; Taylor's Mistake.</p> <p>While I fully support the project I would ask that the club committee look to see how the new club house can become more a part of the community, both local and Christchurch. The capital required to complete the project is significant and the club will make use of the building/facilities perhaps only 40% any year. Making it available to other concerns who might be involved in walking, board riding, mountain biking etc. may be able to affiliate their group within the Taylor's Mistake Surf Club structure.</p> <p>I appreciate there will be problems taking an approach such as this but I am confident there would be more gains than losses for the Surf Club should they adopt such an approach and it would see a capital asset used more and resulting in a more accepting and more supportive local community.</p>	David Bradley
27564	I am in full support of The Club to rebuild on their original building footprint which will be partly on legal road and partly on a land parcel at 229 Taylors Mistake Road (Lot 7 DP 6419) held for recreation purposes. The proposed new storage building will also be on legal road which am happy with.	Liza Sparrow

27565	This new club looks fantastic! For an organisation such as surf life saving that provides such a great voluntary community service to all those who wish to swim at Taylors Mistake they need a magnificent facility to assist in their magnificent service. I fully support this idea and can't wait to see it on the beach!	Luke Smith
27566	Grant the licence, Wonderful new facility.	Erica Brouard
27567	Yes. I think it should be granted. The team there do great work.	Maree Stachel-Williamson
27568	The new lease and licence should be granted so the new club rooms can be constructed. The surf club provides a great service to the community and saves people's lives at the beach. They are doing a great job in temporary portacom structures.	Greg Clark
27570	<p>I am in full support of this proposal to enable the Taylors Mistake SLSC rebuild on the existing site.</p> <p>I have been involved in Surf Life Saving in Canterbury for over 40 years. The service to the community is immeasurable and the dedication of the Taylors lifeguards to keeping that beautiful (but often dangerous) bay safe for all beach goers is exemplary. To think of relocating the pavilion to another location within the bay would be ill-conceived, the current location as iconic to Taylors as the historic batches in the bay. It's a focal point for the local community and it provides the ideal central location for the safe management of the beach.</p> <p>Happy to be contacted to discuss my submission if required.</p>	Matt Ellis
27571	Taylors Mistake Surf Life Saving Club provides a great service to the community, and I support the rebuild/lease.	Patrice de Beer
27573	Wholeheartedly support the Surf Club with the rebuild & occupancy as per their plans on the same footprint. It is pivotal for this location to be where it currently is especially in the lifeguards continue protecting the public	Ange Ellis
27574	I support this fantastic new facility as the surf life saving club is an essential part of the Taylors Mistake community and will support all visitors and locals in this popular recreational location.	Stacey Day
27579	An absolute necessity and much required resource for the city as far as safety of the people and visitors of Christchurch is concerned.	Anthony Nunnick
27589	The building looks amazing and our family is so excited to have a brand new facility for our boys to enjoy at Surf Lifesaving during season!	Ashlie Gauld
27590	I am supportive of the new lease and recognise the important role that the TMSLSC provides for the immediate community and wider Christchurch. The new design reflects a good outcome for the long-term and future use of the site.	Kristine Bouw

27602	Having been brought up at Taylor's Mistake since a baby I can vouch to the necessity to have a Surf Club to protect lovers of the Sea. Many times we have had to ring the Police to report mishaps after hours and with this club and its members that sometimes stay overnight and have access to rescue equipment, more protection is given to the public. I have two grandchildren that have been awarded for their rescue of 14 people last year and this would not have been possible without these club members. It is not taking up any more area than the previous club-rooms and doesn't interfere with public access.	Helen Timms
27606	I totally support the building of a New surf club just what the community needs	Michael Hartwell
27616	My son is a part of this surf club and this new pavilion looks great. I can't wait for this to be completed for the lifeguards to operate out of it compared to the current set up. I look forward to seeing this start	Chris Smith
27618	A great way to continue to make our beach a safer place to swim. Much needed resource for our surf life savers.	Carrie Worthington
27642	Love the design and no objections. Get on with it and start building!	Robert Snoep
27650	What an amazing asset to the community. Coming from a lifeguarding background and having patrolled at the old club this new proposed club looks to have taken into consideration its purpose and functionality needed for Christchurch's busiest beach. The layout, colour scheme, and positioning allows it to blend into its natural landscape.	Maia Smith
27651	Beautiful design. Will be such a great asset to have in the community once again.	Thomas Wood
27653	great idea think about the next generation could be a great surf club/function room just like Sumner surf club	Kane Marshall
27654	I strongly support the proposal to allow a new lease for the Surf Club. The design is elegant and understated which mitigates the buildings impact on the Bay. Additionally the Surf Club provides essential life saving services to the area.	Amy Carter
27655	No Brainer. They need to operate from a suitable premises. They provide an extremely important community service. Shame we have to waste money on full consultation. Make it happen.	Stuart Anderson

