

## Christchurch City Council MINUTES ATTACHMENTS

**Date:** Thursday 10 March 2022  
**Time:** 9.30am  
**Venue:** Held by Audio/Visual Link

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>3.1.1. Historic Places Canterbury - Mark Gerrard</b>	
A. Council 10 March 2022 - Public Forum Historic Places Christchurch - Upper Riccarton War Memorial Library - Supporting Document .....	4
<b>3.1.2. Christchurch Civic Trust - Ross Gray</b>	
A. Council 10 March 2022 - Public Forum Christchurch Civic Trust Public Forum Supporting Document Upper Riccarton War Memorial Library .....	5
<b>3.1.3. Chris Doudney</b>	
A. Council 10 March 2022 - Public Forum - Chris Doudney Supporting Document - 86A Beachville Road Redcliffs .....	7
<b>3.2.1. Governors Bay Jetty Restoration Trust - Prue Miller, Chair and Louisa Eades, Trust Secretary</b>	
A. Council 10 March 2022 - Deputation Governors Bay Jetty Restoration Trust - Memo to Council Meeting item 21 Community Loan Application - Supporting Document .....	8
<b>7. Monthly Report from the Community Boards - February 2022</b>	
A. Council 10 March 2022 - Papanui-Innes Community Board Presentation to Council .....	12
B. Council 10 March 2022 - Spreydon-Cashmere Community Board Presentation to Council .....	18
C. Council 10 March 2022 - Banks Peninsula Community Board Presentation to Council .....	24
D. Council 10 March 2022 - Coastal-Burwood Community Board Presentation to Council .....	31
E. Council 10 March 2022 - Fendalton-Waimairi-Harewood Community Board Presentation to Council .....	38
F. Council 10 March 2022 - Halswell-Hornby-Riccarton Community Board Presentation to Council .....	41
G. Council 10 March 2022 - Linwood-Central-Heathcote Community Board Presentation to Council .....	48
<b>21. Community Loan Application - Governors Bay Jetty Trust</b>	
A. Council 10 March 2022 - Staff Presentation Item 21 - Community Loan Application - Governors Bay Jetty Restoration Trust .....	54
<b>11. International Relations Policy Framework</b>	

A.	Council 10 March 2022 - Staff Presentation item 11 - International Relations Policy Framework.....	56
----	--	----

**3.2.4. Catholic Diocese Christchurch**

A.	Council 10 March 2022 - Deputation Catholic Diocese - Supporting Document item 15 Performing Arts Precinct - Car Park - Public Consultation (Jo Appleyard - Chapman Tripp) .....	65
----	--	----

**3.2.6. Nathaniel Herz-Edinger**

A.	Council 10 March 2022 - Deputation Nathaniel Herz-Edinger - Supporting Document item 15 Performing Arts Precinct - Car Park.....	80
----	--	----

---





*The Voice of Heritage*

**Historic Places Canterbury Public Forum Presentation to the Christchurch City Council  
Thursday, 10th March 2022**

**Mayor and Councillors,**

Thank You for allowing me to make this presentation.

Historic Places Canterbury (HPC) has concerns about the processes leading up to and the decision to demolish the Upper Riccarton War Memorial Library.

Our major concerns are the following:

**Lack of Extensive Community Engagement.**

HPC considers the community and stakeholders should have had a say in the future of this iconic building, on site since 1919.

After HPC raised its concerns publicly; a Christchurch RSA has been in touch expressing an interest. For myself, within a minute of finishing my live interview with Radio New Zealand's Jessie Mulligan, a property developer rang asking about strengthening costs.

There is interest in the community.

HPC has received an usually large number of emails expressing opposition to the proposed demolition.

HPC has been told that regular ANZAC services were held at the Library with an attendance of 200 odd people, chairs were lent by the adjacent Spagalimis and a local bakery opening up early to supply food.

**Why will the CCC not work with the community to retain and determine a future for this building?**

**No Heritage Assessment included in the Report to Council.**

The CCC Heritage Team did not provide a formal heritage assessment of the building. The question needs to be raised, why were they not asked? A 1919 building called the Upper Riccarton War Memorial Library, any reasonable Christchurch Resident would conclude it should have been assessed by the CCC Heritage Team before a recommendation to demolish.

Surely the CCC should be leading by example? This is a case where Leadership was required.

Some of the Councillors may recall similar circumstances occurred with the Yaldhurst Memorial Hall. We were given assurances then, it would not happen again.

Stating the building was not listed with the HNZPT or scheduled in the District Plan so it has little heritage relevance, the cost, no economic use (as assessed by CCC Staff) are similar arguments used regularly by Property Developers when they plan to demolish.

Surely the CCC can do better and lead by example?

**CCC Heritage Strategy- Our Heritage Out Taonga**

I could find no reference to this Strategy in the report to Council.

The question is being asked what is the value of this much consulted and supported strategy that a 1919 War Memorial Library Building does not warrant an assessment yet alone a reference to the Strategy in a CCC Report?

Jock Philips in his book "To the Memory" observed there was a transition from Sculptural Monuments (South African/WW1) to Living Memorials (like the WW 2 Memorial Halls). This Library Building, a Living WW1 Memorial, the first of its kind, could be significant. It awaits the CCC Heritage Team to make this assessment.

