

Organisations/businesses

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb	Organisation and role
42594	2	Loving the space from living in where Ave, the paddock offers a very gradual slope comparatively to most of the village and this vantage point is best maintained as open area without getting chopped up with "interference lines" of private property architecture/subdivision. Character of the ridgeline leading to te Ahu Patiki from Te Waipapa matters to us.	Joseph Jagusch	Diamond Harbour	Airbornpadding Director
41827	1		Scott Davison	Diamond Harbour	Chalfont Construction Director
41826	1		Mirjam Robam	Diamond Harbour	Chalfont Farm
42611	4	<p>Not Option 1 or Option 2. However the gullies should be reserved and the school track protected and some small urban parks created on the remaining land, as well as housing. Option 3 or 4, or a mix of the two is more preferable. Option 5 should be used while sorting out future development.</p> <p>Having to choose one of these options completely biases the results of this consultation. Many people want a mix of these options or a different option. We hope that the submission analysis relies upon interpreting what people write, not the numbers put against each option. An option that gains the most ticks does not make that option the most desirable one for the community. You have to take into account that for all the 'votes' for any Option X there are the combined total 'votes' for the other Options (that do not include Option X). The original submissions analysis for Godley House site lease consultation was flawed to justify an outcome and we do not wish to see this happening again. The attached DH Community Association submission describes our position which does not align with a tick boxing exercise. Our recommendations outline steps for protection and development and further consultation that are more varied than any one Option. Submission for the Diamond Harbour Community Association (DHCA)</p> <p>The DHCA supports some housing development on the land as that has been its ownership purpose for more than a century; it is zoned residential and there is demand for more land as there are no new Church Bay sections. We consider the housing to be provided should cater for a wide demographic and age range, providing accommodation for young people, families, retired people and those who wish to downsize. Good design should be encouraged, including the use of sustainable materials. Homes should be highly energy efficient, and options should be available for a spectrum of tiny homes, townhouses, and stand-alone dwellings. Offering shared facilities, light shielding and integrated walking (including the school track) and cycling routes should be encouraged. Awareness of the changing environment due to climate change and the need to be flexible in response to that is important</p> <p>Selling the land in one large block will be unlikely to achieve these goals. Good housing and subdivision design may not be mandated by Council beyond the requirements of the District Plan and there probably would not be community consultation on subdivision proposals. An option that provides for later stages of input is desirable. Submitters on the LTP expressed concern about more houses and cars increasing pressure on services and transport infrastructure. The increased use from land development will require adjacent streets (Hunters Rd, Bay View Rd, Ngatea Rd and Where Ave) to be upgraded and will put more vehicles on the main road. The main road is a narrow and winding route and will be threatened by sea level rise in the future, creating significant future costs for the Council.</p> <p>Most Long-Term Plan submitters said that if the land is to be sold, the gullies, (including their plantings and tracks) and the school track need to be protected first. An easement is required for the school track and Council have proposed covenants for the gullies. DHCA asks that Morgan and Sams Gullies are made into Council reserves now, as placing them into private ownership will lead to more complex relationships for the people who are working on restoration. We do not agree that short-term cost savings by the Property Section of Council and a developer, justify delaying putting them into their suited reserve status. A covenant on the 'Unnamed' Gully by the school, or its retention as Council freehold, may be more suitable, as restoration has not commenced, and the area is still grazed.</p> <p>Property sections have been created by Council that do not reflect local conditions. The sections at the top of Where Ave overlap with the covenants and include recently planted areas. In addition, the land includes a long-standing garden that should be offered to the adjoining landowner. The land at the top of Ngatea Rd is also used for access, parking, and gardens by adjacent residents. Council has now</p>	Richard Suggate	Diamond Harbour	Diamond Harbour Community Association Convenor of the Planning Committee

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb	Organisation and role
		<p>suggested that an area could be set aside for a cemetery (for when Stoddart Point is filled) and with the additional housing and the increase in the school roll, room for school expansion would be desirable. LTP submitters also proposed a range of alternative uses for the land (e.g. horse riding, dog walking, bike track, community garden, parkland and afforestation). These ideas should be considered in more detail through a combined community and Council planning process for the lands' future function.</p> <p>Council has stated that considering grazing income, it has a net expenditure of \$15,000 every year it holds onto the land. A cost breakdown provided to the DHCA shows Council annual grazing income to be \$2886, their maintenance costs \$545 and internal rates charge of \$16,484. This does accurately reflect actual operational costs and Council's annual capital gain derived from its years of land banking, which will be substantial. In other words, it does not cost Council to hold on to the land in real terms.</p> <p>If Council is determined to sell the land, then the DHCA consider it should be sold in stages. A staged sale will enable a range of land-use proposals to be considered at each stage, so that different uses or types of housing or other development happen on each ridge. Rather than abdicating responsibility to the private sector and cutting community input to decision-making, a staged development will enable complementary designs to be created, reflecting developing community needs. In addition, rather than going directly to tender to sell parcels of the land, Council should ask for RFP (Request for Proposals) which then can be assessed against Council criteria developed with community input.</p> <p>The following is the DHCA's assessment of the Options:</p> <p>Option One: Complete covenant and sell. This option creates the greatest risk and uncertainty for the community even if the gullies are reserved and the walking track protected. A developer may be sympathetic to community aspirations and committed to the most sustainable urban and subdivision design, or alternatively they may go for cookie cutter section sales and the meeting of minimum Council District Plan standards. Given that development will be relatively slow (as demand is steady but not heavy) there may be decades of gradual development controlled by one private company. It is unlikely there would be further community consultation on subdivision design and impacts. The DHCA does not support this option.</p> <p>Option 2: To retain as a park. While some open space on the ridge tops and some future urban small parks is desirable; the gullies provide walking recreation and Diamond Harbour is currently well served by other Greenspaces. The provision of more housing and other uses including open space, seems a higher priority. However additional small urban parks and plantings should be provided for in any developments.</p> <p>Option 3: Council develops the land. A Council commercial relationship with property developers in consultation with the community, could see housing and other uses that meet multiple needs in a sustainable manner. The financial risk can be minimised by contractual partnerships with the private sector. If this Option is progressed in stages using an RFP approach, the land may be sold over a period of decades rather than immediately. This Option can enable community ideas and proposals to be woven into the development design. Council collaboration with the community is essential to getting a favourable outcome.</p> <p>Option 4: Transfer ownership to the community. This brings the decision-making back to the community. Its success depends upon establishing a land-owning entity (e.g. a Community Land Trust, Community Housing organisation, etc.) to manage future development and in finding people to take this on in a voluntary capacity. The entity would have to make both commercial and community-based decisions, and it may struggle to achieve consensus. To assist in raising the funds or loans to buy the land from the Council should initiate a staged buy-out of the land. The participation interest level in the community could be tested as part of the ongoing consultation should this option or Option 3 be preferred by the community.</p> <p>Option 5. Status Quo. Given that we consider that there is no annual expense to Council holding the property (if you put aside the rates charge), the Status Quo is a satisfactory fall-back option, if Option Three or Four do not proceed and is more desirable than Option One. It still retains future choices for development, preferably as some variant on Option Three or Four. Under this scenario Council can still go ahead with reserving Sams and Morgans Gullies and developing restoration options with the community for the Unnamed Gully.</p> <p>Recommendation: That the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reserve Morgan's and Sam's Gullies and place a covenant over the 'Unknown Gully'. 2. Prepare an easement to protect the route of the school track from development. 3. Refine the boundaries of the land that may be sold, taking into account the current plantings, local and adjacent usage. Relevant local people should be consulted. 4. Call for local Expressions of Interest for a Community Trust to purchase all or part of the land. 			

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb	Organisation and role
		<p>5. Depending on the outcomes of the above, consider selling the land in stages for mixed purpose housing and social development. Further community consultation on design and infrastructure undertaken as part of this and an RFP process to be used.</p> <p>6. Continue the Status Quo as long as is required to get the process right and to enable adequate community consultation at every stage of design and development.</p> <p>Submission lodged by Richard Suggate for the Diamond Harbour Community Association.</p>			
42350	3	<p>Our submission reflects that we are unhappy with the amount of information provided for anyone to properly choose an option. Agreed submission of the Diamond Harbour Reserve Management Committee (DHRMC)</p> <p>The DHRMC's primary purpose and priority is the maintenance and regeneration of existing and future park/reserves. The regeneration work in Sam's and Morgan's Gullies is directly affected by the options for future use of the land at Hunters Road and Whero Avenue.</p> <p>DHRMC provides the following comment:</p> <p>Status quo (option 5) DHRMC would support retention under the status quo for strategic purposes, as well as environmental and social benefit. If this option were chosen, DHRMC requests that the securing of all three gullies and access by way of covenant and/or easement is completed. DHRMC questions the conclusion of holding costs given grazing rental, and that rating costs are nominal only because minimal actual services are used. There is a clear financial benefit in land appreciation.</p> <p>Retain as a park (option 2) DHRMC would support retention of the whole site as reserve for environmental and social benefit although we acknowledge the current level of Council reserve land is adequate and that there would be some potential cost to Council in development and maintenance as a park.</p> <p>Residential development (options 1, 3 & 4) DHRMC recognises that that there is some argument for sale or use of part of the land for residential purpose and supports the proposal to incorporate the three gullies as open space regeneration blocks. DHRMC considers that setting the three gullies aside for regeneration should be a minimum bottom line in any residential development proposal. This should include the existing walking tracks having permanent protection for public access.</p> <p>DHRMC considers that there is a lack of detailed information supporting the three residential options making it difficult to provide additional feedback.</p> <p>DHRMC requests that before proceeding with any option in relation to residential development:</p> <p>1. Actual detail and explanation are provided around how the covenants would work and tracks are secured. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would a sale include the land with covenant? • Would that land then be available for reserve contribution and off-set against infrastructure development contribution? 	Graeme Fraser	Diamond Harbour	Diamond Harbour Reserve Management Committee Chair

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb	Organisation and role
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What would be the financial impact and what rights are preserved by the covenant? <p>2. A disposal process is designed that enables Council and community consideration and input into the proposed design and nature of development. Graeme Fraser, Chair, DHRMC, 15 Nov 2021</p>			
42285	4	For community gardens	Karen Clarke	Diamond Harbour	Shunyata retreat Owner
41627	4	such an untouched paradise - lets keep it that way	paru clarke	Diamond Harbour	shunyata retreat/day spa owner operator

Option 1 - Place a covenant over Sams Gully, Morgans Gully and a possible third gully and dispose of the remainder of the land
(Our preferred option)

No comments

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Name	Suburb
42636	1	David Bar	
42176	1	Margaret Frankish	
42168	1	Loris Beck	Diamond Harbour
41791	1	Maike Fichtner	Purau
41617	1	Pete Bloxham	Diamond Harbour
41606	1	winter Sacha	Diamond Harbour
41589	1	Mischa Allan	Diamond Harbour
41588	1	Mischa Allan	Diamond Harbour
41566	1	Cynara Lewis	
41562	1	Nicholas Alpe	Diamond Harbour

With comments

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
41781	1	<p>We're out of available residential land to develop and build on in the area. So it would be great to see this sold to a developer.</p> <p>Many locals have put in a lot of volunteer work to cut tracks and plant the gully's so I agree these should be kept as reserves.</p>	Scott Davison	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
41568	1	We would love to see this turned into small lifestyle blocks.	Amy Paulsen	
41563	1	We have lived here for 12 years and currently building. If it wasn't for land becoming available we wouldn't have been able to build. We are all for people being able to build here and enjoy the area	Kimberley Turland	Diamond Harbour
41595	1	We are at that stage where a few hundred more people will solidify need for amenities and overall improve diamond harbour.	Dominique O'Callaghan	Diamond Harbour
42627	1	The small 'reserve area' at the end of Ngatea Rd should remain a tiny green belt. It's used by children and Ngatea Rd is a walking thoroughfare for school children.	Grant Hindin Miller	Diamond Harbour
42180	1	<p>The protection of all 3 gullies and walking access is our main concern.</p> <p>Regardless of which of the 5 options is chosen, I would like to ensure the following:</p> <p>All 3 gullies are protected to the same level as reserves. Boundaries to coincide with existing fencing.</p> <p>The School Track is legally protected where it crosses land outside of the protected gullies. Specifically, between Morgan's and Sam's by Whero Ave. Between Sam's and Ngatea Road. Between Ngatea Rd and the School.</p> <p>Legal protection should also be considered for a walking track between Ngatea Rd and Marine drive. This would be a practical short cut for people using the School Track to get from Southern DH to the new shopping area.</p> <p>I acknowledge that New Zealand is in a housing crisis that is causing many social problems. I do not want to stand in the way of land that is zoned residential from being developed for housing.</p>	Kirsten Mackay	Diamond Harbour
42179	1	<p>The protection of all 3 gullies and walking access is our main concern.</p> <p>Regardless of which of the 5 options is chosen, I would like to ensure the following:</p> <p>All 3 gullies are protected to the same level as reserves. Boundaries to coincide with existing fencing.</p> <p>The School Track is legally protected where it crosses land outside of the protected gullies. Specifically, between Morgan's and Sam's by Whero Ave. Between Sam's and Ngatea Road. Between Ngatea Rd and the School.</p> <p>Legal protection should also be considered for a walking track between Ngatea Rd and Marine drive. This would be a practical short cut for people using the School Track to get from Southern DH to the new shopping area. The attached image shows the existing tracks that need protection outside the gullies in orange. The blue line is the proposal for a shortcut track to access the shopping area</p> <p>I acknowledge that New Zealand is in a housing crisis that is causing many social problems. I do not want to stand in the way of land that is zoned residential from being developed for housing.</p>	Peter Ozich	Diamond Harbour
42245	1	The options suggested are, in my view, disappointing showing the Council's self interest beyond that of its citizens with limited views as it suits and weighting the options towards its own preferences which may not be in the best interests of the community. There are a number of obvious disadvantages to some options which have not been listed, in particular the effects of further housing on infrastructure where roads are in poor condition, where the Council itself holds meetings about the effects of sea water rise on some roads suggesting that road use is likely to be compromised. Public transport is difficult to access and no account appears to have been taken of the potential needs of an enlarged community on schooling and health. Further, option 3 states that "there is unknown demand for housing". I am surprised that the Council is unaware of the building activity that is underway on empty land at the moment which would indicate that there is a demand.	Gay Wood	Church Bay