27656	<p>I am opposed to the rebuild of the surf club building in this location and therefore to the proposed new lease/licence.</p> <p>For more than 35 years I have had a close association with the bay and am of the view that the surf club building is both oversized for its function and badly located. I am confident that many others, both residents and the general public, hold similar views.</p> <p>Proof of the facility being oversize for purpose is obvious from the club's ability to function from the temporary container/portacom units over recent years. Further, it is my view that the existing facility had minor use prior to the earthquakes.</p> <p>The current location conflicts with beach users access, causes safety related issues from manoeuvring vehicles and is in a high-risk sea inundation zone.</p> <p>Should the rebuild proceed in the marked location there will be accelerated land erosion, increased conflict from vehicle manoeuvring and less than desirable beach access.</p> <p>I would support a rebuild in the region of the existing toilet block, the stopping of the legal road for the building footprint and the lease of the then underlying reserve land. I am confident Wilson and Hill could design a superb facility in this location that would be a wonderful asset for the surf club and the general public who use the bay. Vehicle manoeuvring, parking problems for users and sea inundation problems would all be alleviated.</p> <p>However it does appear that, sadly, council is once again issuing a consultation document with a predetermined outcome. This is not a 'have your say' but merely justification of a 'closed door' process.</p> <p>Finally, as council's 'have your say document' indicates the proposed rebuild as extending well beyond the existing building footprint the surf club/council have the legal requirement to stop the area of the road over which the proposed building is to be sited. In parallel I suggest council take the opportunity to provide a ROW easement for the property owners over Lots 7 & 8 DP6419 who currently have their only means of access via the existing formation over these lots. I trust (but cannot say I have confidence) council will undertake the necessary steps in an orderly and lawful manner.</p>	David Evans
27659	<p>The Taylor's Mistake Surf Club is an important asset to the community and I support the granting of the lease for the rebuilding of their club rooms.</p>	Charlene Herring

27678	<p>It is important for the Surf Club to have buildings on this site. The Club provides fantastic services to New Zealanders and visitors to this beach. The Club mentors young children, adolescents, and adults into skilled sporting and surf rescue practices. This work has an influence beyond the immediate environment, enhancing many lives.</p> <p>I would like to see inclusion of plantings in the areas surrounding the buildings and in the broader environment - this may not be the responsibility of the Club, but needs to be considered. This is a vulnerable area, exposed to extreme weather and the negative impacts of climate change.</p>	Michele Laing
27681	I support the new lease and license for Taylors Mistake SLSC to occupy this land and rebuild their Clubhouse. Having a fit-for-purpose building is necessary to continue the Lifesaving service.	Vivienne Bickley
27716	I agree with the proposed new lease. Even though this is a 'legal road' it does seem to be used as such - more of a driveway. The proposed building looks like it has minimal impact on the landscape. It is definitely so much nicer and useable than what is here at present. As ratepayers I believe that we should support surf life saving clubs as much as we can - they provide a vital service which is not supplied by local or central government.	Sarah Tiplady-Scurr
27719	Hello, I'm in favour of issuing a 35 year lease for the Taylors Mistake Surf Club. The surf club is an asset to the community, saves lives and is a culture that must continue!	Kelly Hall
27720	I'm in favour of granting the 35 year lease of the surf club. The club is an asset to our community and is an institution that must continue.	Nicholas Hall
27751	<p>I support the granting of a lease and a license for the proposed new buildings.</p> <p>The Taylors Mistake SLSC provides an invaluable public (voluntary) service for the citizens of Christchurch and need to be in a beach front position to do so.</p> <p>They have a long history on this site having provided patrols from it for the past 103 years</p>	David Hill
27754	<p>I am in favour of the proposed new lease/licence for Taylors Mistake Surf Life saving club, but think the new building should be built to accommodate the local boardriders club as well.</p> <p>Surfing is now an olympic sport and the Point Surf Team is a small but growing local club involved in surfing predominately throughout the south island but also on a national level. Formed in 1983 we have been the dominant force on the south island circuit since, and boast a national open champion within our ranks. Currently the club is going through a re-building phase, with most of the members still at school (primary and high) competing in competitions around the south island, we run weekly training sessions and club comps in the weekend through summer. In September we have 4 kids heading to Gisborne to compete in the national primary school champs.</p>	<p>Point Surf Team</p> <p>David Entwisle</p>

