

**Te Hapori o Ōhinehou rāua ko te Ahu Pātiki**  
**Lyttelton-Mt Herbert Community Board Submissions**  
**Committee**  
**OPEN MINUTES**

---

**Date:** Wednesday 1 June 2016  
**Time:** 1pm  
**Venue:** Boardroom, Lyttelton Service Centre,  
15 London Street, Lyttelton

---

**Present**

Members

Denis Aldridge  
Ann Jolliffe  
Paula Smith  
Andrew Turner  
Christine Wilson

---

31 May 2016

Liz Beaven  
Community Board Advisor  
941 5602  
liz.beaven@ccc.govt.nz  
[www.ccc.govt.nz](http://www.ccc.govt.nz)

- Part A**      **Matters Requiring a Council Decision**  
**Part B**      **Reports for Information**  
**Part C**      **Decisions Under Delegation**
- 

### **In Attendance:**

Denis Aldridge, Ann Jolliffe, Paula Smith, Andrew Turner and Christine Wilson.

The agenda was dealt with in the following order.

The meeting adjourned at 1pm and resumed at 2.06pm.

## **1. Election of Chairperson**

### **Part C**

It was resolved that Member Smith be appointed Chairperson of the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board Submissions Committee .

Member Aldridge/Member Jolliffe

**Carried**

## **2. Apologies**

### **Part C**

### **Apologies**

#### **Committee Resolved LMSC/2016/00004**

It was resolved on the motion of Member Aldridge, seconded by Member Jolliffe that the apology from Member Turner for early departure be accepted. Member Turner was absent for part of Clause 4 – Feedback on Draft Dampier Bay Design Guide.

Member Aldridge/Member Jolliffe

**Carried**

## **3. Declarations of Interest**

### **Part B**

There were no declarations of interest recorded.

## **4. Feedback on Draft Dampier Bay Design Guidelines**

At this meeting, the Submissions Committee formulated feedback on behalf of the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board on the Lyttelton Port Company's Draft Dampier Bay Design Guidelines. The feedback is **attached**.

#### **Committee Resolved LMSC/2016/00005**

That the Committee:

1. Approve the feedback on the Draft Dampier Bay Design Guidelines.

2. Decide that the feedback on the Draft Dampier Bay Design Guidelines be submitted to Lyttelton Port Company by the Committee Chairperson.

Member Smith/Member Wilson

**Carried**

**Meeting concluded at 2.18pm.**

**TO:** Lyttelton Port Company

Email: [feedback@lpc.co.nz](mailto:feedback@lpc.co.nz)  
[jared.pettersson@lpc.co.nz](mailto:jared.pettersson@lpc.co.nz)

**FEEDBACK ON:** Draft Dampier Bay Design Guidelines / He Aratohu Hoahoa

**FEEDBACK BY:** Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board

**CONTACT:** Lyttelton Service Centre  
PO Box 73027  
CHRISTCHURCH 8154

Email: [amy.hart@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:amy.hart@ccc.govt.nz)

**DATE:** [2 June 2016](#)

Te Hapori o Ohinehou Raua ko ahu Patiki / Lyttelton Mt Herbert Community Board represents the communities around Lyttelton Harbour and Port Levy. The Board's statutory role is, "to represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of its community" (Local Government Act 2002, section 52). In this capacity the Board provides feedback on the Draft Dampier Bay Design Guidelines.

---

**Question 1 – Overall, do you support the direction of the Draft Dampier Bay Design Guidelines?**

Yes, overall the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board (the Board) supports the direction of the Draft Dampier Bay Design Guidelines (Draft Guidelines).

**Question 2 – What do you like best in the Draft Dampier Bay Design Guidelines?**

- (a) The Board supports objectives articulated in *Section 5.0 - Design Objectives / Ka Whaika*, in particular the two following objectives regarding heritage:
- *Protect and maintain historic heritage features including archaeological elements as part of the design and story-telling at the site;*
  - *Recognise the social, industrial, architectural, and maritime significance of the Port.*
- (b) The Board supports *Section 3.0 - History and Context / Te Horopaki*.
- (c) The Board supports the use of both English and Māori languages throughout the Draft Guidelines.

**Question 3 – What are the aspects of the Draft Dampier Bay Design Guidelines you would like changed?**

- (a) In *Section 5.0 - Design Objectives / Ka Whaika*, the Board supports the following two objectives regarding accessibility and quality with amendments:
- *Provide a lively, safe and accessible destination for people of all ages and physical abilities, ~~as far as practicable~~;*
  - *Implement Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED), Injury Prevention through Environmental Design (IPTED), and universal access design principles, ~~where practicable~~*

The Board's view is that these objectives are not “nice-to-haves”. As achieving universally accessible and safe outcomes often costs more, including references to practicability enables design decisions to be made which do not result in the outcomes intended. The Board requests that the two objectives be amended as above to give an unambiguous signal to developers regarding what is expected.

- (b) While the Board is pleased to see reference to protecting and maintaining heritage in the overarching objectives, the Board cannot see where this intent is articulated in any of the sub-chapters of the Draft Guidelines themselves.