Submission #42179

Hunters

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>I would therefore submit that no option is without considerable disadvantage.</p> <p>I would therefore favour a modified Option 1 for consideration.</p> <p>Modifications to the option should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Covenants on all gullies 2. Building only on flat land 3. The immediate upgrading of Bayview Road along the boundary of the area 4. A requirement that there be public consultation on the subdivision design. <p>PG Wood</p>		
41600	1	<p>The community as it currently sits is crying out for rejuvenation in its existing clubs i.e. bowls, rugby etc, the local preschool & playcentre are crying out for more bodies to remain more sustainable, all clubs and community organisations are needing more support to keep them alive and running - developing this area would reinvigorate some of these clubs. This is just one of many examples.</p> <p>Naturally preserving the gullies and allowing for growth at the school and potentially a new site for the Fire Brigade would allow for future planning but developing this area would allow for new faces, new ideas, more community support and spirit.</p>	Laura Palmer	
42600	1	Save the area. People have made such a great effort to keep the area for walkers/fauna/ flora/ birds. We moved here for the beauty of what is here. Please keep it as it is. Definitely NOT development	Lorraine Heaton-Caffin	Diamond Harbour
42528	1	Retain the gullies and school walking track and native plantings with the remainder of the land subdivided into sections	Kim Clinch	Church Bay
41599	1	Put a percentage of the sale price into developing the old Godley House site.	Ricky Hornsby	Diamond Harbour
42164	1	<p>Protect the gullies and the school track is of utmost importance</p> <p>The remainder of the land I would like to see a combination of housing and park, further walking tracks</p> <p>We don't have the infrastructure for mass housing</p>	Jules Askin	Charteris Bay
41582	1	Please retain the walking tracks in the gullies and along the boundary of the property. These are greatly appreciated and used by the local community. Happy to have some used for a new cemetery if that's required and perhaps retaining some as a park/reserve - for dogs to play off leash, mountain bikers to use etc. There's not a lot of available space allowed nearby for these activities currently.	Jo Milligan	
42170	1	Please place covenants that ensure eco friendly housing with Diamond Harbour residents and their children first opportunity to purchase land	Cassidy Simone	Diamond Harbour
41805	1	Please make sure the remainder of the land is made available primarily for residential development.	Tony Dale	Riccarton
42290	1	<p>Of the 5 options proposed, our thoughts are:- We acknowledge Option 2 does not serve the CCC well.</p> <p>We do not support Options 3 or 4.</p> <p>Option 5 is a fallback choice, allowing more time to consider options, with community consultation.</p> <p>We support Option 1 with the following provision</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We DO NOT want the land to be sold to just one developer. 2. We want the land in the 3 gullies mentioned to be placed in a Covenant and keeping the School Track open. 3. We want the development to cater for a wide demographic and age range, providing housing for young people, families, retired people and those who wish 	Wendy and Ian Douglas Coles	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		to downsize. This reflects the diversity of the older, main part of the Diamond Harbour community. 4. One of the main reasons retired people move from the Diamond Harbour area is because of the difficulty of managing to live on larger or steep slopes of the sections. The ridges of the slopes, which are flatter, should be prioritised to cater for those who are retired / physically compromised. 5. We want the land to be developed in stages. 6. The extra pressure put on the existing services and transport infrastructure will need to be considered by CCC before the development. This will require major upgrading but should not be funded by local rates.		
41973	1	It would great to see new housing BUT not a Lego Land type such as so many of the new city developments are.	Robyn Hedges	Diamond Harbour
41779	1	It is important that the gullies be not just covenanted but be set aside as reserves (all three). Also a portion of the land near the school should be maintained in council ownership for needed expansion of school. If land is sold for development, the developer must be required to fully develop the required infrastructure including land for parks, foot paths along all streets, and all utilities underground. Also, land must be preserved at the highest point for additional water storage.	Thomas Kuenning	Church Bay
42174	1	Increased development will help make more commercial operations in the area more viable ie supermarket, cafes , doctors dentists etc There is already substantial conservation areas in the Diamond Harbour Charteris Bay Area without adding anymore until all existing walking tracks parks etc are maintained to a acceptable level Council set this land aside for future residential development sometime ago Do not be swayed by selfish individuals in the area who don't want to share this wonderful area with others	David Cox	Charteris Bay
41790	1	If you could also put in the covenant a space for a dog park and space for another community space like a skate park or something then this would be my preferred option. Definitely a space for dogs off leash!!!	Gibson Chad	
41803	1	I would like to see the gullies covenanted and then the remaining land turned into a native planting block. Could this be put into the ETS scheme?? If not, the community would benefit from a motorcamp/calling ground - not a freedom Camping area!!!	Williamson Margaret Williamson	
41984	1	I recall speaking to the Council approximately two years ago in relation to the said land as I was interested in purchasing some of it. Personally I would like to see it subdivided into 1 - 2 ha lifestyle blocks for families with covenants attached. Owners could plant their own native bush in keeping with the surroundings. Dwellings should have a minimum footprint of 200m2 single storey.	Maura Ronald	
41594	1	I have chosen this option as I believe increased rates on other options are not viable they are already high considering the lack of footpaths we have suitable to walk on around the area I would think there are other priorities in the area for the council	ashleigh curtis	
41571	1	I believe that the growth of Diamond Harbour over the last 10 years will continue and this could be a attractive investment for a developer. With the gullies and pathways protected it is by far the best option.	John Eskett	Diamond Harbour
42045	1	I am in favour of a mix of option 1 and 3, I agree with most of the DHCA proposal. I understand the land was purchased originally for new housing, the council has no proper use for it and requires the money to lower the rise of our rates. First of all, Morgan's Gully and Sam's Gully should become Council Reserves, and a covenant put on the unnamed Gully to protect the restauration work that has been done and will be done in the future. I am in favor of a combined community and council planning process. Let's develop criteria together that future developers have to adhere to. That will include space for a range of community activities like dog walking, horse riding, community gardens, walking treks etc Let's sell the land in 3 stages. It will indicate how much demand there really is. It will enable a range of alternative land-use proposals to be considered at each stage, ie different types of development or housing could evolve on different parcels as a result.	Herbie Mues	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>Let the council ask potential buyers for RFP (Request for Proposals) which can be assessed against the criteria developed by council and community (see above) instead of putting the land quickly out for tender. Criteria will include a good design, allow for different house sizes, will try to attract a wide range of people, houses should be build sustainably, energy - efficient and not too close to each other.</p> <p>I am concerned about increased pressure on local services and the local infrastructure. The main road to Christchurch will require a major upgrade and the school has to manage a bigger role, as examples. The council needs to keep these aspects in mind, that's why the combined planning approach with the community is so important.</p> <p>I don't see why the council has to rush into this and sell asap. The council's income from the lease is higher than the maintenance costs. The rates are a charge to themselves, the capital value of the land can only increase.</p> <p>The council should plan long-term. There will be need for climate refugees, who could be settled on the land. Considering the rather advanced age of its population, DHB could do with a rest-home in the near future, don't just think cemetary.</p> <p>I ask you to seriously consider the opinions of the locals, we have to live with the decision you make in the council chambers....</p>		
41567	1	Generate income by selling, but protect the gullies. Then use the income to fund a replacement for the amenities that were lost in this community during the earthquakes.	David Rice	
41613	1	Covenants on all gullies a must, only reason we have not revegitated third gully is because of sheep. Pathways between gullies a must. Spare land for possible school expansion. DH will benefit from more families, it will make our community and shops sustainable.	Andrew Nugent	Diamond Harbour
41619	1	<p>Could you please clarify what the funds from any sale would be used for to benefit the community?</p> <p>Could land be set aside for a high school please?</p> <p>Could land and funds be set aside for a community swimming and fitness centre please?</p>	Sean Whitaker	Diamond Harbour
41561	1	Consulting with school for future growth and room for a new fire station would be great too	James Grant	
42340	1	<p>27 Hunters Rd & 42 Whero Ave</p> <p>I would like to see all 3 gullies have a covenant put on them to protect them for biodiversity & public access in continuity. If the land is to be developed for housing, I would like to see all sections developed as Land & House packages as a strict enforcable requirement for the sale of the blocks of land so that most, if not all dwellings can have a view through good landscape planning. This would create superior housing for many years to come in this spectacular location.</p>	Richard Hill	Diamond Harbour
41801	1	<p>1/ The tracks over this land and thru the 3 (three) gullies have high amenity value for us. They also enhance safety for students and others walking to school and thus reduce risk for us as car drivers on what is a windy road with narrow footpaths. So the covenants are important.</p> <p>2/ That aside the land should be made available for some new private owner to take on residential section development risk. It is flat-ish thus hopefully reasonably priced sections as a result and furthermore a little more scale/more residents would add benefit to Diamond Harbour as a community.</p> <p>3/ Finally by selling this land outright the Council gets some cash to spend/help contribute to other reserves in our area such as Mt Bradley; improving wastewater services and keep developing Lyttelton Port which is important for our regional economy.</p>	Vincent POOCH	Diamond Harbour
41590	1	I am not selecting one of the options above but have to in order to submit this form. My selection is for 'Other' - place a covenant on Sam's, Morgan's and third gully. And develop the flat land for mixed use and plan for future energy needs, e.g. solar bank, wind turbines, green housing, community gardens. Not standard mass housing sub divisions. Remain responsibility of CCC and use as pilot project for affordable, energy efficient, green community.	Christine Maynard	Diamond Harbour

Option 2 - Retain as a park

No comments

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Name	Suburb
42629	2	Vanessa Marshall	Diamond Harbour
42608	2	Olivia Mexted	
42361	2	campbell wear	Diamond Harbour
41828	2	Joy Harding	Diamond Harbour
41677	2	Timothy Glubb	Hillmorton
41676	2	Els Els Desart	
41670	2	Jules Holdstock	Diamond Harbour
41612	2	Ellie Hammond	
41605	2	Rohin Palmer	Diamond Harbour
41603	2	Vicky Coultas	Diamond Harbour
41584	2	Kate Carran	Purau
41583	2	Kate Carran	Port Levy
41581	2	Tony McCaffrey	Charteris Bay
41570	2	Andy Dopleach	

With comments

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
42625	2	<p>My particular concern is the sale of land at the top of Ngatea Rd.</p> <p>Ngatea Rd is a walkway which is well used by the community, including children accessing the school. It connects to the walking tracks in the gullies and all the way to Mt Herbert. It is part of the school walking track.</p> <p>The land at the top of Ngatea Rd should remain as a park/reserve to maintain the safety of all the pedestrians who use this road. There are no safe footpaths and two cars can't safely pass each other currently. Increasing traffic volumes will change the nature of this street and its safety.</p>	Jennifer Hindin Miller	Diamond Harbour
42620	2	<p>Ngatea Rd is a walkway which is well used by the community, including children accessing the school. It connects to the walking tracks in the gullies and all the way to Mt Herbert. It is part of the school walking track.</p> <p>The land at the top of Ngatea Rd should remain as a park/reserve to maintain the safety of all the pedestrians who use this road. There are no safe footpaths and two cars can't safely pass each other currently. Increasing traffic volumes will change the nature of this street and its safety.</p>	Rebecca Hibbert	
42605	2	I enjoy being in diamond harbor and be able to walk on the track.	Romain Albert	
42602	2	<p>The land has significant value to me as I have grown up on the property at Te Papau Crescent and have lived there for most of my life.</p> <p>The recreational value of the Whero and Hunter Road land blocks is significant as there is the "school track" that runs to Diamond Harbour School from Waipapa Avenue. I go running along these tracks, and along the paddock that runs along the ridge of Whero Ave, which offers stunning 360 degree views of Lyttelton Harbour. I also enjoy walking the tracks which the community have spent considerable time in planting native trees and shrubs.</p>	Clare Fryer	





Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>I think that Diamond Harbour would benefit in the future with this land being kept as a park or undeveloped and grazed with access to the public. If this land were to be developed then the local community of Diamond Harbour would lose the opportunity to walk along the ridgeline at the top of Whero Avenue, which is an iconic landscape and offers views of Lyttelton Harbour.</p> <p>I think that for Diamond Harbour to have a sustainable urban plan in the future, then our green spaces should be maximised for future generations.</p> <p>I also have been inspired by this landscape for my artwork growing up. If the land above Whero Avenue were to be developed, then this would mean that the public could not walk along the ridgeline, and buildings and houses would disrupt the aesthetic appeal of the landscape.</p> <p>As a local from Diamond Harbour I do not support the land being developed and my preference is for the land to be made into a park for the public to enjoy in the future. This may be either community owned and operated or council owned and operated.</p> <p>I have attached two photographs of the land at the top of Whero Avenue to illustrate the beauty of this landscape and the significance for me of it being undeveloped.</p>		
42592	2	Would be great to keep the land as a park and plant all land with natives to have as community bushland for native wildlife.	Molly Fryer	Lyttelton
42575	2	<p>I think the land should not be sold or developed. Ironically there is very little open green space that people can walk dogs and or flat space for kids to ride bikes I think it should be turned into dog park like the one on Victoria park. And a decent play ground/ park.</p> <p>I don't think Diamond Harbour has the infrastructure to sustainably support more development particularly in that area while being committed to better climate outcomes. Diamond Harbour doesn't need more houses it needs better infrastructure such as skate parks or other activities for older kids, footpaths, disabled access, better roads and better parking solutions on both sides of ferry and sewers that don't leak into ocean, water pipes that aren't a health hazard and lastly Godley house to be reinstated as community hub. These are things the community needs.</p> <p>To develop would negatively impact the special character of Diamond Harbour. It would also negatively impact the delicate and dedicated restoration work that has been put into the gulleys.</p>	Lucy Matthews	Diamond Harbour
42567	2	<p>Definitely for a park!</p> <p>To bring the community together for future generations, keeping it the beautiful community it already is and maintaining that safe place</p>	Shairn zoe Cane	Diamond Harbour
42561	2	unless affordable housing for our tamariki is confirmed or provisions made for our kaumatua then please leave it as a park. Making the decision to live in an area that is rural depends on still living rurally	Kylie Brand	Diamond Harbour
42332	2	<p>I strongly object to the sale and development of the remainder of the land at 27 Hunters Rd for residential subdivision purposes and recommend that it be retained in CCC ownership and protected from future development as a reserve for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paddocks in their current state (leased for grazing) allow uninterrupted views to Mt Evans / Mt Herbert and constitute outstanding natural landscape with rural character. Any development of these paddocks will be clearly visible from Lyttelton and from properties on Hunters Rd. and will effectively destroy the natural landscape and rural character which makes Diamond Harbour such a desirable place to live. 2. If sold to developers, the conditions of the RMA requiring notifiable consents, allowing public consultation will no doubt be circumvented - examples are Black Point and Taimana Lane where development above the natural recession plane and removal / landscaping of significant amounts of topsoil and rock was allowed under non-notifiable consents. There is no evidence of a need in Diamond Harbour for additional land for development. Sale of the land to developers will remove the chance for the community to have any input and consultation in the future use of the land. 3. Development of land would require a significant upgrade of infrastructure such as waste water / storm water and roading. The land at Hunters Rd. generates significant natural water run-off in winter conditions. This would need to be managed to prevent flooding issues down slope. 	Rachel Musgrave	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>4. If the portion of land at Hunters Rd was protected as a reserve / park the existing grazing lease could remain, with a plan to develop the land for use by the community for horse riding / biking / walking in time. Further development of the ecosystem by revegetating the remainder of the land (currently being grazed) with native forest could be considered as a possible alternative land use. Investment by private companies wanting to offset their carbon credits could provide resources to boost the already considerable input by local volunteers.</p> <p>I support the CCC decision to continue with the conservation covenant of the three protected gullies to allow for reforestation with native vegetation and to allow public / community access through a network of walkways . In principle, I have no objection to a portion of the land being retained to expand Diamond Harbour school and perhaps some of the flatter land near Whero Ave being sold to generate some income. This would require a boundary and zoning change.</p>		
42316	2	A network of tracks for walking would be a wonderful development to connect with the lower Mt Herbert walkwy	Rachelle Chadwick	Diamond Harbour
42306	2	<p>Definitely don't want option one or option 5. Selling this land and putting it into the hands of a developer is very risky. The community would have no say in how this land was to be developed.</p> <p>This land is a wonderful assett to Diamond Harbour. Leaving it status quo as in option 5 would be a waste.</p> <p>I would like to see a combination of options 2 and 3.</p> <p>Some housing on this land seems a fair thing to offer and I think the community could cope with a small number (so that there would not be too much increased pressure on the DH infrastructure and services) of new housing catering to a wide diversity of people. Sustainable design needs to be strongly encouraged, perhaps even offering shared facilities. An area for tiny houses to be included.</p> <p>Some land retained for extension of the present school and Kindergarten.</p> <p>The rest of this land, 40 -50%, to be retained as a park. The gullies would need to be placed into a covenant and the existing school track protected. Then a skateboard park, dog park, a natural burial ground, an emergency helicopter landing area and training area for the local fire brigade could all be developed here for the use of the whole community.</p> <p>Also a camping ground for those wishing to holiday in this lovely part of Banks Peninsula. This would encourage more local business</p>	Michele Cherry	Diamond Harbour
42198	2	<p>I prefer yet another option. With any new development the developers pay for the infrastructure. However in the case of Diamond Harbour this would have to include updating the water system coming all the way from Dyers Road and the sewage upgrade taking from Diamond Harbour to Bromley. A road upgrade would also be necessary to cater for all the extra traffic. No developer is going to wear all that extra cost and the CCC would lose everything that they gained from the sale and a lot more besides.</p> <p>My preferred option is for the CCC to continue to own the land and with the help of the DHB Community plant the area and gain income from the Carbon Credits accrued.</p> <p>The CCC gains considerable income, the Community doesn't lose its open space and most importantly the CCC isn't lumbered with a huge debt in providing all the essential services needed .</p> <p>Euan Godfrey Diamond Harbour it</p>	Euan Godfrey	Diamond Harbour
42189	2	Future urban development should be close to Christchurch where all the main services are.	Graham Christie	Purau
42187	2	This area is too large for residential development in one go - we have read possibly 250 houses. The impact on existing residents on Whero Ave (our whanau live on Whero at the very top) will be enormousthe junction between Whero Ave & Marine Drive is already a high risk area due to poor visibility in either direction and you have to pull out at high speed as you're at high risk of a collision if something is coming and has not seen you - increased vehicle volume will add to this existing risk.	Mel Johns	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>If there was an option to develop say no more than a 1/4 of the space with a guarantee on maximum number of houses (25?) then we could possibly support that - but this unknown sell the full site to a developer (and hope...) just leaves us with so many uncertainties and as I said to begin with - the site is disproportionately too large (in comparison to DH community) to be sold and developed in one go - it is too much of a gamble/impact and parameters re size need to be clear prior to any sale and agreed upon by the community.</p> <p>Overall, too large a site for residential development to occupy it fully - no more than a 1/4, 25 properties to reflect a steady incremental growth of DH and associated infrastructure to be upgraded alongside increased population size. There's nothing definite being offered in that area - the 'develop the land' option had no guaranteed parameters - so 'retain as a park'. Thank you & Ka Kite</p>		
42186	2	I think we should keep it as a park because I live 1 house down from part of the land and I like it the way it is, nice and quiet, a place for the sheep and an easy way to access walking tracks.	Carys Johns	Diamond Harbour
42182	2	PLEASE PLEASE don't sell to a developer. When thought is given to the lack of infrastructure, the poor/dangerous road between DH and the city, the very real threat of sea level rise inundating the Teddington flats, it makes no sense to build more houses here. The council will end up paying so much more! How about a campaign to encourage people with empty baches to sell them to people trying to buy their first/only home??	Melanie Gliddon	Diamond Harbour
42166	2	It is such a lovely area and we've got far too many houses here anyway. The infrastructure is not good enough, the road is terrible, an absolute disgrace, not enough safe footpaths etc	Rose Guscott	Diamond Harbour
41976	2	This could include things for our young people to do, like a bike track or pump track. There is a lack of things in the community for our young people especially the 9 to 18 year olds. Native planting would also be great, this would encourage the native birds like the tui to return to this area.	Ursi Riederer	Diamond Harbour
41971	2	<p>I request that the gullies (2 x named) are classified as Council reserves rather than covenants so as to best protect them. Also the 1 unnamed gully yet to be restored back into nature to be protected by Council as a Council reserve. The school track also as a protected easement. As for the mass of land, I request that much of it is restored back into native bush with some green spaces for horse riding, bike tracks, parkland, etc. A small portion of this space may go into housing so option 3 + 4 could come into play. Any housing should demonstrate a climate change housing model i.e. low emissions housing, sustainable materials used, shared facilities, Storm water filter system, reflect protection of local natural surroundings, etc.</p> <p>I absolutely dispute the concept of another cemetery at the top of Ngatea Rd. I ask that the Council consults the community first about what they want to do with their deceased. Cemeteries are unsustainable, not a good use of land and many people do not like to go near them.</p>	Gina St J Ives	Diamond Harbour
41897	2	Revegetate the entire area into native bush and have walking tracks . Similar to Wellingtons Wilton Bush	Catherine Dalley	Huntsbury
41836	2	<p>I fully understand this is an asset the council has no use for. However, I do not believe the land should be developed. Whilst public transport exists, the vast majority of people are going to drive into the city for work given it takes anywhere between 45 and 85 minutes to get to/from the CBD by ferry and bus. This is born out by the fact most people currently commute by car. Significantly increasing the population of Diamond Harbour will, therefore, have a big impact of the amount of traffic. I fail to see how this aligns with the government's plan to reduce traffic/journeys by encouraging higher density settlement within the city limits.</p> <p>My order of preference for the above mentioned options is, therefore, as follows:</p> <p>2 (retain as park)</p> <p>4 (transfer ownership to the community)</p> <p>5 (status quo)</p> <p>1 (covenant gullies and dispose of)</p> <p>3 (develop land)</p> <p>If the land must be sold, it should be broken up and sold over a period of time to lessen the impact on the community.</p>	Jonathan Wright	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		Regarding the placing a covenant on the third gully I would think carefully about the implications of this as it would mean the only access to the middle section would be via Ngatea Road which is in no way suitable for through traffic in its current state. Furthermore, turning right onto Ngatea Road from Marine Drive is not the safest as the left-hand bend on Marine Drive limits the visibility of oncoming traffic.		
41831	2	As a resident of Diamond Harbour, my family and I would prefer to see the whole of the land package transformed into regenerative native forrest, which would include walking & biking paths suitable for general recreational use. The forested parkland would be another important step in the process of adding more green space locally and another step in restoring what's been lost on Banks Peninsula.	Kenneth Poulsen	Diamond Harbour
41806	2	Quite frankly there is no way the junction of Whero Ave and Marine Parade could handle more traffic if the land was developed. Also, why not just leave as is but with options for the community to use parts for various activities; dog park, bike park, food forest, allotments etc etc. However, Lot 1 off Hunter Ave is ripe for development and this could be offered for sale to help offset the park above Whero Ave.	Jim Pollard	Diamond Harbour
41795	2	<p>1. I particularly want the small area of reserve above Marine Drive at the end of Ngatea road kept for public use. I walk my dog there daily, as do many others, because it is safe from cars & is quiet, and it is bounded by a row of pine trees from which I constantly harvest pinecones all year round for my woodburner. It is a great area for children to play behind the houses that line Marine Drive in that area, and it allows access to the back boundaries of those Marine Drive home owners, without which they would be forced to exit their homes onto the main road. Believe me, as someone who lives on the other side of Marine Drive & trys to cross the road regularly on foot, the traffic is murder along there due to limited visibility. Thus cars are almost on top of you as soon as you step off the curb, even though you've looked both ways multiple times & listened hard for approaching cars.</p> <p>2. As for the 2 main blocks of land, I agree that they should be developed in stages. Develop one block first, see how it works, then decide how to develop the 2nd.</p> <p>3. I am happy for the Council to sell the land in stages, as long as the Council listens to the community and is careful to select a developer that specializes in eco homes/ small homes/ nature- centred homes. Something different to the cookie cutter 4-5 bedroom houses that exist in suburban developments like Wigram/ Aidenfield. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE do not select a developer who builds large " family" homes which are unaffordable to first home buyers & people of limited means. Think about the aging population needing to downsize to smaller more manageable homes. Maybe consider modular homes that can be added to in time as first home buyers have children. Please also stipulate some green spaces within the development. I am thinking that the first block of land should be sold to a more specialized eco or tiny home developer, then wait and watch to see the end result on the first block before deciding if the 2nd block can be bought by the same developer. Or not.</p> <p>4. What I am most concerned about is the state of the road into and out of Christchurch for Diamond Harbour residents. I regularly witness near- miss head on crashes due to all the blind corners on the Dyers Pass and Governors Bay routes, due to having limited places to pass, rough road surfaces, icy road surfaces in winter with sheer drops off the side of the road in many cases, & very narrow roads. Not to mention the multiple cyclists that you come upon unexpectedly as you round a corner, giving you hardly any time to avoid them without crossing the centre line. It's hard enough now to negotiate the hazards. Imagine 100 or more new households each with 2 cars, most of whom will be unfamiliar with the roads. I foresee much frustration being stuck behind newbies & visitors who routinely drive at 40 km/ hour during commuting hours, with hardly any safe passing opportunities. I need to know that the council will create more passing bays, and that the roads will be better maintained and widened where possible if more housing is to be created.</p> <p>5. Lastly, consider these parcels of land as extremely valued by our community. They are in a superb position. Everyone loves spending time there. We are a community of walkers & Nature lovers. Please make sure the land is developed in a way that is sympathetic to our values. In a way that is uniquely Diamond Harbour. Not just another housing development like all the other housing developments. We moved here to get away from all that. Don't let that model of development stalk us all the way out to our beloved haven.</p>	Trudy McBeath	Diamond Harbour
41758	2	<p>I support the retention of the land as a park for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A park planted with eco-sourced native species will contribute significantly to the biodiversity of the area and reinforce the work already underway in the two gullies. • Parkland planted with eco-sourced native species will not be a source of invasive plant species that will threaten the work already done in the two gullies. 	Robert Goldie	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>(Significant volunteer time is already spent combating invasive species in the two gullies).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiverse parkland would provide recreational opportunities for local residents and visitors from the city and will promote wellbeing in the community. • Established biodiverse parkland could provide educational and even scientific opportunities; and could be used to preserve, display and promote rare and endangered Banks Peninsula species. • Biodiverse parkland could include amenities that contribute to community wellbeing (e.g. dog play area, children play area, walking tracks, accessible tracks). • The establishment of biodiverse parkland is aligned with actions required to mitigate the climate crisis and the biodiversity crisis. • Biodiverse parkland would add to the restoration efforts already established elsewhere in the Harbour. • The net operating cost to the Council appears to be approximately zero (given that Council rates are paid to the Council in a circular bookkeeping manner). • Development and maintenance costs would apply to biodiverse parkland however this could be partly mitigated by engaging volunteers and phasing out grazing over a number of years. 		
41691	2	<p>A park would provide a central recreation space and connect the Purau, Diamond Harbour, Church Bay and Charteris Bay communities. It would provide a resource for the school and add value to curriculum. If regenerated in native vegetation, opportunity would be available to and a small network or walking and cycling trails. Opportunity could also be provided for picnic space. Further increasing and connecting the native planting will give native fauna a larger range and act as a buffer from the farming use south of Bayview Road.</p> <p>It would also connect with conservation areas surrounding Te Ahu Patiki and be a asset to the wider Christchurch residents. It would also increase the 'destination' value following the loss of Godley House.</p>	Nicci Mardle	Diamond Harbour
41682	2	<p>We do not need more development. A park allows for widespread native plantings to assist with reducing the impacts of climate change. A longer term view is needed and it would also provide for another outdoor area for people to enjoy walking, etc.</p>	Jim DuRose	Diamond Harbour
41673	2	<p>The map of your current covenant plan does not include the walking track that runs along the top of Whero Avenue, connecting Morgan's gully to Sam's gully. It also does not include the track that runs between Ngatea Road and the school. This is VERY disappointing!</p> <p>A lot of kids that live on Waipapa Avenue, Whero Avenue and Ngatea Road walk to school on this track. The track is much shorter and safer than walking along the main road. The track crosses over a large part of 42 Whero Avenue. This access way and the native plantings put in by the community in that area NEED to be part of the covenant. Also, a covenant needs to be placed on the walkway between Ngatea Road and the school.</p> <p>If the council does not protect this track it is going to anger a lot of people! This is a popular track used by many people for exercise, walking their dogs and walking between the neighborhoods separated by the gullies. It is also part of what makes it wonderful to live in Diamond Harbour.</p> <p>Ideally, I would love the area that is currently grazed to either be left how it is or turned into park land. The community has been asking for a dog park, a community garden and a skate park. However, if you insist on going with your preferred option of selling the land for development it is essential that in addition to putting a covenant on the three gullies, the walking track that runs from Morgan's gully to the school is also preserved with a covenant.</p>	Catherine Gongol	Diamond Harbour
41672	2	<p>A caravan park!!</p>	Kerianne Johnson	
41654	2	<p>There isnt the roads and other infrastructure to support more settlment in this area of the Peninsula. It would be a great assett to leave the area for recreational purposes which both visitors and locals would use.</p>	Christy Hammond	Diamond Harbour
41636	2	<p>Retaining the open vista of this land and as a walkway is I feel important.</p>	anita cox	Diamond Harbour
41604	2	<p>I believe it needs to be formalized into being a park, to save this park of Banks Peninsula for future generations.</p>	Blyde Dale	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
41602	2	Dog park, children's park, skate park and COMMUNITY GARDENS X	Candice Milner	
41596	2	Could be a mixed park area with dog park and skate park retaining the gullies with their native regeneration. We could also gets submissions from a developer for a retirement complex in part of it which could help fund the development of other areas.	Elizabeth wyllie	
41592	2	A) the community developed 2 valley regeneration will be superbly enhanced with a park in between (rather than housing) and is a perfect opportunity to grow a future native tree, bird (tui, bellbird), farm sanctuary or much needed dog park. B) \$15000 deficit is very small in the big picture of the council finances and doesn't warrant creating another suburb in a community developing area. (\$7 per person per year would cover it)- could be called the Whero park levy. C) in 20 yrs time families from DH and Chch will thank the vision of the council with the grown trees and developed valleys to wander through. D) status quo could remain if this is a reasonable income stream, but increase by \$15000 per year...	Thomas Proctor	Diamond Harbour
41586	2	There has been some support to use this land as a dog/park enclosure. The views are stunning taking in the harbour from Sugarloaf to Godley Head. Any dog noise would be minimal and some distance from existing housing. There would be little cost in achieving this as the area is already fenced, only needing suitable gates and dog poo facilities. Dogs give so much pleasure, let's give them something back.	Graham Duncan	Diamond Harbour
41585	2	Fencing off the field so that it could be an enclosed dog park would be an appreciated addition to the community, as there are no such facilities currently. The gullies can be kept separate if need be in order to protect bird life and other native species.	Karen Shaw	
41580	2	Plant the whole area with native trees and make it a nature reserve. Let the community look after it.	David Hammond	Diamond Harbour
41576	2	Turn into a native botanical park. As it is already fenced have some of the park turned into the dog park the community requested.	Marielize Goldie	Diamond Harbour
41564	2	There has been growing support via the community Facebook page for the paddock at the top of Whero Ave to potentially be used as a dog park. There is increasingly a need for a space like this due to (1) a growing population of residential dog owners coming up against (2) a seemingly equal increase in residents who are opposed to the "off-leash" exercise of dogs in current parks. The roads in and around Diamond Harbour are also much busier than they used to be, and due to the number of blind corners and the often limited-width footpaths, it does not feel safe to walk dogs around the roads anymore (especially at night). The provision of dedicated dog park would surely be good for all residents – those who love dogs AND those that don't want to be around them – as it would create a safe space for dogs and their owners to exercise, while leaving other areas to potentially become 'on-lead' spaces.	Luke Wood	Diamond Harbour

