

# 27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour

## General Comments

## Officer Response

### **27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour**

#### Background

Since 1913 Council has owned these properties intended for the development and expansion of Diamond Harbour. For at least 40 years these have been zoned for potential residential development.

Council has no plans to use the land for these expansion purposes, and they are not required for infrastructure or service delivery. Generally Council does not take on the risks associated with residential development directly.

In the absence of plans and direction Council has leased the land for the grazing and has allowed the revegetation of the gullies. Grazing produces insufficient revenue to cover the costs of rates on the land, resulting in a net ongoing economic loss to Council from ownership. The loss is currently about \$15,000 per annum. The land does generate social and environmental benefits, through paths used for school access and recreation, and the revegetated gullies. Council is in the process of protecting the gullies through conservation covenants.

With no plans for any Council use, it has sought the communities' views on the future of the land through the 2021-31 Long Term Planning process. There has been significant response on the future of the land, particularly from Diamond Harbour residents.

#### Themes and Issues

There has been significant levels of general support for disposing of properties no longer required for their original use. Many of these submitters have referred to the ability to use the capital revenue from sales for offsetting rates increases or reinvestment.

There has also been a lower level of general opposition for disposals, particularly as this is perceived as a one off opportunity to generate revenue. There has been a significant number of submissions specifically relating to the properties at 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour.

Key themes from the submissions relate to a desire to protect the natural value and public access particularly of the revegetated areas. Some submitters have indicated that they are less concerned about development of the flat land as long as the reforested gullies are protected. Others have expressed concerns about their ability to influence development outcomes.

Some have suggested that they would like to see specific forms of development of the land, including housing for those who wished to age in place in their communities. Others have indicated a desire to see land set aside for future

education needs. Many have expressed concerns about the impact of development on infrastructure. Concern about changing the character of the area is also commonly expressed.

There is also a perception that the Long Term Plan (LTP) consultation is not “consultation” and preference for an alternative process. This includes concerns that the LTP process is a “fast track” process that prevents Community Board and public consultation.

### Discussion

The gullies will be protected for public benefit regardless of a retention or disposal decision. The Council has decided to protect the revegetated gullies with a conservation covenant registered against the title. The work to implement this protection has been undertaken with the local Reserves Management Committee and is well advanced. If Council did decide to sell, then this would not occur before the covenants were in place. Public access is possible from both formed and unformed legal road.

Council could consider further protecting the gullies by subdividing these from the main property and protecting them as reserves. In addition Council could consider formalising the track through a right of way.

Council could consider developing the property itself or through a subsidiary. This would allow more community input in to the design of a development, but would involve Council (or the Council family) taking on development risk. Council does not have significant experience in managing residential development risk.

Anyone wishing to subdivide this land would need to apply for a subdivision consent. Decisions about public consultation would ultimately depend on the design of any subdivision. A subdivision that complied with zoning rules would be unlikely to require notification.

The LTP is the appropriate vehicle for making decisions about the future of property that is not being used for its original purpose. A LTP provides for integrated decision-making, allowing decisions about the future of property to be made in the context of the Council’s financial ability to implement decisions.

Decisions to retain property will be made as part of the financial planning process so Council can set aside funding for holding and/ or development costs. Equally a decision to dispose at this time will result in more accurate revenue budgets.

The LTP process requires extensive consultation, ensuring that there is a wide variety of input into decisions. Local interests can be considered, through individual submissions and Community Board input, as well as whole of City considerations, through full Council making final decisions.

The process being used is not a fast track process – it is a process designed to get better decisions based on community input and with proper consideration of the financial implications of the decision. The previous process referred to by submitters did not include a mandatory public consultation process unlike the new process.

### Options

Six possible options have been considered. These are not necessarily mutually exclusive options.

1. **Do nothing:** Council could decide to continue to let the flat land for grazing, accept the access track, protect the gullies through conservation covenants, allow revegetation and operate the property at an economic loss.
2. **Dispose with additional protections for the paths:** Council could decide to dispose of the site following the completion of the conservation covenants for the gullies and with additional protection (e.g. right of way covenant) for the paths. The land is held for development purposes and Council has no plans for development, so rather than leaving capital tied up in underperforming land, it should dispose of it. While the community has identified concerns, Council disposing of the land does not mean that development will occur.
3. **Retain as a park, managed by Council's Parks Unit:** Council could decide to retain the land as a park. In the short term this would result in no change with the gullies continuing to be revegetated through community partnership and the flat land leased for grazing. Parks have advised that they definitely want to see the gullies protected and also the community built track that runs along the lower part of the land to the school. They have no plans for the remainder of the site at this stage, it is not required to meet their Levels of Service and they are not aware of any evidence-based community need for the land to be developed as a park.
4. **Develop:** Council could consider developing the property, in consultation with the community, either directly or through ChristchurchNZ's urban development staff. This is likely to carry significant financial risk (i.e. the revenue gained may be less than the cost of developing to the community's needs) and is not Council's core business.
5. **Transfer to the Community:** As the land is not needed for Council purposes but is valued by the community it could be transferred into community ownership. This could be at a less than market price subject to Council having a value claw back mechanism to recover the capital value of the land should the community decide to dispose or develop it.
6. **Withdraw from process and undertake a targeted consultation process:** the local community has indicated a desire for specific targeted consultation on the specific property in addition to the wider approach taken for the whole portfolio. Given the level and variety of interest this is considered desirable. With this option Council could test community views and gain more information about what the community want.

### Recommendation

Based on there being no current or proposed Council use for the site, its current poor financial performance, the ability for the values of the site to be protected through other mechanisms, and a strong desire expressed by the community that the property should not be used for the purposes it was originally acquired and for which it is currently held, staff advice is that the property should be declared surplus and sold.

Notwithstanding this, implementing such a decision is likely to be difficult and risky. Taking a pragmatic perspective, it is recommended that:

1. Council defer making a decision about the properties at 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue Diamond Harbour until a targeted consultation process can be undertaken to gather additional information to support the material gathered through the LTP consultation process.
2. Council creates a project in the first year of the Long Term Plan 2021-22 Annual Plan and set aside a budget of \$65,000 for this purpose. The budget would be used for relevant studies to support the consultation and to cover staff time for project funded staff.
3. That the options including disposal, retention as a park, residential development and community asset transfer be included in the targeted consultation
4. To ensure that final decisions can be made in the context of Council's financial planning process, this matter be reported back to Council for a final decision as part of the 2022/23 annual plan process.

## Support

### 1259

with regards to the disposal of land on Hunters Road Diamond Harbour: provided there is reserves protected in the covenants and there is space put aside for future expansion of the Diamond Harbour School I support the selling of this land for future residential developement. Many clubs and groups over here could do with the increase of members to improve viability, and the flow on effect for local businesses and employment opportunities would be positive. Yes, i have a vested interest here but i truly believe in this last bit of final growth for this community size.

### 1565

Very happy for the disposal of the land in Diamond Harbour. Hunters Road, Waipapa etc

Will be great to see our community grow and flourish

>>>

Diamond Harbour School really needs better signage on Marine Drive especially with the new development going in

### 1955

I support the disposal of the land at Hunters Road in Diamond Harbour, on the condition that the gullies and school track are made into reserves and protected for public use and enjoyment. I only support this provided the land remain zoned residential, although I would like to see some of the land be required to have

smaller section sizes than currently allowed in DH so that retirement/easy care properties can be constructed. Community consultation must be sought in any development. A commitment by council to improving our roads and three-waters network must be made prior to increasing the population of the area and over taxing an already struggling network.

## Oppose

### 235

I would like to register my disapproval of the plan to dispose of the following property: 27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++ This is a large area of land that is used frequently by many residents of Diamond Harbour. Locals have spent a considerable amount of time replanting and installing footpaths for the benefit of the community. I am led to believe that if this land is disposed of in the way you are proposing, it will remove the ability of residents to have any meaningful input into its development. This is totally unreasonable bearing in mind the location of the land within this special community. I don't have objections to the development of the land, but it must be done with meaningful input from the many residents that will be impacted by such development.

### 236

I am writing in relation to the proposal to dispose of the land as described as 27 Hunters Road, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1DP14050 ++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres. I request that this land be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal. Further consultation with the community should be taken and proper consideration given as to the future of this land. Many locals in Diamond Harbour tend native vegetation on this land. They have built and continue to maintain walking tracks for the benefit of all Diamond Harbour residents. The land at present is an asset to the community, much of it being a beautiful and peaceful place of recreation. Again I urge you to involve the community in further consultation and remove the land from fast track disposal. Thank you.

### 237

I am writing in relation the disposal of the land in the Diamond Harbour area. I have lived in DHB (and indeed live adjacent to the poposed lot) for the past 30 years. It has always been a peaceful sleepy village with a rural feel. Recently (in the past couple of years) some of the locals have been very busy planting natives and constructing walking tracks in the very area proposed for sale. These tracks are incredibly well regarded and utilised. Please I urge you to consult with the local community before the disposal of this most loved and great natural asset of our community.

**238**

I would like to request public consultation for changes in land use

**243**

PLEASE PLEASE don't make beautiful paddocks in Diamond Harbour available for greedy development. This area is unsuitable for housing for many reasons. I look at these paddocks from my home (its my main view) and i witness SO MANY locals enjoying the natural open space as they walk/run/dog walk around and through the green space. Diamond Harbour has limited features such as this to access, and its the wrong place to encourage people to reside. Private vehicle useage to drive to the city is selfish and near-sighted behaviour (I've arranged my life to drive in every 10 days or so) Shouldn't we dissuade this activity?

A simple, quiet life is the conscious choice of most residents here. We already lack a communal gathering place (eg decent, large cafe/pub). Please don't allow further reduction of our quality of living.

**244**

No house building on land outlined in this proposal. Much prefer a reserve as tracks have been made over time for children to walk to school. Very community driven walking track construction and planting has taken place and I strongly disagree with the land outlined being used for residential development.

**250**

I would like the land known as 27 Hunters Rd, Diamond Harbour to be removed from the LTP and instead disposed off following consultation with the community board. My primary concern is the loss of "Sams" and "Morgans" gullies. These sites are being extensively reforested with native vegetation and my understanding is they will one day become reserves. As an active member of the reforestation group, and a proud father who enjoys walking the tracks with my boys I would hate to see all the good work go to waste only for a few houses to be built. I have no problem with the sale of the flat useable land for residential building, just not the reforested gullies.

**261**

i am generally happy with the proposals however not with the sale of land without the usual consultation process in Diamond harbour. The land in two local gullies is being looked after by locals - regenerating native trees. The land is steep and rugged and not suitable for development so should be gifted to the community to continue to look after for generations to come. The paths are used by local kids to

get to school and to play on. They are also an added attraction to visitors to the area and are safer than the cliff tracks.

## 272

---

I am writing to you in regards to the disposal of council land in Diamond Harbour, 27 Hunters Rd., Vacant land, Pt Lot 1 DP 14050++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres). I ask it to be removed from the LTP and from fast track disposal. The normal process for disposal of land, that would require Community Board and public consultation should be used instead. The property has special environmental values that can be only protected by public ownership. For many years local volunteers have planted and cared for native plants in parts of the property. The volunteers's group "Friends of Morgan's and Sam's Gullies" even has been awarded in this years Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board Awards for their committed and meticulous work. What an affront to sell this land without proper public notification!! There is an 'immediate identified public use' to combat climate change and the council wants to destroy best intentions and the volunteer work of many years. I ask again to take the land mentioned above to remove it from the list of disposable land and let it go through the proper public channels.

## 273

---

The Council property section are trying to fast track disposal of this land, and avoid meaningful public consultation by inserting the disposal into the Long Term Plan. This is a submission to the LTP on this, requesting that the land as described as (27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres), be removed from the LTP and from fast track disposal. The normal process for disposal of land, that would require Community Board and public consultation, should be used instead. Deforestation of Diamond harbour land meant the destruction of important ecosystem services and renewable resources, and the reduction of carbon sinks. However, this destruction can be slowed, stopped, and in some cases even reversed. Here in Diamond harbour a large bunch of volunteers have been planting out the gullies in Diamond Harbour and particularly Hunters Road Gully. We move regularly amongst these gullies planting a huge range of native trees that are unique to the Diamond harbour region. We spend weeks over the warmer months watering the plants we all lovingly care for. From young plants to the point where they will hold their own is about three years. When we plants these natives we have a commitment to keep the weed down around and trees that we plant and ensure they receive adequate water. Many of us have purchased huge lengths of hose that are connected to our own house water supply to ensure the survival of the native trees we planted. We want to establish these native forests to encourage the return of all the fauna that is unique to this region. We already have a flourishing bird population thanks to the existing native vegetation that is not limited to the following birds; chaffinch, yellowhammer, greenfinch, goldfinch, starling, house sparrow, Californian quail, rock pigeon, white-backed

magpie, blackbird, song thrush, skylark, mallard and pheasant. But there are lots of native birds too: bellbird, tūī, brown creeper (pīpī), tomtit, rifleman, kererū (NZ pigeon), grey warbler, fantail, silvereye, morepork, shining cuckoo, kingfisher, paradise shelduck, grey duck, pipit, welcome swallow and spur-winged plover. It is so important to protect these very valuable native forests to ensure we rebuild the previous ecosystems that we destroyed in the past. Help us to retain these young ecosystems so that our children can enjoy them into the future.

285

I am submitting on the inclusion of 27 Hunters Rd Diamond Harbour in the list of potential sale land. I strongly object to the sale to private developers or buyers. 1. It would be contrary to the current nature of the area. A past attempt at a subdivision misjudged the community by trying to install a gated community. 2. The roads and infrastructure are insufficient to cope with a lot more houses. 3. The community has spent hundreds of volunteer hours ( with support of council) planting and enhancing the natural environment of the gullies and built tracks for healthy walking. Although we are assured these would be covenanted there are other areas where planting could be extended and help meet the Councils Climate Change challenges.

Instead I propose the CCC continues to hold the land which is a unique opportunity to provide appropriate, cost effective, and community focussed development. The saddest thing for residents is to have to leave Diamond Harbour because their family home and section is too large, steep or unmanageable. Many single people live in houses that have become too big. Part of this land could be used for varied size homes sold or leased to the residents by CCC thus bringing money just as the sale to a developer would do. Community involvement would ensure that the rural village environment would be maintained. A developer is more likely to put up 6 ft. wooden fences enclosing sections before any houses appear. This is what we saw near Hallswell this week. I am sure there are councillors able to see that new ways of living are demanded by changing challenges. I have had 25 years experience living in a housing community of six families sharing gardens and grounds but maintaining independent homes. Unlike sub division houses a complex for retired people would be more able to meet needs in the local area from the new shopping complex rather than travelling to the city for work.

Tuesday, 30 March 2021

298

Re No 27 Hunters Road proposed sale of land and potential sub-division: I do not support the sale of this piece of land for subdivision purposes at this current time. Many of us who live in this area of the peninsula came here for the semi-rural nature of the environment and the close knit nature of the community. Neither will be



enhanced by a subdivision of this size. Currently there are plots of land that have been on the market for a number of years and are yet to be sold so this large parcel of land is not required at the present time.

The infrastructure of the community would be put under pressure with such a large development. The roads, the ferry service, the sewage system and school are not suitable for a large increase in population. I support the Christchurch City Council maintaining ownership of the land in the medium to long term. I also strongly endorse the Council's protection and enhancement of the gullies in the area, with native planting and pathways.

