

RECLAMATION

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Diamond Harbour Community Association	Consent Process	4.1.1 - Support the consent being publicly notified. This gives the opportunity for residents to influence its design and construction.	Public Notification
Governors Bay Amenity Preservation Society	Consent Process	Is the area being reclaimed being rightfully reclaimed? If the land belongs to the public then what rights do LPC have to reclaim it?	We understand that the reclamation has restricted notification and consider it should follow the proper protocol for public notification.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Consent Process	p8 We fully support public notification of the reclamation consent application.	No change
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Consent Process	p53 (Section 4.1.1) We support public notification of the resource consent application for Te Awaparahi Bay reclamation.	No change
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Consent Process	p53 (Section 4.1.1 - Sidebar) Matters for Control - Development of a container terminal capable of servicing larger ships on the enlarged reclamation will have significant adverse effects on the Lyttelton Harbour landscape. There is also considerable community concern about the effects of the reclamation on harbour circulation and sediment transport. Both these issues should be included in the list of matters for control.	Add Landscape/visual effects on harbour circulation and sediment transport to the list of matters for control for Te Awaparahi Bay reclamation.
Matthew Ross	Consent Process	I support consideration of the detailed proposals for Te Awaparahi Bay Reclamation under the Resource Management Act however I do not support Controlled Activity Status in section 4.1.1. The preliminary draft Recovery Strategy states that the location is "necessary" because Te Awaparahi Bay is separated geographically from Lyttelton Township by a headland and therefore relocation of the container terminal will reduce the adverse effects on that community. However LPC's information package provides evidence that the Te Awaparahi Bay Reclamation will have effects on the wider harbour environment and associated amenity impacts (e.g. visual and light pollution) for Diamond Harbour. Controlled Activity Status for Te Awaparahi Bay would fast-track LPC's preferred approach and effectively foreclose the development of alternative options that could benefit both Lyttelton and Diamond Harbour.	Te Awaparahi Bay Reclamation should have Controlled Activity Status only if: It is assessed to have a positive contribution to the environmental, social, cultural and economic well-being of Diamond Harbour, and; ECan, LPC, TRONT have signed off the completed integrated management. The addition of a breakwater to the Te Awaparahi Bay Reclamation is made a prohibited activity. Map 5.7 is amended to provide flexibility for reclamation to be orientated to allow for configurations that minimise environmental effects.
Pete Simpson	Consent Process	4.1.1 - Support the consent being publicly notified. This gives the opportunity for residents to influence its design and construction.	N/A
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Consent Process	Activity status should be Discretionary. Public notification is required.	Activity status should be Discretionary. Public notification is required.
Southshore Residents Association	Construction	Earthquake rubble has been used for reclamation at Port, including plastics and timber which has entered marine environment and washed up on Southshore beach, this poses a risk to recreational users and marine wildlife. Future reclamations should use solid perimeter wall of clean quarried material, other material should then be placed on the landward side of this wall so that contaminants are stopped from escaping.	Recognise that the use of earthquake rubble in reclamation to-date has led to adverse deposition of building materials on Southshore beach; tighten controls on the amount of debris that can be used in reclamation (no more than 10% of the volume) and how it is placed in future.
Ms Wendy Everingham	Construction	I object to all the fill that will be needed to create the reclamation. This will come from the nearby hills and believe the Sumner Road project overkill is purely to create the fill for this project. The destruction of the local environment is a travesty. You are going to destroy a very ecologically sensitive area purely for fill to develop a large reclamation.	This project should be reduced in size.
Mrs Ann Thorpe	Construction	I agree with the reclamation of Te Awaparahi Bay, if it is subject to the highest stringent controls on leakage of materials from the area.	To be subject to the highest stringent controls on leakage of materials.
Capt Jan Eveleens	Design	There is no consideration in the plan for nautical operational aspects like protection from ocean swell coming up the harbour. Easterly swells already cause problems with ships surging along Cashin Quay, even behind the Sticking Point breakwater, earning it the nickname Crashin Quay. The new container berths are totally exposed to swell coming in. This makes it very likely the surging problem will be worse. This will have the following effects: Slowing down cargo operations, as it is difficult to land a container or spreader on a moving ship. In some cases cargo work may have to be stopped. In very worst cases it may be impossible to keep a ship alongside. It will create a hazard for wharfies working cargo, so it is certainly a safety issue.	This could be achieved by a new breakwater further East. Or having the new berths in berth pockets laying in a North/South direction. The reclamation may have to extend further east to create enough space. I would like to see the reclamation extend less to the South, to have less impact on the harbour in general, and more shelter from the strong NW winds, that can also disrupt cargo work. I propose the layout of the reclamation and the new container terminal to be designed by an expert (likely from overseas). I propose a new provision in the plan to consider these nautical aspect of this plan.
Te Waka Pounamu	Effects on Harbour	Reservations are held on the ecological impacts and longer term effects on the harbour marine life which the club has no expertise in. On this matter we expect others to submit.	None - I support the proposed reclamation to allow for a marina and limited recreation activities to go in to the inner harbour.

RECLAMATION

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lyttelton Community Association Inc.	Effects on Harbour	We are concerned about the potential impact on the health of our harbour from any reclamation.	We request that the further reclamation issues be deferred until these matters are clarified.
Mark Watson	Effects on Harbour	Guarantee reclamation and dredging will not contribute to further modification of harbour circulation patterns and sedimentation problems. LPC says the reclamation will make no difference and Ecan's experts agree but there is plenty of anecdotal evidence that port activities have contributed to changes in the past. I want to be certain that what is proposed will make things better not worse.	N/A
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Effects on Harbour	A detailed assessment of the effects on mahinga kai is carried out prior to the application for the proposed reclamation. A technical assessment should be required which demonstrates why a further breakwater will not be required.	A detailed assessment of the effects on mahinga kai is carried out prior to the application for the proposed reclamation. A technical assessment should be required which demonstrates why a further breakwater will not be required.
Green Party	Effects on Harbour	ECan's audit of the sedimentation and current movement studies by LPC is superficial and provides no reassurance that the effects of the reclamation will be minor as claimed, Controlled activity status for the reclamation and the limited range of matters to which ECan's consideration is restricted is strongly opposed. This provides no incentive for LPC to minimise its adverse effects.	Amend the plan so that it provides only for the port's rebuild and repair, not further expansion of the container terminal. Stage the proposed reclamation so that only a portion (e.g. 5 ha) is provided for in the plan. Require LPC to use the Resource Management Act processes for further stages (22 ha) of the reclamation.
NZ Labour Party, Port Hills	Effects on Harbour	The reclamation at Te Awaparahi Bay has been part of the 30 year plan as a component of moving the Port operations eastward. I understand that this reclamation will still have further processes to go through, but I cannot emphasise strongly enough how important it is to get this right, in terms of the impact of this reclamation on the harbour. Issues of water quality, the impact on tidal flow, marine life and activities on the water must be of paramount consideration.	N/A
Governors Bay Community Association	Legal	The Plan makes no reference to any obligations under the Marine and Coastal Area /Takutai Moana Act 2011. This Act also states that, (2) Neither the Crown nor any other person owns, or is capable of owning, the common marine and coastal area, as in existence from time to time after the commencement of this Act (Part 2, Section 11, Common marine and coastal area). This alone should indicate that the community, and in particular, the interests of those holding mana moana over the area, are paramount. It seems that the Port Company are acting as though they have a freehold interest in the Port Operational Area, when in fact the area cannot be owned. The LPRP is unclear on the present and future status and ownership of the reclamation which appears to be an essential part of the Port's future.	That the LPRP acknowledges the primacy of the Marine and Coastal Area /Takutai Moana Act 2011 in any decisions involving the use and development of the common marine and coastal area as defined in the Act.
Helen Chambers	Legal	Is the area being reclaimed being rightfully reclaimed? Who actually owns this land? If it belongs to the public then maybe it is not for the LPC to reclaim without following the proper protocol for public notification. We understand this is not the case.	I request that the proper notification processes are followed
Melanie Dixon	Lighting	There is no serious consideration of the effects of light pollution in the LPRP. Ecan has not conducted a separate technical review of LPC's Appendix 24 lighting effects. The serious negative impacts of light pollution on ecology and human health have been well documented in the scientific literature and yet seen to have been ignored in Ecan's LPRP.	I request that Ecan prepares a full environmental impact assessment on the effects of increased light pollution as a result of the reclamation and circulates this report widely. I also request that LPC takes on board all steps recommended to mitigate the effects of light pollution both in current and future operations.
Governors Bay Amenity Preservation Society	Lighting	There is insufficient evidence in the Plan to indicate how the spread of lighting from the port will be contained. This should not be harmful to human health or affect biodiversity. The exclusion of height restrictions from the plan is of concern to us.	More research is required into the affect of lighting on humans and marine animals. Container height restrictions should be in place.

RECLAMATION

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Naval Point Club Lyttelton; J Allott; A Duncan; A Ludlow; A Carter; A Bowater; A Herriott; A Lealand; A Taylor; A Farqyharson; A Graham ; Ballingers Hunting & Fishing Ltd; B Gordon; B Moore; B Cowan; B Frederikson; B Godwin; B Robinson; B Armstrong; B Keen; B Parker; B Anderson; B Lang; B Hawkins; C Gibbons; Canterbury Maritime Training; Canterbury Yachting Association; C Dodds; C Cameron; C Guy; B Carrell; B Frederikson; C Lock; C McCulloch; D Atkinson; D Lake; D Bastin; D Munro; D Vile; D Haylock; D Miller; D Paterson; D Southwick; D Main; D Petrache; D Taylor; Des Crosbie; E Riley; F Bowater; F McLachlan; G Dixon; G Suckling; G Mentink; G Savage; G Irwin; G Anderson; G Burney; G Perrem; G Armstrong; G Bowater; G Ronald; Groundswell Sports Ltd; H Sylvester; H Anderson; H Walls; H Wilkinson; I Scott; I Armstrong; I Atkinson; J Riddoch; J Hopkins; J Mann; J Vilsbek; J Hern; J Davis; J Hawtin; K Selway; Ka Beatson; K Cowan; K Oborn; Ke Beatson; K Duncan; K Guy; L Hern; L Falconer; L Boyd; L Crawford; L Lilburne; L Duke; M Guy; M Ramsay; Martin Wellby; Matt Oborn; Matthew Shove; M Ferrar; M Hore; M Moore; M Anderson; M Hitchings; S Knight; N Wilde; M Griffiths; N Blain; O Corboy; P Beckett; P Lang; P Moore; P Savage; P Tocker; P Auger; P Folter; P Prendegast; R Atkinson; R O'Sullivan; N Grant; N Matthews; Oborn's Nautical; R Lascelles; Rob Wellesley; R Gibb; R Norris; R Lee; R Hale; R Hofmans; R Eveleens; R Rodgers; R Connolly; R Miller; S Jones; Samarah; S Chisnall; S Riddoch; S Hinman; S Oborn; S Moore; S Pierce S Cameron; South Island Finn Association; S Page; S Chester; S Coombe; T Wooding; T George; V Sue-Tang; V Moore; V Williams; V Newman; Waitaha Paddling Club; Wayne Keen; W Taggart; X Bowater; Coastguard Canterbury Incorporated; Coastguard Southern Region; M Brown; Te Waka Pounamu; Yachting NZ	Need for it	Reclamation will impact on recreational harbour users in terms of water space, however this reclamation will enable a shift of some port activities out of the inner harbour and allow development of a marina and associated commercial activities and public access in Dampier Bay. It will also relieve pressure on flat land resource in Naval Point to ensure continued availability of space for recreational activities for the benefit of the wider Canterbury community.	None - I support the proposed reclamation to allow for a marina to go in to the inner harbour.
Andrew Stark	Need for it	We support this reclamation and the proposed new container terminal facility.	None
Governors Bay Amenity Preservation Society	Need for it	Based on what evidence are freight volumes increasing? Is there a business plan that supports and documents these projections for increased freight volumes? It seems the media are reporting quite the opposite. With these dwindling exports is the reclamation of this large area going to be an economically viable project?	Would like more information
Green Party	Need for it	The 10 ha. reclamation under construction, more efficient use of the coal storage area and reduced coal volumes requiring storage should provide LPC with sufficient additional areas to reconfigure its operations as Cashin Quay and wharves are repaired.	Amend the plan so that it provides only for the port's rebuild and repair, not further expansion of the container terminal. Stage the proposed reclamation so that only a portion (e.g. 5 ha) is provided for in the plan. Require LPC to use the Resource Management Act processes for further stages (22 ha) of the reclamation.
Herbie Mues	Need for it	I oppose the reclamation of an additional 27ha. I don't believe the expert assessments.	No extensions beyond the consented 10 ha at Te Awaparahi Bay.
Jill Morrison	Need for it	I totally oppose further reclamation in the Cashin Quay area. LPC must not be allowed to put the environment at risk.	If the harbour is not suitable for monster ships so be it. Timaru is not another country!
Juliet Neill	Need for it	37ha of reclamation is a huge area to reclaim, and is likely to have huge consequences for the harbour. Exactly how this will be used is not mentioned in the plan. Surely, now that the coal industry is suffering and being downscaled, the area set aside for coal will not be needed as much, and this could offset the need for such vast reclamation?	Consider whether 37 a of reclamation is necessary, and whether this plan could be offset by altered use of the coal storage area.
Lyttelton Community Association Inc	Need for it	LPC want to reclaim a further 27ha of harbour to provide additional wharf space. Is it necessary? Given the large area allocated to coal, and prospect of the coal business being seriously curtailed, the decision to allow reclamation should be deferred until (a) the demand can be more reliably forecast, and (b) the status of coal mining is clarified.	We request that the further reclamation issues be deferred until these matters are clarified.
Lyttelton Harbour / Whakaraupo Issues Group	Need for it	Uncertain commercial environment. In 2009 resource consent application for reclamation for coal stockpiling. Circumstances changed. Acknowledge high financial cost of investing in large scale port infrastructure and cost on; on natural environment. Concerned with: justification of scale, dimensions, configuration of reclamation. Meeting foreseeable requirements for next 10 years more appropriate.	