Option 3 – Develop the land

No comments

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Name	Suburb
42607	3	Arno Andres	Diamond Harbour
41729	3	George Howden	
41728	3	Courtney Howden	Diamond Harbour

With comments

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
42635	3	I support mixed housing development on the land (including a range of alternative uses - tracks, community gardens, other plantings) and placing a covenant over Sams, Morgans and the third Gully. I believe that a staged selling of the land for the development of additional housing is certainly preferable to disposing of it all at once as in Option one. For option one to actually benefit our community significantly, the proposed developer would need to favour benevolence over profit, which is highly unlikely. There would be little onus on the developer's side to engage with the community, which is therefore more likely to lead to a less desirable outcome for the community as a whole. Having the Council develop the land, in smaller lots over a longer period of time, would allow for community consultation and a flexible plan as our community grows and our needs change. If this could also be achieved through option 4, I would support this also. If neither of these options receive the required support, I would then favour the status quo beyond any other alternative. To summarise, I support option 3 or 4 with suitable opportunities for community consultation as the development goes forward. Both options should be accomplished in stages, developing the areas in smaller lots over a longer period as required. If these options cannot proceed, then I favour the status quo, option 5. I do not support retaining the land as a park, option 2, although any development should include green spaces. Most importantly, I object to Option 1 as it carries the greatest risk for our community as a whole.	Nathan Graham	Purau
42593	3	Combination of option 3 and 4 with a council developing the land with association with community. Also with protection of gullies and tracks.	Martina Heath	Diamond Harbour
42590	3	Neither of these five options are preferred. I would like to see a hybrid of options 1, 3, and 4. Options 2 and 5 are not acceptable. Council's stance that there is not an interest to live in DHB shows how out of touch they are with the community. There is a great demand to live out here which has grown steadily and rapidly over the last five years. At one point several months ago there were no sections for sale and no houses for sale. People are regularly enquiring on our facebook group looking for rentals, sections, or homes for sale. The demand for housing in NZ and Canterbury is going to grow, This land is already zoned residential and has been so for almost 100 years. This land, with the exception of the gulleys and walk ways, should be developed for housing. However, option 1 is not preferred because it will require a large developer to take interest in such a large plot of land, and we are likely to see cookie cutter sections which maximize the number of lots and don't fit in with what the community want. Option 3 is not preferred, because CCC are terrible at land development. Option four is not preferred because it puts the responsibility onto the community and does not guarantee the land will be developed and council will profit off our work. This land should be sold in smaller blocks for development. This would increase the chance of the land selling more quickly and making sections available sooner. There should be opportunity for a mix of section sizes and styles to serve those looking for larger sections and those looking for low maintenance retirement sections. Council also needs to commit to upgrading our infrastructure to accommodate the new housing.	Marga Lamoreaux	Diamond Harbour
42588	3	I do not prefer any of the options and options 2 and 5 are not acceptable. I would like a mixed of option 1, 3 and 4 and have the the area which is zoned residential be use for that purpose with the DH Community input so that there is a mix of section sizes to cater for retirees and also new larger sections for families. The gullies and the walkways should be retained but the remainder develop such that any development does not just create small sections that does not fit with the community.	Anthony Parkes	Diamond Harbour
42587	3	I support the proposals put forward by the Diamond Harbour community association. There is a need for more land availability in the community, however the development needs to be sensitive to the environmental needs and unique character of the community, and therefore a normal disposal to a development company is not appropriate. I support a combination of options 3 and 4 whereby council develops the land in partnership with the community so there can be a suitable mix of density and value in the sections and housing made available, without layering on private development costs and the resulting financial incentive to meet minimum district plan requirements and nothing else. I would like to see this become an example of responsible sustainably development with a community focused design, sustainable housing options, and a mix of low and medium density that encourages energy efficiency and social interaction among residents, rather than the cookie-cutter style of subdivisions with poor urban and social planning seen in areas such as Rolleston and Templeton.	Adrian Heath	Diamond Harbour
42553	3	I have a bach in Diamond Harbour [REDACTED]. I live in Christchurch ([REDACTED]). My wife and I spend 1-2 weekends in Diamond Harbour and host gatherings there as well. We support the native planting in the gullies. I am in favour of using some of this land for housing as we need more houses. In my experience, there is growing demand for houses and land in Diamond Harbour. I want to see the Council find an effective way to ensure the housing development is built in stages using RFP approach, so can be controlled. I would like to see the housing development support a wide demographic and income range and support mainly full time residents. Given the climate emergency, homes should be highly energy efficient, and end up with a friendly neighbourhood, as most of	ian wells	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		Diamond Harbour is, ie sidewalks, no high fences, access to sunlight for solar, low impact from vehicles, walking/cycling infrastructure supported, support sharing and friendliness. Higher density would be acceptable if does not also result in more vehicles. I also want to see the gullies protected and all the hard work done by volunteers preserved and supported in future. I support least Morgan's and Sam's galleys made into council reserves.		
42545	3	<p>Hunters Rd submission Jane Harrison Shaun Fitzgerald</p> <p>I would like to support Option 3, closely followed by Option 4. The wholesale disposal of the land at 27 Hunters Rd to a developer is likely to result in development that does the bare minimum to provide necessary infrastructure and to encourage large numbers of properties to ensure maximum profits. As an alternative, Council working alongside the Diamond Harbour community to develop the land in stages, ensuring a variety of housing types and section sizes, while ensuring that infrastructure, roading and services are kept to a high standard, will result in a residential and recreational develop that meets the needs and aspirations of the local community. The Diamond Harbour community has a number of highly skilled people able to work through this process with support from Council staff and in conjunction with any developers that are invited to participate.</p> <p>However, if Option 1 is approved I would like to make the following submission.</p> <p>As a resident whose property backs onto the piece of Council owned land at the end of Ngatea Rd, I would like to submit that this piece of land is retained for community use. It is already well used by the local community as a safe dog walking area and walking and recreation space for those who live nearby. Additionally, a small community orchard has been planted on the land and neighbours help to maintain the trees and are able to harvest the fruit and nuts growing there. This land is also used regularly for safe parking space for visitors to the homes that back onto it. There is virtually no safe parking on Marine Drive, where resident's driveways are. If visitors have children, parking on Marine Drive then requires crossing the road on a very windy section, with cars appearing suddenly around blind corners. Having a safe parking space for children, visitors or deliveries to homes is important for the people that live there.</p> <p>If this section of land is developed there will be an increase of traffic on Ngatea Rd which will affect those who live there and road quality. This is in addition to the need for additional infrastructure required to provide necessary services to new homes.</p> <p>It would be a simple matter to retain this piece of land as it is surrounded by houses and a gully, with only a small entranceway off Ngatea St. I think it is important that existing community use is included in the decision making process – not only protecting the gullies, but also areas of existing community use and the track that accesses the school.</p>	Shaun Fitzgerald	Diamond Harbour
42544	3	Please see attached submission	Jane Harrison	Diamond Harbour
42393	3	<p>I prefer Option 3 for development of the land in a partnership between the Council, the Community and in future retainment of property developer/s to realize the wishes of the district through a consulted, staged development of the land.</p> <p>While it is not the core business of Council to develop property and a local community does not necessarily have the expertise or time available to drive this development long term; the Council has processes and the community has people resources and the will to make any development work for the people. There are already a number of local residents who give freely of their time to: - the work of the Community Association; supporting local organisations; developing and maintaining walkways; planting trees; caring for gardens and providing public services etc. These are all very valuable to the community - for example building a Medical Centre (which now needs extending), fighting for the return of Godley House land, developing a town centre, driving a shopping bus to town for seniors, driving people to medical appointments, supporting the youth and the many local organisations.</p> <p>But first there are steps to be taken –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure reserves and/or covenants over Sam's, Morgan's and the unnamed gully are legally preserved in perpetuity, including the School Track and adjacent planted areas. 2. Review current use of land. The proposed sections in the consultation document appear to overlap with land already extensively planted. 3. Preserve land for future School expansion and for other identified needs, e.g. an alternative cemetery site. 	Lynley Aldridge	Purau