	<p>What is missing for our club is a clubroom or space to hold our meetings, gather for events and display our history, the surf life saving club only use the clubhouse through the summer months, where we would use a space all year round.</p> <p>Surely within the new building there is some room to accommodate our club to help support the sport of surfing within the Sumner/Taylor's mistake community.</p> <p>*Photo attachment provided not shown (children)</p>	
27757	<p>I think the proposal is a fantastic one. Taylor's mistake is one of Christchurch's Premier beaches and premier facilities should support this. I fully support the new lease and think it will contribute significantly to the a positive beach environment at Taylor's Mistake</p>	<p>Jonathon Pettigrew</p>
27760	<p>I believe being one of Christchurch's iconic historic areas, the new building should retain a classic, timeless look. There are surrounding baches that have stood for a long time and help create the strong identity of Te Onepoto. The surf lifesaving club should complement its surrounds to further enhance the identity of this iconic NZ beach.</p> <p>Also, the local surf team: Point Surf Team (PST) are looking for a facility to use as a base. It would be great to have use of the new building during trainings and surf events</p>	<p>Article Studio Mark Townshend</p>
27773	<p>As a local resident I support the rebuild and the granting of both lease and licence to the Taylors Mistake Surf Club. The value and benefit the surf club community provides to the public is immeasurable. What value do we place on saving lives? The Taylors Mistake community thrives during the summer months due to the engagement of the surf life saving club. Many of the members reside in the bay or close by. They are the heart and soul of the bay. The new building will be multi-functional and provide the local surf club with a year round base for training and education. The new design is aesthetically aligned with the natural environment and is a vast improvement on the current building. We look directly over the beach and building and can't wait to see the new surf club replace the old building.</p>	<p>Helen Mahon-Stroud</p>

27774	<p>I would like to ensure that when Lot 6DP6419 is offered as a 35yr lease (minus 1 day) that special these consideration be addressed as part of the lease agreement.</p> <p>*The access route across Lot 7 for private freehold properties owners be maintained for their use only.</p> <p>*That adequate access way for emergencies vehicles for private freehold properties also made available across Lot7.</p> <p>*That ambulance access way and parking always be kept clear as close to the surf club first aid room.</p> <p>*If Surf club members could have their own parking area closer to the new gear shed rather than near the entrance to the road providing access way to private property owners.</p> <p>Yellow dotted lines have been absolutely useless in previous years. There needs to be another way of keeping this access way devoid of casual parking.</p>	Jan Lane
27775	<p>I fully support this proposal. The Surf Club provides an important safety role and has done so for 100 years at this site. The facility will look fitting for the environment and not take away from what is already existing at this site.</p>	Greg Digby
27794	<p>I fully support Re: Taylors Mistake Surf Life Saving Clubs proposal for a new lease / licence.</p>	Trevor Graham
27795	<p>Just make this happen - I think it would be a big loss for the community if a new lease/grant doesn't go ahead.</p> <p>It's not just going to be great for the SLS club but the local surf clubs and also for public to use.</p>	<p>All About Heat</p> <p>Wayne Clark</p>
27796	<p>As local residents and potentially affected party we wish to express our concern about the proposed increase in footprint of the surf club on public beachfront which does not appear entirely justified unless the surf club is planning to increase commercial activities. This in our view would be an inappropriate use of this precious environment.</p> <p>In addition access to residential properties is already severely hampered by inconsiderate parking of vehicles associated with the surf club. The new configuration is likely to exacerbate this problem. If this proposal is accepted it is important that the council are prepared to monitor parking restrictions opposite the surf club to ensure ongoing access to local residents at times of surf club activities.</p>	Kim Sykes

<p>In our opinion placement of the surf club in front of current toilet block would solve access and parking issues and allow for re-establishment of a natural beachfront.</p>	
---	--

Attachment to submission #27143