RECLAMATION

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Ms Wendy Everingham	Need for it	I do not believe the economy will grow so strongly and believe with a whole of country port strategy you would receive a better outcomes.	The Port of Timaru could be used more effectively.
Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited	Need for it	Agree that to ensure the Port remains as efficient as possible during the recovery, additional land is first made available through reclamation of Te Awaparahi Bay first. The current 10ha reclamation needs to be completed as soon as possible to allow port operations to commence migration to the east with the additional 27ha required to future proof the Ports operational requirements.	N/A
Tasman Young	Need for it	One must seriously challenge the Lyttelton Port Company application for another 27 hectares of water for reclamation especially as there is no great detail of how it will be formed and the wharf profile. I really think it is a straight out land -water grab for the sake of it. True once it is built it will get used but I think it should be subject to an Environment Court decision.	I oppose further reclamation at Cashin Quay.
Thomas Kulpe	Need for it	Projecting compound annual growth rates of the past into the next 25+ years is both misleading and flawed. The expansion component of LPRP is portrayed without any alternatives.	Reduce port expansion to what is necessary and appropriate for the recovery.
Wayne Nolan	Need for it	I fully support the proposed extension of the reclamation to the East.	N/A
Young 88 Association of New Zealand Inc.	Need for it	The Association supports the proposed reclamation to enable expansion of port operation out of the inner harbour. This will enable areas in the inner harbour to become available for the development of a marina which is desperately needed in Canterbury. We accept that there will be a loss of potential space on the harbour for Young 88 racing events and activities. However on balance we believe this is well worth forgoing as it will enable the development of a marina which is a much more pressing need.	The Young 88 Association supports the proposed Te Awaparahi Bay reclamation and does not seek any changes to the Plan on this issue.
Boat Safety Association	Need for it	We support the proposed reclamation plan for this Bay provided all commercial activity is removed from around the reclamation grounds at Naval Point. The planned 37 hectare reclamation in Awaparahi Bay extra land becomes available to the Port Company. The commercial activities near the Naval Point recreational area could be moved and the land that is vacated could be used for recreation. We do not suggest the commercial activities should be moved to Awaparahi Bay but nearer to the other heavy industry sites or out of the Lyttelton area. The activities we refer to are; the Stark Brothers Transport garages, the storage area, the boat sales yard and the new Pegasus fish company building. The area occupied by the commercial activities is approximately 2.2 hectares and is badly organised and not used to its greatest advantage. The whole operation could be moved to another site based (not necessarily in Lyttelton) on a logical plan occupying considerably less land than 2.2 hectares. A new site or sites would be more convenient and efficient for the commercial enterprises.	All commercial activity is removed from around the reclamation grounds at Naval Point.
David and Heather Bundy	Need for it	This will mean a huge area of the public estate will be transferred into the ownership of LPC. This amounts to a huge transfer of wealth from the public domain to a private company. The value of LPC could double. No independent study has been undertaken and we deserve to be informed before this reclamation is permitted.	Make sure an independent and comprehensive study is undertaken and its findings made public.
Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron	Need for it	Support the proposed extension of the reclamation.	None
William Hall	Need for it	4.1.1 - Support	None
Alastair Brown and Frances Young	Noise	Reclaimed land for container storage Te Awaparahi Bay to be engineered as soon as is possible to ensure that noise levels associate with storage and loading of containers on and off ships are reduced ASAP for the Lyttelton community's home-based wellbeing.	Sound carriage to be carefully considered in the meantime and superior sound modifications of equipment used within container.
Helen Chambers	Noise	The initial noise from the construction of the reclamation area and the ongoing noise from cranes, vehicles will affect the people of the Harbour Basin depending on wind direction. More importantly the noise may affect fish and dolphins and they may not return.	Reducing the size of the reclamation may help

RECLAMATION

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Alastair Suren	Noise	Operational Noise does not take the noise contours out towards Diamond Harbour so no conclusion can be drawn on the potential for adverse effects on residents. A noise contour plan and appropriate mitigation process was determined after many years through the District Plan. If needed similar provisions should be made for Diamond Harbour but this is not possible to determine. The ECan noise peer review notes significant gaps in the information provided (memo 23/12/14).	Provide appropriate acoustic modelling to include areas over in Diamond Harbour and Purau to assess the effects of the proposed activities.
Alastair Suren	Operation	There is no mention of the existing Port lighting and any required replacement/upgrading. Currently the light spill and noise is significant on adjacent land.	Implement more focussed lighting for existing Port Infrastructure, and for any new developments. Minimise any skyward spill of light and focus lights in a downward direction.
Belinda Durney	Operation	I oppose the Lyttelton Port Company's proposal to reclaim a further 27 ha at Te Awaparahi Bay and to re-site the container terminal there. I live directly opposite the proposed terminal, along with many other Diamond Harbour residents. Lyttelton Harbour acts as a natural amphitheatre and noise from the Port is projected straight across the bay. There is already a considerable noise issue in our area coming from the activities of the container terminal on its current site at the Port. The distance across is approximately 1.8-2km. I believe that the impacts of noise from the proposed terminal at Te Awaparahi Bay (24/7) would be untenable for residents in our area. This seems to be a case of moving the 'adverse effects' from one community to another without redress. There is completely inadequate research around the impacts of noise, air and night time light pollution on Diamond Harbour residents. There is nothing about the visual impact of the proposed terminal from Diamond Harbour.	I do not support the further reclamation of land at Te Awaparahi Bay, the resitting of the container terminal, or the move of the port activities further east. I would like to see these removed from the Plan.
Frances Therese James	Operation	I would like more research done to investigate how the different wavelengths of light interact with both physical and biological environment.	That more research be done into lighting that is suitable for human and animal health.
Helen Chambers	Operation	There is insufficient evidence in the Plan to indicate how the spread of lighting from the port will be contained. This lighting should not be harmful to human health or affect biodiversity. Where is the evidence that the effect of the lighting will not be harmful to animals and human on land and in the marine environment? The exclusion of height restrictions from the plan of the reclamation area is a concern to us. The visual effect of these cranes and containers will be an eye-sore to tourists arriving, people using the harbour, the residents of the Harbour Basin, and in particular the people who live in Governors Bay.	More research is required and reduce the area of the reclamation
Learn2Sail	Operation	LPC and ECan proposals make no consideration for light and noise pollution on the reclaimed land.	More detail is required.
Frances Therese James	Operation	Currently I have uninterrupted views of the heads. My concern is that I will loose this view if the containers can be stacked five high.	I think the visual impact is an important consideration, container height should be restricted.
Lyttelton Harbour / Whakaraupo Issues Group	Other	The Group opposes, has serous concerns, and seeks amendments on many aspects of the pdLPRP, including: 4) Environment and other Lyttelton Harbour Communities - LHWIG considers the pdLPRP is flawed or fails to assess the proposal on the well-being and effects on other harbour basin communities and Lyttelton Harbour. Disagree with conclusion that reclamation effects will not be significant or can be appropriately managed. Concern for changes in coastal/marine environment. Do not support proposed scale and configuration - would welcome explanation on what may be encompassed by the term 'can be appropriately managed'.	
Michael Sandridge	Size	Accepting LPC's assessment that the port need more space, I support expansion through reclamation as proposed to the east of Cashin Quay. Expansion to the east will have the least impact on Lyttelton township and recreational activities in the area.	N/A
Diamond Harbour Community Association	Size	Support the size of consent being up to 27 hectares (so that the size can be consented as less)	N/A
Frances Therese James	Size	The Port should not be able to claim this land without proper public notification.	It should seek to follow the correct processes, consider a smaller reclamation area. Reclaim to the east no the south. Gollans Bay could be renamed Gollans Cove.

RECLAMATION

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lucy Rayner; Aleksandra Turp; Michael Turp	Size	I strongly believe the Port should not extend further south into the harbour at the cost of other harbour residents, wildlife and harbour users	The proposed container terminal should not extend south of the existing wharf line. If it must expand it should be east only towards Gollans Bay. There is plenty of space available in this direction. This would minimise the visual impact and noise pollution of the extension and it would have less of an effect on the water flow in the harbour whilst still gaining the port the same amount of reclaimed land.
Ms Wendy Everingham	Size	I am in support of a Port Recovery Plan BUT I do not think it should support such a huge reclamation project. The reclamation is too large and too bulky. It will really detract harbour views for residents of Diamond Harbour and Governors Bay. I don't think a reclamation project of this size should form part of the recovery plan. This is a project that needs more thought and more public input.	The reclamation should not extend further into the sea than the current 10 hectare addition. The coal area should be explored as another container storage area to increase capacity. The 27ha s should be removed from this process and become part of the normal RMA process.
Nick Rayner	Size	The harbour itself is a precious resource. Its our job to look after it for our kids, so they can enjoy it as we have. The word Reclamation suggests we have a right to fill in even more of the harbour, but this should be a last resort, and if considered then should be minimized as far as possible. I would prefer there was no further reclamation of the harbour. If there must be, it should be done within the existing wharf line. I strongly object to the proposed Te Awaparahi Bay container terminal being allowed to push out to the end of the breakwater, meaning ships will sit well into the main harbour, impacting water currents, view, and wind for other harbour users.	If there must be further reclamation it should be done within the existing wharf line, i.e.: the proposed Te Awaparahi Bay container terminal should not extend south of the existing wharfs. If further reclamation is required, I would prefer it extended East and to avoid reducing the width of the harbour.
Pete Simpson	Size	4.1.1 - Support the size of consent being up to 27 hectares so that the size can be consented as less	N/A
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Size	The proposed reclamation is undertaken in a phased manner as follows: (1) There should 4 phases of no more than 10 ha each (to a total maximum of 37 ha), including the current consented 10 ha as phase 1; (2) Phasing must occur in accordance with an Adaptive Environmental Management Plan that is prepared by a Joint Committee under the Local Government Act on advice from a technical advisory committee; (3) A minimum of 1 year of baseline monitoring data is necessary before the 2nd phase can be consented; (4) Phasing needs to be linked to a market viability assessment to demonstrate the need for each phase of reclamation. Assessment criteria should include reasonable consideration of alternatives.	The proposed reclamation is undertaken in a phased manner as follows: (1) There should 4 phases of no more than 10 ha each (to a total maximum of 37 ha), including the current consented 10 ha as phase 1; (2) Phasing must occur in accordance with an Adaptive Environmental Management Plan that is prepared by a Joint Committee under the Local Government Act on advice from a technical advisory committee; (3) A minimum of 1 year of baseline monitoring data is necessary before the 2nd phase can be consented; (4) Phasing needs to be linked to a market viability assessment to demonstrate the need for each phase of reclamation. Assessment criteria should include reasonable consideration of alternatives.
Vanessa Ross	Size	I strongly believe the Port should not extend further south into the harbour at the cost of other harbour residents and harbour users; then provide a Change e.g.: The proposed container terminal should not extend south of the existing wharf line. If it must expand it should be East only towards Gollans Bay.	The proposed container terminal should not extend south of the existing wharf line. If it must expand it should be East only towards Gollans Bay
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Size	The consequence of notified map 5.7 is that the reclamation area includes the berth pockets. The entirety of the berth pockets will not fit into this area.	Amend rule 10.11 and map 5.7 to reflect this.
Governors Bay Community Association; P Ensor	Visual Effects	Concern about visual impact that expansion of reclamation would have on lighting and view of the harbour as seen from Governors Bay. LPC did not supply visual impression of development on view from Governors Bay, GBCA member produced mock-up of possible view. It appears to us that the development as seen from Governors Bay would extend halfway across the harbour. This would be a gross visual effect on townships on both sides of the harbour as well as to those visiting.	That ECan and LPC consider an alternative configuration for expansion of container handling facilities that would see the reclamation extending further along the natural shoreline beyond Te Awaparahi Bay, instead of across the harbour along the Cashin Quay breakwater. This would minimise the visual impacts of the development as seen from townships around the harbour.
Green Party	Visual Effects	The landscape assessment by Graeme Densem for ECan concludes that the proposed container reclamation will create visual discordance with its natural setting due to its alignment and symmetrical shape. The reclamation will be visible from the Port Hills, Mt Herbert and parts of the Summit Road including public walking tracks and recreational areas as an obvious and unnatural protrusion into the harbour. No attempt has been made to align or shape the reclamation, particularly its eastern and western edges so that it is more in keeping with the natural character and contours of the harbour basin and coastline.	Require the reclamation to be shaped and aligned so that it is more in keeping with the natural character of the harbour and a less intrusive and discordant element of the harbour landscape and seascape.

RECLAMATION

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Learn2Sail	Visual Effects	The reclamation in a SE direction has huge visual impacts too all visitors and residents. The view from our home will be depreciate, will we receive compensation? The relocation has no consideration for visual impact, just a square blob, no curves, water flow thoughts, it is a number efficient solution to land expansion. If it were bare land then this may impact less but 5 containers high, ships at birth and cranes will block views from Lyttelton West Corsair Bay, Rāpaki, Cass bay, Governors bay, Diamond Harbour and the crater rim walkways. This is a disaster for the residents of the Harbour, tourists and local operators and all water users.	The additional reclamation southwards (SE) should not be allowed but investigate reclamation further eastwards (NE) and land making better use of the coal berth and quarry
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Visual Effects	P39 (Section 3.7) Landscape Change - In the Recovery Plan's summary of key issues for the recovery of Lyttelton Port, the omission of landscape effects surprises us given the scale of changes and visual impact of combined rebuild / enhancement / redevelopment projects. Avoiding the issue of landscape effects does not make it go away, nor help communities come to terms with the changes that are coming, but only makes people feel angry and powerless.	Add Section 3.7(a) Landscape Change, which acknowledges the landscape and visual effects of development proposals.
Melanie Dixon	Visual Effects	With regard to Effects on Landscape Character and Visual Effects, there are significant grounds to oppose ECan's finding that the effects will not be significant or can be appropriately managed. The proposed reclamation at Te Awaparahi Bay will have expansive adverse, irrecoverable visual impact on the open-sea horizon as viewed from Governors Bay. The southward expansion of the reclamation outwards to the end of the existing breakwater (and beyond with the addition of wharves and ships) will forever destroy the visual landscape and the stunning, unique views towards the Outer Harbour and the open sea from Governors Bay, where hundreds of houses and residents enjoy the outstanding views as do thousands of visitors per year. As a result of the reclamation is that the open sea horizon will be impacted and shut down by up to 50% if the proposed works go ahead.	Modifying the reclamation alignment would lessen the sense of discordance. This could be achieved by realigning the south (berthage) edge to run parallel to the shoreline of Te Awaparahi Bay. Aligning the berth with Cashin Quay, as currently proposed, is the source of the discordance with the natural surrounds. In such a realigned scenario the eastern face of the reclamation would need to extend further into Gollans Bay, to maintain the required 30ha. However such a reclamation would be significantly less intrusive in the harbour form and would not impact significantly on the naturalness of Gollans Bay. I request that the southern edge of the proposed reclamation extends only to the same southern extent as the existing Cashin Quay wharf i.e. only as far as the landward end of the breakwater, not extending to the southern end of the breakwater.