299

---

I submit that the land described as (27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 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. The gullies included with the land in question are in the process of being ecologically restored by local volunteers - a process that has been underway for about 7 years now and has involved many hours of volunteer time with thousands of trees planted and nurtured to independence. The tracks in the gullies (built by local volunteer efforts) are popular with Diamond Harbour walkers and provide a valuable recreational resource for locals and visitors. Prior to the involvement of the community the gullies were weed infested wasteland ignored and neglected by council. The LTP's disrespectful lack of acknowledgement of the community work undertaken is very disappointing.

Thursday, 01 April 2021

346

---

With regard to 27 Hunters Road, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++ 12F/538, 390222 sq meters.

This large piece of land is slate for fast track disposal in the LTP.

It would be wholly irresponsible of the council to to dispose of this land and zero foresight is demonstrated by the council. The suggestion is that this would likely be subdivided with potential for a possible 1000 new dwellings (approx doubling of current population. Prior to sale significant upgrades to local infrastructure would be needed. It would be very short-sighted for the council not to put sufficient funding into massive infrastructure overhauls prior to sale. This is not the responsibility of the developers - it is the responsibility of council.

The following would be minimum requirements:

1) The roading access is already appalling and not suited to further traffic from cashmere right through to Diamond Harbour. Another 1000 vehicles per day would

stress an already over-stressed infrastructure. The road is not wide enough from Cashmere right through to Purau. It is very windy, does not cater for safety of all road users (predominantly cyclists in danger who are regular users) and is a patchwork of repairs from under-runners and subsidence. The road will need rerouting or will need to be raised in elevation in multiple areas as it is prone to flooding during periods of high rainfall (Charteris bay, Teddington specifically) and future sea-level rises will require new roading solutions as many areas are close to sea-level at current high-tide marks.

2) There is a lack of provision for public transport. A potential doubling of the Diamond Harbour population would require substantial upgrading of the ferry service and bus access to the city (the most efficient and best way to get to the city). At peak times the ferry is already over-subscribed and ferry operators regularly make multiple unscheduled trips to move people across the harbour. Bus and ferry timetables often do not coincide making public transport loathsome to use during peak periods. At minimum buses and ferries must run on 20 minute intervals between 6-8.30am and 4.30-8pm with low transit times between modes built in to get people off the road and onto buses. Later ferry options must be offered on Friday and Saturday evenings. The wharf area in Diamond harbour and Lyttleton must be improved to cater for increased use. Consideration of light trains on current rails from Lyttleton to city would be an advantage to keep transport on time. Further provisions would be required for bicycle users with bus-cycle transport racks already at maximum capacity and patrons having to wait for the next bus so they can transport bicycles through the Lyttleton tunnel to the city. 30 minute waits for buses because bikes cannot be transported is infuriating.

3) The sewerage systems and water systems are already at capacity. New piping and capacity would be required across the harbour and the pumping stations likely need upgrading.

4) Pedestrian infrastructure requires major upgrades with narrow footpaths requiring widening and footpaths actually provided in places where they are absent.

5) Local schooling and education would need expansion with further provision for access to high-schools required (Cashmere high-school is already struggling to keep their role down and extra students from Diamond Harbour would not be helpful).

6) Electrical supply infrastructure would need upgrading and the security/resilience of the system improved.

7) Provision for increased capacity for other important services would need to be considered - doctors, dentists, fire and emergency, pharmacy etc.

8) Parks and reserves (of which some lie within the boundaries of the land to be sold) have been put in and maintained by locals. These must be protected as they provide significant public amenity and significant local investment must be respected.

9) Telecommunications would require significant upgrades (internet is appalling, cellphone reception very patchy for some areas).

In summary, the proposal for selling this particular tract of land is premature and council must address the significant infrastructure issues prior to sale. To sell the land without upgrading access and all other points mentioned above completely lacks long-term vision. It would be irresponsible and ill considered specifically in light of future climate impacts and sustainability issues for moving population around the city without the need for automobiles.

### 364

---

I request that the land parcel described as 27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot DP14050 etc, 390,222 m2 be removed from the Long Term Plan and fast track disposal. The normal process for disposal of land that would require Community Board and public consultation, should be used instead. There are many community connections with this land, it is very important to the community that the community takes a full part in any proposed disposal process.

>>>

Re: Proposal to dispose of 42 Whero Ave, Diamond Harbour.

There are several issues regarding potential disposal of this land that should involve community consultation, so fast-track disposal through the Long Term Plan is not appropriate.

Issues include:

- protection of the gullies;
- future of the walking tracks (which provide safe off-road access to the school for children) through this land;
- possibilities of land uses other than housing on this land;

Therefore I ask that the normal process for disposal of land that would require Community Board and public consultation be used.

### 365

---

This submission is specifically focussed on the Hunters Road fast-track proposal in Diamond Harbour

This process is unfinished and incorrectly driven. The public are not adequately consulted. The detail of this section is buried so deep in the plan that many folk would miss out on learning about the detail.

The council should do a proper consultation process with the Community Board first followed by the public. The process requires seriously further thought and strategy.

It should be thinking about:

1. Covenant should be placed on Sam's Gully and Morgan's Gully to protect our recently planted native trees. We need a covenant controller.
  2. Noise pollution will be an issue for many households living in this area. It's a rural setting and the main reason why people move to Diamond Harbour and the Banks Peninsula. This should not be developed into more residential sections. We do not require a Rolleston or Lincoln situation.
  3. Currently there are working schemes to get native birds back in the area. Should residential development ever be the decision, our gullies, native birds and environmental projects will all be without success.
  4. The infrastructure requires further thought. Where will the new roads go in and out for any further development? It needs a very careful well thought out plan to avoid disturbance to current dwellings and households, foot traffic etc. The boundaries are drawn all over the place with no consideration of where this infrastructure is going to go. The boundaries are placed directly over tracks and foot traffic areas.
  5. The public should know more about the subdivision process and how the council manages the walking access and easements.
- Think of ways how the whole area can be used to the advantage of the people who live here - perhaps make it a reserve with the help of DoC, Environment Canterbury, philanthropists, grants etc.
- Perhaps extend the school, build a small retirement facility instead coupled with having a good size reserve area.
- Fast-tracking this area will be a HUGE mistake and will create problems in many ways in the long term.

Wednesday, 07 April 2021

368

---

It is vitally important that the community has a say in what happens to the land described as 27 Hunters Road, Vacant Land, Pt Lot DP14050. It should be removed from the LTP

372

---

I do not support the un-notified and quick disposal proposal of 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue. This needs to involve consultation with the local community. Disposal of the land for development should not be advanced without proper consideration for infrastructure including roading, water, sewage, schooling, transport etc. Some of this land has already been developed by the Community as reserves and should be gifted to the community for reserve use.

379

---

Regarding 27 Hunters Rd and 42 Whero Avenue. I am rejecting these land sales. I am asking that normal land disposal processes are used including full community consultation and community board input. Also, the locals have put a lot of work into the planting of the gullies included in these sales.

**385**

---

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.

**390**

---

I am writing in regard to the proposed disposal of the land at 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour and 27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour. I reject these land sales as stated and ask that the normal land disposal processes are used, including full community consultation and community board input. We live directly next door to the land at 42 Whero Ave. and use 'Pete's track' (which crosses through both of the land sites-Whero Ave and Hunter's Road) every day for walking our dog and for a safe 'off road', short route for our 5 and 7 year old kids to get to and from school. My kids and myself have put a considerable amount of work into helping to spread gravel onto the track and plant and water native trees along the track. It is critical that the track remains open for public use and for children to get to and from school safely. It would also be ideal for Sam's and Morgan's gullies to be turned into a reserve for the community to enjoy. In addition it is in the community's best interest to have a say in the boundaries, road access for subdivision development and land for school growth. Please consider our submission closely in your plan.

**395**

---

I would like to see the land up the back of diamond harbour (between Bayview rd and Whero ave not subdivide and made into a reserve for the next generation.

**402 [1.1 Residential Rates]**

---

Please don't sell off land in Diamond Harbour without placing covenants on our planted natives and protecting our children's walking track. Surely the millions you get from selling the land will cover any rates increase.

**414**

Regarding 27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres. This property must be removed from the 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. In terms of infrastructure, the Diamond Harbour area is at capacity, if not beyond it, e.g., water, sewage, roads (the roads in the whole area are shockingly bad), therefore no new residential developments should be allowed until the entire infrastructure is significantly upgraded!!! To solve the problem of housing shortage, building multistory apartment buildings in Christchurch would be a much better solution.

449

The CC need to consult (i.e. publicly notify) all development and land sale

>>>

It is an understatement to call the proposed sale of properties small - if you include all the land to be sold small. In particular: sale of land in 42 Whero Ave Diamond Harbour - and the sale of land 27 Hunters road. The sale of this land will significantly change the character of the community if it is to be developed. It will affect the following: - water/drainage/sewerage is currently at capacity with regular problem - a large housing development would strain the systems and increase the danger of pollution of the harbour if there were to be overflows. - The current road is very delicate and would not cope with further traffic increases. - The school would need expanding While some of these costs can arguably be sheathed home to government, the sale of the land and the consequent development would generate as many costs to the CCC as the sale benefits would create.

>>>

The overall aim of this submission is to reject the sale of land on 42 Whero/27 Hunters Road in Diamond Harbour on the ground that it would fundamentally change the character of an otherwise settled community. If the council was to propose the sale they must use the normal land disposal process including community consultation and Community Board input.

493

These 2 plots have been earmarked for disposal without public consultation prior. I would propose you ditch the fast track disposal and have proper community consultation with our small community as there will be many far reaching changes to our way of life. Also our stretched infrastructure will not manage further strain on the sewerage system, roading and quiet pace of life. We live in the Harbour for a reason, its not suburbia and we do need to have our say.

496

Hunters Road , Diamond Harbour Record of title CB12F/538 Lots 1 and 7 DB14050 I would like to propose you stop the fast track with no community consultation on

these plots. We should have full disclosure and proper consultation with our close community prior to disposal of these plots. Due to the nature of our community and possible biodiversity issues around this development and irreversible changes to a small community and its way of life. Not to mention the stress on our already failing infrastructure. thank you

**497**

---

I would like to raise an objection to the fast track disposal of the plots on Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour Lots 1 and 7 DP 14050 Title recorded as CB12F/538 I propose you hold full and proper community consultation to hear community concerns regarding our aged infrastructure, caviats around the impressive pathways created by locals for locals and visitors, alongside the dynamic changes this would bring to a small community. Protection of our biodiversity is also a major concern. This is life changing for our small community, we need to be heard. Thank you

**498**

---

Regarding the land listed as 27 Hunters Road PT LOT 1 DP 14050++ and 42 Whero Ave LOT 1 DP 9607++. I oppose the proposal to dispose of these properties and request that they are permanently protected in a Conservation Covenant and become reserves. I request that the land be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal. This land has special environmental value with extensive planting of native trees carried out over the past few years. These plantings, while done by volunteers, contribute to the council's commitments to climate change and carbon reduction policies. The land also includes numerous public access walking tracks including a walking track to Diamond Harbour School. The track to the school provides safe and off the road access for children encouraging exercise and carbon-neutral transport to school. Part of this land is subject to a grazing licence which helps to keep farming jobs in the local community. This land, if partially planted, would link the plantings in Sams and Morgans Gullies further increasing the environmental benefit of the existing plantings. The land also provides clear views to the surrounding hills and harbour which contribute to feelings of wellbeing and stress relief of residents using the walking tracks. Developing this land for housing will negatively affect the mental health of the local community. Does the property have special cultural, heritage or environmental values that can only be protected through public ownership?

**509**

---

Land needs to be disposed by the normal method, with FULL CONSULTATION with the local community etc.



Friday, 09 April 2021

539

### **Potential Disposal of Council-owned Surplus Properties, here 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue**

The Council has notified in its draft Long-term Plan (LTP) that it may dispose of the land between the current Diamond Harbour housing area and Bay View Road, without further consultation (other than LTP submissions). The land in excess of 40ha contains Morgan's and Sam's gullies as well as the school track. Many local volunteers have spent time building and improving the tracks and restoring native vegetation. The gullies have not yet been protected by covenants (long-term they should become reserves).

The Diamond Harbour Community Association (DHCA) asks the Council to remove the 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue properties from the list of surplus properties. DHCA is of the opinion that the LTP is not the appropriate planning framework for the decision as to retain or dispose of the properties.

DHCA welcomes the assurance from Councillor Andrew Turner that the covenanting project that is currently under way for the protection of ecologically significant areas on the properties will be completed before any decision on the future of the properties is made. However, the protection of the re-planted gullies and the walking tracks is not the main reason why DHCA rejects the proposed process. Due to the size and current zoning of the two properties a potential sale would have a significant impact on the Diamond Harbour Community and on the supporting infrastructure.

The 2018 census show that around 1500 people live in the community and that there are about 700 occupied dwellings. The two properties are zoned residential, which means that a housing development is a permitted activity and the community would not need to be consulted in relation to any subdivision application. Even if a portion of the area is covenanted, the

remaining size of the properties has the potential to increase the number of houses and residents in the Diamond Harbour by about 30%.

A large scale residential subdivision like this has the potential to change the character and amenity values of Diamond Harbour and it is our view that this requires both adequate consultation of the affected community as well as in-depth infrastructure planning.

The quality and reliability of the network infrastructure in Diamond Harbour is currently far behind the standard maintained in the urban areas of Christchurch. After the 2011 earthquake the Council established that the networked infrastructure in Diamond Harbour is generally based on a single conduit, making its susceptible to failure.

Even if the development contribution for newly built dwellings increases significantly, it is more than likely that the infrastructure cannot keep up with the additional load without Council making significant capital investments.

If 27 Hunter Road and 42 Whero Avenue properties are sold as a potential outcome of the LTP process then there is no mandate for community participation in the planning and implementation of a likely large scale subdivision. We believe that this would be in violation of the principles of consultation as laid out in section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.

545



1. Regarding the potential disposal of Council owned properties:

- 27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour      PT LOT 1 DP 14050 and LOT 7 DP 14050  
Title ref. CB12F/538, 38.9654ha
- 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour      LOTS 1-5, 56-62 and 69 DP 9607  
Title ref. CB452/50, 1.1825ha

These 2 parcels of land should be withdrawn from the "Potential Disposal of Council owned properties" list in the Long Term Plan. A number of matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving the Community Board and community input, such as:

- Designation for further expansion of Diamond Harbour School (as the school roll would increase with additional housing) and already there is inadequate room for locating additional facilities, and for safe bus and car manoeuvring for the shared school and Kidsfirst Early Childhood centre carpark. This submission will also be forwarded to Banks Peninsula MP Tracey McLellan with request to lobby for the Ministry of Education to purchase/acquire land from the CCC for futureproofing the School and ECE centre, before any land disposal proceeds (normal or fast-tracked).
- Protection of Morgans and Sams Gullies and the extensive planting that has taken place to date with CCC, ECan and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour support.
- Designation of easements for the "School Track", and its connecting network, that are within these parcels. The School Track is the primary pedestrian access (and safest access) for children walking to school from the wider neighbourhood.
- Upgrading existing infrastructure is critical. The existing sewerage system is old, it leaks, and pipes break regularly releasing sewerage across walking tracks and to the beach. How would this system cope with more housing?