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>4. Develop remaining land in stages via Council & Community determining the best use for each area over time.</p> <p>There is already support for mixed living development, especially for local senior residents to downsize to smaller sections, more manageable & environmentally sustainable homes with easy access. As most sections currently developed in this district have already been purchased there will be a need to release some land for family homes in stages that fit with the continual upgrading of services and infrastructure to cope with more homes. This is good for the community in maintaining school numbers and sustaining local businesses.</p> <p>I would not want to see all the land offered for sale in one go (Option 1). I believe with the gullies and other areas identified permanently retained, then the remaining area is not required as a park (option 2). The status quo (Option 5) is a fall-back position but does not necessarily serve the district well in the long term.</p> <p>My reason for thinking this would be difficult for a community alone to develop the land (Option 4) encompasses the difficulty of financing the purchase of the land; paying rates; raising the capital for development and recruiting/employing people with the expertise to successfully manage future sub-divisions but together a staged development of land in Diamond Harbour could be beneficial to the whole community.</p>		
42366	3	<p>I would like to request that 27 Hunters Road, Vacant Land, Record of Title CB12F/538 being Pt Lot 1 DP14050 and Lot 7 DP 14050, (390,222 sq metres), be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal. The normal process for disposal of land that would require community board and public consultation should be used instead. I am against Option 1 offered by the council. Having a covenant on Sams Gully, Morgans Gully, and the unnamed gully only is not a satisfactory solution. Selling wholesale to an unnamed developer to be able to develop in a way that would not need consultation with the community is a recipe for disaster. The community has to be involved in future development. In Option 3 you state that you are not aware of any significant demand for residential development in Diamond Harbour. I would suggest that the local real estate agents may be in a better position to gauge that. I am in favour of using the land for residential use but it needs to be developed in a way that does not over burden the present infrastructure. We only have one road from Teddington to Diamond Harbour and residential development of this land in question would see a dramatic rise in traffic volume. There is also the three waters issue to consider carefully. A variety of housing would be essential. We don't want to only cater for the wealthy to build their mansions. Consideration of smaller dwellings for present day elderly residents to move into is also needed in Diamond Harbour. Whatever development happens should be in consultation with the community and NOT just left to a developer. We don't want another Wigram on this side of the harbour. I'm in favour of the land being developed in stages to minimize the demand on present day services. New infrastructure would need to meet the needs of the new building. Developing in stages, covenants on the three gullies and the walking path from Waipapa Ave to the school, and suitable housing to meet the needs of the community, in consultation with the community, would get my vote. Therefore, in my opinion, Option 3 is the most favourable.</p>	Dereck Porter	Diamond Harbour
42365	3	<p>I've attached a pdf of my opinions.</p>	Janie Porter	Diamond Harbour
42352	3	<p>I am disappointed with the level of information provided to the community during this consultation. This includes both written and verbal information (as in the meeting of 04/11/21).</p> <p>I think that the framing of option 1 seems designed to mislead, by its coupling of the private development option with covenanting the gullies.</p> <p>I support the detailed submission of the DHCA, and urge the Council to engage fully with the community to explore in particular options 3 and 4 and to greatly increase the level of information relating to these options.</p>	Graeme Fraser	Diamond Harbour
42350	3	<p>Our submission reflects that we are unhappy with the amount of information provided for anyone to properly choose an option. Agreed submission of the Diamond Harbour Reserve Management Committee (DHRMC)</p> <p>The DHRMC's primary purpose and priority is the maintenance and regeneration of existing and future park/reserves. The regeneration work in Sam's and Morgan's Gullies is directly affected by the options for future use of the land at Hunters Road and Whero Avenue.</p> <p>DHRMC provides the following comment:</p>	Graeme Fraser	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>Status quo (option 5) DHRMC would support retention under the status quo for strategic purposes, as well as environmental and social benefit. If this option were chosen, DHRMC requests that the securing of all three gullies and access by way of covenant and/or easement is completed. DHRMC questions the conclusion of holding costs given grazing rental, and that rating costs are nominal only because minimal actual services are used. There is a clear financial benefit in land appreciation.</p> <p>Retain as a park (option 2) DHRMC would support retention of the whole site as reserve for environmental and social benefit although we acknowledge the current level of Council reserve land is adequate and that there would be some potential cost to Council in development and maintenance as a park.</p> <p>Residential development (options 1, 3 & 4) DHRMC recognises that that there is some argument for sale or use of part of the land for residential purpose and supports the proposal to incorporate the three gullies as open space regeneration blocks. DHRMC considers that setting the three gullies aside for regeneration should be a minimum bottom line in any residential development proposal. This should include the existing walking tracks having permanent protection for public access.</p> <p>DHRMC considers that there is a lack of detailed information supporting the three residential options making it difficult to provide additional feedback.</p> <p>DHRMC requests that before proceeding with any option in relation to residential development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Actual detail and explanation are provided around how the covenants would work and tracks are secured. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would a sale include the land with covenant? • Would that land then be available for reserve contribution and off-set against infrastructure development contribution? • What would be the financial impact and what rights are preserved by the covenant? A disposal process is designed that enables Council and community consideration and input into the proposed design and nature of development. <p>Graeme Fraser, Chair, DHRMC, 15 Nov 2021</p>		
42273	3	As long as the gullies are retained as covenants, the rest is suitable for development. assuming that the community may have a say in what is done. e'g' smaller lots for the elderly who want to stay in the Harbour but cannot maintain their full-size homes and gardens. Green spaces would be essential too- people need to feel free to add their two pennorth worth.	Prue kennard	Church Bay
42207	3	<p>- Protection of the gullies and tracks is paramount. I believe they should have Reserve Status rather than Covenant.</p> <p>- Disposal of the land by council in one parcel [Option1]will not provide much/if any opportunity for community input once sold. Infrastructure development on the scale required long term will provide huge and unacceptable disruption.</p> <p>- Council development of the land in partnership with a developer, in consultation with community input in stages is the desirable compromise in my view. The 'Request for Proposals ' approach seems like a reasonable way forward.</p>	Brent Rees	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>- I accept that the status quo [Option 5] is not an option.</p> <p>Other possible opportunities</p> <p># Develop the majority of the parcel of land as a Carbon Sink with significant community input. Basically an extension of existing gully plantings onto the the currently grazed ridges. Council retains ownership, gets some development revenue, gets the carbon credit \$ and engages a green leaning community. The entire block would have been planted after 1990 and thus would potentially qualify I gather. There are numerous examples of successful carbon sinks around Banks Peninsula. Couple with this proposed carbon sink the development of a few residential sections at each of the road frontages around the overall block. Thus there would be minimal roading development required at each site and therefore minimal long term disruption for existing residents.</p> <p>Thankyou for the opportunity to submit. Such consultation is absolutely essential long term for any development of this site.</p> <p>-</p>		
42204	3	<p>I would like to submit for the Hunters Road and Whero Ave land options.</p> <p>I would like to vote for option 3 although maybe the council could go into partnership with a developer to minimise the risk. If there is an opportunity to do a deputation I would like to do that. Here is what I have written:</p> <p>I know this is the highest risk for the council but there are opportunities here to really engage with the community and showcase how connected CCC are with communities. Tūranga is an amazing library showing what the council working with our communities can do. Our world is changing, planning where we live requires forward thinking to what our communities will need in the future. Diamond Harbour has a very active and connected community with many people that are very talented and forward thinking. Let's not just hand it over for another property developer with the ultimate goal of lining their own pockets. Let us work together and create a well planned community area that is affordable for first home buyers, with everything people need. With areas for community gardens, playgrounds, sharing sheds, community buildings, public transport links, smart parking areas for residents with charging points and opportunities to learn about species in the covenants. CCC created an amazing library with community engagement, let's create an amazing and inspiring place for people to live. There may be an opportunity to go into a partnership with a developer. There may be a developer that is looking to take on this type of project as more and more people recognise our current lifestyles do need to change. This would minimise the risk for council and enable all parties to work together.</p>	Katrina Miller	Charteris Bay
42188	3	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to give specific and robust feedback regarding the proposed disposal of 27 Hunters Rd/42 Whero Ave sites.</p> <p>Before any disposal process commences, I strongly believe that the gullies (Sams Gully, Morgans Gully and Unnamed Gully) should be made reserves and the walking tracks rights of way. There has been significant and sustained community interest and labour in revegetating and maintaining the native bush in these areas and therefore they should be protected for future generations to benefit from.</p> <p>As for disposal of the rest of the land, any selling to potential developer/s must be staged, in both land/section size and over time (i.e. decades). I categorically do NOT want the parcels of land outside the protected gullies/tracks to be sold in a one-time sale to developer/s, which would prohibit any future input or consultation with the wider Diamond Harbour community regarding how the land will be developed.</p> <p>Any sale of land (whether managed by the Council - Option 3 or the local community - Option 4) must allow for the community to be consulted as part of the planning proposal, including discussion around: type of use (homes, park, carbon credits farming, grazing land, etc.), environmental impact, infrastructure impact (which roads will become access roads, etc.), planning & design (aesthetics, etc.).</p> <p>Therefore, I would support a slow (over decades), staged sale of the land with the tender process for interested parties to include obligatory consultation with the wider community - this could happen by the Council developing the land (Option 3) or the wider Diamond Harbour community obtaining ownership (Option 4) and selling the land.</p>	Christine Murphy	Diamond Harbour
42157	3	<p>Option 3 (Develop the land) is my preferred option, but failing that my preferences are in this order:</p> <p>Option 4 (Transfer ownership to the community)</p> <p>Option 5 (Status Quo)</p>	Ron Dubin	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>Option 2 (Retain as a park)</p> <p>I am totally opposed to Option 1 (Place a covenant over Sams Gully, Morgans Gully and a possible third gully and dispose of the remainder of the land)</p>		
42019	3	<p>Covenants do need to be in place for the gullies, however there is plenty of space for some of the remaining land to be developed. This needs to be done in stages and look to provide housing for all demographics. Diamond Harbour is in need of suitable sustainable housing for the elderly looking to downsize their properties. This is an ideal opportunity to develop something well worth having.</p> <p>It is important to us that the reserve land area at the top left of Ngatea Road is kept as a reserve. At least a dozen properties back onto this area. This reserve is popular with local dog walkers, it includes an area of fruit and nut trees, and provides safe parking for residents and visitors unable to use limited steep driveways with no turn around options available. It is very unsafe to back out onto the main road. This area is also used by delivery trucks as it is unsafe to park on the main road with it's many bends.</p>	Christine Turner	Diamond Harbour
41938	3	<p>Above Whero Ave has relatively flat land which may be suitable for housing development under a request for proposals so that the land is sold as parcels as opposed to one private sale. Will be important to require consent for sustainable building and for a range of dwellings with restricted height or levels. In essence I concur with the recommendations of Richard Suggate. The gullies and existing tracks need to be protected. The Hunters Rd side of land is likely unsuitable for housing development and I suggest that this could be forested or continue to be used for grazing. The school may benefit from extra land...</p>	Gavin Cape	Diamond Harbour
41911	3	<p>I don't support option 1 or 2. (#2 not needed in our corner of the world) But I do support a version where CCC can, should be involved for a short period of time.</p> <p>Intro: I can understand the need to get revenue, this parcel of land is by a lot the largest one-piece in the (mentioned last night) lot of 62 land lots of CCC to make potentially some revenue. So having one large lot gone, in one go, is most convenient for the council. But then it is to the developers to get a good concept going. I don't trust any developer at this time of our century. It needs more than just a 'sustainable, green, fun social' label, which is selling point these days.</p> <p>I very strongly feel, whoever takes on the project, (CCC would be a good start)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a development plan competition, multidisciplinary professional groups, who are keen to design a concept and win this project. It could be so exciting, to see landscape architects, architects and people from social science field, (finding out the REAL needs of our area!!) finding their solution for this very large piece of land. If we receive several entries into this competition, it will challenge all of us, CCC included, and we will be getting the best solution long term. • This approach could also be great advertisement possibility for CCC, if ownership stays for time being during competition phase. This could be such a great way of advertising 'working with people', having fun too, DOING IT differently for a change, getting revenue at the end, more than just passing it on to a developer for sure! • The budget for this sort of large scale, project competitions could be funded via community if need be. A competition is not free but it will pay manyfold afterwards. • After a concept has been found, it can be handed to developers who will work in stages to achieve an extra ordinary story here. I am 100% convinced about this way of getting the best for the land, but particularly for the community too. They go with the process, first draft ideas, finer concepts later...you make the people move within this process. Less 'no no nos'. <p>So my say here is, # 3 but with very clear expectations, that this large parcel can be developed as a sample for future community design (Europe has some great and proven to work ideas) If this has to be via community ownership then so be it. But in my eyes, our community is not capable to find 'a perfect' solution for our needs. There is no proper research/ design possible, around the table in the bowling, camera or garden clubs. Not even in the room of the community association group.</p> <p>Ordinary people will ONLY suggest what they KNOW. Design and planning shall go into professionals' hands. And then the money is NOT in forefront either (if a developer goes ahead, by themselves, then it is run with \$\$ as driving force). Money constraints should not "run" a design concept phase. This is a chance to design a special place, affordable for families (if this is a need, we don't really know do we?) in cooperating elderlies (We have had several attempts to get elderly units built in DH, see previous conversations with council, 2000 onwards) maybe posh houses, who knows...all in the open before a proper study has been done.</p> <p>One idea years ago, was to develop early childhood and elderlies' accommodation together, above the school. This could still be a part of this large picture now.</p> <p>As a professional planner myself, I can see a real potential here for multidisciplinary professionals to come together and design concepts we have never thought of.</p>	Franziska Schmidlin	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
41910	3	<p>Hi:</p> <p>I DO NOT want option 1, where the community has no say in the disposal and we end up with a subdivision like those in Lincoln where there are 300 x 600 sq. m. sections all the same, 200+ sq m houses. (600 cars commuting daily) This would kill the community. DEAD.</p> <p>I've opted for 3. 'develop the land' but it was a toss-up with 4. What the community wants is a staged development with a variety of housing types and integration of the development with the gullies in reserve.</p> <p>There must be models of this type already in existence, if not in NZ, then in Europe.</p> <p>Housing should be developed for young families as well as for older people who do not want to have to move to the city at 65. So these types of housing would need to be affordable. But also, integrate more 'architectural' housing to create a balance, not a low-rent ghetto.</p> <p>I'd propose that the Council and the community representative body engage a PM to run a design competition for multi-discipline submissions.</p> <p>To summarise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staged development • Diversity of housing types • Cater to range of demographics: single people, young families, elders • Integration of the development with the gully reserves • Solicit design through competition based on the community values. 	Al Wilson	Diamond Harbour
41593	3	There are people desperate to move into the area and housing o pop prions are limited so residential development makes sense. This would really help to keep and support the growth of the local school providing larger opportunities for our current and future tamariki and whanau.	Lizzy Laing	
41587	3	Hi. I am a local 29 year old lad that grew up here most my life. I now have a wife and we want to build a house and start a family BUT there is no land for sale and no where to build. My submission would be to develop the land. I'm not alone I have spoken to others that grew up here that also want to come move back here and build. Thanks	Henry Jenkins	Port Levy
41574	3	Council initiated development is the only way to get what the community needs....small houses on shared land with room for gardens. Many people are forced to go to the city when their family sized properties become too large and unmanageable for them. Developers motivation is all about making money not building communities. Our community needs council help in creating sustainable healthy homes that keep people in the community they love.	Joy McLeod	Diamond Harbour

Option 4 - Transfer ownership to the community

No comments

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Name	Suburb
42209	4	Anne GODDARD	Lyttelton
42196	4	Katie Earle	
42193	4	Eroica Ritchie	Diamond Harbour
42192	4	Sue McManaway	Diamond Harbour
41904	4	Samantha Brown	Diamond Harbour
41739	4	Leneke Pearson	Diamond Harbour
41738	4	Ted Pearson	Diamond Harbour
41572	4	Sam Farrar	Diamond Harbour

With comments

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
42639	4	It would be my option to transfer the land to the community to allow the community to develop the area at the pace that suits what is happening within the community. The land can be left leased as it is currently with the gullies being managed and over time the school could use some of the land as could community groups or social or aged residential housing can be developed or a farm park - but in line with what the community wants	Dawn Sutton	
42604	4	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I prefer a combination of several options. Let me explain further.</p> <p>I definitely oppose the first option of selling all of the land at once. This would mean that the council and community have no say over when and how much property is developed at a time. It may mean that the new owner may not develop the land at all or for a very long time which could create a shortage of residential property. Or it may mean that the new owner develops a large amount of the land in one go which may mean that there is an oversupply of sections and it could mean that community infrastructure is overwhelmed before it has a chance to catch up. Some such infrastructure could be roads, schools and possibly other amenities. Therefore selling the entire area of land would basically mean that when and how the land is developed would be entirely in the hands of the developer, and because it is such a large piece of land compared to the existing population it could have an overly large impact on the existing community and at the same time it remove any future options for community facilities or parks on the land.</p> <p>My view on the matter of council selling the land is that if the land is sold off then it should be in much smaller parcels, as this is a significant sized piece of land. This would reduce the risks associated with the first option, some of which I have identified already.</p> <p>I'm not against developing parts of the land, at a rate that it is required for the community to grow sustainably. This could be achieved by the council developing the land a little bit at a time themselves and with community input, or by it subdividing chunks of it off in consultation with the community and selling the chunks off one at a time and leaving it up to developers to further divide the chunks up into normal section-sized pieces.</p> <p>I am not opposed to transferring some or most of the land to the community, or retaining some or most of it as a park. I think there may be a need to develop some of it for housing in the not too distant future, but certainly not a large amount of it at once as the land area in question is quite large in relation to the existing Diamond Harbour population.</p> <p>If the land is sold off, it would be prudent to retain some of it in case there is a need to build more community facilities and parks, especially because any development of the land is likely to lead to an increase in the population.</p> <p>It could be useful if a small amount of the land next to the school on Hunters Road could be used for more school and kindergarten parking. Parking on the road is quite dangerous because there is no footpath to the South of the school, so I often have to park there and walk on the road with my children and there is a road hump with limited driver and pedestrian visibility just to the South of there. Therefore if no extra parking is made available via the council land then other options to make things safer could be to widen Hunters Road immediately to the South of the school (so that it is the same width as the road to the North of the school) and install a footpath on the school side of the road and/or to extend the 40km speed limit on Hunters Road which ends just to the South of the school so that it covers the entrance to the school and reduces the risk of people coming over the brow of the hill immediately uphill and to the South of the school too quickly. If the status quo of the parking situation and lack of footpath remains and the land is sold off and developed, then the situation is likely to become more dangerous as the numbers of school and kindergarten pupils increase (and therefore the number of cars parked on the road increases), and as the traffic on the road increases due to an increased local population.</p> <p>In addition, I feel like it would be best for the gullies to be made into proper reserves or to be transferred into community ownership and not put into covenants and included in the sale. This is because these options would enable the council and/or community to undertake maintenance and improvements as required without the complication of having the ownership be in another persons' name. I also feel like it would be prudent for the same reason that in regards to the part of the school track that isn't in the planted gullies (essentially the section of the track between Ngatea Road and the school), to retain a passage of land around the track in council or community ownership or as a reserve, which would allow for access and maintenance of the track. It may also pay to look at retaining some land next to the school for future school and community recreation facility expansion.</p>	Sarah Dunckley	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>I also refer to the advice of the Diamond Harbour Community Association on this matter, as I believe that they are making a submission. I don't know exactly what their submission entails, but am sure that they would have very reasonable opinions on this matter.</p> <p>Thank you for you time in considering my opinions.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Sarah</p>		
42557	4	<p>I think the 4th option is the best one for the community as it could then be developed in a variety of ways as deemed most relevant by the community . If it was disposed of by the council it would most likely be purchased by one of the big developers and turned into another huge subdivision with cookie cutter sections. Yes housing is needed but a limited and diverse range of housing e.g. smaller properties so they are are more affordable for the young and the elderly who want to downsize and to reflect the existing community. Taking climate change into account the housing should be built with sustainable materials and be highly energy efficient. Part of the area could be given over to large areas of planting to extend all the hard work that has gone into the native planting of Morgan and Sam's gullies. These and the school track should definitely be permanently protected as they are such a wonderful asset to the community.</p>	Margaret Dickinson	Diamond Harbour
42523	4	<p>I recognise some argument for the sale of the land, however, considering the local effort involved in the development of the reserve areas that I believe now have a covenant on them, the gullies should be protected 100% from developers and land owners alike. With developing all the area around the gullies will open up the possibility to vandalism of gullies, road congestion, easement issues, noise pollution meaning most of this can be disrupting school learning activities.</p> <p>Wonderful walking tracks have been established and are used with respect in the community. Developing the land with more properties could cause issues with over congestion to this area. It has disaster written all over it - UNLESS it has been very thoroughly thought out with a very good strong and stable process. I refer to Option 1 being weak.</p> <p>We need more detail here if you want community support. There are so many flaws already in the planning of properties in this area with lack of easements, covenants and purchasers have been left arguing out access rights to beaches, across to paper roads.</p> <p>Transferring ownership to the community will protect all the above. We can offer a strong and caring board and committee who will care for this environment and who lives in it. Protection from pests to support further bird life and native trees is vital to help our environment thrive.</p>	Felicia Forbes	Charteris Bay
42511	4	<p>All three gullys should be placed in a covenant. Ownership by the community gives control on how to develop it as the community expands. Selling off the land is not an option. A developer will unlikely stage the development. There will be huge stresses on our current infrastructure, especially roading which is already in a diabolical state, stress on water supply, sewage disposal, stormwater and our local school. A development of this scale would double our community. Growth needs to be gradual so infrastructure can catch up. Selling to a developer will not let the community have a voice in how it will be managed. What would a developers contribution be??</p>	Jill Rice	Purau
42461	4	<p>A Community Land Trust or an Agrarian Commons are just two possible models which privilege the needs and interests of the community above the profits of private developers. This could be an extraordinary opportunity for developing community resilience in a changing world. CCC could enable a community development approach with a backstop of option 1 if planning and feasibility studies are unfavourable. At least give the locals a chance to put together a proposal. Thank you.</p>	Jane Ash	Charteris Bay
42391	4	<p>Lot of Land to be held for expansion of the school and keep walkway to school open.</p> <p>Small development of sections in small pockets ie blocks of 10 sections ,retirement apartments or smaller houses ,life style blocks 5-10 acres.</p> <p>Protect the gully's walkways open to public and native plantings.</p> <p>Council to maintain the walking tracks</p>	Robert Meynell	