DREDGING

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Pete Simpson	Capital Dredging	4.1.4 - Dredging to deepen and widen the Main Navigation Channel should be publicly notified at the same time as consents for dumping the dredge material. There are still public concerns that the dredging and dumping will have significant effects on turbidity, sedimentation and marine life generally.	Add that the consent to deepen and widen the Main Navigation Channel will be publicly notified, and that additional dumping zones outside of the Harbour entrance will be investigated to mitigate potential effects within the Harbour area.
Green Party	Contaminated Material	The impacts of spoil dumping have only been cursorily investigated. Dredging and dumping on this scale risk significant adverse effects on turbidity, sedimentation and marine life in and beyond the harbour. The plan provides inadequate information on contaminated sediments, the contaminants involved, their toxicity to marine life and how they are dealt with. LPC should not be able to dump contaminated material at sea because of potential effects on marine life and marine ecosystems. This should be discouraged through non-complying activity status. The plan should include limits on the level of contaminants which ECan determines as acceptable in material to be dumped in the spoil dumping grounds.	Make the offshore dumping of contaminated material a non-complying activity. Amend the plan to ensure that capital dredging to deepen and widen the Main Navigation Channel should be publicly notified at the same time as consents for dumping the dredge material are.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Contaminated Material	Agree with Rule 10.17 other than clause e). The red area on map 5.8 needs to be treated differently, they are areas known to contain significantly contaminated sediment.	Deposition of dredge spoil from the red area shown on the planning maps should be restricted discretionary dealt with under rule 10.18. Clause f) needs to be replaced with the reference to the monitoring of disposal ground.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Disposal sites	p10 Dredging - Accept that dredging is an integral part of port operations. Current dumpsite is ecologically vulnerable. Precautionary approach needed. When the existing maintenance dredging consent comes up for renewal, we will seek a change to the current dumpsite location as it is in the least modified part of the harbour where there is still high marine biodiversity, good ecological health and a largely intact ecosystem. Terrestrial ecological communities on the adjacent hillsides above are also intact. Ki uta ki tai. Natural values of the marine area surrounding Godley Head are high enough for consideration as a future marine reserve. We support this concept, as it is consistent with our plan to complete a coastal walkway. We oppose any increase in the volume of dredge tailings dumped in this location associated with deepening existing berth pockets to accommodate larger vessels or deposition of any potentially toxic dredging from the inner harbour. A precautionary approach is needed and no inner harbour dredging should be dumped back into Lyttelton Harbour. A better dumpsite with fewer potential adverse effects on harbour ecology or other disposal solutions must be found for all new dredging associated with the re-development of the port. All port dredging, including existing maintenance dredging, should be dumped at the new site.	Amend to prohibit dredging from the inner harbour to be deposited anywhere in the harbour. Amend to prohibit dredging associated with new development to be deposited anywhere in the harbour. Include a direction that maintenance dredging covered by the existing consent be deposited along with other dredging outside the harbour.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Disposal sites	p56 (Section 4.1.4) We are opposed to extra dredging, from deepening berth pockets and swing ship turning basins, deposited at the Spoil Dumping Grounds in the Outer Lyttelton Harbour. We are opposed to any dredging from the inner harbour deposited back into Lyttelton Harbour	Amend to prohibit dredging from the inner harbour to be deposited anywhere in the harbour. Amend to prohibit dredging associated with new development to be deposited anywhere in the harbour. Include a direction that maintenance dredging covered by the existing consent be deposited along with other dredging outside the harbour.
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Disposal Sites	Limits must be set on the volume of dredge spoil that can continue to be dumped at the existing spoil grounds (which is no greater than the volumes currently being dumped), and a direction should be included requiring an assessment of alternative locations for spoil dumping to be undertaken. A plan should be agreed, by a fixed date, to eventually cease dumping of dredge spoil at the existing spoil grounds.	A plan should be agreed, by a fixed date, to eventually cease dumping of dredge spoil at the existing spoil grounds.
Tasman Young	Disposal Sites	Dredge is to be dumped only about 6 km off the heads, it should be at least 20 km off the heads to prevent Sumner Beach becoming a silt beach even though the predominant tide is south heading. Once this project proceeds I visualise the people of Sumner will go to war with the Port Company.	All future dredging in Lyttelton should be dumped 20 km offshore. I oppose dredging until full consultation and the above or similar conditions are met.
Juliet Neill	Environmental Effects	Dredging - who is monitoring the environmental effects, and if they are proved to be unsatisfactory, then what?	Include information on who is monitoring the effects of dredging, and what action will be taken should the effects be damaging to the marine environment.
Mark Watson	Environmental Effects	Guarantee reclamation and dredging will not contribute to further modification of harbour circulation patterns and sedimentation problems. LPC says the reclamation will make no	N/A
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	General	Best practice dredging methods that result in the least suspension and distribution of sediment plumes should be a requirement.	Best practice dredging methods that result in the least suspension and distribution of sediment plumes should be a requirement.
Jill Morrison	General	I totally oppose further dredging. LPC must not be allowed to put the environment at risk.	If the harbour is not suitable for monster ships so be it. Timaru is not another country!

DREDGING

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Diamond Harbour Community Association	Maintenance Dredging	Dredging to deepen and widen the Main Navigation Channel should be publicly notified at the same time as consents for dumping the dredge material. There are still public concerns that the	Add that the consent to deepen and widen the Main Navigation Channel will be publicly notified
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Maintenance Dredging	Confirmation needs to be provided of the existing and proposed volume of maintenance dredging spoil to be dumped.	Confirmation needs to be provided of the existing and proposed volume of maintenance dredging spoil to be dumped.
Mrs Ann Thorpe	Maintenance Dredging	I support dredging if highest stringent environmental controls on the dredging of Lyttelton Harbour are applied, in terms of protecting life on the harbour floor and disposing of removed material.	Highest stringent environmental controls on the dredging of Lyttelton Harbour are to be applied, in terms of protecting life on the harbour floor and disposing of removed material.
Herbie Mues	Water quality	I want to be able to swim in clean water	No further dredging

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Finn McLachlan	Cycling	4.5 - I would like Norwich Quay to be more safe for riding bikes. When I ride to the market with my mum and dad on Saturday mornings the parked cars are scary because people can open their doors. The big trucks are also scary. I would like it to be safer so that I can ride to the market. I would also like it to be safer so I can ride to the Rec ground on my bike when I go to Lyttel Soccer on Sundays. I wanted to take a video of the street with my GoPro but ran out of time, so you will have to bike there to see what it is like. I am 11.	None
Pete Simpson	Ferry Terminal	Add other potential locations e.g. adjacent to No4 wharf and the current location also. The current No1 wharf is the best location and No4 wharf the best alternative. Oppose the non-notification of the ferry terminal facilities. These should be discretionary and publicly notified. There has been strong public interest in the ferry terminal location for many years and it is the biggest issue for Southern Bays residents. Failure to consult at application time for consent to move the terminal would be insulting to this concern.	Add other potential locations - the existing No2 wharf site and adjacent to No4 wharf. Amend to any consent required under the proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan for ferry terminal facilities will be discretionary and publicly notified.
Sarah van der Burch	Ferry Terminal	I would like to see the DH ferry terminal kept where it is and have the area upgraded for other local boat terminals	
Alastair Brown and Frances Young	Ferry Terminal	to have one instated within 5 minutes walking distance of London Street in Lyttelton Centre.	to have one instated within 5 minutes walking distance of London Street in Lyttelton Centre.
Black Cat Cruises	Ferry Terminal	Support the proposed relocation of the Ferry Terminal as part of the LPRP. It seems illogical to have a planned public space/access in the Dampier Bay area and yet keep the public transport terminal in a totally different location. These days, even finding the ferry terminal for someone who is not familiar with the area can be a challenge with a maze of fences and walkways. We believe it is also important to consider the current users of the ferry and ensure their needs will be met when considering any relocations / redevelopments. Around 90% of the users of the ferry service would benefit from moving the ferry from its current location. We also believe that the increased walking distance specified in the proposal is minimal and would not have a great impact on those using the ferry. From an operational point of view, the current location is a dirty and industrial location. There are often large ships manoeuvring near the ferry terminal restricting the ferry movements and creating additional hazards.	The only change we would like considered with regards to the Public Transport and Ferry Links would be the time line. The sooner the better.
Chief Planning Officer Christchurch City Council	Ferry Terminal	The Council remains concerned about the distance from the Lyttelton Town Centre to the proposed new location at Dampier Bay and the accessibility of this for users of this essential service and the potential impact on local businesses it may have. Easy access to the Town Centre is important for the recovery of the Town Centre. The Plan and the recovery framework does not mention whether there could be improvements to amenities in the current ferry location, particularly if any relocation is still up to 10 years away	If the ferry terminal is relocated then it requires careful consideration in relation to its physical and visual connections to the town centre. In this regard, Sutton Quay is of great importance and the District Plan provision that requires non-complying consent if the ferry terminal is relocated without opening of Sutton Quay to public vehicle access is supported.
Diamond Harbour Community Association	Ferry Terminal	Add other potential locations e.g. adjacent to No4 wharf and the current location also. The current No1 wharf is the best location and No4 wharf the best alternative. Oppose the non-notification of the ferry terminal facilities. These should be discretionary and publicly notified. There has been strong public interest in the ferry terminal location for many years and it is the biggest issue for Southern Bays residents. Failure to consult at application time for consent to move the terminal would be insulting to this concern.	Add other potential locations - the existing No1 wharf site and adjacent to No4 wharf. Amend to any consent required under the proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan for ferry terminal facilities will be discretionary and publicly notified.
Green Party	Ferry terminal	The plan commentary recognises the need for a ferry terminal for the Lyttelton-Diamond Harbour ferry which is within easy walking distance of and well connected to Lyttelton town centre to encourage the use of public transport but the plan provisions do not adequately support this. The ferry caters for residents and visitors. The Mt Herbert Walkway appears to be being used more by recreational walkers including tourists and Christchurch residents. The summertime concerts at Stoddart Point have attracted many day visitors.	Amend the plan to provide for the future location of a rail passenger terminal and a walkable ferry jetty and bus terminal for the Diamond Harbour ferry service.

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Green Party	Ferry Terminal	The proposal (p61) that any resource consent required for ferry terminal facilities not be publicly notified is opposed as failing to recognise the significant public interest in the ferry terminal location and the time community representatives have spent in agency processes about this. The Plan is ambiguous about the future location of the ferry terminal talking of it remaining at the present site for seven years. The wharf is used by local tourist and day-trip traffic, and visitors approach the boats through a prison camp maze which needs to be improved.	Amend the Plan to provide for public notification of any resource consent application for the ferry terminal.
Lyttelton Environment Group	Ferry Terminal	The LEG believes the ferry terminal should be moved to the west end within the inner harbour in Dampier Bay as a matter of urgency and it is imperative that such a development be included in the proposed port recovery plan, not some vague reassurance it will be considered in the future. It (the move to the west end) is integral to the development of Dampier Bay as no integrated planning for appropriate development of the Bay can proceed without the inclusion of planning for a ferry terminal on the site.	The development and building of the terminal at the west end of the inner harbour must be included in the proposed port recovery plan and be an integral part of the plan.
Lyttelton Harbour Business Association	Ferry Terminal	We note that the proposed ferry terminal location is further from London Street than the existing location. We support the development of a ferry terminal as close as possible to, and with direct and safe pedestrian access to, the town centre (London Street between Canterbury and Oxford Streets).	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Ferry Terminal	p8 Diamond Harbour Ferry Berth - Strong community opposition to moving ferry berth - a succession of consultation processes. Dampier Bay is NOT the best location for a public transport connection. There are many good reasons why the ferry berth should either remain where it is or, if it must be moved, relocated to a place which is just as close or closer to the town centre. Deferring decision means ferry users will have unacceptable standard of facilities at the ferry berth for the foreseeable future, does not support recovery. It does not support community wellbeing. It provides no certainty for residents or for business owners or for owners of commercial property in Lyttelton who need to make decisions about their future. It is also unfair to Black Cat who are trying to develop their visitor product as well as provide the public transport service.	Amend Recovery Plan to include a direction fixing location of the ferry berth at the best location for community wellbeing, which is either at or near the current location with improved facilities. Direct agencies to work together to make this happen within a set timeframe.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Ferry Terminal	P41 3.8.4 Ferry terminal Diamond Harbour Ferry Berth - Strong opposition from ferry users who have made it clear they want the ferry berth to stay where it is, or, if it must be moved, to a new location which is just as close. If the ferry berth is too far away from the town centre people will stop using it to go to Lyttelton. Growing population on southern side of harbour - need direct access to the range of goods and services in Lyttelton. Moving the ferry - significant risk to the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and resilience of communities on both sides of the harbour. Seems likely no decision will be made for at least seven years. Looks as if ferry users will have to put up with substandard interchange facilities for the foreseeable future. A recovery plan which provides no certainty does not help any of the communities.	Amend Recovery Plan to include a direction fixing the location of the ferry berth at the best location for community wellbeing, which is either at or near the current location with improved facilities or even closer to the town centre. Direct agencies to work together to make the above happen within a set timeframe.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Ferry terminal	p61 (Section 4.4) Public Transport and Ferry Links - We do not support delaying the decision about the best location for the Diamond Harbour ferry. If LPC need resource consent to move the ferry berth, we support public notification of the application.	Amend Recovery Plan to include a direction fixing the location of the ferry berth at the best location for community wellbeing, which is either at or near the current location with improved facilities or even closer to the town centre. Direct agencies to work together to make the above happen within a set timeframe. Amend Recovery Plan to require public notification of any application to move the ferry berth.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Ferry terminal	Section 4.4, page 61, second paragraph. This paragraph notes that relocation of the ferry terminal would require changes to the bus service route. A potentially more significant issue which should be recognised is the need to ensure adequate bus access is provided into Dampier Bay. The Transport Agency considers that bus access close to the ferry terminal would be preferable to access being provided on Norwich Quay.	Amend section 4.4, second paragraph, final sentence as follows: Relocation would also require changes to the current bus service route and possibly access improvements to link with the ferry terminal .