## 601

"small number of properties"? DH Hunters land is by far the largest block of land, not comparable with ANY of other blocks!! . 36ha! this size of a parcel should NOT just given away under the hand, we are not in Mexico!! 3.4 million rated, which potentially could make a developer 10million ? This is a large scale story which is not just a back section in town!! We are asking for a proper consultation with our community. This 'disposal' to a developer has a huge effect on our living quality over here. First and foremost the only long gravel road used by dog walkers, joggers, horse riders etc, will be get hard surface and within one moment we will have car speeders on this road, as seen on the other half of Bay View road. it is UNSAFE for young girls riding their horses..we chose to live out here because we have this rural feel and won't become a Lincoln /Halswell rabbit /chicken coop subdivision! Please we are asking for changes ONLY made after consultation. Our gully group, our local pest trapping groups, our many community groups deserving consultation, after putting years of dedication into our community and making it a good place to live. I don't say no to development, but not THIS way. WALKING TRACKS MUST HAVE PRIORITIES, THIS IS A SAFE COMMUNITY, NOT A PLACE FOR

BOY RACERS, AS SEEN CLOSE BY DO NOT SELL THIS LAND BEFORE APPROACHING OUR VERY EDUCATED, INFORMED COMMUNITY!

>>>

I have written a letter to CCC a few years ago, regarding hard surfacing Bay View Road. Claudia Reid at the time has answered me politely and promised to always keep me informed if and when CCC would hard surface parts of Bay view Road. Unfortunately this is now obviously not the case anymore. A couple of years ago, CCC surfaced around 50m at 400 bay View, without any notifications. Afterwards they put a counter onto the road, at last houses of the road, to see the numbers of traffic. again this spot is not representing how many cars are using the gravel road. whenever the road workers working on the gravel road, once or twice a year, just afterwards we find ourselves , as dog walkers, to run for life, even in the dark at 6am, because some idiots are taking short cut over to Hunters road. Until the road gets worse again and they have to drive carefully and many give up to take this road, safe again for horse riders, joggers and nature lovers. so please take this into account when making long term decisions out here. we are not Hagley park, not Redcliffs etc community. Thanks for carefully thinking this process through. ps I would appreciate if you find the letter sent to me, and reinstall the promise to inform me when you change surface of Bayview road.

### 603

---

I wish to request that the land as described as 27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050 + Lot 7 DP 140505 and 42 Whero Ave., Lots 1-5, 56-62 & 69 DP9607 be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal and that public community consultation should be undertaken. Fast tracked disposal would bypass consideration for gully protection, boundaries, road access, school development, walking tracks, infrastructure and other local interests. This is unacceptable to the Harbour community.

### 604

---

I reject the following properties for the fast track disposal and request these are removed from the LTP so that they can be given proper community consultation. This refers to 27 Hunters Road PT LOT 1 DP 14050++ and 42 Whero Avenue LOT 1 DP 9607++. The reasons for this request include:

- The importance of the land to the community
  - Parts of the land have been utilized for walking tracks providing great use to the local and tourist public.
  - Locals have invested a lot of time planting natives on these properties to grow the native bush.
  - The land is regularly used by horse riders in the area (it is really hard to find good horse riding in diamond harbour)

- The land is home to many native birds e.g. Kereru
- The infrastructure e.g. roading, is not adequate to support a big influx in residents from a further subdivision in the area. Diamond Harbour is already experiencing an influx in permanent residents as baches are being converted to permanent homes. Higher traffic volumes are not suitable for the current road conditions.

## 606

---

Referring to the fast track disposal of council land in Banks Peninsula Diamond Harbour, I would like to reject this decision.

This refers to 27 Hunters Road PT LOT 1 DP 14050++ and 42 Whero Avenue LOT 1 DP 9607++.

The Diamond Harbour community is a very collaborative one and therefore must be given the opportunity to discuss and deliberate what is being done to the land in which they frequent.

The above property must be carefully considered and discussed with the local community as it is currently offering well used and locally maintained natural amenities such:

- nature walks, exercise paths
  - community native tree planting and maintenance
  - dog walks,
  - horse riding which is difficult to find in this area
  - natural Sanctuary for various bird and animal life such as the Kereru
  - also a home for the NZ Falcon or Karearea which is a near threatened species
- These paths also offer tourist attractions that are coupled with the ferry and bus routes to create a "day out" type activity that is welcomed by the local community. Additionally due to Diamond Harbours relative remoteness, the infrastructure is not capable of taking an influx of residential housing as compared to Rolleston due to the difficulty and cost of upgrading infrastructure here over Dyers Pass or from Lyttleton.

There are no direct buses here as of yet which will only add to the road usage as many people will find the long drive constantly tiring. The only other option is the ferry which can get full quickly.

An increase in residential activity will mean running more ferry services or investing in a single larger ferry.

Additionally there are currently many old run down baches and properties that would be better to upgrade first before adding new property that would very likely have less sqm area per plot than what exists here currently leading to a city like way of life in a remote and spacious wider context ill suited for such cramped developments.

**614**

Please take the area of land at 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour Lots 1-5,56-62 and DP 9607 out of the proposed LTP so public consultation can take place.

**616**

Please take the area of land at 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour Lots 1-5,56-62 and DP 9607 out of the proposed LTP so public consultation can take place.

**644**

There are two properties 27 Hunters Road, & 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour I would like removed from the long term plan's list of properties to dispose of. I am not against a sale in principle but would like the sale to go through due consultation with the community and to ensure that the gullies that have had a lot of planting and weed clearing done, become conservation reserves and the school track is protected before the exact area to be sold is finalised. There may also be an interest from the Department of Education, to have some areas set aside for future school development & expansion. I believe that only by letting this disposal go to through the full consultation process, will all the communities needs or requirements be considered before a decision is made on what areas will be sold.

**645**

Disposal of 42 Whero Avenue and 27 Hunters Road in Diamond Harbour must follow normal land disposal processes including full community consultation and Community Board input

**655**

I do not want the fast track disposal of land between Diamond Harbour and Bayview Road without public consultation.

**662**

I reject the proposal for the fast tracked land sales of both 27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour and 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour. I ask that normal land disposal processes are used including FULL community consultation and Community Board Input.

I ask that this fast track disposal be rejected and that proper community consultation should be undertaken. That would consider gully protection, boundaries, road access, school development, walking tracks, infrastructure and other local interests. If the land sells now, there will be no further consultation and subdivision can proceed without community input.

On a personal note both of my children, like many here, walk to school using the school track. This is far safer than them walking on the incredibly narrow and frankly dangerous footpath alongside Marine Parade. If this is community track is lost to developers it would be a terrible travesty.

**675**

---

I oppose the sale of the land. The infrastructure of Diamond Harbour cannot support development on this scale.

We come to Diamond Harbour for the semi rural space, the walking etc.

Thousands of hours of voluntary time has been given to Morgans and Sams gullies and have been promised that these will be covenanted so they cannot be built on. If the school has to expand in the future, some of Hunters Road land would be needed for this purpose.

No more possibilities for developers coming and imposing their plans for this very special place please

**Tuesday, 13 April 2021**

**751**

---

Im requesting that the land described as 27Hunters Rd(record of title CB12F/538,38ha, and 42Whero ave (0record of title CB452 /50,1-18ha be removed from the LTP fast track disposall. The normal process for disposal of land that would require community Board and public consultation, should be used instead.

The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the potential disposal of council land in the LTP for the following reasons A The current process does not meet the requirements of Section 82 f the local government Act 2002, principles of consultation. B Thorough community consultation to determine the best future use of the land. C Decisions on the sale of the land should not be made only by council staff, without community board recommendation. D Boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal to protect existing walking tracks, ie the School track and the Mt Herbet in Morgans an Sams gullies. In addition extensive replanting of native vegetation has been undertaken by by community members

**752**

---

I request that the land described as 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue 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.

758

The properties in Diamond Harbour that are listed for disposal '27 Hunters Rd' and '42 Whero Avenue' must not be disposed of without full community consultation and discussion. If these properties are sold to developers it will significantly change the community, the infrastructure is not in place to support developments of this size without major improvements to infrastructure including roading and wastewater. There are still a large number of vacant sections in various subdivisions in Diamond Harbour, and there is no need to add more.

788

Proposed disposal of 27 Hunters Rd and 42 Whero Ave, Diamond Harbour. Both these areas should be removed from the City Councils LTP and fast track process.

Instead they should be treated to the normal process for disposal of land that requires Community Board and public consultation. Fast track disposal as advocated in the LTP doesn't adequately met the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.

The land is currently zoned as residential, but there are many issues that need to be considered before it is disposed of. The Black Point development is an example of what happens without proper community consultation- there is no beach reserve or easy access.

Sam's and Morgans' Gullies, which are adjacent to the land, have been extensively replanted by local volunteers as well as council staff and need need to be protected by covenants before not after disposal of land.

Consideration needs to be given to the impact on the local school roll by any future development and the likely need for more classrooms and grounds to accommodate this.

A gradual, staged disposal would better enable a smooth process of development and integration into the existing, relatively small community.

Community consultation is likely to encourage more variety in the use of the land; there is a strong local interest in council owned housing for older residents, for example.

The impact on existing aging and, in some places, inadequate drainage and roading must be considered and who will pay for them needs to be considered before not after disposal.

Diamond Harbour and the neighbouring Church Bay and Charteris Bay comprise a community, who value the natural beauty and relative isolation of where they live. The culture of this place has been built up gradually over the years with a strong local flavour. This needs to be respected and made to thrive in any future disposal of the land in question.

546

---

The Council has notified in its draft Long-term Plan that it intends to dispose of the land between the current Diamond Harbour housing and Bay View Road.

The land described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) should be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal. The normal process for disposal of land that requires Community Board and public consultation, should be used instead.

There are many issues that the community need to discuss with the Council and the Community Board before the land is sold e.g. the uses of the land, the gullies, disposal sequencing and access.

The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan.

936

---

Long-term Plan of CCC concerning land disposal of 27 Hunters Rd & 42 Whero Ave.

As a recent resident of Diamond Harbour and a rate payer I am concerned that the council is proposing to fast track the disposal of the above land without consultation of the residents in whom it will affect. Should not democracy be maintained with the consultation of the community board and public consultation. I am totally against the council disposing of any of this land without this procedure.

The community has invested many man hours and dollars in plantings and beautifying the area, if the council run rough shod over the community board and just sell it what is to happen with this effort. Protection of gullies has to be decided along with future road access, infrastructure and upgrades. All this requires consultation with the people who live here.

Proper consultation is required so please remove the above properties from the LTP and fast track disposal.

979

---

I, Angela Boer, hereby strongly request the Christchurch City Council to remove the land in Diamond Harbour described as 27 Hunters Rd -Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++,12F/538, 390,222 sq metres- from the current Long Term Plan.

I am of the opinion that, only by public consultation of the community and liaison with the DH Community Board, a fair and democratic process would be used for the disposal of surplus land.

I would like the CCC to keep in account the immense efforts the locals (all volunteers) have made to restore the vegetation in Sams and Morgan gullies by planting hundreds/thousands of native trees and shrubs. Also to have a good look at the many natural walking tracks, they have build through and along these gullies, creating safe tracks for school kids to walk to and from school, and adding huge recreational value for all DH residents and day visitors! NB we do not have any park of significance where we can go for a longer walk!

Keeping climate change in mind and being aware of all the different bush/shrub fires we've have endured on the Port Hills/Christchurch over the last 5 years, I think that we need to have left a safe empty larger area in Diamond Harbour, where we could flea to in case of a huge bush/shrub fire! In fact we do not have many open spaces where we could evacuate to in an event of a big fire.

in my eyes it is clear that disposing of this surplus land is NOT so cotton-dry! There are many valid reasons, like eg the ones I mentioned above, to require Community Board and the public consultation.

Please, do not surpass the residents of Diamond Harbour Community!

### 1075

---

I oppose the disposal of the land in Diamond Harbour (Whero Ave./Hunters Road) as I do not believe the current infrastructure can cope with the increased number of houses that this would potentially mean. It is also a much used recreational track.

### 1250

27 Hunters Road Vacant Land. Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, and the adjacent land to the south of Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour.

The Council are trying to fast track the disposal and so avoid a meaningful public consultation by inserting the disposal into LTP.

I wish to make a submission that the normal process of land disposal that requires Community Board and public consultation should be used.

I have the following primary concerns regarding this develop :-

- (1) That multi-storey dwellings will be developed
- (2) That there will be through traffic onto Bayview Rd



- (3) That there will be increased light pollution in a rural area.
- (4) Loss of established native areas.
- (5) Loss of the amenity of the established walkways.

### 1235

Diamond Harbour properties- 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue. Volunteers have spent several years restoring Morgan's and Sam's Gullies with support from CCC Rangers, ECAN and Whaka-ora. We are in the midst of a biodiversity loss emergency. We need to support restoration not hinder it. The disposal of these land parcels should be withdrawn from the Long Term Plan and the normal process for the disposal of land should be used instead, in consultation with the local community. The gullies need to be legally protected and eventually made into reserves.

### 1422

---

Please remove 27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour and 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour. The Diamond Harbour community needs to be fully involved through normal land disposal processes including full community consultation and Board community input. The high number of houses that could be built on this land negatively impacts on this local community along with a wide range of associated issues. Request that these two properties are removed from the LTP and put through the public consultation process.

### 1423

---

The following pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan:

- 27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour (Title Ref: CB12F/538)
- 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour (Title Ref: CB452/50)

Reasons why:

1. The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation). Local residents must be properly consulted given the massive impact this sale could have on them.
2. A thorough community consultation must be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process.

3. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through a normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process:

1. Gully protection. Extensive replanting has been undertaken in Morgan's and Sam's Gully This work has been done by community members, including myself, with the support of the City Council, Environment Canterbury and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for these gullies, but it has not been finalised. The gully by the school is also unsuitable for housing, and should be protected. These covenants must be completed. Furthermore, it is my view that these areas should have reserve status before any sale is considered. This would protect the replanting and ensure continued community usage.
2. The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, at the top end of Ngatea Road there is current usage and access by local residents on Marine Drive.
3. Walking tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas. Access to these tracks must be protected. The main school access walking track from Waipapa Avenue does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.
4. Residents must be consulted with regards to road access to the site. For example, Ngatea Road is narrow with a sharp bend. There is no way it could safely support even a moderate increase in traffic, let alone construction traffic over an extended period.
5. Diamond Harbour's wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay to upgrade the system to cope with the large number of houses that can be built on the land?
6. The road in and out of Diamond Harbour can be dangerous at the best of times. A significant increase in traffic during peak hours would make the situation worse.
7. Should all the land be sold at once? Would a staged housing development be better for the community? Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses, e.g. a new Fire Station?

I sincerely hope the Council will take into account all of the above mentioned points and remove these areas from the list of Council owned properties that could potentially be disposed of in the Long-term Plan.

The following pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan:

27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour (Title Ref: CB12F/538)

42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour (Title Ref: CB452/50)

Reasons why:

1. The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation). Local residents must be properly consulted given the massive impact this sale could have on them.

2. A thorough community consultation must be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how the land should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process.