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
42382	4	I am strongly opposed to option 1. Already the smaller development set to take place at the top of Whero Avenue has significantly cut into gully A. to establish new dwellings and a new road from marine drive. New property developers within the last 10 years have had insufficient engagement with the community. To move forward sustainably amidst a climate crisis the community has to have its need areas met. For this we need a diverse range of affordable housing supporting people who will have continued input to our community. I live and work within the community. And have done so for 8 years and my 7 year old son was born here. This is our home and we support option 4. I would be happy to have input into a community housing organisation.	Cherie Taylor	Diamond Harbour
42371	4	Owned by the community for the community	Dale Wear	Diamond Harbour
42357	4	<p>I support housing development on the land as that has been its ownership purpose for more than a century; it is zoned residential and there is demand for more land as there are no new Church Bay sections or other new sections in the Southern Bays. I consider the housing to be provided should cater for a wide demographic and age range, providing accommodation for young people, families, retired people and those who wish to downsize. Good design should be encouraged, including the use of sustainable materials. Homes should be highly energy efficient, and options should be available for a spectrum of tiny homes, townhouses, and stand-alone dwellings. Offering shared facilities, light shielding and integrated walking (including the school track) and cycling routes should be encouraged. Selling the land in one large block will be unlikely to achieve these goals. Good housing and subdivision design may not be mandated by Council beyond the requirements of the District Plan and there probably would not be community consultation on subdivision proposals. An option that provides for later stages of input is highly desirable. Submitters on the LTP expressed concern about more houses and cars increasing pressure on services and transport infrastructure. The increased use from land development will require adjacent streets (Hunters Rd, Bay View Rd, Ngatea Rd and Whero Ave) to be upgraded and will put more vehicles on the main road. The main road is a narrow and winding route and will require ongoing costs for the Council.</p> <p>Most Long-Term Plan submitters said that if the land is to be sold, the gullies, (including their plantings and tracks) and the school track need to be protected first. An easement is required for the school track and Council have proposed covenants for the gullies. I support that Morgan and Sams Gullies are made into Council reserves now, as placing them into private ownership will lead to more complex relationships for the people who are working on restoration. I do not agree that short-term cost savings by the Property Section of Council and a developer, justify delaying putting them into their suited reserve status. A covenant on the 'Unnamed' Gully by the school, or its retention as Council freehold, may be more suitable, as restoration has not commenced, and the area is still grazed.</p> <p>Property sections have been created by Council that do not reflect local conditions. The sections at the top of Whero Ave overlap with the covenants and include recently planted areas. In addition, the land includes a long-standing garden that should be offered to the adjoining landowner. The land at the top of Ngatea Rd is also used for access, parking, and gardens by adjacent residents. Council has now suggested that an area could be set aside for a cemetery (for when Stoddart Point is filled) and with the additional housing and the increase in the school roll, room for school expansion would be desirable. LTP submitters also proposed a range of alternative uses for the land (e.g. horse riding, dog walking, bike track, community garden, parkland and afforestation). These ideas should be considered in more detail through a combined community and Council planning process for the lands' future function.</p> <p>Council has stated that considering grazing income, it has a net expenditure of \$15,000 every year it holds onto the land. A cost breakdown provided to the DHCA shows Council annual grazing income to be \$2,886, their maintenance costs \$545 and internal rates charge of \$16,484. This does not accurately reflect actual operational costs and Council's annual capital gain derived from its years of land banking, which will be substantial. In other words, it does not cost Council to hold on to the land in real terms, and is unlikely to in future.</p> <p>If Council is determined to sell the land, then I consider it should be sold in stages. A staged sale will enable a range of land-use proposals to be considered at each stage, so that different uses or types of housing or other development happen on each ridge. Rather than abdicating responsibility to the private sector and cutting community input to decision-making, a staged development will enable complementary designs to be created, reflecting evolving community needs. In addition, rather than going directly to tender to sell parcels of the land, Council should ask for RFP (Request for Proposals) which then can be assessed against Council criteria developed with community input.</p> <p>The following are my assessment of the Options:</p> <p>Option One: Complete covenant and sell. This option creates the greatest risk and uncertainty for the community even if the gullies are reserved and the</p>	Pete Simpson	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>walking track protected. A developer may be sympathetic to community aspirations and committed to the most sustainable urban and subdivision design, or alternatively they may go for cookie cutter section sales and the meeting of minimum Council District Plan standards. Given that development will be relatively slow (as demand is steady but not heavy) there may be decades of gradual development controlled by one private company. It is unlikely there would be further community consultation on subdivision design and impacts. I do not support this option.</p> <p>Option 2: To retain as a park. While some open space on the ridge tops and some future urban small parks is desirable; the gullies provide walking recreation and Diamond Harbour is currently well served by other Greenspaces. The provision of more housing and other uses including open space, seems a higher priority. However additional small urban parks and plantings should be provided for in any developments. I do not support this option.</p> <p>Option 3: Council develops the land. A Council commercial relationship with property developers in consultation with the community, could see housing and other uses that meet multiple needs in a sustainable manner. The financial risk can be minimised by contractual partnerships with the private sector. If this Option is progressed in stages using an RFP approach, the land may be sold over a period of decades rather than immediately. This Option can enable community ideas and proposals to be woven into the development design. Council collaboration with the community is essential to getting a favourable outcome. This is my second placed Option after Option 4.</p> <p>Option 4: Transfer ownership to the community. This brings the decision-making back to the community. Its success depends upon establishing a land-owning entity (e.g. a Community Land Trust, Community Housing organisation, etc.) to manage future development and in finding people to take this on in a voluntary capacity. The entity would have to make both commercial and community-based decisions, and it may struggle to achieve consensus without clear terms of reference. To assist in raising the funds or loans to buy the land from the Council should initiate a staged buy-out of the land, and should also consider selling each stage on 'builder's terms' where payment is only made to Council on final sale of the developed properties. The participation interest level in the community should be tested as part of the ongoing consultation should this option (or Option 3) be preferred by the community.</p> <p>Option 5. Status Quo. Given that we consider that there is no annual expense to Council holding the property (if you put aside the rates charge), the Status Quo is a satisfactory fall-back option, if Option Three or Four do not proceed and is more desirable than Options One and Two. It still retains future options for development, preferably as some variant on Options Three or Four. Under this Option Council can still go ahead with reserving Sams and Morgans Gullies and developing restoration options with the community for the Unnamed Gully.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>That the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reserve Morgan's and Sam's Gullies and place a covenant over the 'Unknown Gully'. 2. Prepare an easement to protect the route of the school track from development. 3. Refine the boundaries of the land that may be sold, taking into account the current plantings, local and adjacent usage. Relevant local people should be consulted. 4. Call for local Expressions of Interest for establishment and membership of a Community Trust with the intention that it purchase all or part of the land. 5. Depending on the outcomes of the above recommendations, consider selling the land in stages for mixed purpose housing and social development. Further community consultation on design and infrastructure undertaken as part of this and an RFP process to be used. 6. Continue the Status Quo as long as is required to get the process right and to enable adequate community consultation at every stage of design and development. 		

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
42343	4	<p>Option 4 "Transfer ownership to the community" would better server the interests of the Diamond Harbour community.</p> <p>Most people who live in Diamond Harbour do so because they want to be in a semi-rural community away from developments in general, this includes busy roads and increased traffic that such a development would bring.</p> <p>Many people move away from the area after a few years because of the distance from Christchurch and its many amenities. Diamond Harbour people find it more difficult to access the amenities that their rates pay for in Christchurch. So I think that Christchurch council should put something back into the Diamond Harbour community directly by allowing the people of Diamond Harbour to take control of this land.</p> <p>People who own properties directly adjacent to the land in question will be affected for years to come by busy noisy lorries and machinery, especially those who chose the area for is peaceful aspect and also those who live at home as retirees or work from home. This would also affect the quiet ambience currently enjoyed at Diamond Harbour school as the constant noise of large lorries and machines through years of development behind the school would interfere with the children's concentration levels and learning ability. Everyone in the community with children at the school should be concerned.</p>	Shane France	Diamond Harbour
42333	4	<p>Option 1 - No But need those Gullies Protected</p> <p>Option 2 - Yes</p> <p>Option 3 and 4 mix - Develop under community Management and a limit on the amount of properties, size of sections. Lifestyle blocks would work in this area.</p> <p>Boundary with the existing gullies so the water run off is not diversely affecting the gullies flow and damage the planting done to date. Have the area checked to see that no diverse affect to flora and fauna as there are many species here on the peninsula that are under threat. This should be managed carefully. Required up grade of local infrastructures and roads that are only really useful for low traffic numbers. But a large development would see the local traffic numbers increase vastly.</p> <p>I dont want to see what happened at Black Rock and the Top of Whero Ave little or no community (in the latter) consultation. Part of the Gully has been cut into with the Whero Ave subdivision with no consultation.</p> <p>I would also like to see some of the area planted to sell carbon credits to help fund projects locally.</p> <p>Opt 5 Yes.</p> <p>I would like to feel you will take this submission process seriously, unfortunately you have left communities feeling as though their lifestyles do not warrant care and attention. Please prove the nay Sayers wrong this time. Community Ownership is the way to go. If it can be done in other areas, we in DH can do this too.</p>	Mark Faulkner	Diamond Harbour
42314	4	<p>Option 4 is the only option I could see working well. We are a small village with a big heart. Yes I do understand we need some housing for the area to grow and support those who have grown here and want to return. Plus new locals that would enjoy our community way of life.</p> <p>I don't want to see hundreds of similar home plonked on a hillside without local consultation, large homes on small sections with little thought for the biodiversity of the area. We are known for our local wildlife and this would create a great stress on many of these species. Water run off causing issues around the beautifully planted and cared for gullies which are a great asset for local and wider community. Road and traffic mayhem with the influx of a great many more vehicles.</p> <p>Dont ruin our community for the sake of some dollars in your kitty. I think we can manage this as a community together and have a great outcome.</p>	Rachel Callow	Diamond Harbour
42310	4	No to Option 1 and 5	Martyn West	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>Yes to option 2 and 4</p> <p>We do need more housing in the area but need this to be done with the existing community in mind. A combination of Opt 3 and 4 could work. I think we could get a great working group up and running to manage this. The diversity of skills in the village is wide. Our way of life is central to why we live in the village and placing several hundred look a like homes is going to change this irrevocably. We are open to community managed development, looking out for those who want to be part of our community.</p> <p>My Major concern with a large development is the lack of good roading through to the city and long travel times at peak times, lack of good quality infrastructure to cope with the influx of a large amount of people.</p>		
42309	4	<p>Please note this is my Second Submission, I would like this to replace my first. Thank you</p> <p>Option 1 a definite NO from me. Have a faceless developer cram as many houses a possible in a village the size of Diamond Harbour would not only ...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create roading issues that our small, winding lanes could not cope with, without a massive commitment from the Council to upgrade the roading from DH through to the city. 2. Water and drainage would be considerably changed and the face of the gullies could be changed forever. 3. Safety of the Biodiversity would be undermined. We have many species of birds and Skinks here that are no long found in large developed areas. This should be saved. 4. Infrastructure will need upgrading too. The primary School would need to be grown, sewerage upgraded (I believe it is still trucked out of the area and not yet connected to the mains) 5. The growth of the area with this many people would spoil our distinctive and local diverse population forever. You would take the heart out of the area. We are a community that cares and this balance should not be put at risk for the mighty \$ <p>Option 2 is possibly not an option for the Council but I would be happy to see it remain as is.</p> <p>Option 3 A combination of this option and option 4 would be best. Agreed we do need to have more housing built in the area but not to the decimation of our local identity. But this could be a considered development catering for the needs of the locals and their families. Plus others that share our community ideals. We don't want it to become a cookie cutter subdivision like that terrible wart Lincoln that house commuters who dont get involved in where they live.</p> <p>Option 4 YES PLEASE</p> <p>Option 5 we do need to progress but with our community at that heart. This option is not sustainable but would be nice.</p>	Janette West	Diamond Harbour
42242	4	to create affordable homes for young families	Jennifer Stoppel	Purau
42201	4	<p>I understand that the council wishes to be free of any burden associated with this land and I am aware that there is a thriving community in Diamond Harbour who would welcome the opportunity to have a strong local voice on the future of this land.</p> <p>This community has the time and energy to consider what is truely best for the expansion of the community and when that would be needed and best undertaken.</p> <p>As I engage with people I hear often a wish to cater for both ends of the community, those coming in with fresh blood and children and those who are retiring and perhaps down scaling. Giving this parcel over to a developer would tend to create more of the same, profit motivated , greed inspired , basic function,</p>	Nirdosh Brown	Purau

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>highly expensive , vision less same as same as.</p> <p>We are moving very fast into different and perhaps challenging times and whole new needs will arise and as I see it, strategies would be better assessed by the immediate local community.</p> <p>Thank you for reading this.</p> <p>Nirdosh</p>		
42195	4	I oppose option 1 as then the developer does not have to work with community to provide what the community wants with the new residential area. Also the current sections overlap with the gullies that locals have done lots of native plantings. These areas need to be made into reserves. More residential land is needed so I don't support the whole area be made into a park but the new area should contain some parks. Reserving some land for expansion of the school would be beneficial. The council developing the land would be my second preference but would need the land to be sold in smaller bundles and with much community consultation. My preferred option is for the community to own the land and then work with developers to develop the area within the bonds of the desires of the community. If option 3 or 4 can't be achieved then staying with the status quo is preferred.	Bronwyn Graham	Diamond Harbour
42194	4	I think the land should be transferred to the community so we can use it best for the local needs. Any developing housing should be based on social housing needs and not be driven by profit making. A community housing project should include options for young people to buy their first home here as well as a possibility for the elderly to have supported accommodation, so it needs to include a variety housing sizes to accommodate different needs. Those effected locally by rising sea levels should have an opportunity to re-locate to this area. Some land needs to be set aside to expand the school (as a result of the increased population size). The land should have walking tracks connecting the gully nature reserves and spaces for communal meeting and children's play areas. There is also needs to be a covenant on the 3 gullies to enrich our local biodiversity	Mareile Stoppel	Purau
42162	4	<p>I selected Transfer Ownership to the Community because the other options aren't adequate for the best use of the land.</p> <p>I support the full protection of Sam's, Morgan's and the Unnamed Gully with covenants. This also needs to include the full length of the walking track that runs from Morgan's Gully to Sam's Gully as this is the walking track to school. It needs to be extended to include the track that crosses the unnamed gully so there is access to the school. Morgan's Gully is not suitable for housing as it's steep and already planted with regenerating bush. Lot 115, Lot 5, Lot 6 should be included in the covenant of Morgan's Gully.</p> <p>I support some development for housing on the flat land. I do not support dense housing with big houses on tiny sections, but I do support a variety of housing options including varying section sizes and houses for young families and older people. This would allow people to stay in the community after they retire when their existing steep sections are too much for them. If the land is developed then the current walking tracks need to be upgraded so people can walk to the school and shops, this would reduce congestion and traffic. Walking tracks should include handrails on the hills. Bike lanes on the road would be good as the road is narrow and dangerous for kids biking to school.</p> <p>Access to the developed land should be from Ngatea Road and Whero Ave. Bayview Road is too narrow. A green belt should be established along Bayview Road to join the three gullies. A minimum 25 metre wide green belt of native planting would connect the native plantings of the three gullies increasing the ability of wildlife to move between the existing habitat. It would help to protect the new developments from the Southerly wind and would provide a walking track along the back of the development.</p> <p>I support setting aside land for expansion of the school and the cemetery.</p> <p>I support a dog park - this would give dogs a place to run off-lead and would reduce the number of dogs that run off lead on the beach.</p>	Helen Townsend	Diamond Harbour
41970	4	I think the land should be developed by the community, for the community, we don't want another eclectic mix of multi million dollar mansions owned by people who have zero input .we have a housing crisis, We want homes for young family's , first time buyers and down sizing retirees.	Andrew Gale	Diamond Harbour
41933	4	<p>The land needs to remain in community ownership and NOT be sold.</p> <p>The Mt Herbert community does not have strong enough public infrastructure to support the sale of the land for housing development.</p>	howard NEEDHAM	Charteris Bay