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
New Zealand Transport Agency	Ferry terminal	Section 4.4, page 61. This section discusses the potential relocation of the ferry terminal. Movement of the ferry terminal will have a number of effects on the transport network. It is difficult to efficiently plan transportation improvements without certainty about whether the ferry terminal will be relocated or not. It would be beneficial for this issue to be determined prior to the opening of Sutton Quay, as the effects of relocation could then be considered as part of the ITA required before the opening of Sutton Quay. Mr Blyleven's evidence explains some of the transport effects associated with moving the Ferry Terminal (para 49).	Amend the LPRP to include an Action for LPC to confirm a ferry terminal location by 2020 or prior to the opening of Sutton Quay, whichever occurs first.
Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society	Ferry Terminal	It goes without saying where the Diamond Harbour Ferry goes so to does the Tug Lyttelton. Our submission is that the Ferry remains where it is. The measurement of time and distance to London St as alluded to in Section 4.4 is greeted with some mirth. Further, moving the tug Lyttelton will create dust nuisance problems the closer it gets to the dock where smoke would end up trapped as it did in earlier times. Hang the washing out at 10 - black by 12.	Any changes to incorporate the above.
NZ Labour Party, Port Hills	Ferry Terminal	Maintaining a connection between the ferry, other public transport and access to parking in this area, as well as amenities for those using these services in vital.	N/A
Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited	Ferry Terminal	I agree that a relocated ferry terminal should be included within the proposed Dampier Bay changes. I think this is a wonderful opportunity to develop the Lyttelton community in conjunction with an improved port facility.	N/A
Ms Wendy Everingham	Ferry terminal	I support the retention of the ferry in the current location unless it can be relocated with 400 metres of the township from the Dampier Bay area.	The ferry location would be within 400m of the township.
Pat Pritchett	Ferry Terminal	3.8.4 - Regarding the ferry. The Port says it is physically restricted by the current ferry terminal and wants it moved to Dampier Bay despite surveys and submissions in favour of retention of the current site. I absolutely support the retention of the current position and strongly oppose any suggestions that it may be moved. The present position is the most suitable, accessible and convenient for elderly and those with young families. The distance is the shortest making it manageable. LPC removed the pedestrian stairs for commercial and safety reason and I do not trust their statements about what they will do in the future to secure easy access. ECan overseas transport routes in Canterbury and I would ask them to take the lead in this matter. It is good planning practice to come to an agreement with the community, not to propose shifting the terminal every few years. If the area is needed for Port activities there could be a purpose built pedestrian over bridge built from the terminal across to Oxford St (presuming the over bridge is not kept) which would allow LPC to use the majority of the land. One of the proposed possible cruise ship terminals is nearer the ferry terminal than Dampier Bay (which would need shuttle) and would allow passengers to walk to the terminal. If the ferry terminal is moved to Dampier Bay it would necessitate a shuttle to and from London Street which would be a waste of money and create more environmental issues as well as inconvenience with timetables to adhere to.	Delete "...for now, makes provision for it to be moved to Dampier Bay if required, button directed." pg.8 Delete any suggestions that the ferry terminal be moved to Damper Bay and instead state that Ecan will ensure that the ferry terminal will remain at its current location near Oxford Street. 3.8.4
Marcia Bryant	Ferry Terminal	Access to the waterfront and to the Diamond Harbour ferry has deteriorated over the years, and despite a lot of plans and meetings and submissions over the last 10 years, there has been no progress. I do not support the fast-tracking of consents for what would clearly be a major expansion program for LPC, without rapid progress on the ferry terminal and easy access to the waterfront. I do not support any possibility of the ferry terminal being shifted to Dampier Bay. It is too far from the business centre of Lyttelton. I support the following options for the future location of the ferry terminal: 1. Stay where it is; 2. Move to directly below Canterbury St (near wharf 4)	Easy public access to a comfortable terminal for the Diamond harbour ferry. This must be walkable from the Lyttelton Farmers' Market, and also have a decent amount of car parking. This needs to happen in the next 5 years, not 10 years or longer. We have waited long enough.
Dr Peter Kempthorne	Ferry Terminal	Moving the ferry terminal closer to Lyttelton Township by placing it at the site of No 4 wharf would shorten the walk and help link the two commercial developments. This would also provide a suitable buffer between the recreation area and the ships. It could be accessed by a pedestrian or vehicular over bridge that would later become a major link from the town to the public area of the wharves.	That the Ferry terminal be at the site of No 4 wharf. That an over bridge be built to provide access to the Ferry terminal at the site of No 4 wharf.
Mike Pearson	Ferry Terminal	LPC is distorting and minimising the impact of moving the DHB ferry terminus - there will be a longer walk which will be beyond that of the harbour's senior residents.	Retain location of ferry terminus

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Nancy Vance	Ferry Terminal	1.4.13 Ferry and other Tourist Vessels - As the Diamond Harbour Ferry serves as a commuter connection, there needs to be good connection to the bus network as well as good pedestrian access to Lyttelton Township. The new facility proposed at Dampier Bay will have sufficient space to enable these to be provided. 1.4.13, has firstly, not adequately identified the requirements of this public transport node for residents of the southern bays and secondly has given judgment that there is certainty of a new ferry facility at Dampier Bay. If the current site is retained, planning needs to consider how to mitigate restrictions such as access to convenient parking, toilets and a suitable terminal. Priorities for the ferry location include proximity to town, accessibility, heritage and linkages with parking and other forms of transport.	New facilities, with short timeframe
Jeremy Agar	Ferry Terminal	Retention of the ferry service at or near its present location has long been an agreed item between CCC, Ecan and LPC.	Retention of the ferry service at or near its present location has long been an agreed item between CCC, Ecan and LPC.
Maike Fichtner	Ferry Terminal	That the ferry terminal shall remain in its current position and be developed to a user friendlier and safe facility asap rather than a 6 year old very unfriendly and ugly access. Oppose the Dampier Bay option, as it too far removed to the Lyttelton Centre and should not more than 500 m away from the centre.	I would like to see the ferry terminal stay in its current location or to be shifted to a similarly close quay near the town centre. Pedestrian access should be aesthetically pleasing and the stairs could be re build, as they were very practical.
Henry French; Carolyn Nicol; John Hannam	Ferry Terminal	It has come to my attention that the preferred option is to shift the Diamond Harbour ferry berth over to Dampier Bay. As a Diamond Harbour resident and regular user of the ferry, I STRONGLY disagree and oppose this option. We need to reconnect Lyttelton CBD to the waterfront and allows people direct access to the water edge from the Lyttelton CBD. The Dampier Bay option would discourage this as it is too far away from the CBD. I question whether you have considered or even discussed any of the concerns of residence who will be affected by such a ridiculous option not to mention the detriment to Littleton Businesses.	Here are two options I am happy with. Option 1: keeps the ferry berth close to where it is at present; reinstates the stairs and incorporates a lift up to the existing Oxford Street over bridge, has the bus stop near the old railway station, and car parking nearby. Option 2: involves a new pedestrian over bridge connecting the bottom of Canterbury Street with Number 4 Wharf has a new passenger interchange combined with Black Cat Office, cafe etc. in a new building at the waters edge, Adaptive re-use of pre-1900 finger wharves, has bus turning and car parking nearby, creates a public open space/maritime area.
John and Anna Holmes	Ferry Terminal	I support the Ferry Terminal remaining in its current position. The situation of the ferry terminal is a matter for public importance and there must be input from users of the ferry (residents of Diamond Harbour and wider Christchurch) if changes are proposed. I request that any resource consent under the CRDP relating to the ferry terminal is publicly notified. I request that if estimated walking times are used to quantify the additional time to get from the proposed new Ferry Terminal at Dampier Bay to London Street they should make reference to the average walking speed of older persons as well as fit young people.	I seek removal of the possibility for removal of the terminal 'if required.' I request there is public notification and input on any proposal to move the ferry terminal if the site is required for port operations. I request the retention of the ferry terminal in its present position be given priority over the possible wishes of LPC to redevelop the area.
Anders Peter Gillies	Ferry Terminal	That the ferry should at no time be moved to Dampier Bay. The operation is currently unsafe and unlawful.	Don't move the ferry terminal
Linda Goodwin	Ferry Terminal	I fully support the relocation of Diamond Harbour Ferries to be based in Dampier, to enable the main wharfs to be used for commercial/industrial usage and Dampier Bay for light commercial/tourism.	Appropriate public transport linkages to be included.
Juliet Neill	Ferry Terminal	The positioning of the Ferry Terminal at Dampier Bay will adversely affect access to the main commercial area of Lyttelton, compromising the businesses.	The existing placement of the ferry terminal should remain but be upgraded to make it more easily accessible, and less unattractive.
A J Wilson	Ferry Terminal	I oppose the reduction in car parks available to ferry users	I would seek an increase in the number of parks available to Diamond Harbour ferry users for whom the bus link to the city is impractical - specifically overnight parking.
John McCaskey	Ferry Terminal	The re-instatement of an inter-island ferry wharf (approx tug jetty) to have commuter rail connection that also services cruise ships - eastern end Cashin Quay.	Commuter rail connection that also services cruise ships
Herbie Mues	Ferry Terminal	Dampier Bay is too far away	Ferry terminal in inner harbour at either existing place or wharves 4-6.
Mark Watson	Ferry Terminal	A plan which settles on the location of the ferry berth now so better passenger facilities can be provided immediately, not seven or more years into the future. The location must support communities on both sides of the harbour by providing for the most direct access between the ferry and the town centre so that public transport becomes the mode of choice for the future.	The best possible location in my opinion is directly opposite Canterbury St, next to the historic wharves 4,5, and 6, connected to the town by a pedestrian bridge over from Norwich Quay, and by a road via the Oxford St overbridge for buses and cars.

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Dr Peter Kempthorne	Freight Route	That the time until the moving of heavy vehicles from Norwich Quay down onto the wharf be shortened. It is vital to an integrated approach to the development of the waterfront and the recovery of Lyttelton township. If not done early there will be a complete split between the proposed new commercial development on Dampier Bay and the existing Lyttelton township.	That the road below Norwich Quay be developed as early as possible.
Canterbury Maritime Developments Limited	Freight Route	LPRP is fundamentally flawed by failing to address the significant traffic and transport issues (Norwich Quay in particular) which the ports current and expanding activities impose upon the Lyttelton township. While the Plan does not preclude an alternative route to the Port in the future, it has accepted Becas Integrated Transport Assessment advice and analysis that Norwich Quay can handle the projected traffic increase until 2026. The Plan is equally silent on the role of Kiwi Rail in the recovery of the Port with no apparent consideration given to how much of the fill required for the Te Awaparahi Bay might be brought in by rail reducing heavy vehicles. 2.2 explicitly acknowledges that there are serious traffic issues.	It is this submissions contention that an alternative route to the Port should be very much part of this Plan if Lyttelton Port is to become a major export/import hub and reinforce its role as one of NZs principal ports (as per the Vision and Goals, p. 11). In that regard, a new tunnel, dedicated for mainly port activities running from the Heathcote Valley to Te Awaparahi Bay would largely remove heavy vehicle movements from the existing tunnel as well as Norwich Quay with the Quay reverting to a much preferred role as an urban street overlooking the port. It seems remiss not to have specifically identified alternative port access even though it maybe something not considered within the next 10 years.
Christchurch City Council	Freight Route	Norwich Quay is an essential connection for the Port and for Lyttelton township. The Council accepts that freight will continue to increase, along with construction traffic, and that Norwich Quay will retain its freight function, with the assessment concluding that it can function effectively for recovery purposes. The return of Norwich Quay as a town street has been a long-held desire of the community and is included as a priority outcome and action in the Lyttelton Master Plan.	The Council is supportive of Actions 8 and 9 which seek to deal with recovery related matters for the transport network and provide for appropriate upgrades for various users on Norwich Quay. The Council would like to see these actions take into account the Lyttelton Master Plan and the Lyttelton Access Project, both of which have matters that are recovery related and relate to the matters in the Direction. The Council also seeks that both actions provide for amenity improvements, which contribute to a safe and convenient environment for pedestrian and cyclists
Diamond Harbour Community Association	Freight Route	Oppose the 10-15 year time frame for consideration of any alternative route for heavy traffic off Norwich Quay. Within 10 years traffic on that road will have significantly increased providing increased hazard and loss of amenity. Downsizing of the coal handling area and better use of the inland ports will provide greater flexibility for the Port Company to shift the log storage elsewhere.	Change the paragraphs in this section to make provision for a heavy traffic route to be built between Norwich Quay and the railway line, within the next five years.
Green Party	Freight route	Heavy traffic on Norwich Quay has significant adverse effects on amenity values; noise, fumes, barrier for access to waterfront. Extra space for port from reducing coal storage and consented reclamation. Defies belief that LPC cannot provide for alternative access road between Norwich Quay and railway lines. Port unwillingness to use space more efficiently does not justify repeated blocking of community wish to remove heavy traffic from Norwich Quay.	Amend Plan provisions to provide a policy base and a timelines to require LPC to work with NZTA and CCC to divert heavy vehicle traffic off Norwich Quay.
Lyttelton Community Association Inc	Freight Route	In 4.5, ECAN say that they have accepted the conclusions of the Integrated Transport Assessment and that they will not require port traffic to be removed from Norwich Quay. The assessment was done on the basis of the traffic carrying capacity of the roads and tunnel. We believe a proper assessment would also include the amenity values of the area. When Banks Peninsula District was absorbed into Christchurch City, \$10 million was set aside to get industrial traffic off Norwich Quay. This money could be used to offset the costs of planning for the removal of this traffic, and the port recovery plan should mandate this.	We request that LPC be directed to move its traffic from Norwich Quay.
Lyttelton Environment Group	Freight Route	The LEG continues to support Norwich Quay as an essential conduit for port operations as it (the LEG) has done many times in the past. Small numbers of individuals who oppose the continued use of the Quay as an essential industrial conduit have a mistaken view that Lyttelton is essentially a residential suburb of greater Christchurch. It is not. It is and must remain a working port essential for the export/import commerce on which the financial well-being of the whole of Canterbury depends.	Include an unqualified statement of intent that Norwich Quay will be the permanent conduit to port operations.
Lyttelton Harbour Business Association	Freight route	Strongly support the long-term plan for an alternative port access, that reduces heavy traffic use of Norwich Quay, but submit that this needs to be prioritised into medium-term to facilitate business redevelopment along the street. In the short-term, safety of road users is a primary concern, and we submit that forms of traffic calming are essential, particularly given the escalating volume of heavy traffic.	