3. The following matters must be considered if disposal is to proceed through a normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process:

1. Gully protection. Extensive replanting has been undertaken in Morgans and Sams Gully This work has been carried out by community members, including myself, with the support of the City Council, Environment Canterbury and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for these gullies, but it has not been finalised. The gully by the school is also unsuitable for housing, and should be protected. These covenants must be completed. Furthermore, it is my view that these areas should have reserve status before any sale is considered. This would protect the replanting and ensure continued community usage.
2. The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, at the top end of Ngatea Road there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive.
3. Walking tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas. Access to these tracks must be protected. The main school access walking track from Waipapa Avenue does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.
4. Residents must be consulted with regards to road access to the land. For example, Ngatea Road is narrow with a sharp bend. There is also limited visibility of oncoming traffic when turning right into Ngatea Road from Marine Drive. There is no way Ngatea Road could safely support even a moderate increase in traffic, let alone construction traffic over an extended period.

5. Diamond Harbour's wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay to upgrade the system to cope with the large number of houses that can be built on the land?
6. The road in and out of Diamond Harbour can be dangerous at the best of times. A significant increase in traffic during peak hours would make the situation worse.
7. Should all the land be sold at once? Would a staged housing development be better for the community? Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses, e.g. a new Fire Station?

I sincerely hope the Council will take into account all of the above mentioned points and remove these areas from the list of Council owned properties that could potentially be disposed of in the Long-term Plan.

**1466**

---

With regard to the proposed disposal of vacant land adjacent to Diamond Harbour school on Hunters Road. I am strongly against this idea and feel that it would alter the sense of village community that we have enjoyed for many years now in a negative way. Another point of concern should the land be sold and developed would be any future expansion of our growing school and preschool. The community is upset with council handling of the Godley site. The proposed sale and development of this land will be upsetting to many more i feel. There is a reason people move to Diamond Harbour.

**1563**

---

I ask that proper community consultation should be undertaken for this selling of the surplus land holdings in Diamond Harbour, I would like the fast track disposal be rejected. With Community consultation, the following can then be considered; gully protection, boundaries, road access, school development, walking tracks, infrastructure and other local interests. Community input is needed, especially in such a small community where this would have large effects. Please stop disposal of diamond harbour land until proper process can be followed.

Please stop disposal of diamond harbour land until proper process can be followed. Thank you for reviewing my thoughts.

**1513**

---

Disagree with sale of 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue Diamond Harbour.

I understand the council has to make best use of existing investments for the benefit for all and people do need house to live in.

Housing development would require much upgrading of water sewage and roading infrastructure .

This land has wilding pines and much gorse and broom . This has been overplanted by the community with NZ native trees and well looked after by the local people who have set out a watering system and weeded around the plantings which despite drought are doing very well.

A safe walkway has been created through this land for schoolchildren going to and fro from school. This walkway is suitable for the elderly too for exercise and to walk dogs .today we encountered 7 people and two dogs exercising

The vistas from this land are exceptional ...onselling it would deprive visitors from enjoying extensive sea and mountain views. It is a popular destination for visitors from Christchurch and can be easily accessed from the Diamond Harbour ferry terminal as a good family day trip from Christchurch

## 1582

---

My submission concerns the land described as 42 Whero Avenue and 27 Hunters Road. I believe that this land should be removed from the disposal of surplus Council-owned properties plan to allow more consultation with the community. I walk regularly on the tracks through Morgan's and Sam's gullies and several additional tracks connecting to Waipapa Ave, Marine Drive, Ngatai Road and Bayview Road. I note the significant work done by volunteers to plan and nurture native trees and plants. I'm delighted with the increasing bird life that has occurred over the previous two years and the number of families who enjoy walking through the various different tracks and I strongly support these areas being classified as native reserves and being protected by covenants. If the land is sold to a developer without any covenants, there is a risk that these beautiful reserves will be closed in with subdivisions and roads. The community values these spaces and in many residents have moved to Diamond Harbour because they value a quiet and peaceful lifestyle I would not have considered purchasing my property at the end of Whero Avenue if I had known that there could be potential for a large subdivision at the end of the road and a new through road built. Whero Avenue is already too narrow when there is parking on either side and there is no foot path. I strongly recommend that the council delay a decision about the disposal of this land until such time as there can be full community consultation and Community Board input.

## 1584

---

I don't support the sale of land in Diamond Harbour and agree with community representatives that this process should not be part of the Long Term Plan.

(1) Request the land described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) be removed from the LTP and its disposal therein.

Reason: resolving questions concerning this land being surplus to requirements, and preferences for its future use, should be the domain of the Banks Peninsula Community Board (as decision-maker) and by way of public consultation which satisfies the 'Principles of consultation' as described in Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002. The current LTP process is unlikely to satisfy the said Section 82 requirements.

(2) If disposal of this land was to proceed then it is asked that the three gullies which dissect it are conservation covenant protected from development, and are eventually gazetted as reserves.

Reason: land in the gullies is unsuitable for housing development; and, through the Reserves Management Committee much work by the Diamond Harbour community has been undertaken to restore gullies with Banks Peninsula endemic native flora (planting and water irrigation systems) and to provide walking track access including the School Track which traverses from Waipapa Avenue across the said land to the Diamond Harbour School on Hunters Road.

(3) Limit development and protect this land for its food producing value.

Reason: It is ironic that we persist to favour economic growth without limits, when world-wide we must know our numbers and associated activities are imposing massive pressures on space, resources, and other life. To such a degree that we are experiencing symptoms of ourselves as the cause of climate warming, the very high rate of extinction of other species, damages to our waterways, oceans, our current pandemic, etc.

If you have lived here in Diamond Harbour even for a short while, myself for 17.5 years, you would have a strong sense of how it has changed, and most notably since the 2010/11 etc earthquakes, when we came to recognise the consequent (and now Nationally) the need for more housing. And presently we who live in Diamond Harbour are soon to have our own supermarket, and which will require motor car parking space, and thence we will see more motor cars on our roads, and thence the need for wider and better roading within Diamond Harbour and connecting to Christchurch. All these changes in the name of economic progress will make Diamond Harbour, as anywhere, more attractive to people to want to live here. More pressures, and more problems due to growth without limits. So, who seriously does consider our ecological foot-print limits (protecting the life-supporting capacity of air-watersoils-ecosystems), transitioning to some form of

steady state economy (versus the current no limits progressive economy), and becoming more nature-centred versus only nature-friendly.

To take this opportunity to state a perception. While we Homo sapiens urgently need to address this pandemic in the immediate short-term, and climate warming in the near-short term, and other survival concerns, we more seriously, in the short to longer term, need to address the ultimate cause of these symptoms - ourselves). I feel strongly and can present the argument that we urgently need to change how we sense our world and live in it, if we are to survive 'with our humanity goodness intact'. Professor Murray Cox (School of Fundamental Sciences, Massey University) recently said on Radio NZ that in the last 50,000 to 100,000 years (known as the Cognitive Revolution) Homo sapiens has experienced little genetic change.

**1589**

---

In regards to 42 Whero Avenue and 27 Hunters Road - I ask that this fast track disposal be rejected and that proper community consultation be undertaken. That would consider gully protection, boundaries, road access, school development, walking tracks, infrastructure and other local interests.

**1573**

---

I ask that proper community consultation should be undertaken for this selling of the surplus land holdings in Diamond Harbour, I would like the fast track disposal be rejected. With Community consultation, the following can then be considered; gully protection, boundaries, road access, school development, walking tracks, infrastructure and other local interests. Community input is needed, especially in such a small community where this would have large effects. Please stop disposal of diamond harbour land until proper process can be followed.

**1693**

---

However I am strongly opposed to the sale of all parcels of freehold land in Diamond Harbour without CCC first surveying out the gullies and other areas which have been planted and restored by the local community over many years.

There is a strong rhythm of gullies alternating with broad ridges at the toe of the Mt Herbert Ramp landform where Diamond Harbour is located. It is important that the gullies remain as reserve to protect water quality, reduce sediment, provide off-road walking and cycling access to the foreshore and links to other reserves. There is a logical point where the gentle slope of ridgetop changes to steeper slope into gully where natural boundary between residential land and reserve land should be located.

CCC should carry out a landscape assessment to identify the areas on the ridges which are suitable for housing. Only the parts suitable for housing should be sold for residential development. Developers working with the district plan cannot be relied upon to include all the land which should be reserved. Community input is needed, a consultation process.

### 1732

---

I would like to submit my view against the sale of this land for the following reasons:=-

- a) there are serious problems with the infrastructure in Diamond Harbour area - water leakage, sewerage, and poor roading. Development on this land would add to these problems.
- b) housing development on this land would change the aspect of Diamond Harbour that attracts the existing residents - rural, peaceful and community minded.
- c} there is the scope to use this land to benefit the community in the future if it is retained by Council.

### 1734

---

please remove requesting that the land as described as (27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 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.

>>>

please remove 27 Hunters Road, vacant land, plot Dp140550++ from the LTP and fast tracked disposal. Please ensure that it receives the normal process of disposing of land that includes community board and public consultation.

### 1736

---

I oppose the disposal of the above property, without further input from the community and other interested parties.

The block of land is large and borders existing housing. I would think a block this large would accommodate approximately 200 house sites. Although the block was purchased by the previous council for future housing needs, I do not think it was ever anticipated that the block would be disposed off wholesale without any controls/requirements, other than those imposed by the District Plan. A potential increase in this number of residents would have a major impact on the Diamond Harbour community and surrounding areas. The demand on services such as roading and infrastructure would place major immediate and future capital cost on



the Council which would be well beyond the contribution a developer would have to pay to under the development. The fact is the area is rural and not well served in terms of roading (the route from Christchurch is hilly and a not an easy commute), public transport and other infrastructure. There is little prospect of major roading capital works and/or or public transport improvements in the foreseeable future meaning that a major increase in the number of residents will likely result in an increase in daily road users making their way to and from Christchurch. In the current environment this cannot be a desired outcome for a Council and community mindful of a more sustainable future.

Of course there is nothing stopping developer from developing other residential zoned land in the area, as happened at Black Point and Doris Faigan, in accordance with the district plan rules, but here we can do better with Council owned land. I would like to see the land removed from the disposal schedule, with Council staff then required to consider options for the future use of this land and that those options be put to the community for its input.

Although allowing the land to be sold without considering and consulting on options may result in a short terms gain in Council's balance sheet, the, at this stage unconsidered, potential adverse effects and future capital costs to the community and Council may far outweigh any short term financial return.

## 1788

---

I was concerned to hear that Council was proposing to dispose of a property in Diamond Harbour which has gullies where local volunteers have for many years and with Council support, been planting natives. This property needs specific community consultation and it may be that once these conservation areas are secured for the future, that parts of this block could be sold.

## 1901

---

Specifically, I would like to comment on the proposed disposal of 27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour. This property is used continuously by people in the Diamond Harbour community in order to get close to nature and in order to walk safely and peacefully around Diamond Harbour while keeping away from traffic. Therefore if any disposal was to proceed, I believe that it would need to be with the following requirements: A corridor for the school track would need to be retained so that children can get safely to school. The school track stretches from Waipapa Avenue all the way to the school. On the way, people need to walk a short way down Ngatea Road, before continuing on the track. Therefore, if you're confused where the track goes, it goes from Waipapa Avenue (between 1 Te Papa Avenue and 51 Waipapa Avenue) to the top of Ngatea Road (it also passes close to Whero Avenue on-route between Waipapa avenue and Ngatea Road). People then walk down Ngatea Road briefly and reenter the track between 13 and 15 Ngatea Road. From here, the track continues over farmland to the school. This track is a fantastic asset and needs to be retained. Especially given that for people at the top of Waipapa

Avenue, the alternative walking routes to the school are potentially troublesome. Walking along the main road (Marine Drive) to get to the school is a very long way, and the alternative shorter walking route along Bayview Road and down Hunters Road is potentially dangerous with primary school aged and preschool children because of the narrow gravel road and lack of a footpath. Given the Councils' aim to improve parklands, if a sale was to proceed, the section of the track between Ngatea Road and the School (and an area to both sides of the track) could be divided off from the property to be sold and the area retained on both sides of the track could be planted with native trees. As a bare minimum though, a safe and pleasant thoroughfare (safely away from any driveway or carpark areas) should be retained for walking access to the school for residents of Ngatea Road, Whero Avenue and Waipapa Avenue. It is important that safe and pleasant access (on the track) is retained. When we purchased our property on Waipapa Avenue, I was expecting to be able to use the entire track in perpetuity, as it has been used by the public for many years. As a family with 2 preschool age children, I was looking forward to (and would be disappointed if I couldn't) using the track for my children to get to and fro from school and preschool (once at least one of them is able to walk the whole distance). In addition, I would be expecting and desire that all of the land that isn't currently grazed would be made into a council owned park or reserve, and therefore the native trees that have been planted would not be at risk, and public access to all of the tracks (including the school track and other tracks that pass through these areas) would be retained. Also, if the land is to be disposed of and potentially subdivided (given that it is zoned residential), then it is desirable that part of the land is retained for a strategically placed future picnicking park or playground, given that the population in the area is likely to increase if a new subdivision goes ahead.

## 1865

---

Re proposed disposal of 42 Whero Avenue and 27 Hunters Road properties, Diamond Harbour. My name is James Dale Nieman and I reside at 5 Purau Avenue in Diamond Harbour. I have been a permanent resident of Diamond Harbour for over 50 years. I am completely opposed to the disposal of these properties without a full consultation process, that is, the LTP consultation is insufficient. The issues below need exploration and community discussion. It is completely inappropriate for the CCC to sell/dispose of the properties without addressing these issues, examples of which are outlined below. Furthermore 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 functional. If there were to be a substantial development (of the order that the land disposal 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.

In any event Morgan's Gully and Sam's Gully and the walkways and walking routes need to be fully protected and covenanted. I support Morgan's Gully and Sam's Gully being given Reserve status. 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. 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.) 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. It is imperative that there is full consultation and a planned approach to these land not just disposal. For the above reasons I cannot support the disposal of x and y properties. The elements above (and likely others) need to be integrated into a planned package and discussed by the community.

## 1872

---

Ref.: proposed disposal of 27 Hunters RD and 42 Whero Avenue in Diamond Harbour. We need to request removal of the 2 properties from the Long-Term Plan and fast track disposal. The normal process for disposal of land that would require Community Board and public consultation, should be used. Rural feel close to the city, gullies as native reserves, walking tracks created and cared for by the local community, a sanctuary for native birds, all enjoyed by locals and wider community and tourists this all need to be protected so consultation with our local community is highly recommended. We have no idea how many houses will (can) be build on the land what will be disposed, density of the likes in Rolleston or Wigram or will we see lifestyle blocks and a retirement village / care facility? How does our climate change goals for Christchurch fit in this? We need to have some meaningful public consultation. With kind regards,

## 1879

---

The Council has stated in it's Long-term Plan that it intends to dispose of land at 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour. The likelihood is that it would be sold to a private developer for housing. The nature of the development with regard to existing infrastructure, roading access and Sam's and Morgan's Gully reserves and it's impact on the community would not be considered if this eventuates.