This seems to be at odds with the purpose of the Guidelines as stated in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan, which is to *“address how the development of new buildings and public spaces will maintain and enhance the historic, maritime and industrial character of Lyttelton Port.”*

The Board supports inclusion of a sub-chapter of the Guidelines, *Heritage and Context*, which expresses the need to make the most of what heritage remains by using and incorporating existing heritage fabric into new development and only destroying or demolishing tangible evidence of the past when there is no alternative.

**Question 4 – Please indicate how much you support the ‘principles’ included in the Guide**

- (a) The Board strongly supports design principles which create an expectation to **“respond to existing local character.”**

**Why?** New development at Dampier Bay would be a good fit with the wider Lyttelton townscape.

- (b) The Board strongly supports **“quality access and connections,”** in particular good access and connections to the public transport network.

The Board supports quality pedestrian connections between Dampier Bay and the rest of Lyttelton, and opposes any temporary or permanent measures which are not universally accessible, safe and high amenity. In particular, the Board opposes use of the existing steps as the interim connection to and from Norwich Quay. The Board also notes that safety improvements will need to be considered regarding the proposed pedestrian link to Godley Quay, as there is no footpath on the Dampier Bay side of Godley Quay.

The Board suggests consideration should be given to providing public access from the sea by incorporating a short term mooring area for harbour residents arriving and departing by their own vessels.

**Why?** Optimising accessibility maximises the number of people passing through Dampier Bay and activates the place.

- (c) The Board strongly supports **“integrated car parking,”** particularly to meet the needs of users of the public transport network and users of Black Cat's services and other commercial operators. The Board notes that large areas of parked cars are (or were until recently) a familiar sight in Lyttelton as imported cars are unloaded and stored on the waterfront. This is a familiar and acceptable part of the Lyttelton vernacular.

- (d) The Board supports **“positive relationships between buildings and spaces.”**

**Why?** “Positive relationships” between buildings and publicly accessible open spaces help to activate and enliven the area and will make places safer.

- (e) The Board supports a design principle which requires developers to **“respond to local building forms and scale.”**

**Why?** Lyttelton evolved before there were planning rules (or design guidelines!). Existing commercial and industrial parts of Lyttelton are characterised by building diversity with unexpected juxtaposition of buildings of different scale, form and even uses. This eclecticism contributes significantly to the existing character of Lyttelton.

- (f) The Board supports the **“incorporation of local materials and colours.”**

**Why?** Use of local materials will result in a built environmental outcome which sits comfortably within its receiving environment.

- (g) The Board is neutral about the principle to **“provide a range of quality public spaces.”**

**Why?** The most important publicly accessible space at Dampier Bay will be the waterfront promenade. This is the public space which needs to be top quality. The Board supports a promenade width of 8 metres, with at least 4 metres of usable space.

The spaces between the buildings and to the rear could be relatively industrial. There may be value in seeking some contrast in quality between the promenade and other spaces in the area to highlight the primacy of the waterfront promenade.

- (h) The Board strongly supports **“incorporating a quality public promenade.”**

**Why?** For many in the Lyttelton community the main benefit of development at Dampier Bay will be provision of an alternative off-road pedestrian and skateboard route between the town centre and recreation areas at Naval Point. Dampier Bay is the only place (apart from the Diamond Harbour ferry berth) where it is possible for the public to access the inner harbour. The promenade will make the most of this connection with the water.

- (i) The Board is neutral about the **“incorporation of coastal planting.”**

**Why?** Formally arranged street trees are not a feature of the existing Lyttelton townscape, nor is landscaping a feature of other parts of the inner harbour waterfront. The Board is unconvinced that decorative landscaping will *“maintain and enhance the historic maritime and industrial character,”* which is the over-riding objective of the Draft Guidelines. However if planting is to be a feature of development then coastal natives would be most appropriate.

- (j) The Board neither supports nor opposes the **“creation of a distinctive street and spaces with a local look and feel.”**

**Why?** The back road through Dampier Bay will contribute positively overall to accessibility at the site provided it is designed to connect with the existing road network in ways which do not create issues or problems for residents, or for users of the public transport network. Care may be needed to ensure the back road functions mainly as a slow service lane for the businesses at Dampier Bay and does not become a short cut between Norwich Quay and Naval Point.

**Question 5 – General comments**

The Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan states, *“Lyttelton Port Company Ltd intends that the preparation of the design guidance will be a collaborative process, including members of the community, local Rūnanga and Christchurch City Council.”*

While the Board acknowledges that Lyttelton Port Company has sought public input, and is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Guidelines, the Board does not consider the process used to develop the Guidelines to be collaborative.

The Board suggests consideration should be given to establishing a robust process for regular and ongoing collaboration with both community and mana whenua as Dampier Bay develops.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. The Board would be happy to discuss any of the points raised with Lyttelton Port Company.

Yours sincerely



**Paula Smith**

Chairperson, Te Hapori o Ōhinehou raua ko Ahu Pātiki/Lyttelton Mt Herbert Community Boa