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Freight route	The MoU does not help to recover, doesn't provide certainty to commercial property owners in Lyttelton particularly those along Norwich Quay.	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Freight Route	p9 Traffic/Norwich Quay - We have been seeking the removal of port freight traffic from Norwich Quay for many years to support revitalisation of Lyttelton's original main street. Even though many of the heritage buildings have now been demolished, some still remain. Since the earthquakes it has become even more important that the street environment improves to support recovery on vacant lots, especially those which front onto Norwich Quay. We need the trucks to go down onto a new freight only road beside the railway line, so that we have a safe, pleasant pedestrian-friendly street environment to encourage new businesses. Delaying the decision prolongs uncertainty for commercial property owners in Lyttelton town centre and works against Lyttelton's timely recovery.	Include a direction which requires all parties to work together to fund and build the alternative freight route Option C in the Lyttelton Access Project Scoping Report. Add a deadline on when the new road is to be completed.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Freight route	p36 (Section 3.6) Norwich Quay - Getting certainty about when port freight traffic will be moved off Norwich Quay is as important to the recovery of Lyttelton town centre as the extension of the reclamation is to port recovery. The port may place high importance on Norwich Quay to continue to provide efficient road freight access in the future, but the community places high importance on getting freight traffic off Norwich Quay to support the town's recovery and ongoing economic viability. This shared community vision includes return of pedestrian-friendly commercial activity along Norwich Quay. The ever-growing river of freight flowing both ways along a wide carriageway presents a significant barrier, with the physical bulk of trucks, their noise, vibrations and diesel exhaust fumes making the street environment unpleasant. For anyone trying to cross the road to get to a bus stop, Norwich Quay feels dangerous. Attachment 2 (Option 2 Plan - Alternative Public Access to Inner Harbour Waterfront) supports rebuilding on commercial properties along Norwich Quay by re-directing trucks down onto a new freight only road beside the railway line. The alternative freight road need not happen immediately but we will be asking for a deadline to be set, not too far into the future, by which the decision will be made in order to give commercial landowners certainty.	Delete: many in the community would like to see trucks re-routed off Norwich Quay onto an alternative route. Replace with: an alternative route for port road freight is needed to support recovery and ongoing economic viability of Lyttelton town centre.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Freight route	p66 (Section 4.5) Norwich Quay - The Recovery Plan states, environment Canterbury has accepted the conclusions of the Integrated Transport Assessment that an alternative port access may have merit in the long term but would not assist in recovery of the port in the next 10-15 years.... It is our view that continued uncertainty about alternative port access undermines the recovery of Lyttelton town centre. While the port access route does not need to change immediately, the Recovery Plan should set a date by which this will happen. The Recovery Plan states Norwich Quay will be able to cope operationally with increasing freight traffic until about 2026. It directs parties enter into an MOU (Memorandum of Understanding), which is all well and good but does not help our community recover nor provide any certainty to commercial property owners in Lyttelton, particularly those along Norwich Quay.	Include a direction which requires all parties to work together to fund and build the alternative freight route Option C in the Lyttelton Access Project Scoping Report. Add a deadline on when the new road is to be completed.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Freight route	NZTA has specific interest in role of Norwich Quay, local road network connection into the state highway network and freight access to the port. Lyttelton is a key freight hub on the state highway network. NZTA is responsible for the state highway network. NZTA supports the LPRP's focus on the local transport network as links between the Port and the local network are key to achieving the recovery of the Port, considers that recovery of the wider network is addressed appropriately through other channels. NZTA has confidence that; there is no need for the LPRP to direct that specific upgrades are made to the transport network to cater for increasing freight volumes as a result of port activities, that the state highway network in Lyttelton can cater for this growth within the next 10 years, that the LPC information has been adequate to support the development of the LPRP some of the information will need further investigation and testing over time.	NA

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
New Zealand Transport Agency	Freight route	Section 3.6, page 37 sixth paragraph. The Transport Agency supports reference to the draft Scoping Report, Lyttelton Access Project and agrees with ECan (as stated in section 4.6, page 66) that changing the freight route would not assist with recovery of the Port. For clarity, amendments are necessary to ensure the findings in this Report are accurately conveyed.	Amend section 3.6 page 37 paragraphs 6, 7 as follows: the Scoping Report for the Lyttelton Access Project considered a range of options suggests two viable options for freight access to the Port, including: Retaining Norwich Quay as the freight route with improvements. An alternative access road between Norwich Quay and the railway lines."
Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society	Freight Route	Our submission is that in 2026 when projected traffic increases exceed the capacity of the roadway that the alternative - beside the railway- be given priority consideration. This would reflect the views of not many (as quoted) but most in the community.	We seek change to the draft: To include in strong language that a formal review of the road way ieSH74 and use of Norwich Quay be undertaken by 2020 with a view to finding alternative corridors to Cashin Quay in particular.
NZ Labour Party, Port Hills	Freight Route	Pursuing alternative routes from the City to the Port rather than using Norwich Quay is a consistently raised safety message from the community and while enabled in this draft Plan, is not progressed and should be progressed. Continued shift of mode of transport from trucking to rail should be emphasised. LPC has done a good job on this over recent years but it should be a priority.	N/A
Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited	Freight Route	Ideally would like to see commercial traffic diverted from Norwich Quay, however understand that this will be problematic in the initial stages of the Recovery Plan due to restrictions of available space in-between Norwich Quay and the railway line	Once additional land is opened up through reclamation, long term consideration should be given to putting in place a more efficient commercial traffic flow plan within the LPC boundary that address current issues of commercial operations 'crossing paths,' e.g.. logging and bulk product discharges, and the current positioning of the weighbridge.
Mr John Mckenna	Freight route	Support port traffic directed from Norwich Quay along harbour wharf area so that Norwich Quay can be developed	None specified
Mrs Ann Thorpe	Freight route	I strongly disagree with Norwich Quay remaining the freight route to the Port. I propose that trucks arriving in Lyttelton from the tunnel are detoured off at the first exit right on Norwich Quay, with the return journey to the tunnel via the same route.	That a trucking route be separated from other traffic routes with a route in front of Norwich Quay away from pedestrians and residential/visitor traffic. This would be an incentive for the public development of Norwich Quay.
Marcia Bryant	Freight Route	I also request that the plan be changed to take port traffic off Norwich Quay. This road is getting increasingly dangerous for pedestrians wanting to cross, and the quantity and noise of heavy traffic is a deterrent to businesses wanting to move back into that area. It also deters tourists and local pedestrians from venturing into this part of the town.	Take port traffic off Norwich Quay.
Pete Simpson	Freight Route	4.5 - Oppose the 10-15 year time frame for consideration of any alternative route for heavy traffic off Norwich Quay. Within 10 years traffic on that road will have significantly increased providing increased hazard and loss of amenity. Downsizing of the coal handling area and better use of the inland ports will provide greater flexibility for the Port Company to shift the log storage elsewhere. Likewise improved storage and inventory optimisation practices will enable the Port Company to minimise stockpiles held within the Port areas.	Change the paragraphs in this section to make provision for a heavy traffic route to be built between Norwich Quay and the railway line, within the next five years. Add provisions that require the Port Company to undertake research specifically focused on optimisation of cargo and log storage inventory optimisation, making use of experts in Operations Research field.
Mike Pearson	Freight Route	All changes to the port should be as part of an integrated transport policy (regional and national.) Better use of rail would reduce the amount of truck movements through the port. Port productivity should not be measured by TEU throughput - from an economic standpoint this presents an incorrect view of any improvement and is not consistent with international best practice.	Reduce truck movements by better design and use of rail
Dr Chris Bathurst	Freight Route	The opportunity should be taken to improve the transportation for the overall Lyttelton port operational risk and safety. A second road tunnel should be constructed between the vicinity of the new Te Awaparahi Bay port extension and the city at Ferrymead. This construction will provide the rock spoil needed for the extended container storage area and improve the traffic problem facing the port operations. Also having two road tunnels could enable one way traffic flow as well as lessening the congestion in the Norwich Quay route.	A second road tunnel should be constructed between the vicinity of the new Te Awaparahi Bay port extension and the city at Ferrymead.
Jeremy Agar	Freight Route	Removal of heavy traffic from Norwich Quay has long been an agreed item in the CCC plan.	Removal of heavy traffic from Norwich Quay has long been an agreed item in the CCC plan.

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
David and Heather Bundy	Freight Route	Norwich Quay is the Heavy traffic road into the Port. The use of this road whilst is quite legal causes a huge reduction in the amenity value of the lower township. There is a substantial nuisance from the large trucks of noise, dust, vibration, fumes and traffic danger. A corridor below Norwich Quay was set aside 25 years ago, this is partially formed and should be used.	The Lyttelton people want the trucks off Norwich Quay.
Maike Fichtner	Freight Route	Norwich Quay commercial traffic is directed through a tunnel and local traffic guided so it is compatible with pedestrian access to the water front.	Norwich Quay commercial traffic is directed through a tunnel and local traffic guided so it is compatible with pedestrian access to the water front.
Alastair Suren	Freight Route	Identify location(s) where future internal port road can go (alternative to Norwich Quay for heavy vehicles post 2026) so the area is not developed to the extent that it precludes development of an internal road, that is, don't allow significant, expensive infrastructure that would never be removed.	Include Figure 2.4 from Appendix 12 in the Integrated Transport Assessment in the Recovery Plan.
Juliet Neill	Freight Route	Norwich Quay is dangerous to pedestrians, cyclists and cars. It is already polluted and dusty, meaning that it is unlikely to be able to be resorted as a commercial area. A plan to monitor pollution levels has been announced. By the plan's own admission, traffic volumes are going to increase significantly, compounding existing problems. Rebuild is a misnomer. This is clearly a plan for expansion, being hurried through under earthquake regulations. The separation of Te Awaparahi Bay from Lyttelton township will not reduce the adverse affects on the community unless traffic is removed from Norwich Quay. Clarify what is meant by Norwich Quay continuing to function "effectively, despite the increase in traffic. What does this mean. It certainly will not be effective for the residents of Lyttelton, and already pollution levels are high and being monitored.	Truck access to the wharves is already available for loading and unloading, and has to be retained. It would make environmental and economic sense to upgrade this now and divert traffic from Norwich Quay. Remove port traffic from Norwich Quay. In 4.5 it states that no action is required. I dispute that.
A J Wilson	Freight Route	I oppose continued use of Norwich Quay until 2026 and delay of an alternative access road until 2041. Current truck traffic is dangerous for residents and unconscionable environmentally. I personally have had several near fatal close calls with trucks at excessive speeds ignoring cross-walks on Norwich Quay.	I seek limitation of truck traffic volume by construction of an alternative road and increase in use of rail transport. In the meantime I propose reduction of the speed limit on Norwich Quay for trucks to 40km/h 7am-9pm (ferry operation house) with rigorous enforcement. I support investment in rail infrastructure to facilitate improved rail service to replace truck service to the port.
Jill Morrison	Freight Route	The plan declares that Norwich Quay can accommodate traffic flow safely for years to come. Turning right onto Norwich Quay from Oxford St is extremely dangerous. At busy times there are lots of heavy trucks travelling from Cashin Quay.	Traffic lights at the Oxford St/Norwich Quay intersection
Sarah van der Burch	Freight Route	There is no expectation of getting the large trucks of Norwich Quay - which I would like to see happen.	Even if we simply reduced the volume by 50 % for the next 5 years and then got the large truck traffic off altogether after that.
Mark Watson	Freight Route	Heavy port traffic off Norwich Quay	Trucks go down onto a new freight-only road beside the railway line so that the public have a safe pleasant pedestrian-friendly street environment to encourage new businesses.
Tasman Young	Freight Route	LPC has openly stated in their Port Lyttelton Plan of 2014 that freight will increase by about 400% in the next 30 years and your ECAN draft still defers the issue of Port related traffic on Norwich Quay. Why would you suggest deferring this for at least 10 years when the sheer volume of traffic would make this a logistics nightmare.	I oppose deferring the removal of Port traffic from Norwich Quay predominantly on safety grounds.
KiwiRail	Freight Route	KiwiRail submits that it is important that the PDLPRP identify and protect existing and future transport corridors and associated access, provides for future rail freight growth requirements, and hubs and yards to service the increase in freight to the Port.	
KiwiRail	Freight Route	KiwiRail operates network 24/7. Critical to maintain present operating parameters - noise, dust, times of operation, activities, restrictions of at-grade crossings, public access. Reverse sensitivity significant concern - potential to adversely affect safe, efficient and effective operation. Unclear whether changes to pRDP capture existing an future rail operation and activities - noise and other reverse sensitivity issues. KiwiRail considers the long established existing rail operation and activities should be recognised and accommodated accordingly as an existing activity with known noise parameters. Difficult to establish whether the concept of 'Lyttelton Port' captures rail activity in the rail corridor and adjoining yards - noise and other reverse sensitivity matters. Changes to pRDP chapter 2 Definitions - port activities - does not define rail corridor and freight marshalling yard - do fall within Port Operational Area.	Clarification as to whether noise associated with the existing rail operation and activities within the geographical area covered by the PDLPRP are addressed.