There are specific housing needs for some residents of the area wishing to move to smaller accommodation, which is scarce in Diamond Harbour but this would not be met by a private developer

Volunteers have worked extremely hard and spent many hours on the replanting of Sam's and Morgan's Gullies and creating numerous footpaths to be enjoyed in the plot of 27 Hunters Rd. Although covenants are proposed, they are not yet secured and we do not want all this hard work lost. Also the track created across the plot at 27 Hunters Rd by a local resident for the children to be able to walk to school instead of being driven or walking along a busy and dangerous road with no footpaths in some places is invaluable and needs to be protected. Ownership by a developer is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and its aspirations. Infrastructure in Diamond Harbour would not cope with the increase in population if a large subdivision is created on the plots. Some roads in Diamond Harbour are already in a poor state of repair with constant water bursts and the increase in traffic would only accentuate this. The sale of the land should be removed from the LTP and it should be put out for full public consultation as it is highly likely that there will be no consultation if the land is sold to a private developer.

1961

With regards to the properties 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Ave Diamond Harbour I propose that the sale of the land mentioned is not fast-tracked and disposed of without consultation with the community that this development will effect. As outlined by our local Diamond Harbour Community Association we feel it is not in our interests for you to ignore the wishes and concerns of our residents. 1. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process. Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations. The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles. Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.

If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan. If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner. The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to

blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land?

### 1963

---

With regards to the proposed diamond harbour land sales of 42 Whero Ave and 27 Hunters Rd, I would like these land sales to be removed from the long term plan (LTP) and put through a public consultation process due to the many issues of concern to the community that would arise from the sale

### 1969

---

I strongly oppose the disposal of land described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) in Diamond Harbour. 1) The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan and the normal process for disposal of land requiring Community Board and public consultation must be used instead. 2) The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002. 3. Thorough community consultation should be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process. 4. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not just be made by Council staff. 5. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process. Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations. The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles. Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for. If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan. The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land? The tracks mentioned above are used

extensively by this community, including the school along with children, families and residents of Whero Avenue, Kura Lane, Ngatea Rd, Hunters Rd, Marine Drive and surrounding roads. Utilising these tracks on a daily basis gives residents beneficial access to the outdoors, provides strong connections within the community, improves both physical and mental health and contributes to overall wellbeing. It would be detrimental to the entire community if the correct consultation process is not followed

## 1971

---

I disagree with the fast track disposal of land described as 27 Hunters Rd and 42 Whero Ave, in Diamond Harbour. I request that land as described as 27 Hunters Rd and 42 Whero Ave be removed from the LTP and fast track proposal. The normal process for disposal of land requiring Community Board and public consultation should be used instead. This ensures community interests and concerns are addressed

## 1892

1.11 Potential disposal of surplus Council-owned properties.

We view with concern the current proposal to sell off the large block of land bounded roughly by Marine Drive, Hunters Road and Bayview Road. Given that there may be significant impacts on our reserve areas, the community and local infrastructure, such a sale should be preceded by a comprehensive consideration of options and a detailed analysis of costs and benefits. The current proposal contained in the LTP does not include such consideration of these matters but delegates the authority to sell that land as staff see fit.

We also question whether the proposal contained in the LTP meets the decision-making requirements of s76-79 Local Government Act 2002 for this property and could potentially be liable to subsequent challenge. We therefore request that the proposal to sell this land be removed from the Plan, and that if it is reconsidered in the future it should be subject to a full consultation process including consideration of all infrastructure, community, and environmental perspectives.

In association with the above, we note that the covenant proposed for Morgan's and Sam's Gullies – which form part of the above residential block, has yet to be finalised. The covenant would provide essential protection for the gullies which have been the focus of substantial community reforestation efforts over the past 7 years. Not only is the proposed covenant not yet complete, but the proposal to grant authority to sell without direct discussion with the residents regarding the impact on this community work, demonstrates a lack of respect for the work undertaken and the people involved.

## 1897

I am requesting that the land as described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal.

1. The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan.
2. The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation).
3. Thorough community consultation should be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process.
4. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not just be made by Council staff.
5. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process.

- Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations.
- The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles.
- Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.
- If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan.
- If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner.
- The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land?

- Should all the land be sold (privatised) at one time? Would a staged housing development be better for the community?
- Different use options for the land need to be considered not just a sale to a housing developer. Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses? Should the Council consider the needs of the community for special types of housing e.g. catering for older or younger people looking for smaller units?

## 1538

---

The proposal to dispose of land in Diamond Harbour listed as 27 Hunters Road (CB 12F/538 - 38.96 ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (CB452/50 - 1.18ha) must be removed from the Long Term Plan and fast track disposal process.

To bypass the normal consultation processes with residents and the Community Board would be a disaster for this community. Any discussions on future development must involve public consultation and the development of a future plan for the district.

The area proposed for sale contains land planted out by this community and includes - Morgan's & Sam's Gullies and the "School Track" - all developed by local residents. These are all used by Diamond Harbour families for safe access to school and for recreation. The introduction of native planting in the gullies is absolutely in line with the restoration of natural corridors for birds and wildlife (with pest management) on Banks Peninsula. It is imperative that these areas with access avenues, space to extend, and link to other planting are, at the very least, preserved by covenants before any development is considered.

Any future development of residential properties in Diamond Harbour will put additional pressure on the School and Kindergarten requiring expansion to accommodate students and facilities, e.g. playing fields, larger swimming pool, school hall etc. It is imperative that the Council retain land for this purpose with access to the school track, neighbouring streets and the gully tracks to enable school children and families to safely travel between their homes and school without being exposed to main road traffic.

Any proposal to sell this block for potential residential use would change the face of the community. Diamond Harbour/Church Bay/Charteris Bay and Purau are not satellite towns - they are a collection of villages. The infrastructure on this side of the harbour was never planned, or improved, to incorporate a third more houses.

Any new residential development of the area must take into account the need to improve the entire infrastructure which would simply not cope with that much growth.

- The water pipes are very old and all need upgrading to ensure a constant flow of clean, unchlorinated water.

Likewise waste water has to be efficiently removed.

- The safety of electricity supply is tenuous with overhead wires. I recently witnessed a sparking pole near my home and it was terrifying that these sparks on a pole within a section could ignite long grass and trees creating a fire that could have easily, and quickly, got beyond control. It is important that all overhead wires are relocated underground to ensure a continuous electricity supply to this area before any more houses are added.

- The roads are not constructed to manage the increased traffic that more housing would bring - they are narrow, uneven camber, no safe side parking and in many areas dangerously



close to the footpaths. Purau Avenue is a good example where, on the bend beside the entrance to the bowling club etc, the camber of the road causes the traffic to come up hard against the footpath which itself is compromised by land slips and vegetation making it unsafe and unsuitable for wheelchairs, pushchairs/prams and scarily uncomfortable for people walking. All local footpaths are impossible for seniors to use walking frames due to angles & obstacles. In recent years the number of large trucks travelling these roads (at speed) have greatly increased and the bends in the area are insufficient width for these trucks (frequently towing large trailers) to safely navigate the corners. I have been caught myself by a truck jack-knifing around a corner and coming to rest against my car. If I had been pushed by this vehicle I would have been over the bank. More homes will mean more young people needing to travel to high school by bus adding more larger vehicles to narrow roads.

- More people will require a larger ferry and frequency of crossing and the associated transport links from Lyttelton.
- The community has struggled since the earthquakes cost us all the facilities that Godley House provided. Adding more people without resolving the social aspects of the community is going to cause continued frustration and dissatisfaction.
- More houses will require more telecommunications - phone and internet - and we clearly saw during the Covid lockdown with the community working from home and school students learning online, that the internet infrastructure here is totally inadequate now let alone adding hundreds of new users.
- We need money spent urgently on coastal protection. Rising sea levels will cut off all of these villages if work is not urgently completed at the lowest points at Teddington (planned) and around Charteris Bay/Orton Bradley Park.

I am not against development, with appropriate consultation. It may be that some land can be released for residential uses with larger parcels of land hence reducing the number of properties. Some areas adjacent to houses may offer a natural extension for houses but please do not put the entire area up for sale when it could be purchased by one or more developers looking to build city-style sub-divisions with no care about local services and facilities or the development of walking tracks and open spaces to enhance the unique aspects of this community. One of the delightful aspects of housing on this side of the peninsula is that buildings are unique. The area will not be enhanced by multiple buildings of similar design being plopped down on hill sections.

Please remove this land from fast track sale and consider the community as a whole. With communication and negotiation, development can be managed at a sustainable level.

## 1942

I would like to recommend that the fast track proposal to open up the area below Bayview Rd Diamond Harbour for housing be rejected and proper community consultation undertaken. This should include the gully planting covenant all the walking tracks, road access and increased use of main roads and general infrastructure such as power and water and drainage which are already vulnerable in this area.

## 1976

---

the Council has notified in its draft Long-term Plan (LTP) that it intends to dispose of the land between the current Diamond Harbour housing and Bay View Road, without further consultation (other than LTP submissions). Many residents live adjacent to the land or use the land. As well as the current sheep grazing, it contains Morgan and Sam's Gullies where many locals have spent time restoring the vegetation. The Gullies however have not yet been protected by covenants (long-term they should become reserves). The land is currently Council freehold with a Residential Banks Peninsula district plan zoning. There is a presumption that housing will go on it, as it was purchased by Banks Peninsula Council for future Diamond Harbour expansion. There are many issues however that should be discussed with the Council and the Community Board before the land is sold e.g the uses of the land, the gullies, disposal sequencing and access. The next stage after disposal, would entail subdivision, where decisions are made by the developer and Council in relation to roading access, public access, infrastructure, and reserves. However there is no requirement on the Council to consult widely about subdivision applications. In the past this has led to poor decisions in our community - Black Point is an example of this where no beachside reserve was created and easy access is lacking). There should be a consultation process prior to any disposal, as it is likely there will be no consultation afterwards. I believe the Council Property section may be trying to fast track the land disposal and avoid meaningful public consultation by inserting the disposal into the LTP. This is a second attempt as about two years ago fast track disposal was tried, and this was rebuffed by the Community Board. I therefore request that the land as described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) be removed from the LTP Potential Disposal of Council Land and hence fast track disposal.

the normal process for disposal of land that would require Community Board and public consultation including public meetings and a submission process, should be undertaken instead including Council proposals as to how the land should be utilised. This should consider protection of the gullies, boundaries, road access, school development, walking tracks, infrastructure, and other local interests. Furthermore I believe that the current process through the LTP does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the LGA 2002 in relation to Principles of Consultation. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on any sale should not just be made by Council Staff. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process. Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations. The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, the 42 Whero

Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles. Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for. If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan. If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea Road is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner. The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land? Should all the land be sold (privatised) at one time? Would a staged housing development be better for the community? Different use options for the land need to be considered not just a sale to a housing developer. Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses? Should the Council consider the needs of the community for special ty

Finally, given the current state of affairs in relation to the Godley House site here in Diamond Harbour and the appalling lack of progress in relation to the Community aspirations for this site over the past ten years, coupled with a lack of due diligence in the past I would respectfully suggest to the Council that a very real opportunity now exists going forward to engage with the Diamond Harbour / Church Bay Community and its representatives meaningfully, with integrity and in good faith on the above matter as something that has the potential to impact the community and its wellbeing significantly. As a resident I therefore look forward to a more considered approach in the future to engaging and consulting with the Community on the current proposal before us pes of housing e.g. catering for older or younger people looking for smaller units?

## 2099

---

1. We are concerned about, and object to, the Council's plan to dispose of the land between the current Diamond Harbour housing and Bay View Road, without further consultation (other than LTP submissions). We believe that course of action is inappropriate and that thorough community consultation should instead be undertaken to determine the future of the land.

This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process.

2. The land described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) is adjacent to Diamond Harbour School and includes a walking track known as the "school track" used by students of Diamond Harbour School who reside in the Waipapa Avene end of

Diamond Harbour to walk to school. This is a far safer alternative for students than the very narrow footpath that runs along the main road (Marine Drive).

3. Furthermore, as an Enviroschool, Diamond Harbour School is also concerned about the threat to Morgan and Sams Gully posed by the fast track proposal.

4. There are many issues that should be discussed with the Council and the Community Board before the land is sold e.g the uses of the land, the gullies, disposal sequencing and access. It should be borne in mind that if there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan. We also note that Diamond Harbour School's current car park, which it shares with the Kids First Kindergarten, is very small and may need expanding if the school roll were to increase significantly.

5. The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation).

6. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not just be made by Council staff.

7. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process:

\* Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community

usage and aspirations.

\* The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For

example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles.

\* Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.

\* If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land

considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan.

\* If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner.

\* The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land?

\* Should all the land be sold (privatised) at one time? Would a staged housing development be better for the community?

\* Different use options for the land need to be considered not just a sale to a housing developer. Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses? Should the Council consider the needs of the community for special types of housing e.g. catering for older or younger people looking for smaller units?

In light of the above matters, we request that the land as described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) 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.

## 2061

one of these properties is the land in diamond harbour (27 hunters rd and 42 whero ave). The fast track disposal should be rejected and a proper community consultation should be undertaken. This area has been looked after and replanted by locals and is well used for walking.

1984

---

I would like to propose that the two pieces of land 42 Whero Ave and 27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan. We as a community need to have full and open consultation with any repurposing of this land. It is our community and village lifestyle this will affect and add more heightened stress on our already crumbling infrastructure. 1. The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation). 2. Thorough community consultation should be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process. 3. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not just be made by Council staff. 4. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process. Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations. The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'

For example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles. Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for. If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan. If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner. The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land?

**2068**

I am not in support of the land disposal proposals at 27 Hunters Rd and 42 Whero Ave. This needs full community consultation as the community has a number of interests and ongoing activities on some of this land including extensive native plantings in gullies. It is my submission that these land disposals need to be removed from the LTP.

**2070**

My submission is regarding the land at 27 Hunters Rd and 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour. I submit that this fast track disposal be rejected. A proper community consultation must occur. Community energy has been invested into projects to care for and nurture this land. The best interests of the community would need council to consider gully protection, boundaries, road access, school development, walking tracks, infrastructure and other local interests. The council must initiate a robust community consultation process before making any decisions about the disposal of this land.

**2090**

---

I submit that the fast track disposal of land in Diamond Harbour be removed from the Long Term Plan. The normal process for disposal of land that would require Community Board and public consultation should be used instead, to provide for informed consideration of any alternative uses and local community needs.

**2105**

I am a Diamond Harbour resident and have lived there for many years.

Our community is semi rural and would be irrevocably changed if 40 hectares of land at Hunters road were sold and developed for residential use. The great number of extra residents would change the very essence of what makes Diamond Harbour a unique place to live.

It is also unlikely that the existing infrastructure could cope with this large increase in residents. The road intersections are hardly safe now. Sewage disposal will become a further issue. Public transport like the excellent ferry service would not cope.

I am opposed to the land being added to the disposal schedule, allowing Council staff and not elected members or the community the right to decide the future of the land.

I cannot understand how Council staff could have considered placing such a large parcel of land in the proposed disposal schedule, considering the potential major impact of this disposal would have on the community, a good idea.

Is this decision heavily weighted toward financial gain rather than respect for the unique character of the Diamond Harbour community. Please remove the land from the schedule, and plan any future development as small incremental steps rather than a large development like this which will damage the character of the community

**2077**

concerning 27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres - and 42 Whero Ave, Diamond Harbour. I request that this land be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal to enable full community board and public consultation. This land includes Morgan's and Sam's Gullies both of which have been planted in native trees and bush by locals plus walking tracks that are regularly used by many people and school children. The biggest concern is that these gullies and tracks are protected and secured for public access. Also of concern is the fragile infrastructure of water supply (always leaks) and other services that need to be updated before further development occurs.