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>Before the community faces that sort of population growth the sale of this land will encourage, the council needs to invest in the area - provide footpaths, road side lighting , public transport, upgrade the main road into christchurch city, supply high speed internet etc</p> <p>The city council has happily vocalized the importance of climate mitigation, stated they want Christchurch to be a green city, reducing the city's carbon footprint.</p> <p>This block of land should be transferred into a community trust and planted in native and hardwood trees. These can then be sold for carbon credits for an continued income for the community. This could be done with no financial input or risk to the council. By planting for carbon credits this meets the councils green credentials , provides educational opportunities for the local school next door and will provide a steady income to the Mt Herbert community for the coming future. This option also allows option for designating some land for a dog exercise area, walking and biking forest tracks , encourage bird life and other community activity</p> <p>Howard Needham</p>		
41912	4	<p>Not quite sure how this would work effectively and I am torn between option 3 and option 4</p> <p>I would like to see appropriate housing for senior citizens as in not having to have a 150 squares when between 80 to 150 would be preferable. And the consideration of flatter land for seniors was a good point voiced at the meeting.</p> <p>While I understand the need to have affordable housing for first home buyers I just don't understand how this can be regulated or allocated in these very difficult times where lack of supplies and costs are pricing us all out of improving our living conditions. It would have been nice to have seen a larger representation of the younger members of the community at the meeting but hopefully this option will give them a voice along with those of us in our twilight years. Many thanks</p> <p>Nicci Becconsall</p>	Nicci Becconsall	Diamond Harbour
41824	4	<p>The community of Diamond Harbour should have ownership over the land so that it can be preserved for wildlife and future generations to enjoy. There are many unique native birds that live within these gullies and require the food found here for survival. I live just below these valleys and I know that there are more than 20 kori mako families that reside and call out to one another throughout the day. Kori mako glean on tree tops, flaxes, and hunt during flight for insects, as well as feeding off the nectar from the trees in these valleys. Living here there are also countless keruru, piwakawaka, pipipi, and even titi ponamu. Please think of the wildlife whose home is within these valleys. Without the protection and expansion of their native habitat, their survival is uncertain.</p>	Mehhan Sheehan	Diamond harbour
41749	4	<p>Community Entity setup - expertise and appetite resides in the local community.</p> <p>Ensure development of land considers best outcome for local community, retirees, local first home buyers, sustainability, tiny home initiatives, "off grid" initiatives, park areas, planting, profits back to fund other initiatives in community, use of local businesses, contractors, resources</p> <p>CCC assist with funding community entity and professional management of development</p> <p>CCC receive payment in phased approach based on land development sales</p> <p>CCC assist with funding of maintaining land on reducing scale as land developed</p>	Ricky Shaw	Diamond Harbour
41725	4	<p>I would be awesome to have a large working community vege garden, fruit trees etc. The community could fundraise to add water tanks / catchment area, bbqs, tools, outdoor furniture.</p>	James Bidwell	Purau
41678	4	<p>I think the land is too strategic for the growth of diamond harbour to be off loaded to developers. After seeing the inappropriate developments around black point, I think this land should be used for the enhancement of diamond harbour, not for maximising profit for developers. I would be interested in being involved in the community trust created to manage the land. My second option would be to keep the land as a park. From my understanding, there definitely</p>	Daniel Bristow	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		is not enough space around diamond harbour to have dogs off lead. The only public spaces to walk dogs are along the cliff track which is a great community asset but we need somewhere safe for dogs to run and interact.		
41668	4	I would like to see the walking tracks thst have been developed and maintained by locals kept as they are and if the land was owned by the community we could plant community gardens with fruit trees. These areas are well used by locals and are great for the local children in this rural community	Diane McQueen	Diamond Harbour
41667	4	I have chosen Option 4, however would also consider Option 2, if 4 was not possible. Although the Council states it is 'unaware of any significant demand for residential development in Diamond Harbour.' I do not believe this to be true, as land prices are starting to rise and the recent government proposals on changing resource consent will (quite rightly) allow higher density building. I am not anti-housing, however I do not believe the the current roading infrastructure or land drainage will support a possible large residential expansion. If community ownership was possible, in partnership with local hapu/iwi, I believe that the interests of people who live in Te Waipapa Diamond Harbour will be best served. Thank you for the opportunity to feedback.	Joanne Butfield	Diamond Harbour
41625	4	Covenants should be placed over the gully walkways what ever option you go for. Although unfortunately the community here does think you wont put our views/needs ahead of your own and it will in fact be sold to a developer to put up cookie cutter homes at ridiculous prices and compromise our lifestyle. This will impact on the roading and other infrastructures that are also lacking. WE DONT WANT THAT the majority of people in the area want either the status quo/community ownership or other more sustainable ventures on that land. there are so many options other than the 5 you have given us to vote on here. We would enjoy a retirement village for our local elderly to stay in the community, Dog park, community gardens/orchards. Room to extend the School and Kindergarten, Lifestyle blocks so much less density of housing, Eco housing, smaller houses on larger plots. So many options. Why wont you listen to us, you have bulldozered over us regarding Godley House, Removed the Dark Star and refuse to help us get another venue for a cafe bar that the community does in fact want.	Janette West	Diamond Harbour
41579	4	Reserve a parcel of land adjacent to Diamond Harbour School to allow for the possible future expansion of the school as the community grows. Definitely covenant all three gulleys and create protection for the "School Track" that has been formed between Waipapa Avenue and the Diamond Harbour School avoiding roads.	Peter Harding	Diamond Harbour
41578	4	There is no requirement for more development in this area. The rural character of this area is defined by those paddocks, gullies and hills.	Paul Vermeer	Diamond Harbour
41575	4	I think if it is to be developed a retirement home would be the most essentially needed service out in DH. We have a significant aged population who have no options in their own community should they need assistance on old age.	Charlie Mandley	Diamond Harbour

Option 5 – Status Quo

No comments

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Name	Suburb
42601	5	Campbell McLay	Christchurch Central
42599	5	Robin Fryer	Lyttelton
42585	5	Mary Fryer	Diamond Harbour
42525	5	jacqueline coia	Diamond Harbour
42421	5	Nicole Hanning	
42315	5	James Boland	Diamond Harbour
42183	5	Charmaine Vincent	Diamond Harbour
42181	5	Paul Stewart	

42178	5	Penny Julian	Charteris Bay
41620	5	Simon Holmes	

With comments

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
42828	5	<p>I oppose Option 1.</p> <p>I have chosen Option 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: the community has no control at all. • Council and the community are not ready to make a good decision on the other options. • Also unmade gully needs to stay in possession of Council so that it can be planted out and made into a reserve. Easement over the school track. • Agree to have Sam's and Morgan Gully to be reserves, – so the council stays connected to it and the volunteers working in it, don't need to negotiate with the new owners. • If the whole area would be built up, it would wreck the character of Diamond Harbour; the village feel would be lost and we would also lose the rural aspect! We don't need more big mansions, where the owners live only half of the year or less. 	Angela Boer	Diamond Harbour
42642	5	<p>1 First principles: there should be no rushed decision – so option 5 maintain the status quo until clarity is found is my choice, followed by staged decisions, dealing with one 'parcel' of land at a time, and with as much input by this intelligent, highly skilled and engaged local community of Diamond Harbour as possible.</p> <p>I specifically oppose Option 1 ie selling the land to a private developer with a cookie-cutter approach to housing development, and an interest primarily in profit.</p> <p>Notwithstanding my opposition to a wholesale disposal of the remaining land, I believe all three gullies should be covenanted for conservation land.</p> <p>This is a precious opportunity to do something new, in terms of</p> <p>a) Council partnership with community – this is a concept Margaret Jefferies (Project Lyttelton) explored with individuals in Council leadership positions</p> <p>b) meeting the social needs identified at a recent DH community forum – affordable, flexible housing for young people, new families, and older people wishing to down-size their properties and remain in their supportive community context.</p> <p>c) meeting environmental needs and responsibilities and looking ahead – balancing fire risk (very real in DH) with aspirations for planting more forest for parkland enjoyment and in response to climate change urgency. Also I think it's wise to look ahead and build community resilience - perhaps in terms of developing shared food-growing areas in predicted times of turbulence. Perhaps there needs to be flexibility in land use, rather than fixing it down to one thing. Perhaps we will need to do things very differently in the future, in order to survive.</p> <p>We are talking about a relatively large, complex piece of land with much potential, and it is important for Council to remember that there is little remaining available terrain of suitable contour for any significant development (in the broadest sense) in and around DH.</p>	Andrea Hunt	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>It seems to me that the parcels of land created by the hill/gully terrain naturally lend themselves to different purposes. it would be logical to deal with one area or ridge at a time and find the best use for the land based on local residents' and the wider community's needs and aspirations and the proximity of that parcel to other community facilities.</p> <p>2. I have a particular interest in the small boomerang-shaped piece of land that is bordered by Ngatea Road properties, Marine Drive properties and Sam's Gully. This area is already known informally as Ngatea Reserve or Ngatea Commons, and is invaluable to residents with adjoining properties (like mine), importantly for alternative safe access to their properties, but also for many other reasons. I will outline existing customary use in the next points.</p> <p>Customary uses of Ngatea Commons by local residents:</p> <p>A) Access and parking Difficulties exist for visitors, residents or delivery people to park safely on Marine Drive without causing a traffic hazard. In my case there is no suitable garage for my vehicle at my Marine Drive property, so I can hope to park my van 50 metres down Marine Drive in the only safe parking space (which accommodates two parked vehicles only) or more safely and reliably, park in Ngatea Commons. The reality of this - in summer I can park directly outside my back gate, and in winter, soft wet ground there dictates that I park at the top of the ridge where the ground is hard and dry all year round. I cannot develop proper alternative access as things stand, with no proper status for this piece of land. Like me, several other neighbours rely on access and parking in Ngatea Commons, but without any formal provision.</p> <p>B) Broad, safe, open play/exercise area for dogs and small children: Diamond Harbour's footpaths are narrow, bordering equally narrow roads, and many of the walking tracks are challenging; narrow, steep and uneven. The broad, flattish meadow of the Commons, bordered by pines and private properties, is a unique area for neighbouring families. We love that there is no fast-moving traffic, no power lines to entangle kites, no cliffs nearby, and there is shelter provided currently by mature pines and maturing native trees. Neighbours practise their golf, small children try out bike skills and fly kites with their dads, older children learn trapping and tracking skills, many dogs and dog owners enjoy a daily pilgrimage here, and my blind dog has a safe place to run and play without fear of obstacles.</p> <p>C) Community care, community orchard: over the years local residents have used and cared for the Commons. Notably, three consecutive neighbours took on the cost, labour and responsibility of keeping the grass mown, as the Council was not providing mowing. This service to the community was very much appreciated. When I purchased my property in early 2017, the Commons was in poor shape apart from the mowing of the grass, which was great. Through steady contributions of time and effort, but without any fanfare, some local people have been quietly cleaning up invasive weeds, and reducing rubbish that has been dumped (also discouraging the culture of dumping). Some previous owners of my property had started a small fruit and nut orchard, which I and a few others have further developed in a fairly informal way. The aim is to leave a fruitful legacy, create a beautiful, useful and biodiverse food-forest area through joint efforts but in a lowkey, fuss-free way. Improving and maintaining the orchard plantings also provides a sense of community and care, and a focal point for visitors to the Commons.</p> <p>D) A sense of "our place": locals love Ngatea Commons, and keep a watchful eye on visitors and property. Children, dogs and adults feel safe in our village green. We've been using it, playing in it, gathering from it, maintaining it, looking after it. It's our place.</p>		
42641	5	<p>Option 5 selected only because an option is required. A mix of options will best meet community needs. I wish my submission to be heard in person. Re proposed disposal of 42 Whero Avenue and 27 Hunters Road properties, Diamond Harbour.</p> <p>My name is Philippa Joyce Drayton and I reside at 397 Marine Drive, Charteris Bay, Diamond Harbour. I have been a bach holder/ holiday maker since 1968 and for the last twenty years been a permanent resident on that site in Diamond Harbour.</p> <p>I wish to speak to my submission.</p> <p>I do not support any one option as a sole solution re proposed disposal of 42 Whero Avenue and 27 Hunters Road properties, Diamond Harbour, because no single option provides for all aspects of current and future community need. Of what is on offer a variation on Option 3 (Council development) and Option 4 (Community ownership) would be best. At this stage, far more important than "disposal" is to decide what the land should be used for because that may determine the means of disposal.</p>	Philippa Drayton	Charteris Bay

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>I have amended the Council covenant plan and refer to these sections below. I wholeheartedly support a covenant to be placed over Sam's Gully, Morgan's Gully, and the unnamed gully (A, B, and C) on the covenant map- amended version above) that provides protection and enhancement of native flora and fauna, walkways, and pest control/predator free fencing.</p> <p>There are significant infrastructure issues that would need to be addressed and current residents confident that the CCC would provide updated and functional infrastructure (in all its forms, e.g. roading, domestic and heavy construction; sewage; water; power; sporting/recreational/library facilities; public transport, both within the area and size of ferry capacity; social housing; geriatric care; increased medical capability...) To take the last issue, medical capacity, the community funded the medical centre and although at times stretched it is highly functional. If there were to be a substantial development (of the order that a straight land disposal for residential development could permit) then the current facilities would be woefully inadequate and it should not fall on the community to upgrade the medical facilities just so the CCC can dispose of (and make a significant profit from) these lands.</p> <p>Moreover, there are needs within the Diamond Harbour area for spaces that this plot of land could provide.</p> <p>§ I support part of the land in question (adjacent to the school) to be set aside for expansion of the school and pre-school facilities as these will be needed in any event in a growing community, particularly if there is added residential capacity (red on the map).</p> <p>§ I support allocation of a portion of this land to the fire service should this be required. Note at present the Fire Service site is small and the community has just fundraised for a 4WD vehicle and the present site is unlikely to be adequate in even the short term. Land should be set aside for use by FENZ. This too could be in the portion of land adjacent to Hunters Road, or directly off Marine drive (either the dark red or blue on the map).</p> <p>§ I support smaller unit and older persons' facilities (including "rest home") and social housing (e.g. smaller land units so the community is not solely for those who can afford to purchase and maintain a large section.) Such an allocation should be tagged for this type of development. That the space is provided is more important to me than the specific disposal option that provides for it.</p> <p>Specific parcels of land</p> <p>Without extensive redevelopment Bayview Road is not suitable as anything other than emergency access. And even so, the number of houses and volume of traffic on the lower reaches at the Charteris Bay end of the road make it unsafe and unusable for further day-to-day traffic.</p> <p>Hunters Road is fairly narrow at the lower end but could be widened at and past the school.</p> <p>I support a significant parcel of the land adjacent to the school on Hunters Road being set aside for further educational development (Dark red on map).</p> <p>If the land access were carefully managed some of the land (near the school) that abuts Marine Drive would be suitable for aged care small units in that it would be close to the new shopping area and there is a portion of land there that is "relatively flat" (Blue on map).</p> <p>Ngatea Road is narrow and winding and does not lend itself to significant further (residential) use.</p> <p>I would also therefore support the majority of the parcel of land between A and C being set aside as part of the covenanted land so that there is a larger body of land that could be developed into native bush, and a predator free corridor somewhere between A and B (Yellow on map).</p> <p>I would support part of the small segment of land that borders A (and is part of the land for potential disposal) being appropriately fenced and set aside for a dog park (Cerise pink on map).</p> <p>Whero Avenue (between A and B). Whero Avenue, although steep, is reasonably wide and would be the logical site for access to some residential development. If there is to be a sale for residential development, my belief is that it should provide a mixed model of sizes. There are many who have lived in the community for many years but who can no longer manage a large section and therefore some smaller sections would enable them to move to a smaller house and smaller plot of land. It would also allow first home buyers to "get a foot on the housing ladder" if there were smaller sites.</p> <p>Conclusion: no one option meets community needs. The above needs and factors need to be taken into consideration and addressed before the land is disposed. If no conclusion can be reached then Option 5: status quo is the only solution.</p>		
42640	5	5 is selected because a selection is required. No one option is preferred. A mixed approach is required.	James (Jim) Nieman	Diamond Harbour
42638	5	As a Diamond Harbour resident of 19 years, I was drawn to the township by its special character and rural/seaside aspect. I feel that any residential development of scale would destroy that special character and that sense of connection, experienced in a smaller community.	Jeffrey Martin	
42634	5	I think more thought needs to be put into long term opportunities for potential uses of the land and best outcomes for Diamond Harbour Community and the council. My preferred option would be this decision is deferred until there has been a forum for a wider discussion.	Annelise Hall	Diamond Harbour
42632	5	Public transport facilities are at capacity at peak times. Can't handle population growth with current ferry capacity.	Chelsea Dickson	