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
KiwiRail	Freight Route	The amendment corrects the reference to rail spur which is incorrect. The Main South Line is a continuous Line starting at the Lyttelton Port. The amendment provides a more accurate description.	Amend Chapter 3.6 Insert: "Lyttelton Port is defined as the start point of KiwiRail's Main South Line, which runs to Invercargill. On departing Lyttelton, trains pass under the Port Hills via the Lyttelton rail tunnel. At Addington, 12.6 km from Lyttelton, the Main North Line (to Picton) branches off the Main South Line." Delete: "The Port is connected to the rail network by a 12.6km rail spur from the Main South Line, which runs under the Port Hills through a dedicated tunnel."
K L Henderson	Freight Route	No mention is made of the transport of freight by rail	Adequate provision should be made for the ability to transport freight in and out of the port by rail. Road transport is not environmentally friendly.
New Zealand Transport Agency	General	NZTA supports the MoU to provide a non-regulatory approach for partners to provide for transport network outcomes in Lyttelton. MoU enables; coordinated, holistic and flexible approach at appropriate times which could not be achieved solely through regulatory approach, NZTA as road controlling authority for state highway network to be involved in a support any analysis and identification of appropriate mitigation to ensure safe and efficient freight access to port. Benefits relate to; parking provisions and network performance, freight optimisation by road and rail, scope and content of future ITA for Dampier Bay, pedestrian and cycle connectivity. Working group already established as identified in Action 8. NZTA suggests both short term and longer term work programme is needed relating to Dampier Bay - more time needed to develop long term work programme; certainty on Dampier Bay development, further ITA, funding plan. NZTA supports Action for new pedestrian facility on Norwich Quay in short term.	
New Zealand Transport Agency	General	Section 3.6, page 37 third and fourth paragraphs. The fourth paragraph notes that increasing freight volumes will place additional pressure on the wider transport network. The Transport Agency, in conjunction with its Greater Christchurch Transport Statement (GCTS) Partners including LPC have completed a freight study and are now working through an action plan to manage the wider network. This process will provide for recovery consistent with the LURP. Further direction through the LPRP is not required.	Amend section 3.6 page 37 fourth paragraph as follows: The projected increase in freight volumes through the Port will place additional pressure on the wider transport network providing freight access to the Port. This has been recognised through the Greater Christchurch Transport Statement and a freight action plan is being developed in that forum to address issues for the wider network.
New Zealand Transport Agency	General	Section 4.6, page 66. While the Agency generally agrees with the conclusions of LPC's ITA regarding the capacity of the network until 2026, the LPRP is not the appropriate forum to address the ITA's recommendations outside of Lyttelton. These recommendations should be considered in light of the GCTS partners work on ensuring efficient freight access, which will be consistent with the actions of the LURP.	Amend the third paragraph in Section 4.6 The Integrated Transport Assessment concluded that the wider transport network will operate within acceptable levels of service until 2026, except for the Port Hills Road / Chapmans Road intersection. This The wider transport network will be is being addressed through the Greater Christchurch Transport Statement partnership, consistent with the Land Use Recovery Plan and other transport planning processes (in particular the three-yearly Regional Land Transport Plan)." Retain the last paragraph in Section 4.6

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
New Zealand Transport Agency	General	Section 5.2.2, page 85, Actions 8 and 9. The Transport Agency agrees with the intent of Actions 8 and 9. However, it suggests amendments to ensure the purpose of the MoU, and the focus of each Action is clear. In particular, this includes capturing the intent to provide for an investigation of any short term works as well as a long term programme of works. Short term is envisaged to be over the next 1-4 years and will ensure partners consider what works may be provided early in the recovery of the port (prior to phase 4 development in Dampier Bay). A primary focus in the short term will be pedestrian access and connectivity with the new pedestrian facility proposed in Action 9, as well as the local road network and Norwich Quay. The longer term programme would be developed once more certainty on Dampier Bay development was available and using the information to be provided as part of the future ITA. Action 9 can then be simplified to focus on the provision of a new pedestrian facility on Norwich Quay. It is also important for the MoU partners to agree the scope of the MoU and their respective roles at the outset. (See Mr Blyleven's evidence, paras 78 - 80. See also paras 63 and 67 - 74 for background on the uncertainties surrounding the Dampier Bay development and potential impacts.)	New Zealand Transport Agency, Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City Council, KiwiRail and Lyttelton Port Company Ltd will sign a Memorandum of Understanding stating how the parties will work together to ensure the provision of a transport network that supports recovery while maintaining safe and efficient transport solutions for users. The MoU will: clarify the scope and relationship of the MoU partners. Set out the principles and framework to guide partners in the development of an implementation plan including supporting funding agreements. Set out a process to ensure the implementation plan captures short term and longer term responses, This MoU will be reviewed and amended annually as agreed by parties to ensure it remains relevant for the next 10 years or longer as required. A schedule of upgrades will be developed and how costs are to be met will be agreed. The Schedule shall include confirmation of the appropriate interim upgrades to Norwich Quay, as set out in Action 9 . Memorandum of Understanding to be signed within three months of the approval of the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan or sooner as agreed by the partners. Short term implementation plan to be confirmed by December 2016 . Longer term implementation plan to be agreed as more comprehensive information is available. Lead agency: New Zealand Transport Agency Goals: 3a, 5, 7a, 7b
New Zealand Transport Agency	General	21.8.2.3.9 (b). The Transport Agency supports the inclusion of transport standards for access points. However, it is unclear what rule this standard relates to. Further, given potential impact of new accesses onto the state highway, the Transport Agency submits it should be considered an affected party for any resource consent for the formation of a new access point onto State Highway 74. (See Mr Blyleven's evidence, para 74).	Amend the proposed rules to provide that the Transport Agency is notified of any application for a new access point onto State Highway 74.
Canterbury Maritime Developments Limited	Other	Despite discussions and references to the local and wider transport network, there is no evidence suggesting that rail is recognised as a legitimate part of the potential public transport system such as a railcar facility from Lyttelton into the city. We consider this to be an oversight if we are looking to develop a much more integrated approach to the recovery of the port.	Railcar facility running between Lyttelton and the city.
Christchurch City Council	Other	One concern that is not acknowledged in the Recovery Plan is the potential effect that increased traffic volumes on Norwich Quay will have on the ability of commercial sites currently empty (with buildings having been demolished) to redevelop successfully.	The Council considers in its approach to Norwich Quay that the Recovery Plan does not adequately address matters 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 in the Direction, nor the vision and goals of the Plan as they relate to the Lyttelton Town Centre.
KiwiRail	Other	Kiwi Rail anticipates and is planning on the basis that all of the existing land capacity presently used for operations at Norwich Quay for bulk storage and handling will continue to be required. Consequently Kiwi Rail submits that its operational and maintenance requirements for freight handling and storage, and its operations and assets, are not compromised. Shifting Port activities eastward over time does not necessarily mean there will be a reducing need for capacity in the Norwich Quay shunting yard. Capacity at the Port remains a concern - expected increases in freight volumes. Kiwi Rail will engage in discussions on alternative sites for freight storage and handling, alternative access to Norwich Quay in the future, provision of maintenance access for rail activities to the west end of the yard including Kiwi Rail vehicle access and circulation, and options for grade-separated crossings over the rail corridor. Kiwi Rail acknowledges that these matters will be addressed in the MoU as provided in the PDLPRP in section 5.2.2 Transport Network: Action 8 and 9 and supports that approach.	Include Kiwi Rail in list of agencies involved in Action 9. Kiwi Rail is identified as a party to Action 8 which addresses Action 9. As such Kiwi Rail should be identified accordingly as a party to Action 9. This comprises an integral part of the MOU and addresses matters of interest to Kiwi Rail's operations.

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
KiwiRail	Other	A setback applied from the designated rail corridor boundary ensures new buildings or structures can be constructed and maintained without the need to enter the rail corridor. This restriction is considered necessary as encroachment or unauthorised access to the corridor raises serious health and safety issues for Kiwi Rail (and adjacent landowners or occupiers). Trespass is a serious issue for Kiwi Rail and should not be encouraged by a need to maintain buildings or structures on, under or over, or close to the rail corridor where there is insufficient room or access to construct, clean, paint and otherwise maintain these buildings or structures wholly from within private property.	Appendix 4 proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan Add a new Building Rule in the Built Form Standards for the relevant zones comprising Area C adjacent to Norwich Quay (Appendix 21.8.4.4 Dampier Bay Area and Norwich Quay maximum building height) to read: "Buildings, balconies and decks shall be set back at least 4 metres from the designated rail corridor boundary for the locations identified as Area C adjoining Norwich Quay in Appendix 21.8.4.4." Noncompliance with the permitted activity standard should be a restricted discretionary activity with the matters of discretion restricted to: "Whether the reduced setback from the rail corridor will enable buildings and structures to be constructed and maintained without requiring access above, over, on or under the rail corridor. Kiwi Rail shall be notified as an affected party."
New Zealand Transport Agency	Other	Section 4.5, page 66. The Transport Agency supports section 4.5 making reference to the discussion on Norwich Quay in section 3.6 to reduce duplication. However the word requirements is stronger than used in section 3.6 which acknowledges there are competing aspiration and interests.	Amend section 4.5 first paragraph by replacing "requirements" with considerations
New Zealand Transport Agency	Other	Section 4.5, page 66, last two bullet points. As discussed in the key issues discussion section of this submission (above) the uncertainty of development and effects in Dampier Bay means that attempting to identify a programme of works at this time would be premature. Therefore, the Transport Agency supports the MoU approach in the context of Recovery. Consistent with the Transport Agency's requested changes to the Action 8 and 9 of the LPRP, the Transport Agency suggests amendments to this section to clarify that the MoU will ensure identification of any short term works and a more comprehensive longer term programme to tie in with improved certainty and future ITA on Dampier Bay.	Amend the bullet points in Section 4.5 as follows: the Memorandum of Understanding will provide for: A working relationship between partners Guidance to develop a short term programme of works including an improved pedestrian facility on Norwich Quay; Guidance to develop a short term programme of works to address the change in land use in Dampier Bay when the necessary information is available Identify how funding / costs will be agreed between partners.
Christchurch City Council	Pedestrian Access	There needs to be a direct relationship between the waterfront and the town centre, linked with safe and convenient access. The Council supports the inclusion of the reference in the Plan to the possible development of an alternative port access road but notes that ECan does not consider that this assists recovery.	
New Zealand Transport Agency	Pedestrian Access	Section 4.5, page 66, fourth paragraph. The Transport Agency considers that upgrades to pedestrian and cycling access, safety and amenity along and across Norwich Quay need to be assessed as the development of Dampier Bay becomes more certain, regardless of the question of the alternative freight access route. In addition, this paragraph suggests that partners will work together to resolve transport issues in Lyttelton. This implies a wider scope than that intended under the LPRP.	Amend Section 4.5, fourth paragraph, from the third sentence as follows: this Recovery Plan therefore does not change Norwich Quays function as the freight route for the Port, while not precluding a change in this route in the future. Town centre zoning has been retained on the south side of Norwich Quay, although there is provision for port activities to occur there for the next 10 years. Upgrades to improve pedestrian and cycling access, safety and amenity along and across Norwich Quay, especially to access Dampier Bay, will need to be addressed appropriately as the development in Dampier Bay becomes more certain. This Recovery Plan includes a commitment from the New Zealand Transport Agency, Christchurch City Council, Environment Canterbury, LPC and Kiwi Rail to sign a Memorandum of Understanding setting out how they will work together to resolve transport issues relating to Port Recovery in Lyttelton"
Emily Riley	Pedestrian Access	I support the proposal to construct a pedestrian/cyclist facility across and along Norwich Quay to provide safe access to Dampier Bay. Safety measures are required with urgency due to the already large volume of heavy, fast moving vehicles. This is accentuated by the logging storage now being located close to the recreational/rugby ground at Naval Point. I submit that upgraded pedestrian facilities be fast tracked to be completed well in advance of December 2020 to mitigate these safety concerns.	I support the construction of a pedestrian facility across and along Norwich Quay to connect with Dampier Bay. I submit that this development should occur in Phase 1 (2016/2017) of the Dampier Bay development, due to the already inadequate provisions for pedestrian and cyclist safety.