## Alternative

**391**

I am specifically interested in the piece of council owned land that is being considered for sale without public consultation. The land being between Bay View Rd and Whero Ave in Diamond Harbour. Whilst I believe the council have the right to sell the land, which is zoned residential, I do not believe that this should be done without due consideration and consultation with the people that it will affect. I am not anti-housing, or a NIMBY type person, however the council are elected to serve the will of the people, and are not some faceless corporate who can and often do run rough-shod over communities. If developed for housing, the impact on the local roading, drainage, electricity infrastructure, light pollution, school enrolment.. etc will need to be considered. The area is well utilised by dog walkers, as there are no other off-leash areas during the summer months. The regeneration of native plants and safe school walking track are also going to be impacted.

Friday, 09 April 2021

**563**



Regarding Disposal of 27 Hunters Road at Diamond Harbour, I strongly support the a proposal to protect the steeper parts of this land with a Conservation Covenant under section 77 of the Reserves Act 1977, in particular the scrubby areas of Morgan's Gully which are already reverting to native bush with a strong local community effort.

564

---

Regarding the property at 27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour, I fully support the proposal to protect the steeper parts of this land, including Morgan's Gully, Sam's Gully and the massive section below 45 Waipapa Avenue with a Conservation Covenant under section 77 of the Reserves Act 1977.

Already there are many native trees springing up on this section, which have been both sown and self seeded. It would be a great shame if this fledging forest was destroyed. Not only would it be detrimental to the plant life but also to the many native birds which are present in this area.

### 675 [13.5 Urban Regeneration]

---

During the time of discussions about Godley House, 27 Hunters Road, the Village Plan etc, many conversations have taken place at the local cafe and elsewhere. Among older members of Diamond Harbour it is repeated over and over, how good it would be to have some housing here for when we can no long drive. Or, when our houses and sections get too large to manage.

Some kind of older persons co-housing would be very well received.

Probably not seen as "core" Council business, but is Hunters Road the place to look at this??

Tuesday, 13 April 2021

791

---

I strongly object to disposal of land in Church Bay - Hunters Road. There is not the infrastructure to support a new subdivison of that size at the current time. It is so good to keep some rural aspect of our area when there has been so much new development. Our roads are simply not wide enough or good enough to sustain that size of development. We already have the worst roads in NZ - a comment we make each time we move around the country and get back to our roads. The heavy trucks that come with developments are making them much worse. There are 2 gullies on this land that have been planted by the community and used by the community for recreation. There is a school track, also made by volunteers and maintained by them and planted, watered, weeded by volunteers. This is what makes this area so special. Don't dispose of this land. Keep it leased as farmland and covenant the gullies.

792

Please do NOT dispose of 42 Whero Ave & 27 Hunters Road in Diamond Harbour. The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan. The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation). The Gullies and existing tracks must be protected. The Conservation covenant already drafted and submitted needs to be fully implemented instead of being held back. We would request that all the existing plantings and fence boundaries be kept as my children and my cubs group helped plant large areas of those tracks. The area marked for sale completely covers large portions of the school track in particular. And seems to propose the boundary fence line be moved closer to Morgan's Gully edge. You can see the sale would greatly hinder the school track and stop children making the effort to walk to school as a new route would have to be figured out. The healthy harbour initiatives and the entire harbour are at present trying to honour a clean up and preservation of the waterways. This needs to be given consideration. Thank you. Our family whole heartedly oppose the request to dispose of this land with out putting in place proper covenants and protections of all areas already worked on and conserved by our community.

795

1.11 Potential disposal of surplus Council-owned properties I do not support the sale of 42 where ave and 27 hunters road, without proper conservation covenant of the existing tracks and plantings.

805

I am opposed to the sale of the land in Diamond Harbour bordering Hunters, Rd and Where Avenue below Bay View Road. The sale of this land and possible development into residential properties. This would lead to too many people in Diamond Harbour and put a strain on what is already poorly maintained roading and infrastructure in the harbour.

851

the proposed changes to the land in DH (Hunters Rd and Whero Ave needs to be removed from the LTP and put through the correct process including being put up for discussion among the local people who have put endless hours into planting and tending natives. We are a rural area and the land is well used for walking tracks and recreation. Please CCC DO NOT let this become another Godley House debacle.

894

27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue in Diamond Harbour - this should not be a fast tracked disposal and proper community consultation should be undertaken. The land is used by the community in many other more valuable ways than more residential sections where long term vacant sections already exist nearby. In addition to the potential loss of this community asset, the surrounding infrastructure both in the immediate vicinity and wider access from the city can not support an increase in buildings and traffic.

## 941

Regarding land as 27 Hunters Road, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres

I request that the above land in Diamond Harbour proposed for disposal in the LTP be removed from the LTP so that any future proposal to sell land can involve public consultation that is meaningful, recognises the significance of the land in relation to the existing Diamond Harbour community. I would need the opportunity to submit on:

- The difficulties managing stormwater and past experience for properties below the site.
- The aging CCC water infrastructure I have seen on my street and difficulty for it to cope with more stormwater from above the property.
- The uncertainty how stormwater would be managed when more of the higher land is unavailable for absorbing rain.
- The need to protect the gullies that have involved long term significant community work and the need to have buffer zones to protect planting.
- How CCC would manage a significant increase in population subject to the presence of vulnerable areas of sea level rise along parts of the road network.

## 962

Christchurch City Council has indicated intention to dispose of surplus land without further consultation. The list of properties on the Council website includes 27 Hunters Rd (legally described as CB12F/538, Part of Lot 1 DP 14050 and Lot 7 DP 14050). The parcel is large (38.9 hectare) and is located within areas of Diamond Harbour with existing residential housing. The current zoning is Residential - Banks Peninsula. My concerns with the sale of this property are as follows: 1. 1) The current zoning does not adequately identify the values and conditions within the land parcel. Substantial ecological restoration work has been conducted by community volunteers within the several gullies within the parcel. This includes removal of noxious weeds and plantings of native plants appropriate to the site conditions. My suggested remedy: Remove the land parcel from the list of surplus properties, identify the ecologically important areas and protect them as reserve areas or covenanted natural areas. 1. 2) Sudden changes in community structure

are disruptive and potentially create a range of adverse impacts. Local infrastructure (roads, water supply, sewerage, power supply, etc) have all had issues in the last few years. The sudden potential doubling of the Diamond Harbour population is likely to exacerbate all of these problems. My suggested remedy: Split the land parcel into several sub-sections, staging the incremental impacts to be in line with and co-ordinated with the required improvements in local infrastructure. 3) The property at 27 Hunters Rd was acquired by Banks Peninsula District Council many years ago (1913?). It seems to me that the Council has a duty to consider more diligently the possible range of purposes for the investment (the original purpose of acquiring a large block of land in Diamond Harbour) other than a potential economic windfall. My suggested remedy: Consult with the community and community organisations (the school, community groups, etc) and some urban planners. There is a great opportunity here. It should not be lost for a simple quick payout.

### 1011

---

This fast track disposal be rejected and that proper community consultation should be undertaken. That would consider gully protection, boundaries, road access, school development, walking tracks, infrastructure and other local interests. If the land sells now, there will be no further consultation and subdivision can proceed without community input.

### 1013

---

This fast track disposal be rejected and that proper community consultation should be undertaken. That would consider gully protection, boundaries, road access, school development, walking tracks, infrastructure and other local interests. If the land sells now, there will be no further consultation and subdivision can proceed without community input.

### 1097

---

I would like to submit that the land as described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal. This land contains 2 gullies that since 2014, local volunteers have spent thousands of hours of volunteer work in reforestation and building recreational walking tracks. The CCC has invested and supported this process with plants, and track building materials. There is also a very well used walking track (The School Track) that connects the gully tracks from Waipapa Ave to Diamond Harbour School. For school pupils living on Waipapa Ave, this track is just under 1km to walk to school. Walking along the road is 2km. Also, our footpaths are regularly blocked. On a Tuesday, the many wheelie bins on the footpath make it impossible to walk Marine Drive without walking on the road, often on blind corners. The school track takes dozens of people off these

inadequate footpaths. I have attached a PDF showing photos of what our footpaths typically look like. I realise that the blockages are all illegal, but as there is no enforcement, they happen on a daily basis. Many parents believe that it's unsafe to allow their kids to walk to school along roads like this. The School Track is therefore a vital community asset. There is a proposed covenant by CCC that would protect the gullies and the School Track. Unfortunately, even though this has been promised for years, it has been finalised at this time. Therefore, the land disposal should be removed from this LTP and perhaps included in the next one once the covenant has been finalised.



1130

42 Whero Avenue Diamond Harbour. I request for the fast track disposal to be stopped. We need a proper community consultation to ensure that the right decisions are made considering 1. the future



of the walking tracks, 2. the protection of the gullies, 3. the use of the land and future road access, 4. infra structure upgrades, 5. possible school expansion and other uses that may be discussed when enough time is allowed for a public consultation which we all pay our taxes for, "to have our say, not just to pay"

>>>

27 Hunters Road Diamond Harbour. I request that the land described as 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero avenue be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal. I request a normal process for disposal of land, including full public consultation.

**1133**

---

This proposal should be rejected, specifically relating to hunters rd and whero ave. There needs to be proper community consultation. Gully protection, boundaries, road access, school development, walking tracks and general infrastructure need to be all properly addressed before the sale of land and subsequent closure of any further discussion on these matters.

**1160**

---

27 Hunters rd land disposal Diamond Harbour, All gullies and Community paths and walkways need to be protected before sale.

**Friday, 16 April 2021**

**1348**

---

I request the land described as 27 Hunters Rd and 42 Te Whero Ave be removed from the LTP and the fast track disposal. The normal process for disposal ie Community Board and public consultation should be used instead! The current process does NOT adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of Consultation) Thorough community consultation should be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a consultation process. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the council on the recommendations of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not just be made by Council staff only. Disposal of the land requires all sorts of consideration regarding use of the gullies, development of required infrastructure for new housing etc. How can all this be kept out of the public eye??????

1349

27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour: I am writing to request that the Council please engage in full community consultation with Community Board input before disposing of these Council-owned properties. Diamond Harbour is a small rural community with one main access road into the village from Teddington. If these two large properties were sold for residential housing, for example, the quiet rural nature of the village would be negatively affected. Roading would be compromised by increased traffic, and some potential access points - Ngatea Road and Hunters Road, would be dangerous and unsuitable for increased traffic. Hunters Road is the main entrance to Diamond Harbour School and Early Learning Centre. Increased traffic on this road would compromise safety for children and families of the school. Ngatea Road is currently a safe and quiet street which is used as part of a safe walkway to the school and early learning centre for children and their families, thereby avoiding having to walk along the busy main road (Marine Drive). Ngatea Road also has a sharp bend which makes it really only suitable for one-way traffic. This street, its occupants and the school walkway users would all be detrimentally affected if there was increased traffic. Homes on the higher side of Ngatea Road currently back onto farmland. Housing development would negatively impact all the residents in this quiet street, turning it into a suburban neighbourhood rather than a quiet rural area. Council land on these two sites also includes a number of gullies which have been planted and tended by dedicated volunteers, eager to encourage native bush regeneration and to enhance the extensive walkways that have been developed. It would be critical that these gullies are protected.

1396

I would like to make some comments regarding the sale and development of land in Diamond Harbour and the improvement of community facilities. I understand that the council is considering the sale of land on Hunters Road behind the School. While I am not against the further development of land per se, I would like to make a number of observations that I believe are important considerations before any decision is made.

1. Land should be protected for the expansion of Diamond Harbour School. The school is currently quite small, but with the continual growth in local housing the needs of the school are likely to change.
2. Strong consideration should be given to the local infrastructure and if it can support the amount of additional proposed housing. My understanding is that the current water and power infrastructure is likely to be challenged. In addition, the roads will not support a large increase in traffic (and changing the speed limit will make no difference to this).



3. The local community lost one of only two local restaurant and bar facilities some time ago. Nothing has been done to replace it and the remaining cafe in the DH Village is not capable of managing with visitors in the summer. In addition, visitors to Diamond Harbour (which is clearly promoted as a destination by CCC) are often found confused and wondering where all the facilities they expected are to be found. The community has already provided strong feedback via consultation that a replacement for the Dark Star and Godley House is needed. In addition, something for visitors such as a large adventure playground would be beneficial.

Monday, 19 April 2021

1220

---

I ask the Council to remove the 27 Hunters Road property from the list of surplus properties. I am of the opinion that the LTP is not the appropriate planning framework for the decision as to retain or dispose of the property.

I welcome the assurance from Councillor Andrew Turner that the covenanting project that is currently under way for the protection of ecologically significant areas on the property will be completed before any decision on the future of the property is made. However, the protection of the re-planted gullies and the walking tracks is not the main reason why I reject the proposed process. Due to the size and current zoning of 27 Hunters Road a potential sale of the property would have a significant impact on the Diamond Harbour Community and on the supporting infrastructure.

The 2018 census shows that around 1500 people live in the community and that there are about 700 occupied dwellings. The Hunters Road property is zoned residential, which means that a housing development on the 39ha is a permitted activity and the community would not need to be consulted in relation to any subdivision application. Even if a portion of the area is covenanted, the remaining size of the property has the potential to increase the number of houses and residents in the Diamond Harbour by about 30%. A largescale residential subdivision like this has the potential to change the character and amenity values of Diamond Harbour and it is my view that this requires both adequate consultation of the affected community as well as in-depth infrastructure planning.

The quality and reliability of the network infrastructure in Diamond Harbour is currently far behind the standard maintained in the urban areas of Christchurch. Even if the development contribution for newly built dwellings increases significantly, it is more than likely that the infrastructure cannot keep up with the additional load without Council making significant capital investments. If 27 Hunter Road is sold as a potential outcome of the LTP process then there is no mandate for community participation in the planning and implementation of a likely largescale subdivision.

I believe that this would be in violation of the principles of consultation as laid out in Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.

**1376**

---

27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour, PT LOT 1 DP 14050 We have heard significant concerns from our residents about the disposal of this property. Our community has been working hard to revegetate the gullies for a number of years, with the understanding that these areas would be protected for public use. If the Council does not undertake formal consultation separate to the Long Term Plan process on this property, we do not support its disposal until the gullies are gazetted as reserves and existing public access, including a walkway to the Diamond Harbour School, is preserved. We note that the Diamond Harbour Reserve Management Committee made a Long Term Plan submission on this topic.

**1492**

---

I am writing to request that the land as described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) 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. The community has spent many hours planting Sam and Morgan's gullies in native vegetation and these gullies have not been protected yet. Please allow normal community consultation in this process.