Mark Gerrard  
Chair Historic Places Canterbury

Kia ora koutou, good morning Mayor Dalziel and City Councillors

CHRISTCHURCH CIVIC TRUST considers that against a backdrop of war in Ukraine, the matters around this War Memorial Library and its future, take on a special focus.

- 1 The life of War Memorials: they are not made for the short haul, they should be as everlasting as is humanly possible. Once set in stone as it were, they manifest memory and emotion through time, as with the Upper Riccarton War Memorial Library since 1919.
- 2 War Memorials are material things, some as buildings which are just as 'sacrosanct' as statues. The shameful example of the demolition of the Christchurch Technical College War Memorial Hall in 2014 must never be repeated in Christchurch.
- 3 Their materiality is part of the climate change knife's edge we're on: as Cllr Johanson said in effect, the greenest building is the one standing. We must conserve not demolish.
- 4 They are about collective memory: as Chris Macann's letter, which you were all sent on 28 Feb says '...and George lies now forever in a foreign field but he is remembered in that Library Building which was once the heart of the rural community he grew up in ...'
- 5 This war memorial library is about real people and their stories: 38 Upper Riccarton young men who fought and died, including Chris's Uncle George. Alongside George's name on the Library Honours Boards are four Upper Riccarton Raxworthy brothers, one killed in 1916, two in 1917 and one in 1942. Imagine it, the immense grief, but also the consolation that those four names were engraved, enshrined in the heart of Upper Riccarton. But further: Raxworthy St, named in their honour, is the only street in an Upper Riccarton development of the 1960s on land bought from Pyne Gould Guinness which was not named after a PGG employee!
- 6 This is all about deep meaning; remembrance and stories, memories and identity and is beyond mere dollars.
- 7 CHRISTCHURCH CIVIC TRUST cannot command Christchurch City Council to retain and restore the Upper Riccarton War Memorial Library building as a memorial, but it can and does recommend that the decision to demolish be reversed and it can and will commend the council should it act to do so.

Ross Gray Chair Christchurch Civic Trust

February 28, 2022

The city council has decided to demolish the Upper Riccarton World War 1 Memorial Library with no plans for the future of the site, just an intention to consult at some point down the track. The cost of repairing the building is a modest \$500,000, the cost of a medium house. A functional, tangible memorial needs to remain on that site, a room where people can remember that Upper Riccarton was once a small village which gave-up 38 of its sons. These boys never returned home, and those entrusted to maintain this legacy do not have the right to remove the building built to honour them. Uncle George was one of three brothers who went to war. They grew up farming in the vicinity of Middleton Road, and George lies now forever in a foreign field but he is remembered in that Library Building which was once the heart of the rural community he grew up in. Please retain this memorial as a building, and suitable repository, lest we forget.

Christopher Macann, great nephew.

- [C H Raxworthy](#) [Charles Herbert RAXWORTHY](#) d 1917
- [J R Raxworthy](#) [John Robert RAXWORTHY](#) d 1917
- [T A Raxworthy](#) [Thomas Arthur RAXWORTHY](#) d 1916

Daly, Jo

---

From: cm.doudney [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, 10 March 2022 9:00 am  
To: Daly, Jo  
Cc: chris doudney; Daly, Jo; RRA Committee  
Subject: 86A Beachville Road Redcliffs

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to you as a city council regarding 86A Beachville Road, a 6 unit social housing site in Redcliffs. After the earthquakes the Council was intent upon throwing out the elderly tenants of the property and selling off this prime site so as to theoretically build a larger number of social housing units in a poor suburb somewhere else.

The general fuss and opposition to the loss of the homes of the tenants who were part of the local community resulted in the evictions and sale being cancelled.

Subsequent tenanting of the flats (as the elderly incumbents died) with burglars, prostitutes, and other unbalanced people was construed by some of us as spiteful revenge on the part of the property managers.

Now that an old friend, a tenant of 86A Beachville Road, has moved into a rest home in Sumner we have not had a lot to do with the property, so it is a great shock to see it advertised for sale by Bayleys, by deadline treaty concluding on 17 March.

To sell a prime site to finance development in poor locations is shockingly bad social housing policy, and I am surprised that is a policy adhered to by the Council. We should have social housing spread right though the city. Furthermore, the present property managers demolished the 10 single-person units also on the site at the time of the earthquakes, when they could have been repaired and upgraded, or replaced. They could still be replaced. To lose social housing with the aim of re-building elsewhere instead of upgrading the existing building is a very unsustainable approach, let alone the high cost of carrying out the process.(eg cost of sale process, professional fees and land costs for rebuilding elsewhere, etc.Not much of the money raised by this sale will actually remain in actual social housing provision.

The earthquakes caused the loss of many elderly persons homes in Redcliffs, and 86A Beachville Road remains a key surviving element in the suburb. I am aware that the Council's (or Trust's) ruling mantra is that they are a city-wide organisation and need to consider local priorities not at all. But local priorities are important, and local organisations (eg the Redcliffs Residents Association) are available to consult and recommend with regard to the mix of tenants in such establishments. (Probably no recidivist burglars). The main point of this letter is to enquire whether the Council was aware of the current action, and whether even at this late stage the action can be reversed. Social housing is important to the City, and is equally important to Redcliffs.

Regards,

Chris Doudney  
[REDACTED]  
Redcliffs, Christchurch 8081  
[REDACTED]



































































































































