TRANSPORT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Jillian Frater	Pedestrian Access	Section 4.5 - My preferred option is that this section is altered to provide for the enhancement of Norwich Quay for the benefit of the Lyttelton community. The safety of pedestrians is a particular concern given that children from West Lyttelton will have to cross Norwich Quay at the pedestrian crossing at the bottom of Oxford Street to get to the new school site. This crossing is currently extremely unsafe. There is sufficient space within the road corridor of Norwich Quay for a separated cycle path and walkway, particularly if on-street parking is removed. This pathway would ideally also link the town and Naval Point.	the addition of a separated pedestrian and cycle path through the removal of on-street parking and improved amenity of Norwich Quay and the creation of a pathway between Lyttelton Town centre and Naval Point by December 2018. These changes would be similar to those described in Te Ara Mua Future Streets in relation to the enhancement of streets in Mangere, Auckland ☒
David and Heather Bundy	Pedestrian Access	Children who formerly went to Lyttelton West School will need to find their way safely to the new school. This will be impossible on foot with the heavy traffic problem.	Divert traffic onto the waterfront to allow a safe crossing place for these children.
Ms Wendy Everingham	Pedestrian Access	I support a high quality pedestrian link from Dampier Bay to Lyttelton.	N/A
Linda Goodwin	Pedestrian Access	A key current issue is 'pedestrian' and 'road safety' in and around Dampier Bay (specifically entering into Godley Quay from Simeon Quay, and at the lower end of Godley Quay after Voelas Road). I have witnessed many 'near misses' by trucks (including articulated), cars and pedestrians along this strip of the road. I believe there is a high risk of human fatality in this area, if no action is taken by Lyttelton Port Company and NZ Transport Agency. Future planning would benefit from dedicated walkways (separate from the road) from Lyttelton to Dampier Bay, and through to Naval Point. Also, providing safe access for Lyttelton West residents. A good starting point would be to undertake a risk assessment of this area, and develop a plan based on the findings.	Include acknowledgment of current community concerns by pedestrians over the safety of Godley Quay, and for a risk assessment to be undertaken of this area and the findings to be incorporated into future road safety planning.

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
A Duncan; A Herriott; A Ludlow; A Carter; A Bowater; A Herriott; A Lealand; A Taylor; A Farqyharson; A Graham; B Carrell; B Frederikson; B Gordon; B Moore; B Cowan; B Armstrong; B Keen; B Parker; B Anderson; B Lang; B Hawkins; C Gibbons; Canterbury Maritime Training; C Dodds; C Cameron; C Guy; C Lock; C McCulloch; D Atkinson; D Lindner; D Lake; D Bastin; D Munro; D Vile; D Haylock; D Miller; D Paterson; D Southwick; D Main; D Taylor; D Crosbie; E Riley; F Bowater; FitandAbel NZ Limited; F McLachlan; G Dixon; G Suckling; G Mentink; G Savage; G Irwin; G Perrem; G Armstrong; G Bowater; G Ronald; Groundswell Sports Ltd; H Sylvester; H Anderson; H Walls; H Wilkinson; I Scott; I Armstrong; I Atkinson; J Riddoch; J Hopkins; J Mann; J Vilsbek; J Hern; J Davis; J Hawtin; J Allott; K Selway; K Beatson; K Cowan; K Oborn; K Beatson; Kn Duncan; K Guy; L Hern; L Falconer; L Boyd; L Crawford; L Lilburne; L Duke; M Guy; M Ramsay; M Griffiths; M Wellby; M Oborn; M Shove; M Ferrar; M Hore; M Moore; M Brown; M Hitchings; S Knight; N Wilde; N Grant; N Matthews; O Corboy; P Beckett; P Lang; P Moore; P Savage; P Tocker; P Auger; P Folter; P Predegast; R Atkinson; R O'Sullivan; R Lascelles; R Wellesley; R Gibb; R Norris; R Lee; R Hale; R Hofmans; R Eveleens; R Rodgers; R Connolly; R Miller; S Jones; Samarah; S Hinman; S Oborn; S Moore; S Pierce; S Cameron; S Chester; T Wooding; T George; V Sue-Tang; V Williams; V Newman; Waitaha Paddling Club; W Keen; W Taggart; X Bowater; Ballingers Hunting & Fishing Ltd; South Island Finn Association; S Page; S Schumacher	Commercial Development	Support the proposal that will allow some retail and commercial development in this area. There are controls in the Plan which are designed to ensure development is complimentary to the marina and does not inhibit the recovery of Lyttelton's commercial area. I believe these controls are sufficient to ensure this objective is achieve while allowing the Port Company some flexibility to ensure commercial development in the area is feasible and that there will be sufficient opportunity to accommodate the essential marina related commercial activities such as chandleries, marine services, boat brokerage, hospitality etc. I propose that additional controls are put on the commercial development to ensure sufficient car parking is provided to meet the needs of marina users.	I support the development of retail and office activities and provision should be made for adequate car parking to support the marina and retail/office areas.
Coastguard Canterbury Incorporated; Coastguard Southern Region	Commercial Development	Apart from the provision of the pontoon marina for the reasons as submitted above we have no particular view or submission on the commercial development in Dampier Bay. It is vital however for any commercial development to have adequate vehicle access and car parking so as to ensure that access roads are not subject of congestion and traffic jams. Such traffic problems could prevent or inhibit our volunteers from reaching our facility when responding to an urgent callout.	Development of Retail and Office activities should have a requirement for car parking in the area to meet the following standards: All activities shall make adequate provision for car parking and manoeuvring without causing congestion or detracting from the amenity of the surrounding area including the following parking requirements: Marina: 0.6 parks per marina berth
Juliet Neill	Commercial Development	Dampier Bay should genuinely be a recreational area. Green park space is seriously lacking in Lyttelton. Dampier Bay should be a greened picnic area, and Norwich Quay, if cleared of trucks could be restored into a pleasant commercial area.	Development of a commercial area in Dampier Bay will seriously compromise the main commercial area in London Street.
Ms Wendy Everingham	Commercial Development	I support plans for Dampier Bay to be a smaller development for retail etc. as I do believe that a large area has the potential to damage recovery of the other local businesses in London St.	N/A
Lisa Williams	Commercial Development	I support the development but would like more information to be presented to the public on the impact to the immediate area namely being Godley Quay. Godley Quay is a busy road with heavy traffic for port use and boaties. Access to Dampier Bay development using this road will be detrimental to safety as this is also a residential street. Facts and consideration needs to be given to the area in terms of traffic management, parking and noise. Godley Quay is a difficult road to navigate and without a proper proposal considering traffic and parking there will be an increase in accidents on this road. Also consultation should take place on the type of development as it is again bordering a residential street whose resident shall be concerned with noise and heights of buildings.	More information and further consultation
David Carter	Commercial Development	I support the development of retail and office activities and provision should be made for adequate car parking to support the marina and retail / office areas.	N/A
Viki Moore; Glenda Anderson; Nick Rayner	Commercial Development	I support the proposal that will allow some retail and commercial development in this area. The marina would attract retail businesses such as a chandlery, sail maker, charter operators, and hospitality. This would not detract from the retail operations in Lyttelton town centre.	I support the development of retail and office activities and provision should be made for adequate car parking to support the marina and retail/office areas.

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Oborn's Nautical	Commercial Development	I support the proposal that will allow some retail and commercial development in this area. There are controls in the Plan which are designed to ensure development is complimentary to the marina and does not inhibit the recovery of Lyttelton's commercial area. I believe these controls are sufficient to ensure this objective is achieved while allowing the Port Company some flexibility to ensure commercial development in the area is feasible and that there will be sufficient opportunity to accommodate the essential marina related commercial activities such as chandleries, marine services, boat brokerage, hospitality etc. I propose that additional controls are put on the commercial development to ensure sufficient car parking is provided to meet the needs of marina users.	I support the development of retail and office activities and provision should be made for adequate car parking to support the marina and retail/office areas.
Wayne Nolan	Commercial Development	I support the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company (together with any partners) to develop some commercial and retail facilities in the area adjoining the new marina in Dampier Bay.	N/A
Canterbury Yachting Association	Commercial Development	I support the development of retail and office activities and provision should be made for adequate car parking to support the marina and retail/office areas.	N/A
Canterbury Maritime Developments Limited	Commercial Development	If development of Dampier Bay (Areas A and B) and ultimately land further east of Wharf 7 (identified in the LPCs Plan as Non-Operational Port land) is available for commercial development then it is our submission that the proposed District Plan retail and office activity restrictions of 1000m2 and 2000m2 respectively (up to 2026) rather than helping in the recovery of the Lyttelton township businesses will actually inhibit commercial interest in the inner harbour.	If and integrated complex is to be developed the floor space will need to be reviewed
Naval Point Club Lyttelton; Ben Godwin	Commercial Development	Naval Point Club Lyttelton supports the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company (together with any partners) to develop some commercial and retail facilities in the area adjoining the new marina in Dampier Bay. We support this with our proposed amendments for the following reasons: Boat owners and marina users require access to facilities close to the marina for retail of boating and marine equipment, services and hospitality; It is our view that many of the businesses and activities that would be established in this area would do so because of the new marina and would most likely not occur elsewhere in Lyttelton without it, it would therefore mostly be new business activity. We also believe it is essential that sufficient car parking is provided to meet the needs of any new retail/commercial activity and the marina in accordance with industry standard. The Naval Point Club Lyttelton also supports development sensitive to and in recognition of historic recreational activities in the inner harbour and heritage features in the area such as the Dry Dock and buildings with heritage status.	Development of Retail and Office activities should have a requirement for car parking in the area to meet the following standards: All activities shall make adequate provision for car parking and manoeuvring without causing congestion or detracting from the amenity of the surrounding area including the following parking requirements: Marina: 0.6 parks per marina berth.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Commercial development	p8 Development at Dampier Bay We also support provisions in the Recovery Plan which limit commercial development at Dampier Bay so this does not create an alternative town centre. Recovery in Lyttelton's existing town centre is delicately poised at present. We do not support ending commercial development limitations at Dampier Bay in 2026 because we think it is unlikely the Lyttelton town centre will have made a full recovery by then.	Review these provisions at the time of the next review of the Christchurch District Plan.
Te Waka Pounamu	Commercial Development	Recreational access for small paddle craft should also be from this area via a ramp or beach. I support the proposal that will allow some retail and commercial development in this area. There are controls in the Plan which are designed to ensure development is complimentary to the marina and does not inhibit the recovery of Lyttelton's commercial area. I believe these controls are sufficient to ensure this objective is achieve while allowing the Port Company some flexibility to ensure commercial development in the area is feasible and that there will be sufficient opportunity to accommodate the essential marina related commercial activities such as chandleries, marine services, boat brokerage, hospitality etc. I propose that additional controls are put on the commercial development to ensure sufficient car parking is provided to meet the needs of marina users.	I support the development of retail and office activities and provision should be made for adequate car parking to support the marina and retail/office areas. Open space and recreational access to be included.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Commercial development	Section 4.3.3, page 60, second paragraph. The Transport Agency supports providing certainty about the scope of commercial activity within Dampier Bay. However, the reference to within the next 10 years is potentially misleading as the District Plan could be amended before then, or the provisions could be carried over in the next District Plan review.	Amend section 4.3.4, second sentence as follows: the amendments to the proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan will restrict the type and size of commercial space permitted to be developed at Dampier Bay.

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Young 88 Association of New Zealand Inc.	Commercial Development	The Association supports the proposal in the Plan that will enable appropriate development in Dampier Bay to provide suitable facilities for marina users, visitors and the wider community. We believe some controls should be in the Plan to ensure sufficient car parking is provided to meet the needs of commercial activities and marina users. We believe this is important to ensure the success of the marina, retail & commercial development and the proposed public access to this area.	The Association supports the proposal to allow retail/commercial development in Dampier Bay but with a requirement to make adequate provision for car parking and manoeuvring without causing congestion or detracting from the amenity of the surrounding area including the provision for marina parking of at least .6 car parks per marina berth.
Alastair Brown and Frances Young	Commercial Development	The careful selection of hospitality businesses i.e. private traders only (not national or international franchises) to ensure a good quality of health promoting food and beverages are provided - not the standard pies, fries, lollies and ale. Also that the business development demands are reviewed every two years with consultation with the Lyttelton town business community to advise on possible variations required for diversity of competition.	The careful selection of hospitality businesses i.e. private traders only (not national or international franchises) to ensure a good quality of health promoting food and beverages are provided - not the standard pies, fries, lollies and ale. Also that the business development demands are reviewed every two years with consultation with the Lyttelton town business community to advise on possible variations required for diversity of competition.
David and Heather Bundy	Commercial Development	The development at Dampier Bay will not happen. It is a way of trying to satisfy the people. Other problems include the distance from the town centre and the adverse effect this will have on the recovery of the township.	None
Lyttelton Environment Group	Commercial Development	The Lyttelton Environment Group (LEG) fully supports the development of Dampier Bay as a public area with appropriate commercial development cafes, speciality food offerings and dairy etc. to expand the commercial operation of retail development, presently narrowly focussed around London Street as the present situation has created an extremely unbalanced urban, commercial reality. Far too much is being crowded into one small area to the detriment of the rest of Lyttelton, particularly in the west. Planning issues relating to the recovery plan should take a wider view than just the efficient running of the port operations as Lyttelton Port of Christchurch is an integral part of the whole of Lyttelton, not just that part which it has operational interest in. It is the LEGs view that Dampier Bay development must be complementary to the shifting of the ferry terminal to the west end of the inner harbour in an appropriately managed time frame.	Create a firm time line for development and a developed plan for commercial development which will benefit the public in conjunction with incorporating the development of the ferry terminal in the recovery plan along with concept planning images.
New Zealand Fire Service Commission	Commercial Development	The NZFS Commission opposes the Built form standards in 21.8.2.3 insofar as they fail to recognise and provide for fire appliance access and fire fighting water supply via reference to the New Zealand Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008, as is the approach being taken throughout other chapters of the Christchurch Replacement District Plan. Access to a fire fighting water supply is critical to the mitigation of potential adverse effects as a result of fire hazards. It is also consistent with section 5 of the RMA through providing for the safety of people and communities, and with the decision on Objective 3.3.13 in the Strategic Directions chapter of the Replacement Plan. The NZFS Commission therefore seeks the addition of a further standard to align with the above provisions, in the interests of ensuring that all buildings located with the Specific Purpose (Lyttelton Port) Zone have access to an adequate firefighting water supply.	Amend the Built form standards in 21.8.2.3 to include the following additional standard: "21.8.2.3.X - Water supply for fire fighting Sufficient water supply and access to water supplies for fire fighting shall be made available to all buildings via Council's urban fully reticulated water supply system and in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice (SNZ PAS:4509:2008)" As a consequence, an amendment is also required to Rule 21.8.2.2.3 RD1 to include a further matter of discretion that is also added to 21.8.2.2.3. (see full submission)
Governors Bay Community Association	Commercial Development	The Plan provides imagery for the redevelopment of Dampier Bay but there is no guarantee that this redevelopment will benefit Lyttelton or local communities. There is also a risk that Dampier Bay may increase commercial activity to the detriment of local businesses. There is, therefore, a need to be clear about the scale, type and size of this development and how the commercial integrity of Lyttelton Town Centre will be protected.	The Plan ensures the type and size of design of Dampier Bay protects the Lyttelton town centre.
Mr Robin McCarthy	Commercial Development	The proposed restrictions to commercial activity to protect existing businesses and operators in Lyttelton would be contrary to the Commerce Act. The market is the ultimate determinant of commercial activity, not the artificial imposition by way of a Territorial Authority such as ECan. Restricting commercial activity prevents innovation and new product/services to be brought to the market by new business/operators. Will have detrimental effect on stall holders/commercial operators who wish to establish new businesses targeting cruise ships. LPC will be hampered to maximise its returns if restrictions are placed on what it can offer by way of space for third party commercial activity. LPC should be allowed to secure greater revenues.	Remove restrictions preventing businesses/operators wishing to establish new or expanded businesses. Make provision for dedicated area for tour operators and stall holders to offer products and services direct to cruise ship passengers.