**1493**

---

**My submission is to** request that the land as described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) 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. In making this request I provide the following supporting information:

1. The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan. Instead I wish to see meaningful consultation with our Diamond Harbour and Southern Bays communities.
2. The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation).
3. Thorough community consultation should be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process.
4. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not just be made by Council staff.
5. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process.
  - a. Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations.
  - b. The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles and do not follow the fence-lines. This means that extensive areas of native planting are not in the draft covenants.
  - c. Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for. The Mt Herbert Walkway also has no easement at present (as it is on Council land).
  - d. If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school may wish to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is an easement to the western side of the school but no designation for further expansion in the district plan.
  - e. If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue, more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner.
  - f. The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land?
  - g. Should all the land be sold (privatised) at one time? Would a staged housing development be better for the community?
  - h. Different use options for the land need to be considered not just a sale to a housing developer. Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses? Should the Council consider the needs of the community for special types of housing e.g. catering for older or younger people looking for smaller units?
  - i. The land could be used as a test site for a futuristic style community development comprising all facets of modern sustainable design, as outlined here for example: <https://medium.com/hackernoon/natures-whole-system-optimization-informs-community-design-546d484050bd>

1499

Re: Disposal of Council Owned Properties in Diamond Harbour I ask that the fast tracked disposal be rejected and proper community consultation be undertaken. 27 Hunters Road Vacant land PT LOT 1

DP 14050 42 Whero Avenue Vacant land leased for grazing LOT 1 DP 9607++ We have spent many hours planting out the gullies to regenerate the native bush. Thank you.

**1607**

---

This submission is in regard to the proposed selling of land in Diamond Harbour. I hold deep concerns re this being included in the LTP as there would be no possibility for community consultation. This is a large tract of land which if sold to a developer with a high probability of it being carved up into sections, would have a huge impact on this community. There is not the infrastructure in place to cope with potentially 200-300 more homes. There is also the question of protecting Morgan's and Sam's Gullies which many volunteers have spent much time in protecting and enhancing. This land also holds a safe walking track for the school children. What would become of that? Considering the huge impact this would have on this community, it would only be right and just for the community to be consulted and have a say in its future.

**1609**

---

Re: 27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres) There are many environmental issues that should be discussed with the Council, Community Board, and the local community before this land is sold for residential development: the uses of the land, the gullies, public access and reserves (the gullies have not yet been protected by covenants and should become reserves as much work has been done by the community in restoring them- which in turn assists the management of storm water run off, protects our natural environment, provides natural habitat for our native wildlife + creates much needed green corridors for wildlife movement, etc). There is no requirement on the Council to consult about subdivision of this land but its development will greatly affect our community, the environment, wildlife, and have negative ramifications for climate change unless the community is engaged + consulted, and the climate change strategy is reflected in the development of this area. I request that the land as described as (27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres), be removed from the LTP and it's fast track disposal. Instead I demand that the normal process for disposal of land which would require Community Board and public consultation, should be used + the Climate Change Strategy (although still in it's draft form) is stringently applied throughout this process (please refer to

<https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Consultation/2021/03-March/STR3951-Draft-Otautahi-ChristchurchClimate-Change-Strategy-WEB.pdf>).

**1611**

---

I am a resident of Diamond Harbour and am making this submission requesting that the land as described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) please be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal of Council Land. It is vital to have community input into how we see Diamond Harbour growing, and how we see the land being both protected and utilised in a way that is sensitive to the community and surroundings. Main Points to support my submission include: 1. The fact that the current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation). 2. Thorough community consultation is vitally important and needs to be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process. 3. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not be made by Council staff alone. 4. The following matters cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process and should proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. Covenants for these areas should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. Our children have and still do use the tracks daily which have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for. This is a safe way for children to avoid the roads in order to get to school safely. If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan. If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue

has a dangerous low visibility corner and is too narrow for increased traffic. The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land? There needs to be different options for the land use, and not to be just sold to a housing developer. Thank you for your time and consideration, please support our community!

## 1612

---

Regarding potential sale of the land 27 Hunters Road, Vacant Land, Pt Lot DP1405++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq meters The long term plan for this site needs to be reviewed and changed. There are areas and gullies within the land of ecological significance need to be protected with in line of the draft document Ōtautahi Christchurch Climate Change Strategy For the council to understand about impact of and sale or development of land needs to engage with the local community board. We are in a state of climate emergency. We need to involve the community in long-term infrastructure planning, as part of community adaptation discussions. It is the CCC's responsibility to understand the various legal and governance requirements, roles and responsibilities of climate adaptation, to ensure the Council and others fulfill their duty of care for communities. Without consultation through the community board the Council will cease improve its knowledge of the full range of climate change impacts across Christchurch and Banks Peninsula and, determine how best to respond to the physical changes and the flow-on social, economic and wider environmental impacts.

## 1617

---

Diamond Harbour is a small, lovely, connected community with a strong interest in native planting and regeneration. This is evidenced by decades of planting in gullies to eliminate gorse and renew natives. There is a proposal numbered 1.11 Potential disposal of surplus Council-owned properties 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue. This seeks to fast track the sale of this land without adequate community consultation. I am requesting that the Council follow good process and engage in full community consultation on the future of this land. There is a Community Board who should also be engaged in a proper consultative process. The roads leading to Diamond Harbour are in a terrible state. They have been inadequately repaired following the earthquakes and continue to be potholed and unpleasant to drive on. The sale of two large blocks of

land for residential housing will add strain to the already compromised roads, potentially damaging them further. Ngatea Road is a small, narrow road which is essentially one laned due to its size. Increased traffic would be dangerous and unsafe for children who walk this road as part of the Diamond Harbour school track. This track extends to Whero Ave and ends at Hunters Road. I would like to ensure that the track is protected, as are the children walking it. Diamond Harbour School and Early Learning Centre are on Hunters Road. A full and proper consultative process will ensure that the safety and needs of the school and its community are met (or at least considered) when disposing of this land. The Council land includes planted gullies, a school walking track and various other walking tracks. These have been looked after by a community of dedicated volunteers over decades and their protection must be ensured

### 1618

---

27 Hunter and 42 Whero are worthy of community consultation. The fast-track disposal here should be rejected for local input on what community wants to see. reconsider boundaries, school development, walking tracks, infrastructure and other local interests - space for play and reflection of stunning 3 dimensional landscape Very little open space on less-steep land exists in the community. This disposal proposal would starve diamond harbour of opportunity to have such open shared space free of traffic concerns and confinement of tall surrounding trees.

### 1619

---

For the Greater Diamond Harbour Area the potential disposal of surplus Council-owned properties encompasses LOT 9 DP 304811 – a small commercial property at 2H Waipapa Avenue in the centre of Diamond Harbour Village and LOT 1 DP 9607++ a large area of land that is currently used for grazing buried in the complexity of the 10 year plan is not acceptable. The area is bordered by Hunters Road, Bay View Road, across the top end of Whero Ave and bordering on the back of residential property on Te Papau Crescent (approximately). It would boarder or include local gullies (e.g., Sam's Gully) that local residences have been working on to restore native plantings. Any development of the Hunters Road site into residential housing has a high potential to adversely impact these areas with run off silt and water from developments. In addition, with a large development of residential properties the already strained local infrastructure would be put under even more burden. For example,



the transport and roading system which are already adversely effected would not cope with further large increase in population. Further to this the drainage and water system would also be impacted by the population increase. Recreational resources would also be impacted adversely such as access to local walking tracks and impact on the local foreshore which currently has limited public access/infrastructure. Further to this the development of this area would be reduced/limited development of the local educational infrastructure. If this land is to be sold a full consultation process with the community is an imperative rather than the land sale being incorporated in the 10-year Christchurch City Council plan.

## 1632

---

In reference to Infrastructure spending in Diamond Harbour and the potential land dispersal of land between Hunters Road and Whero Avenue. There is not clarity in the existing consultation what the impacts (both positive and negative) will be on community and the environment. There is not enough information in the current proposal to be able to make an informed submission. The proposal doesn't provide any clarity in regard to the following questions. 1.) How does the sale of this land and associated potential damage to existing planted areas and the immediate local environment fit with the Whaka Ora Healthy Harbour Plan and how are Ngāti Wheke, as key partners in the Whaka Ora plan being engaged on this decision? The CCC is a partner in the Whaka Ora Healthy Harbour plan and should be making decisions which will work towards the key outcomes of this plan. 2.) How well is the cost of the new infrastructure required due to a new subdivision understood? How large or small would the subdivision need to be in order to be feasible from an economic and environmental perspective? 3.) Is there more information residents can be informed on to help in their understanding of the implications of a new subdivision and an increase in the resident population , 100, 200 houses?? - how would the 3 waters be improved in Diamond Harbour so that existing issues are resolved and there is future proofing for an increasing population? - what impact will a new subdivision have on the money allocated in the long term plan for roading and traffic safety between Governors Bay and Diamond Harbour? Will this be enough? What is being factored in to account for population growth in Diamond Harbour.



1640

## Council Submission

The following pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan:

- 27 Hunters Road, Diamond Harbour (Title Ref: CB12F/538)
- 42 Whero Avenue, Diamond Harbour (Title Ref: CB452/50)

Reasons why:

1. The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation). Local residents must be properly consulted given the massive impact this sale could have on them.
2. A thorough community consultation must be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process.
3. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through a normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process:
  1. Gully protection. Extensive replanting has been undertaken in Morgan's and Sam's Gully. This work has been done by community members, including myself, with the support of the City Council, Environment Canterbury and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for these gullies, but it has not been finalised. The gully by the school is also unsuitable for housing, and should be protected. These covenants must be completed. Furthermore, it is my view that these areas should have reserve status before any sale is considered. This would protect the replanting and ensure continued community usage.
  2. The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, at the top end of Ngatea Road there is current usage and access by local residents on Marine Drive.
  3. Walking tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas. Access to these tracks must be protected. The main school access walking track from Waipapa Avenue does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.
  4. Residents must be consulted with regards to road access to the site. For example, Ngatea Road is narrow with a sharp bend. There is no way it could safely support even a moderate increase in traffic, let alone construction traffic over an extended period.
  5. Diamond Harbour's wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay to upgrade the system to cope with the large number of houses that can be built on the land?
  6. The road in and out of Diamond Harbour can be dangerous at the best of times. A significant increase in traffic during peak hours would make the situation worse.
  7. Should all the land be sold at once? Would a staged housing development be better for the community? Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses, e.g. a new Fire Station?

I sincerely hope the Council will take into account all of the above mentioned points and remove these areas from the list of Council owned properties that could potentially be disposed of in the Long-term Plan.

1712

Submissions in response to the proposed land disposal between Hunters Road and Whero Ave Diamond Harbour. I do not support the disposal of the parcel as proposed. This area has a number of recreation and conservation values, particularly in the gully areas that need to be protected. In addition, consideration needs to be given to the potentially increase adverse effects of land use change

on Whakaraupo itself. The Charteris Bay, Church Bay and Diamond Harbour communities have seen a increase in number of residents in recent years. Very little consideration has been given to further development of recreational amenities in response to this growth. Before any land is disposed of, consideration should also be given to the establishment of facilities as playground, pump track, dog park and skate park. Current infrastructure appears to be limited in it's ability to manage the current demand and a significant increase in residential areas will add further pressures. In the last few years there have been a numerous failures in the three waters infrastructure which have resulted in raw sewerage entering the harbour, water pipe bursts and significant roading damage. The current infrastructure is unlikely to cope with additional use and land use change.

### 1708

---

Of particularly concern, regarding the potential disposal of surplus Council-owned properties at 2 locations: LOT 1 DP 9607++ Whero Ave  
PT LOT 1 DP 14050++ Hunters Road These properties are valuable community resources. There should be careful consideration as to how these properties are utilised, as decisions regarding them will have far reaching impacts on the existing communities. The Church Bay and Diamond Harbour communities need to be fully involved through normal land disposal processes, including comprehensive community consultation as well as input from Community Boards. Otherwise, the potential for high density residential development, which could otherwise result, would significantly impact the local community in a wide range of associated issues. The communities have invested many hours working to regenerate certain sections of these parcels. If allowed to continue, additional Green Space for the community would be gained and native plantings would help to achieve positive impacts for generations to come, as we further our steps to achieve the goals set out by government initiatives for combating climate change. I request that these two properties be removed from the LTP and put through the public consultation process. Thank you.

### 1748

---

This submission to the draft Long Term Plan concerns the proposed fast track disposal of two parcels of land: • 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha), • 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha)

The Council has notified in its draft Long-term Plan (LTP) that it intends to dispose of the land between the current Diamond Harbour housing and Bay View Road, without further consultation (other than LTP submissions). Many residents live adjacent to the land or use the land. As well as the current sheep grazing, it contains Morgan and Sams gullies where many locals have spent time restoring the vegetation. The gullies have not yet been protected by covenants (long-term they should become reserves). Requested changes to the draft Long-term Plan:

1. The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan.
2. Thorough community consultation must be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process.
3. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not just be made by Council staff.
4. The following matters should be considered, as a minimum, if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process:
  - a. Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations.
  - b. The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles.
  - c. Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.
  - d. If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan.
  - e. If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero

Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner. f. The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land? g. The subdivisions will add further pressure on road infrastructure and public transport requirements. What are the plans to align capital plans and public transport expansion with the expected increase in population. The roads are in bad repair and dangerous, who will pay for the required improvements and capacity upgrades? h. Should all the land be sold (privatised) at one time? Would a staged housing development be better for the community? i. Different use options for the land need to be considered not just a sale to a housing developer. Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses? Should the Council consider the needs of the community for special types of housing e.g. catering for older or younger people looking for smaller units?

### 1803

---

I have a bach in Diamond Harbour. The community groups there have done an impressive amount of work especially in the Sam's and Morgan's Gully to plant natives and encourage a native habitat. The volunteers have been working for years to ensure that this gully land is not sold for housing and this is still in progress. It has come to our attention that the land as described as (27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres), be removed from the LTP and from fast track disposal. The normal process for disposal of land, that would require Community Board and public consultation, should be used instead. Please protect our gullies and the hard work our community volunteers do.

### 1915

---

I am requesting that the land as described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) be removed from the LTP and fast track disposal.

1. The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan.
2. The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation).
3. Thorough community consultation should be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process.

4. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not just be made by Council staff.

5. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process.

Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations.

The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles.

Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.

If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan.

If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner.

The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land?

Should all the land be sold (privatised) at one time? Would a staged housing development be better for the community?

Different use options for the land need to be considered not just a sale to a housing developer. Should some parts of the land be released for residential development

and other parts held for other uses? Should the Council consider the needs of the community for special types of housing e.g. catering for older or younger people looking for smaller units?

**1844**

As a resident of Diamond Harbour, I am submitting an outright rejection of the Christchurch City Council's stated intention in the Long Term Plan to effectively fast-track the disposal of a significant parcel of land in Diamond Harbour. The area comprises two properties described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha)

I propose as follows:

1a. The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan. It is completely inappropriate for the sale of such a complex parcel of land to be fast-tracked without meaningful community consultation, and this in itself contradicts the council's stated intent in this webpage discussion on planning.

1b The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation).

2. Instead, any proposal to engage in discussion about disposal of this land should go through a proper consultation process with residents directly and also via the local community association, which is knowledgeable in tracking historic and current local developments, and is engaged and highly responsive to the



various needs within our community. A consultation process would include Council proposals as to how the land should be utilised, public meetings, and a submission process for residents to have meaningful input.

3. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Banks Peninsula Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not be made solely or even predominantly by Council staff.

4. There are many significant and complex matters which need to be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process.