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
42613	5	<p>We oppose option 1 (selling the land). We prefer option 5 (status quo) as it does not foreclose options 2, 3, or 4, which require more considered analysis of alternative needs for the land. We also support option 4 (community transfer) with the addition of Council funding to facilitate consideration of future use. Our reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The land should remain in community ownership, either through the Council or a dedicated community trust on a not-for-profit basis. The Council cannot guarantee that private ownership will promote social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being outcomes for the community in the present or the future. Private development at this scale may deliver worse outcomes for community well-being than the status quo, and disposal to private interests should not be pursued on this basis. o The Council should instead develop a master plan to promote community well-being for the wider Diamond Harbour area before considering disposal options for this specific land area. The land holding is a significant area relative to existing development, and any change in use may have significant positive and/or negative impacts on community well-being. Understanding this will provide the Council with a more credible evidential basis for how its decision-making will promote community well-being in the present and the future. o Making a decision to sell because the Council does not have a plan and has not assessed needs is poor practice. The management of Council land on Port Hills or around Hinewai in Akaroa demonstrates the potential for wider community benefits to be realised, and it not clear why the Council has declined to look at these alternatives for a significant land holding in Diamond Harbour. The opportunity to use the land to deliver outcomes for the Whaka-Ora Healthy Harbour Plan merits specific consideration, noting the Council is a partner in the process. Selling the land into private ownership would foreclose the Council exploring these benefits for present or future community well-being. o Consultation on land disposal options is not a substitute for meaningful engagement to assess alternative community needs. For example, the Council is currently consulting on a plan to establish a community garden in Laurensen Park, less than 100m away from the land it proposes to sell. The opportunity to create a new reserve for a community garden on Hunters Road land, and provide additional benefits for community well-being does not appear to have been considered. <p>If the land is to be sold into private ownership, the gullies should first be subdivided and remain in community ownership instead of being sold with covenants. The provision of new reserve areas or green infrastructure as a result of subdivision should be met by private development interests from within the remaining land area at their cost. Similarly, the land should also be subdivided for the school track, and an area equivalent to Laurensen Park provided as an alternative location for a community food garden. Specific consideration should also be given to retaining a significant residual land holding (eg. 1/3rd) for potential needs of future communities.</p> <p>Our submission is made in a private capacity as residents of Church Bay.</p>	Andy and Matthew Barbati-Ross	
42610	5	<p>I am strongly against option 1, which is the worst option by far and would be terrible for our community. If the land is sold off to a developer, I am concerned that it will be developed in a way that maximises profit for the developer, is ugly and cheap, not suited to our beautiful environment, does not take into account the wishes of our community, and in a manner that does not take into account the limits of our public transport system, the state of our roads, school size etc. I am also concerned about adequate protection of the gullies (plantings and tracks) and access to the school track. The school track is very important for many families in our community.</p> <p>I am not against some development of the land by council and/or by transfer to the community in theory, including for housing, as long as that is in a gradual fashion (as opposed to disposing of all the land as per option 1), the housing is not an ugly "estate" of densely packed, near identical houses, the gullies and school track remain public land, the amount of development is such that it doesn't overburden our transport infrastructure and the like, and public land is retained as green spaces as well as for possible future school expansion. However, I haven't selected 3 or 4 as my preferred option because I think these options require further refinement. The council appears to have lost the confidence and trust of our local community as a result of its extremely poor handling of the Godley House issue, repeated attempts to dispose of the land the subject of this submission, including by inappropriately including that in the long term plan, and by generally not appearing to care about the wishes and needs of our community. Accordingly, I'm not convinced at present that the council would develop the land responsibly under option 3 and in the manner I have described above. I have doubts about the practicality of option 4, because I do not know how that</p>	Alexia Mayer	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		would be achieved and who would take on responsibility, on behalf of the community, for the developing the land. In light of the above, I prefer option 5 (status quo).		
42595	5	There is no sense in allowing more residential developments and increasing the population of the area when the roads are in shocking condition and repeatedly fixed with bandaid type repairs.	Justin Julian	
42589	5	I'd like only a small part developed, low cost housing for low income, the flat land farmed or gardened, perhaps an expanded area zoned available for light industries. I love the quality of country views here and the planting in the gullies and walking paths. The wild areas, the unkempt areas too. Very much against dense housing covering arable land. I want this place protected, developed for its present likeminded people's with good quality town planning.	Peter Fryer	Diamond Harbour
42583	5	Option 1 - covenants yes (incorporating existing tracks and school track), I do not agree with disposal of the remainder of land without having explored real options with the community Option 2 - a substantial portion retained as park (informal and/or formal/ play) is important particularly as this land is located between residents/school and the Outstanding Natural Landscape across Bayview Road. Option 3 - CCC should not be a developer but could aid in investigations to explore land use options and feasibility with the community Option 4 - quite a complicated process requiring huge commitment that may not be feasible in a small community, but in some combination of other options could work Option 5 - a good option for the time being until ideas can be explored that may be a combination of options 2/3/4. Rural grazing is fine too. (I have only selected #5 as I could not proceed without selecting from the list) I would be open to a feasibility assessment of this land for a cemetery purpose, incorporating natural burial options in a native woodland setting (west of Sams Gully with access off Hunters Road) including a strong public realm (rest, walk, play, gather, bird watch, enjoy views/shade, etc) as part of the site. Cemetery as park. I would encourage the Ministry of Education to acquire/purchase an approx 30m wide portion of land along Diamond Harbour School's entire south boundary (allowing for carpark redesign and for future proofing).	Nancy Vance	
42529	5	Important to protect and continue to establish the plantings in the gullies and the walkway connections to the school. Grazing maintains the rest of the site and is still in demand. Another option could be to consider offering the land for residential development of larger lot sizes so there are only a few developments and it retains its semi-rural nature (not sure of current zoning requirements).	Tracey Ower	Church Bay
42471	5	I would like to retain as Status Quo until a sustainable community friendly decision can be reached	Doreen Howe	Diamond Harbour
42404	5	I do not think the proposed options give the community meaningful options to consider and for this reason, I can only support the status quo. It seems to me the options of a park, council carrying out a development itself and/or community ownership are either not really required, are too risky (given there is no known demand to develop the land at present) and/or are overly complicated. To me the options really boil down to either disposing of the land (without any development restraints other than protecting the gullies) or the status quo. I would not be opposed to the eventual disposal of the land but only after the community is able to consider how the development of the land may look. I think the community needs to better understand the scale and impact of any potential development to be better able to consider the future of the land. I suggest council officers request an options report from an experienced land development consultant to set out the development options for the land. The options	Brenda Nightingale	

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>should include considerations of wider transport and public infrastructure required to service each option, as well the how each option would be laid out and how each would serve the current and future needs of the community and the impact on the surrounding residents and the wider community. The options could then be consulted on - essentially your current option one would broken up into a number of alternatives, with any sale including the extra development constraints that result from the consultation, being protected by registered covenants. I see this submission as a way for council to dispose of surplus land without any risk and for the community to be comfortable that if the land was developed in the future then there would be some extra constraints in place to ensure an optimal outcome.</p> <p>The land is a large area close to the existing residential properties, set aside for future needs of the community and putting some safeguards in place in relation to any sale would not be unreasonable.</p>		
42399	5	<p>Regardless of what happens to 27 Hunters Rd and 42 Whero Ave land, 'Unnamed Gully C' should be protected as a reserve, with the plan to revegetate along with Morgans and Sams Gully's. The benefits of this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cleaning the waterway run off, (especially if the land either side of the gully is going to be built-up) therefore having less of an environmental impact on the harbour - Erosion control (again especially important if the surrounding areas are going to be built-up) - Maintains balance between natural environment and built-up areas - Native planting encourages more birdlife - Provides another public walking area - Planting will contribute to carbon credits <p>With increased housing it's likely that Diamond Harbour School need to expand to cope with more residents, therefore the land around the school should be reserved to enable this.</p> <p>The road from Diamond Harbour to Christchurch city is currently not adequate for the existing population of Diamond Harbour and surrounds and additional traffic generated from housing as a result of residential development of this land would only put more pressure on it.</p>	Lorna Carnaby	
42392	5	<p>Place a covenant over the gullies and maintain existing walking tracks especially Pete's track to the school.</p> <p>Keep some land behind the school for any future expansion.</p> <p>Instead of a developer coming in and putting in a big subdivision just release smaller development of sections in small pockets or develop as lifestyle blocks.</p> <p>Another idea in the community was having smaller sections sold with smaller houses for older people living here wishing to downsize and not have to move back to town.</p>	Carolyn Meynell	
42368	5	<p>I have not really agreed wholly with any option.</p> <p>I can't choose option 1, because council are selling it off as a whole block, without protecting the gullies and existing tracks.</p> <p>I know if I chose that...council would just steam roll ahead with sale.</p> <p>1st before selling please make the gullies into reserves.</p>	Annabelle Wear	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>All 3 gullies are protected to the same level as reserves. Boundaries to coincide with existing fencing.</p> <p>The School Track is legally protected where it crosses land outside of the protected gullies. Specifically, between Morgan's and Sam's by Whero Ave. Between Sam's and Ngatea Road. Between Ngatea Rd and the School.</p> <p>Legal protection should also be considered for a walking track between Ngatea Rd and Marine drive. This would be a practical short cut for people using the School Track to get from Southern DH to the new shopping area.</p> <p>My children would prefer to see no change and keep it as nature, therefore I feel that a slower more considered sale of portions at a time, would work better. There is need to build up...not over the land like a cancer. Too many oversized houses here already that swallow the land.</p> <p>So different uses or types of housing or other development could happen on each area. Rather than abdicating responsibility to the private sector and cutting community input to decision-making, a staged development will enable complementary designs to be created, reflecting developing community needs. In addition, rather than going directly to tender to sell parcels of the land, Council should ask for RFP (Request for Proposals) which then can be assessed against Council criteria developed with community input.</p> <p>I do also acknowledge housing is a big issue facing many New Zealanders right now, but can't see that those needing affordable housing would be able to live over here due to lack of infrastructure and support services. Therefore its going to be more well off owners wanting bachs or homes. Therefore consideration of our environment could somehow be a big part of the development . I do not wish to see more ugly Church Bay or Black Point oversized McMansions.</p>		
42359	5	<p>Hi there are too many houses here already.</p> <p>Diamond Harbour was only supposed to be a village.</p> <p>Would like to keep %49 of the land as nature.</p> <p>I helped plant some of the trees in the gullies.</p>	Joshua Wear	Diamond Harbour
42323	5	<p>I prefer the status quo, as I am a regular user of the walkways in this area. Being able to walk in this beautiful area with my dog and enjoy nature is priceless. However, if it will be decided to develop the land in the future, I would like the development to be environmentally and community sensitive. Namely, I do not want to see an unsustainable housing development like we see all around NZ with ridiculous covenants such as minimum house size and building materials restrictions. Any developments of the land should include public consultation with the community to ensure preservation of our unique community, which is a caring and nature loving community. Any housing development should include a variety of options to cater for different people with different needs.</p>	Micki Bell	
42287	5	<p>I choose option 5. I believe that a rushed decision without proper community consultation would be detrimental to the existing local community. The local community has put considerable work into developing this area as natural amenities and mass residential cookie cutter housing would be in direct conflict with local values and opinions. The natural amenities provides a welcome respite to the constant and seemingly concrete nature of city life, important for mental and physical wellbeing not only for locals but for all people of Christchurch that often travel over for this very sense of escape.</p> <p>My concerns with the other options are as follows:</p> <p>Option 1:</p> <p>As a resident architectural designer I know full well that the desired outcomes of a high to medium residential development is often overshadowed by the financial considerations and return on investment aims of property developers. This results in as many houses as close together as possible in a development to increase yield and generate more profit.</p> <p>If the council is to have the land developed, it risks being done so by profit driven private developers unless the council clearly dictates limits and generous distances between buildings to achieve more sustainable design outcomes above the bare minimum district plan requirements, such as but not limited to:</p>	Paul De Leeuw	

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>shading, wind tunnels, dead spaces, dangerous spaces with lack of passive surveillance, reflectivity issues from bright cladding and glazing onto existing properties, noise and privacy breaches.</p> <p>In summary, sustainable design intentions for both buildings and developments often fall short of expectations due to financial pressures and profit maximization.</p> <p>Option 2:</p> <p>Retention as greenspace is a good option, and arguing that Diamond Harbour is in excess of greenspace is not entirely accurate as much of these green spaces are non accessible ranging from steep walking tracks, hill climbs and cliff walks. None of which can be enjoyed by people with disabilities as much as the greenspace in question which is extremely accessible.</p> <p>Option 3:</p> <p>As mentioned above, if council is to develop the land it will likely be done so in a manner not fit for the local context, and may end up maximising cheap housing resulting in just another community that can be found in crowded suburbs of Christchurch.....completely out of place.</p> <p>Option 4:</p> <p>This could be a good option but it risks proper management, consensus and finding issues from the local community.</p> <p>The suggestion of a cemetery will have quite a negative impact on the local community who have tended and nurtured the vegetation, trees and paths considerably. As the area is so visible from across the gully, a cemetery will not only be visually detrimental, but it will potentially also reduce the desirability and value of all nearby properties.</p>		
42261	5	<p>I chose option 5 because this allows more time for the community to be consulted and a proper plan to be developed for this land. Also as none of the other submissions fully work as a standalone. I chose option 5 because this allows more time for the community to be consulted and a proper plan to be developed for this land. Also seeing the land as 2 pieces only is problematic for the community and the council. This land is of great importance and Opportunity to the community and selling this as two pieces of land without a plan could be a lost opportunity and potentially damaging to the community. The community does not need another high density residential development. Instead it would be great to see the land utilised for community facilities like a dog park, equestrian area, safe community gathering space in case of a fire, forest for native birds, walking tracks etc. Maybe a small amount of the land could be developed, but if this were to be done the land would need to be sold in smaller pieces and stages so the community can provide some input. Regarding the cost of option 5 to council, this is due to internal money transfer rather than absolute cost, which should be considered.</p> <p>Here are my problems with the other options</p> <p>Option 1: This is the greatest risk and provides most uncertainty to the community. The proposed plan does not include all walking tracks, there is a chance the developer does not respect the community wishes and this does not account for issues arising from suddenly having more residents in the area due to poor roading and other infrastructure etc. This is a huge piece of land and Diamond Harbour infrastructure is not equipped for this influx of residents as it is currently already dealing with higher permanent residents due to baches being turned to permanent homes. This also means this land cannot be used for any community needs such as cemetery upgrade, dogpark, equestrian area, safe community gathering place etc.</p> <p>Option 2: this is a great option to further develop the sustainability of banks peninsula and making it more of a destination for the rest of the city. This could emphasize the importance of banks peninsula's sustainability and help the growth of native flora and fauna. However, should all the land be utilised for this? Or just partly.</p>	Paula Arbouw	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>Option 3: agree the council should not develop the land for residential use, but if they are considering public facilities like a dog park which Diamond Harbour really needs they should be in charge of developing this.</p> <p>Option 4: this is a good alternative because this keeps community interests in mind (unlike option 1). The community has put a lot of resources into developing the gullies and would continue to do so if it had the option. In terms of increased rates, I think this piece of land is of greater importance than the rebuild of the central city cathedral towards we are currently paying. However, the land is too big to be solely owned by the community and there should be council input and support. Seeing the land as 2 pieces only is problematic for the community and the council. This land is of great importance and Opportunity to the community and selling this as two pieces of land without a plan could be a lost opportunity and potentially damaging to the community. The community does not need another high density residential development. Instead it would be great to see the land utilised for community facilities like a dog park, equestrian area, safe community gathering space in case of a fire, forest for native birds, walking tracks etc. Maybe a small amount of the land could be developed, but if this were to be done the land would need to be sold in smaller pieces and stages so the community can provide some input. Regarding the cost of option 5 to council, this is due to internal money transfer rather than absolute cost, which should be considered.</p> <p>Here are my problems with the other options</p> <p>Option 1: This is the greatest risk and provides most uncertainty to the community. The proposed plan does not include all walking tracks, there is a chance the developer does not respect the community wishes and this does not account for issues arising from suddenly having more residents in the area due to poor roading and other infrastructure etc. This is a huge piece of land and Diamond Harbour infrastructure is not equipped for this influx of residents as it is currently already dealing with higher permanent residents due to baches being turned to permanent homes. This also means this land cannot be used for any community needs such as cemetery upgrade, dogpark, equestrian area, safe community gathering place etc.</p> <p>Option 2: this is a great option to further develop the sustainability of banks peninsula and making it more of a destination for the rest of the city. This could emphasize the importance of banks peninsula's sustainability and help the growth of native flora and fauna. However, should all the land be utilised for this? Or just partly.</p> <p>Option 3: agree the council should not develop the land for residential use, but if they are considering public facilities like a dog park which Diamond Harbour really needs they should be in charge of developing this.</p> <p>Option 4: this is a good alternative because this keeps community interests in mind (unlike option 1). The community has put a lot of resources into developing the gullies and would continue to do so if it had the option. In terms of increased rates, I think this piece of land is of greater importance than the rebuild of the central city cathedral towards we are currently paying. However, the land is too big to be solely owned by the community and there should be council input and support.</p>		
42200	5	<p>NOT be sold at this point. There is insufficient infrastructure for this to be housing development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Gravel roads surround this proposal, no footpaths or lighting (more traffic and bigger population such as kids on bikes) 2. Local surgery about to close its books for new patients 3. Cemetery in wrong location and too small 4. Road to town appalling and cannot withstand more traffic. The village does not need more traffic either. 5. No or very little police presence - increasing crime, vandalism, speeding vehicles in the village, etc 	leslie hogbin	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>6. School grounds will need more recreational space</p> <p>7. Beach access with increasing population is very limited due to council not purchasing or investigating fresh options</p> <p>8. Christchurch lacks trees, as well as protecting the current plantings in the gully's more are required and this is an opportunity to provide more native area's for plantings and native wild life. Plus walking and biking forest tracks.</p> <p>9. Dog park not required now but with growth / foresight it will be</p> <p>10. Local volunteer fire brigade provide valuable ambulance service but stretched</p> <p>11. Diamond Harbour not well served currently by council, reference the Godley house Fiasco still unresolved.</p> <p>12. Parking for ferry limited and will need more space.</p> <p>13. infrastructure for elderly/disabled not here (transport/accommodation/footpaths etc)</p> <p>14 cost of council ownership is low / negligible. Land is increasing in value. Compare this cost to the huge number of \$100,000+ council managers reported recently, just a drop in the bucket.</p> <p>15 Youths lack facilities such as a skate park, basket ball area, biking area, beach area outside of the wharf etc</p> <p>16 Once gone, greenspace is lost for good. Lets have a planned development rather than a grab for cash towards a Christchurch which is losing touch with people and no longer a place to be proud of.</p>		
42197	5	<p>I am in total agreement that Sam's Gully, Morgan's Gully and the third unnamed gully and walkways around the area in question between 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Ave should be covenanted to protect them. However, I do not believe the council should dispose of the remainder of the land. In my view, in recent years the council has allowed far too many developments within the jurisdiction of Christchurch City Council, to the detriment of the surrounding countryside and to the extent that claiming Christchurch is "the garden city" is laughable, or should I say, rather sad. You will therefore not be surprised that I am not in favour of selling the land off for development. I believe there has already been sufficient development of land within the Diamond Harbour, Church Bay and Charteris Bay surrounds.</p> <p>Therefore, my preference is Option 5. This causes the least upset to the community and continues to protect what is a beautiful piece of "the garden city". I would simply recommend that some native trees are planted, to provide shade for any grazing animals and/or any dogs being walked within the grassed areas.</p> <p>Should Option 3 become the way forward, whilst I don't condone further residential development in general, what would be beneficial to the community is a retirement home for the elderly, and if sufficient room, some pre-rest home housing for retired people who are still able to care for themselves. When elderly people who have lived in the area for many years get to the stage that they can no longer care for their house and garden, they end up selling up and moving into a retirement home in Christchurch or further afield. A suitable building that could cater for their needs using some or all of the grazing land would not only benefit elderly residents, but would also provide additional employment opportunities within the local community. It would, however, have to be built with certain caveats, which include such things as: First priority to residency is given to current elderly residents of all of Banks Peninsula (as opposed to elsewhere)</p> <p>Once filled, a list of interested future residents is kept updated and once a space becomes available, any Banks Peninsula resident on the list gets first refusal over people from elsewhere.</p> <p>The rooms are bought by the residents and when they are sold, the resident or beneficiary in case of a death, is entitled to full costs reimbursed to what was</p>	Madeleine Naylor	Charteris Bay