Some of these are:

- Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations.
- The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles.
- The need for adequate safe green spaces for existing residents (let alone a bigger population) should be thoroughly assessed and addressed.
  - For example, at the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current and historic 'commons' usage and vehicle access by residents on Marine Drive, which needs to be formally provided for. This green space is well utilised by residents in the vicinity, and has been maintained and used by locals for decades in various ways, with considerable harmony and enjoyment. It is well placed and contoured to continue to enrich the neighbourhood with a variety of potential uses such as safe dog exercise, safe children's play, neighbourhood gatherings and further community garden/ orchard development.
  - Diamond Harbour's existing infrastructure of narrow roads and footpaths, and narrow uneven cliff tracks, is not adequate or safe for a mix of users including vehicle traffic, dog walkers and recreational walkers/joggers of all ages. Provision should be made for safe and more evenly-contoured walking/playing/shared areas that all existing residents can access. There is a large proportion of retired residents, and many families with children, whose needs are not well catered for.
  - One example of local enthusiasm for development of community spaces, is the recent action by residents which has resulted in a redesignation of the small reserve on the corner of Waipapa Ave and Te Ra Cres.
- Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.
- If there are houses built, the school roll may well increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan.
- If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Drivers already need to limit speeds to 25km/hour there. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner.
- The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land?
- Should all the land be sold (privatised) at one time? Would a staged housing development be better for the community?
- Different use options for the land need to be considered not just a sale to a housing developer. Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses? Should the Council consider the needs of the community for special types of housing e.g. catering for older or younger people looking for smaller units?

## 1850

---

I am completely opposed to the disposal of these properties without a full consultation process, that is, the LTP consultation is insufficient.

The issues below need exploration and community discussion. It is completely inappropriate for the CCC to sell/dispose of the properties without addressing these issues, examples of which are outlined below.

Furthermore 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 functional. If there were to be a substantial development (of the order that the land disposal 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.

In any event Morgan's Gully and Sam's Gully and the walkways and walking routes need to be fully protected and covenanted.

I support Morgan's Gully and Sam's Gully being given Reserve status.

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.

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.)

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.

It is imperative that there is full consultation and a planned approach to these land not just disposal.

For the above reasons I cannot support the disposal of 42 Whero Avenue and 27 Hunters Road properties.

The elements above (and likely others) need to be integrated into a planned package and discussed by the community.

## 2002

---

We oppose the proposed sale of this land for the following reasons :

The vistas from this land are iconic and deserve to be enjoyed by everyone .

The walkways are within easy reach of Christchurch families visiting our area and easily accesible from the ferry as a day trip adventure.

The infrastrusture required to support housing in this area would be a huge ongoing cost

Tracks are walked as safe routes by schoolchildren to school .

Tracks have been made and planted with NZ native trees by working bees with local student and superannuitant input . These plantings have been watered through hot dry summers by both groups.



## 1854

---

I am submitting about the proposal to fast track the sale of the land as described as (27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres) and request that it 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.

The social, cultural and financial implications of the the sale and development of this land on the existing infrastructure of Diamond Harbour (water, power sewerage, safety, roading, medical and educational facilities) need to be fully considered under due process.

Additionally, there is significant community investment in the restoration of the natural flora and fauna in this area and the environmental impacts of any change to the current situation need to be given due process and consideration via the normal process for the disposal of land.

Fundamentally there are a multitude of social, environmental and sustainability issues to be considered in any potential development of this scale that can only be properly considered with full public consultation as per the usual process.

## 2016

---

### **Diamond Harbour Properties**

The Council has asked for feedback on a number of properties to help inform the decision making on whether these properties will be kept or disposed of. 27 Hunters Road and 42 Whero Avenue in Diamond Harbour form a 50 ha parcel of Council land adjacent to the township. The Diamond Harbour Reserves Management Committee in association with residents of Diamond Harbour and the Regional Parks Team have spent several years restoring the gullies, including planting, weeding and predator control. We note that this site is very important to the local community and there is a proposal to include the gullies in a Conservation Covenant. The Society has a strong mandate to protect the open space and natural character of the Port Hills and the wider Banks Peninsula and we would like to see the recreation and conservation values of these sites managed in line with the wishes of the local community. The disposal of these land parcels should be withdrawn from the Long Term Plan and the normal process for the disposal of land should be used instead. We would like to see the gullies legally protected and eventually become reserves to preserve public access.

## 2020

---

I request that land as described as 27 Hunters Rd (record of title CB12F/538,38.96 ha) and 42 Whero Ave (1 18 ha) be removed from the LTP and the fast track disposal process. The normal process for disposal of land requiring Community Board and public consultaion should be used instead. This ensures the Diamond Harbour Community had input into future development.

## 1953

With regards to the propsed diamond harbour land sales of 42 whero ave and 27 hunters rd, I would like these land sales to be removed from the long term plan (LTP) and put through a public consultantion process due to the many issues of concern to the community that would arise from the sale.

## 2052

---

Remove the disposal of 27 Hunters Rd and 42 Whero Avenue from the Long-term Plan. Any land sales of these two blocks should only be undertaken after extensive community consultation. For more detail and reasons, please read my attachment.

>>>

The Council has notified in its draft Long-term Plan (LTP) that it intends to dispose of the land between the current Diamond Harbour housing and Bay View Road, without further consultation (other than LTP submissions). The land is:

27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha)

Many residents live adjacent to the land or use the land. As well as the current sheep grazing, it contains Morgan and Sams gullies where many local people have been planting, watering, and weeding to restore native vegetation. The gullies have not yet been protected even though draft covenants have been prepared.

The land is currently Council freehold with a Residential Banks Peninsula district plan zoning. There are many issues that should be discussed with the Diamond Harbour community by the Council and the Community Board before the land is sold e.g. the uses of the land, the gullies, disposal sequencing and public access.

1. Both pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan.
2. The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation).
3. Thorough community consultation should be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process.
4. Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not just be made by Council staff.
5. Any future subdivision is unlikely to be a notified consent, therefore the Council and developer may not seek community views on its design. I request that a separate consultation process is established prior to disposal.
6. The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process.

- Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves. Or preferably, the areas set aside as reserves now, rather than going through an intermediary covenant stage. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations.
- The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles and do not follow the fence-lines. This means that extensive areas of native planting are not in the draft covenants.
- Public walking tracks have been built by volunteers within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for. The Mt Herbert Walkway in Morgans Gully also has no easement at present (as it is on Council land) and this needs to be completed before disposal or the land reserved. The Mt Herbert Walkway is going to become more popular with the upcoming purchase of Te Ahu Patiki to create a new conservation park above Diamond Harbour.
- If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school may wish to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is an easement to the western side of the school but no designation for further expansion in the district plan.
- If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue, more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea Road is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner. Bay View Road is steep and narrow and not suitable for a large amount of increased traffic.
- The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land?

- Should all the land be sold at one time? Would a staged housing development be better for the community and release the Council more money over the long-term? Holding back some of the land enables future options to be preserved. The land will increase in value and the current grazing is keeping costs low.
- Different use options for the land need to be considered not just a sale to a housing developer. Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses? Should the Council consider the needs of the community for special types of housing e.g. catering for older or younger people looking for smaller units?

Finally, to reiterate - both pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan.

## 2023

---

We have to consult the Diamond harbour community before the land is sold as it overdevelopment could be an unintended consequence.

## 2025

---

Regarding - 27 Hunters Rd, Vacant Land, Pt Lot 1 DP14050++, 12F/538, 390,222 sq metres.

Dear Madams and Sirs,

The disposal of this land is no surprise yet the mechanism that is being used to dispose of it is rash and unjustified. There is no reason for it to be removed from the requirement of going through Community Board and public consultation. Instead it is being 'fast tracked' for disposal. The normal process for disposal of land would require Community Board and public consultation. This should be followed in this instance.

The reason for my and many other persons who know of and live within the Diamond Harbour area is that it does retain some of its natural water courses/streams/gullies that are of such importance to the native flora and fauna ecosystems within its boundaries and either side of the boundaries.

I acknowledge the need for further housing options within the greater Christchurch City Council zones; I acknowledge that there is historic indication that this land would eventually be utilised for this purpose; although it must be acknowledged that land developers work to a financial model that dictates the maximisation of an asset. This is my concern that without Community Board and public consultation there may be infilling and destruction of natural and universally beneficial land formations such as water courses and gullies and streams.

A real consultation (public and community board) with all stakeholders (representing those who can speak and those who can't/that which can't); we as a collective (a council voted in by the people and the people themselves being heard by our representatives) will be best able to protect this asset that belongs to us all as it transitions into something different and something out of our control.

Please take this land out of a potentially fast tracked process and let all sides be heard in order to hold any future parties with controlling power to account in such a way as to protect the intrinsic value of its natural functions connecting mountain to sea and the areas either side of its boundaries.

Thank you for your time and your highest consideration of this submission,

## 2029

---

Potential disposal of 27 Hunters Road, Bayview Road Diamond harbour

I am a Diamond Harbour resident and have lived there for many years.

Our community is semi rural and would be irrevocably changed if 40 hectares of land at Hunters road were sold and developed for residential use. The great number of extra residents would change the very essence of what makes Diamond Harbour a unique place to live.

It is also unlikely that the existing infrastructure could cope with this large increase in residents. The road intersections are hardly safe now. Sewage disposal will become a further issue. Public transport like the excellent ferry service would not cope.

I am opposed to the land being added to the disposal schedule, allowing Council staff and not elected members or the community the right to decide the future of the land.

I cannot understand how Council staff could have considered placing such a large parcel of land in proposed disposal schedule, considering the potential major impact of this disposal would have on the community, a good idea.

Is this decision heavily weighted toward financial gain rather than respect for the unique character of the Diamond Harbour community.

Please remove the land from the schedule, and plan any future development as small incremental steps rather than a large development like this which will damage the character of the community

## 2037

---

A request to STOP the suspicious fast-track disposal of the few paddocks in Diamond Harbour (especially '42 Whero Ave'). There NEEDS TO BE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION. Please listen to the community.

## 2088

---

This needs to be not rushed through and quickly sold off. This is not OK, public consultation needs to go ahead first before any land is sold and subdivided. Whero Ave in Diamond Harbour and Hunters Reserve is important to the area and I bought a house here as I loved the rural outlook and space. If diamond harbour gets too populated it will lose the charm of why people want to live and visit here, let's not ruin another beautiful landscape like they have in Queenstown, yes extreme scale. It all starts small and scales up quickly. Democracy needs to be executed here.

## 1765

The properties in Diamond Harbour (Sam's and Morgan's Gullies) are incredibly erosion prone, and would be best gazetted as Reserves and offered to the local Rūnanga, Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke for first refusal - as should any land the CCC is planning on 'disposing' of, as fair and just deference to a Treaty partner.

## 1764

---

Land disposal diamond harbour both 27 Hunters road and 42 Whero avenue should be, if locally acceptable and reasonable, only following full community and community board consultation and input.

## 2273

The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process. I propose full consultation be undertaken with our community with regards to the following issues as outlined by our local Diamond Harbour Association. Please do not disregard your responsibilities to the people and community that voted you in your position to look after our interests.

- Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations.
- The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles.
- Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.
- If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan.
- If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner.
- The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land?
- Should all the land be sold (privatised) at one time? Would a staged housing development be better for the community?
- Different use options for the land need to be considered not just a sale to a housing developer. Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses? Should the Council consider the needs of the community for special types of housing e.g. catering for older or younger people looking for smaller units?

## 1689

I would like to make a submission regarding the Council's plan to dispose of the land between the current Diamond Harbour housing and Bay View Road.

This plan should follow normal land disposal processes, i.e. full community consultation and input of the Community Board must be included to determine the future use of this land. The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the "Potential Disposal of Council Land" in the Long-term Plan.

As nearby residents my wife and I value the natural beauty of the adjacent land, I'm also part of the group of volunteers who are

involved in the re-planting project of Morgan/Sam's gullies. The walking tracks created in these gullies have become very popular and are widely used by locals, visitors and school students.

Issues like gully protection, road access, wastewater infrastructure of Diamond Harbour, to only name a few, need to be discussed during a thorough community consultation process.

## 2147

---

### 4.1 Retain Diamond Harbour land as a regional park

A large block of Council owned land in Diamond Harbour is earmarked for disposal. The land is intersected by several gullies which host waterways and native biodiversity and are used for recreational walking, including the track leading to the summit of Mt Herbert/Te Ahu Pātiki and the Te Ara Pātaka network, and the School Track which enables children to walk safely to school instead of being driven by their parents.

Our preference is that this be revegetated in native forest for carbon sequestration and retained with a new status as a regional park. Selling it would be entirely contrary to our view that the Council should obtain more regional parks for sequestration. It is essential that the bush gullies and the walking tracks are protected. Although the Trust generally favours natural regeneration, this land, right in the centre of an urban area, would be ideal for planting, and would provide an excellent place for a climate change community engagement project.

## 2115

---

do not fast track the sale of council owned land in Diamond Harbour.

>>>

requesting that the land as described as 27 Hunters Rd (Record of Title CB12F/538, 38.96ha) and 42 Whero Avenue (Record of Title CB452/50, 1.18ha) 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.

The two pieces of land should be withdrawn from the 'Potential disposal of Council Land' in the Long-term Plan. This is the most important point to make if you wish to see meaningful consultation.

The current process does not adequately meet the requirements of Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Principles of consultation).

Thorough community consultation should be undertaken to determine the future of the land. This would include Council

proposals as to how it should be utilised, public meetings and a submission process.

Decisions on whether to proceed with the sale of the land should be made by the Council on the recommendation of the Community Board. Decisions on the sale should not just be made by Council staff.

The following matters should be considered if disposal is to proceed through normal disposal processes involving Community Board and community input. These cannot be adequately considered through the current LTP submission process.

Gully protection. Morgans and Sams Gully have had extensive replanting undertaken in them by community members with the support of both the City Council, Environment Canterbury, and Whakaraupō Healthy Harbour. A draft conservation covenant has been prepared for them but not finalised. The gully by the school that is also unsuitable for housing should also be protected. The covenants should be completed, and a timeline developed for these areas to become reserves established. Long-term ownership by a land developer while covenanted is likely to lead to conflicts with community usage and aspirations.

The boundaries of the land to be sold should be determined prior to disposal rather than disposing of all land 'as is where is'. For example, the 42 Whero Avenue block contains three sections that have been included in a private garden. Kura Lane has a mixture of roading and gardens on it. At the top end of Ngatea Road, there is current usage and access by residents on Marine Drive. The proposed covenant boundaries intersect in a complex manner with the land titles.

Tracks have been built within the proposed covenant areas, but in addition the main school walking access track from Waipapa Avenue to the school does not have an easement and needs to be provided for.

If there are houses built, the school roll may increase, and the school grounds may need to expand on to the land considered for disposal. There is no designation for further expansion in the district plan.

If road access to the site is developed through Ngatea Road, or Whero Avenue more vehicles will use those streets. Ngatea is narrow and has a sharp bend on it. Whero Avenue has a dangerous low visibility corner.



The Diamond Harbour wastewater infrastructure is prone to blockage and leakage and has an ageing pipe system. Who will pay for the costs to upgrade the system to cope with the many houses that can be placed on the land?

Should all the land be sold (privatised) at one time? Would a staged housing development be better for the community?

Different use options for the land need to be considered not just a sale to a housing developer. Should some parts of the land be released for residential development and other parts held for other uses? Should the Council consider the needs of the community for special types of housing e.g. catering for older or younger people looking for smaller units?