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>paid for the room, not just a percentage.</p> <p>If pre-rest homes housing was also provided, their Conditions of Sale would need to ensure that first and future sales were for say over 60s only.</p> <p>In order to ensure such caveats are adhered to, they would need drawing up with the consultation of the local community and the council and once agreed upon, drawn up in the Conditions of Sale.</p> <p>Regardless what the final outcome of this land option is, I would ask that the walkways around the outside of the fenced off grass and the gullies remain for public use and dogs may continue to be allowed to walk around off leash in perpetuity.</p>		
42175	5	<p>I'm not against some development of the land to some extent. The options don't really offer what I would prefer, which is to release small parts of land over time. It is inevitable that Diamond Harbour will expand.</p> <p>A single sale is what I am entirely against: A developer will want rapid development to gain rapid returns, will erect buildings which potentially are unsympathetic to the surrounding dwellings and countryside.</p> <p>There will be huge consequences with increased traffic on the already poor roads, and will surely affect other infrastructure, ruining quality of life to the existing residents in the area. The disruption to Hunters Road [where I live] with the relatively small development of sites on Stoddarts Terrace is already inconvenient and unpleasant, with heavy vehicles and noisy traffic constantly driving up and down the area. Inevitably, a larger expansion of this sort of activity will make occupation on the roads unbearable, particularly as the development could be over many years.</p> <p>It has been pointed out that the Council actually makes money on the grazing land at the moment, and that although it wishes to dispose of it, it has no real need to. It will no doubt inject a large one-off sum to its coffers, but I am sceptical that any money from the sale will be returned to the community, given it's lack of support with other issues in the area.</p> <p>Estimates I have heard is that this development will double the size of the population. The reason people live in Diamond Harbour is that it isn't Christchurch and is usually peaceful and small. Some expansion is going to happen over time, but this proposal will be highly disruptive to present residents on both the short and long term if the land is released in a single large sale.</p> <p>Finally, this piece of land is spread across a large area of the present village and is part of the character of the place. I'm sure that this is not of consequence to CCC [or any developers], but it is to many locals, enhancing the beauty and retaining the natural surroundings.</p> <p>As my preferred option isn't available, I have selected the Status Quo.</p>	Tim Pattinson	Diamond Harbour
42165	5	<p>I am not against a SMALL amount of development, but the council and developer MUST INVEST IN INFRASTRUCTURE and ensure the water, sewage etc can cope. A large development will put too much pressure on the current systems. Protecting the gullies and other regenerating land is a MUST please.</p>	Andrea Dahl	Purau
42159	5	<p>Until the Council provides more detail on what the criteria are for option 1, I don't think it is possible for the residents of Diamond Harbour to choose this option and I think the status quo for now with protection of the gullies and walking tracks (including the track used by the school chikderne to Diamond Harbour School) should remain in place until we have more information. There has been no detail on the possible size of a future development, how many sections etc.. and the implications for the residents of Hunters Road, Ngatea Road and Whero Ave such as increase in traffic movements generated, necessary upgrade of roads. There would be safety concerns for the children at the school if there is an increase in traffic movements on Hunters Road- there is already a bottle neck at school drop off and pick up times in the morning and afternoons on Hunters Road and the part of Marine Drive near the school and increased traffic movements from a new subdivision especially in the mornings when the residents of the subdivision are going to work would make the problem worse. There is already not enough parking at the school/kindergarten site with many parents parking along Hunters Road and Marine Drive which makes those areas of the road narrower and more difficult to navigate and visibilty poor with car doors opening and children getting out of cars, cars pulling out suddenly etc..</p> <p>Whero Ave and Ngatea Road are narrow roads and in some parts of both roads, it is not possible for two cars to pass each other especially where residents of those roads have parked vehicles on the road outside their homes - more traffic on both roads would make this problem worse. Visibilty in parts of Ngatea Road is poor with the road being more like a crescent so in some parts of the road so you cannot see cars coming round the corner in the opposite direction - the road would have to be straightened and widened to cope with more traffic and reduce safety issues.</p>	Louise Dawson	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>Expanding the population of Diamond Harbour by subdividing the land would add more pressure on the school as no doubt more families would move into the area which means the school would have to expand - there has been no detail about whether or not the school and the Ministry of Education has been involved in this process and there is no mention of whether or not there would be any land available for the school to expand into if expansion was required.</p> <p>Option 2 is not much different from option 5 but again there is no proper detail on what retaining the land as park means for the community. I do not agree that there are holding costs and maintenance costs - the land is mostly paddock and plantings with no infrastructure so would not have any maintenance costs and the Council would not be paying any rates as there are no services. I accept that there may be some costs in maintaining some of the perimeter fencing although some of these costs may be paid by the farmer grazing the land. The only disadvantage to the Council not selling the land and retaining it as a park would be no revenue from a sale of the land. It is stated that in the short term there would be no change - implying that there will be change of some sort in the longer term but no detail is provided on what these changes may be.</p> <p>Option 3 - Council acting as developer - this states that there is no significant demand for residential development in Diamond Harbour. Why is the Council contemplating option 1 if there is no need for further residential development in Diamond Harbour? It is also stated that the revenue gained may be less than the cost of development - why would a developer buy the land in option 1 and develop it if this is the case - won't they have the same problem?</p> <p>Option 4 - this is not practical - it would mean some community organisational body would have to be set up to purchase, own and manage the land and will pose issues in the future as members of the organisation leave the area to live elsewhere. Do all residents of Diamond Harbour automatically become owners of the land or only members of the organisational body? If only members of the organisational body own the land do other residents get to have a say on what the land is used for etc.. Also if the Council gets to recoup the capital value of the land if it is disposed of by the community in the future - is that the capital value of the land at the time it is transferred to the community or the capital value at the time it is disposed of - it is not clear from the information provided. This is also a disincentive for the community to develop or dispose of all or any part of the land as they would have to factor in the reduction in the value of the land once the Council claws back a proportion of the disposal value.</p> <p>Option 5 - maintain the status quo - I don't think there is any other real option . As stated above, there has not been enough information provided on any of the other options so I don't see how you can choose any of the other options when you don't actually know what you are choosing because you don't have enough detail to be able to make a proper informed choice. Its similar to saying you can choose a red car, a blue car or a yellow car but you are not told if the cars are hatch backs, sedans or 4WD or electric, petrol or diesel. You don't know the engine size, how many doors they have, what make the car is and how much each car costs to run or even the price of each car but you have to make a choice.</p>		
42154	5	I wish for the 3 gullies and school track joining the gullies to be Covenanter. Thank you	Phil Swallow	
42145	5	It does not cost the Council (in real terms) to retain this land as it currently stands. If Council is determined to sell this land then it should sell it in stages. A staged sale will enable each parcel of land to be considered at the point of sale and the right type of development given the go ahead. The community SHOULD be involved in decision making and this staged approach can create a place that reflects community needs and desires - surely this is what a Council should be encouraging (even if it takes a bit more time and effort). As well as this staged sale, rather than going directly to tender to sell parcels of land, Council should ask for RFP (Request for Proposals) which can then be assessed against criteria developed with community input. Come on, we're worth it.	Kate Finnerty	
41996	5	<p>I would like the status quo to continue as there is no obvious need for further housing given 3 other local developments still have a lot of sections to sell. That is Black point, sections above Hunters Road and sections around new shopping development.</p> <p>I also believe people chose to live in Diamond Harbour for its semi rural lifestyle . Is it fair that the incumbent older residents be marginalised by an increased population? I don't think so.</p>	Rebekah Allen	Diamond Harbour
41991	5	<p>The options are not mutually exclusive. I would like to see a mix of Option 1 and 5 at this point in time.</p> <p>The important priority is that covenants creating Council Reserves are placed as soon as is practicable over Sam's Gully, Morgan's Gully and the third 'Unnamed' Gully.</p>	Caroline Mackenzie	Charteris Bay

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		<p>The remaining land should continue to be used in its current form for at least 10 years until the next LTP is devised at which point it can be put back out to consultation.</p> <p>At that stage (only) I would support reviewing some housing development on the land. The housing would need to cater for a wide demographic and age range, providing accommodation for young people, families, retired people and those who wish to downsize. Good design should be encouraged including the use of appropriate long-term materials. Homes should be highly energy efficient (above code), and options should be available for a spectrum of tiny homes, townhouses and stand-alone dwellings. Offering shared facilities, light shielding and integrated walking (including the school track) and cycling routes should be encouraged. Awareness of the changing environment due to climate change and the need to be flexible in response to that is important.</p>		
41990	5	<p>The options are not mutually exclusive. I would like to see a mix of Option 1 and 5 at this point in time.</p> <p>The important priority is that covenants creating Council Reserves are placed as soon as is practicable over Sam's Gully, Morgan's Gully and the third 'Unnamed' Gully.</p> <p>The remaining land should continue to be used in its current form for at least 10 years until the next LTP is devised at which point it can be put back out to consultation.</p> <p>At that stage (only) I would support reviewing some housing development on the land. The housing would need to cater for a wide demographic and age range, providing accommodation for young people, families, retired people and those who wish to downsize. Good design should be encouraged including the use of appropriate long-term materials. Homes should be highly energy efficient (above code), and options should be available for a spectrum of tiny homes, townhouses and stand-alone dwellings. Offering shared facilities, light shielding and integrated walking (including the school track) and cycling routes should be encouraged. Awareness of the changing environment due to climate change and the need to be flexible in response to that is important.</p>	Bob Frame	Charteris Bay
41983	5	<p>The current status is fiscally neutral and council charging itself \$15k in rates is a paper exercise only as no services are provided. To sell to a developer for housing may earn council some revenue in the short term, but would put a big strain on infrastructure in Diamond Harbour. How does this fit with council plans to intensify residential building within the city and to reduce vehicle emissions. I support putting a covenant on the gullies but leaving any decision on the other land until we have a clearer understanding of what we are trying to achieve in Christchurch. A more compact, greener city with less commuting by car and a reduced carbon footprint is, we are told, the aim. More subdivisions in Diamond Harbour would seem to fly in the face of that.</p>	martin meehan	Charteris Bay
41907	5	<p>This survey should contain an 'other' option as none of these are quite right. Covenanting the gullies should be included in all options. My preference is to covenant the gullies and then transfer ownership to the community to develop some for low impact housing and retain some for farm or park (could include skate park).</p>	Sarah Pritchett	Church Bay
41797	5	<p>A walking track (Pete's Track / School Track) currently runs through the northern side of this land but has not been identified in this proposal. This track is used daily by many, especially children who wish to avoid the main roads when travelling to school. If this land use changes, please ensure that this track is retained for future, local use.</p>	Andrew Steadman	Diamond Harbour
41764	5	<p>This land is under pressure of development. You are very wrong in the statement that there is no evidence of residential property pressure. The whole of Marine Dr is becoming suburbanised. Stores coming in. Church bay lots for sale, huge chunks of land for sale by Bayleys. On Bayview rd. Do not support sprawl and more car driving.</p>	Marette Wells	Diamond Harbour
41759	5	<p>We live on marine drive and believe the council's core business is to rate payers which includes retaining and managing assets, not selling them off into private ownership</p>	Nick Craven	
41756	5	<p>It should not be sold until there is good infrastructure, especially roading to support residential use. It can be quite dangerous waling up Hunters Road now with traffic increasing as Bayview Rd becomes very dangerous for 2 way traffic to Charteris Bay due to the driveways built over the road verge. The bridge barrier in Hunters Gull gets regularly taken out by trucks or trailers and I have had experience of having to back down to the bridge because a vehicle with a trailer coming down hill could not back up. Check your records for how often this is repaired. The workman loves it! That road is only wide enough for 1 way traffic so any new residential or developed area MUST get this sorted.</p> <p>The \$15,000 cost is made up of??? Do you pay rates to yourself? What was the original capital cost of the land? What improvements do you make? Where are</p>	Pat Pritchett	Church Bay

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		your expenses? CCC has been promising a covenant for a few years now so should go ahead no matter which option is taken to keep faith with the community who have worked hard on these areas. It is very pleasant to see sheep grazing when out walking and great for the school children to have sheep and lambs on their boundary. There is no need for it to be a park. The community already do so much voluntary work in this area that they do not need to own this land. The community certainly don't expect the CCC to develop this land as that would be costly and lack purpose when we prefer it as it is. If it is sold to a developer, I have no confidence in the district Plan to prevent houses being built or other developments with no road improvements happening in this area. If CCC really wanted to look at the future of this area, they should start by making Bayview Rd from Hunters Rd to Marine Drive in Charteris Bay a 1 way road and prohibit large trucks and trailers from the gully. We do all pay our rates over here after all and they are not cheap.		
41745	5	I strongly do not support any development on these areas, all my arguments are already listed in the consultation feedback (AGAINST). This is a small village, with a great community of a good size that children and adults know each other. The farm backdrops is important in terms of nature and sustainability. We would like to keep it this way.	Antje Duda	Diamond Harbour
41687	5	I do not wish the land to be built on as I do not want more green areas destroyed. People live in Diamond Harbour to be part of a small community in a rural area. If more and more houses are built the character of the settlement will change dramatically. The council have not convinced me that their preferred option of selling the land would benefit me - how much would rates be reduced by? I find it hard to believe that the council would reduce rates.	K Pedersen	Diamond Harbour
41681	5	I would hate to see this land sold to developers. There is no demand for this extra land being developed and not enough infrastructure here for that. It is a lovely piece of green space, surrounding our town. My second choice would be Option 2, which is almost the same as now.	Jenny Warmington	Diamond Harbour
41674	5	It really needs to stay as it is until covenants can be properly drawn up to include the integral 'school track' and plantings that are in between the gullies. This area runs all the way from Waipapa to the school and has not been included.	Vicky Pollard	
41671	5	Stay as it is, or option to retain as a park. This land is not suitable for development, surrounding infrastructure wouldn't support it (roads, waste/ storm water). \$15k a year is not a lot of cost, yet the character of the area near the school and tracks is of immeasurable value to the community. Happy for a portion of my rates to go to this cost. Also happy to contribute to a community buy out. Please don't sell it for development whatever you do!	Hilary Quayle	
41629	5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is increasing risk of devastating fires on the peninsula and for many householders in Diamond Harbour/Church Bay there are no easy escape routes given the single road access. The land behind the school is, however, accessible, flat and grazed. It would be an ideal place for locals to gather in safety in the event of a destructive fire. 2. The local community at present can not easily absorb the consequences (intended and otherwise) of a significant increase in housing in terms of infrastructure, services and traffic. <The situation in Halswell with subdivision expansion taking place at the expense of community provision is one we all need to learn from. / 3. This is a well functioning community with strong volunteer participation. Is there any research that links population size and social cohesion? 4. The council has organised the submission form to provide for only one possible response. If there were a hierarchy of option choices from most to least wanted, the council would have a greater appreciation of what it is that the local people want. 5. If the council decides to go ahead with its favoured option, could all three gullies be protected under covenant, as well as all the school tracks that have been developed and planted over the years, largely by volunteers. These tracks are well used and will become more so if the population increases significantly. 6. What is the likelihood of climate change affecting the single road into the area? The larger the population grows, the greater the clamour there will be for alternative solutions. A solution to one problem (council currently having land it no longer sees a use for) can lead to a greater set of problems in the future. If 	Joan Melvyn	Diamond Harbour

Submission ID	Which option do you prefer?	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Suburb
		the council gives approval for greater development then surely the council is responsible for dealing with the consequences of that development.		
41609	5	This land is a great asset to the community. It provides a place for people to walk and enjoy wildlife, run their dogs, enjoy the farm animals and lambs in springtime. As other local areas get built up it will be a very important space where people can find peace and quiet in both open landscape and bushland. Reforesting the gullies is a wonderful activity for the community, bringing together all age groups. The space enhances the area and makes it more appealing for locals and visitors.	catherine Hammond	Diamond Harbour
41601	5	<p>Unfortunately your options do not include 'other'.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The three gullies should be covenanted without further delay 2. Coastal hazards that Council identified for the Church Bay and Purau residential areas will force residents off their land within the next few decades. 3. It is highly advisable to have residential (safe) land in the area available for Bank Peninsula residents who have to abandon their property due to SLR and who want to stay in their community. 4. Council may want to look at a model of a joint venture approach between Council and Community for the long term development of the area with the idea that residential areas are reserved for specific purposes i.e. for SLR re-settlement, for housing/facilities for the elderly etc. 5. The infrastructure in DH is both precarious and expensive. The 'preferred option' with the idea to save an annual amount of \$15,000 when the land is sold to a developer is naive. This would imply that the development contribution and the additional income from rates would pay for the necessary upgrade and upkeep of the infrastructure. DH is a remote city satellite with long transport routes for horizontal infrastructure and single conduits. This does not comply with the policy to encourage dense to medium density housing. 6. The models of market based community building and housing developments that served Council well in the second half of last century are not suitable any more. Council and Community must actively engage in the planning and building of housing development and infrastructure. 	Thomas Kulpe	Purau
41598	5	It's fine as it is 15k is nothing to the council. This has the least impact to the community and needs the least effort. If it isn't broken don't actively break it.	Owen Payne	Diamond Harbour
41591	5	I believe demand in residential land in this area will rise (and is actually rising currently) and the value of the land will increase significantly in the next couple of years. I am also very much in favour of the covenants. To hold the status quo would allow to finalise the covenant-process and to see how far demand is rising. It would also allow to re-visit the question of demand for the uncovenanted land in a couple of years (maybe it will be relatively short, like 2-3 years), to provide for plans which will cater for all the needs of a growing community and hopefully create a profit which will outweigh the ongoing current costs. Waiting would prevent developers from running after short term gains in a situation in which we don't know how fast the growth demand will rise and a development which might not meet the community needs later. Waiting at this stage would also allow regeneration of the gullies to continue undisturbed of building activities and help the planting to establish further.	Ira Schelp	
41573	5	<p>I would support options 2,4 or 5.</p> <p>Why is there no option for 'other' or 'none of the above'?</p> <p>Why is there no opportunity to select multiple options?</p>	John Quayle	Diamond Harbour
41565	5	I am not selecting one of the options above but have to in order to submit this form. Other- place a covenant on Sam's, Morgan's and third gully. And develop the flat land for mixed use and plan for future energy needs, e.g. solar bank, wind turbines, green housing, community gardens. Not standard mass housing subdivisions. Remain responsibility of CCC and use as pilot project for affordable, energy efficient, green community.	Emma Kinnings	Diamond Harbour

Blank

Submission ID	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Name	Address	Suburb
43848	<p>To whom it may concern, the following comments indicate my response to the five options proposed by the CCC, concerning 27 Hunters Rd and 42 Where Ave, 42 hectare land sale. Top priority is the protection of the 3 gullies and the connecting walking tracks, under a perpetual covenant. In view of the housing shortage part sale of the area, ie the paddock extending from Bay view road to where Ave, I'm supportive of. However the Hunters Rd block apart from an area adjacent to the Diamond Harbour school which should be retained for future school expansion, the remaining area should be afforested earning carbon credits, otherwise continue stock grazing, and land banking. The type of housing should reflect the community. No expensive gated community, or tightly packed housing, but a mixture of sustainably designed homes covering family to single persons and community housing. This is more likely to be achieved by a council private partnership. In summation, none of the five options meet my ideal, but a combination of certain aspects of 1,3 and 5 come closer to them .</p>	John Watson		
43121	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 I do not favour any one of the CCC proposed options and instead seek the following. 2 Any solution needs to provide protection of the three gullies and protection of the school track and any other track in the area. This protection needs to happen before any land sale occurs, if it occurs, to ensure the protection is not subject to a land developers programme. 3 I support some of the land being kept for a park or other activity that lets CCC cover costs. Time is needed for the community to define how the land might be used. The land between Morgan and Sam's gullies might be the best area for community use as it could enhance the planting work being done in the gullies. 4 I support some of the land being developed for housing with the inclusion of requirements that affordable housing is prioritised so that people who are living and working here can afford to buy. Buying is not currently affordable for some people whom we need to keep in the area. Time is needed to consider how this form of development might be achieved and to discover, with CCC, what planning tools are available to support creating affordable housing. 	Gay Pavelka	6 Marama Terrace	Diamond Harbour