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Alastair Suren	Commercial Development	There is a significant potential for reverse sensitivity effects from the Dry Dock, Lyttelton Engineering, log storage, bulk goods handling, coal dust and general noise on any new marina development. Our yacht is currently moored in Dampier Bay, and is continually covered with a thin layer of dust (origins mixed) and this is likely to continue. New users of the marina development will need to recognise that this will not change. These comments also apply to potential onshore facilities and their users. Such desirable outcomes are unlikely when large ships are in the dry dock and undergoing maintenance activities such as sand blasting. The Air Quality assessment (Appendix 27) does not consider this aspect, it mainly focusses on construction activities.	State in the Recovery Plan an acknowledgement that any inner harbour marina and onshore facilities will need to be done in the context of being adjacent to current working facilities such as the Dry Dock and Lyttelton Engineering. (E.g., on p 62, we doubt that attractive, high quality and pleasant areas will always be possible.)
Andrew Stark	Commercial Development	We support the proposal that will allow some retail and commercial development in this area - as long as the existing and Long Term Historical Commercial Activities at the Dry Dock are not impeded in any way.	None
Lyttelton Harbour Business Association	Commercial development	We would support the introduction of an initiative that ensures that the Dampier Bay development actually goes ahead, rather than simply ensuring that access is provided. We strongly support the premise that the Dampier Bay commercial development should complement Lyttelton township, and we support restrictions of size and type as a means to achieve this. It is critical to ensure that investment into, and recovery of, Lyttelton township is not compromised by the development of Dampier Bay, which needs to add to the whole. The township must continue to be the commercial hub, and retain amenities such as the information centre and museum which have traditionally been in the town centre. Appropriate access and facilities need to be provided for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, on a direct route to and from the town centre. We would support waterfront access being as close as possible to the town centre, rather than integrated with the Dampier Bay development, to encourage use of the town centre.	
Christchurch City Council	Commercial development	While certainty has been provided through Action 10 that public access to the waterfront is secured in perpetuity, what is not guaranteed is development at Dampier Bay. There is a risk that the Port will undertake its rebuild and reclamation without undertaking the Dampier Bay development or at least achieving a minimum level of development.	The Council strongly supports the limitations on the scale and type of commercial development enabled in Dampier Bay by the amendments to the proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan (Appendix 4). This assists in reducing effects on the ability of the town centre to recover and function and will address matter 5.1.2 of the Direction.
Linda Goodwin	Commercial development	Support the use of Dampier Bay for light tourism	4.3 - include acknowledgement of creative a fun and dynamic area in and around Dampier Bay, including outdoor seating and tables, fun play activity structures, utilising the water in the landscaping. Identifying what has worked well and what hasn't with other ports that have been developed around NZ, and learning from this, i.e., Wellington Waterfront Development.
Governors Bay Community Association	Commercial development	It would be possible to rebuild Dampier Bay to protect local community activity and small businesses that utilise the Bay from the Southerly with careful attention to how the area is rebuilt. Development should consider the necessity of creating sheltered public space to ensure that such areas can be used in all weathers.	NA
New Zealand Transport Agency	Commercial development	Section 4.3, page 59; Figure 9, pages 64-65. Section 4.3 of the LPRP sets out, at a high level, the land use activities proposed within Dampier Bay. It would be helpful to clarify in which phase each land use is likely to be addressed and more clearly link this to the phases of development shown in Figure 9. It may also be helpful to explain types or areas of development that are not able to occur until after LPC has finished using the area to support reconfiguration of the operational port area.	Explain under each subsection of Section 4.3 in which phase(s) it is intended for the activity/development to occur. This will enable the reader to more clearly link the activities with the phases map shown in Figure 9.

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
New Zealand Transport Agency	Commercial development	Section 4.3.1, page 59, second and third paragraphs. This paragraph indicates that parking for the marina may not be provided until the redevelopment of Dampier Bay and possibly as late as phase 4, although the marina redevelopment is proposed for phase 1. This seems to be supported by the proposed amendments to the pRDP, which include marina activities within Port activities, which are permitted. The Transport Agency considers that the parking requirements of the marina should be provided contemporaneously with the marina development. The Transport Agency is concerned that if adequate parking is not provided, this could lead to parking being pushed outside of Dampier Bay onto local roads and the state highway, which can have adverse effects on the local transport network. See Mr Blyleven's evidence (para 71).	Amend Section 4.3.1, second paragraph to clarify that adequate parking facilities for the new marina will be provided contemporaneously with the marina development in phase 1 and within the Dampier Bay development area. This will require consequential amendment to the proposed amendments to the pRDP.
Dr Chris Bathurst	Commercial Development	There is concern that the area will not be the most attractive for the public as afternoon sunlight leaves at 3:00 pm in the winter and the environment cools rapidly. The area to the north-east on the other side of Wharf 7 would be far more desirable, as the sunlight hours are much greater and proximity to Lyttelton central and the ferries would assist trade.	The provision of the manager of the marina should not go directly to the LPC without proper legal agreement as it appears the waters of the Dampier Bay are not part of the designated port area. This is because the LPT may end up being owned by a private commercial concern. It is preferred that the Dampier Bay developments be organised as a public owned facility so that the income from the area be used to develop, improve and maintain the facility.
New Zealand Fire Service Commission	Commercial Development	The NZFS Commission strongly supports Matter for Discretion and Control 21.8.3.3.4 in its recognition of the need for both fire appliances access and fire fighting water supply via reference to the New Zealand Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:4509:2008 where subdivision occurs within the Specific Purpose (Lyttelton Port) Zone, for the reasons stated above.	Retain Matter for Discretion and Control 21.8.3.3.4(b)(v)(b) as notified
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Commercial Development	The regeneration of Dampier Bay will result in a significant improvement in amenity relatively. Operative District Plan does not permit retail or commercial activities. Proposed rules allow this along with community facilities and access. Timing and extent will be driven by market demand.	Provisions for such facilities and activities is necessary and supported.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Commercial Development	Floor limits ensure that Dampier Bay is unable to compete with the town centre allowing the town centre a further 10 years to rebuild. Floor limits also restrict the size ensuring that large format retail providers can not operate as a controlled activity.	Regeneration of Dampier Bay is dependent on commercial interest in order to deliver an attractive, vibrant waterfront area.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Commercial Development	LPRP proposes to control urban design outcomes in Dampier Bay and south of Norwich Quay. Dampier Bay is subject to an ODP that establishes the key locational elements in Dampier Bay. Non-compliance with the ODP is a restricted discretionary activity.	Action 11 is added requiring the production of the design guide prior to the commencement of the redevelopment of Dampier Bay.
	Commercial Development	LPRP proposes that most aspect of the ODP are restricted discretionary and proposals that do not conform with viewsharfts and waterfront promenade are fully discretionary.	Full discretionary is not considered justifiable. The matters that are not consistent are relatively discrete and proposed assessment matters appropriately address the relevant issues. Action 10 works in tandem with the ODP to provide certainty that public access is delivered.
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	General	The district plan rules need to require a Cultural Landscape Values assessment to identify the Ngai Tahu values and recommend how they should be acknowledged in the Dampier Bay redevelopment.	The district plan rules need to require a Cultural Landscape Values assessment to identify the Ngai Tahu values and recommend how they should be acknowledged in the Dampier Bay redevelopment.
Alastair Suren	Marina	The plans show a potential for 200+ berths, but there appears to be no provision for haul-out facilities for these boats. Boats currently haul out on the public slipway at Magazine Bay with significant restrictions due to time, tide and wind. Although we understand that CCC is preparing a development plan for Naval Point, we are concerned that there is not enough integration between this Recovery Plan and the plans for Naval Point. Need to have better integration with the concept plan that CCC is developing. Surely if LPC can afford to reclaim a further 27 ha of land, the creation of a breakwater occupying only a fraction of this area should be a priority, especially when considering the obvious economic benefits that this would provide in terms of follow-up developments.	Delay decision making on Dampier Bay until the CCC Naval Point development plan is progressed and the two developments are better are integrated. Provide a slipway, also suitable for haul out, that are suitable for use in all weathers. Amend the Recovery Plan and Coastal Plan to provide a wave attenuating structure to protect existing facilities at Naval Point.

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
A Duncan; A Ludlow; A Carter; A Bowater; A Herriott; A Lealand; A Taylor; A Farqyharson; A Graham; B Carrell; B Frederikson; B Gordon; B Moore; B Cowan; B Armstrong; B Keen; B Parker; B Anderson; B Lang; B Hawkins; C Gibbons; Canterbury Maritime Training; C Dodds; C Cameron; C Guy; C Lock; C McCulloch; D Atkinson; D Lindner; D Lake; D Bastin; D Munro; D Vile; D Haylock; D Miller; D Paterson; D Southwick; D Main; D Taylor; D Crosbie; E Riley; F Bowater; FitandAbel NZ Limited; F McLachlan; G Dixon; G Suckling; G Mentink; G Savage; G Irwin; G Anderson; G Burney; G Perrem; G Armstrong; G Bowater; G Ronald; Groundswell Sports Ltd; H Sylvester; H Anderson; H Walls; H Wilkinson; I Scott; I Armstrong; I Atkinson; J Riddoch; J Hopkins; J Mann; J Vilsbek; J Hern; J Davis; J Hawtin; J Allott; K Selway; K Beatson; K Cowan; K Oborn; K Beatson; K Duncan; K Guy; L Hern; L Falconer; L Boyd; L Crawford; L Lilburne; L Duke; M Guy; M Ramsay; M Griffiths; M Wellby; M Oborn; M Shove; M Ferrar; M Hore; M Moore; M Brown; M Hitchings; S Knight; N Wilde; N Grant; N Matthews; O Corboy; P Beckett; P Lang; P Moore; P Savage; P Tocker; P Auger; P Folter; P Prendegast; R Atkinson; R O'Sullivan; R Lascelles; R Wellesley; R Gibb; R Norris; R Lee; R Hale; R Hofmans; R Eveleens; R Rodgers; R Connolly; R Miller; S Jones; Samarah; S Hinman; S Oborn; S Moore; S Pierce; S Cameron; S Chester; T Wooding; T George; V Sue-Tang; V Williams; V Newman; Waitaha Paddling Club; W Keen; W Taggart; X Bowater; South Island Finn Association; S Page; S Schumacher; S Coombe; M Anderson; G Bourne	Marina	4.1.2 & 4.3.1 - I support the proposal to allow development of a new marina for 180-200 boats. I believe there will be demand for significantly more berths than this and flexibility should be provided in the Plan to enable further extensions for up to 1,000 berths as a Permitted Activity. I propose that removal of the old piles be a Permitted Activity with a requirement that removal shall be for the purpose of the development of a new floating pontoon marina.	I support the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company (together with any partners) to replace the Dampier Bay pile moorings with a pontoon marina of a minimum of approximately 180-200 berths. The existing pile moorings should be removed for the purpose of developing a new floating pontoon marina, and that additional marina berths should be added in between wharf 7 & 3
FitandAbel NZ Limited	Marina	The previous marina destroyed by a southerly at Naval point, will never be a viable marina unless a substantial solid breakwater is built right across outside the Marina and joining up with 100 m wide entrance to the present breakwater extended out.	
Brent Robinson	Marina	4.1.2 & 4.3.1 - I support this proposal	The existing pile moorings should be removed for the purpose of developing a new floating pontoon marina. Additional marina berths should be added in between wharf 7 & 3
Coastguard Canterbury Incorporated; Coastguard Southern Region	Marina	4.3.1 - Coastguard Canterbury supports the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company (together with any partners) to provide a pontoon marina of a minimum of approximately 180-200 berths for the following reasons: safe and convenient marina would be of benefit to Lyttelton; The current pile berths in Dampier Bay provide safe mooring but provide no walk on access or services; In a modern pontoon marina people can walk to their boat, load and unload equipment, provisions etc. It is safer and much more convenient for people to be able to board a boat in this way particularly for anyone inexperienced, young children and the physically impaired.	We propose the following amendments to the Plan: A new rule should be included as follows: Removal of the existing Dampier Bay Pile Moorings shall be for the purposes of the development of a new floating pontoon marina. We also submit that the development of an additional 850 marina berths in the inner harbour between wharf 7 and wharf 3 should be a Permitted Activity.
Yachting New Zealand	Marina	Supports the proposal enabling LPC (together with any partners) to replace the Dampier Bay pile moorings with a minimum pontoon marina of approximately 180-200 berths for the following reasons: an acute shortage of marina berth / moorings available to recreational displacement boats in the area, boat owners are being forced to moor their boats at facilities outside the Canterbury region, the lack of modern marina facilities in Canterbury is a significant constraint on Yacht / Boating clubs in the area, their activities and membership. Comparable coastal areas around New Zealand such as Wellington having a similar sized population to Canterbury and also has marinas in the Marlborough Sounds available as an alternate and accessible location to moor a boat. A marina in Lyttelton will allow more people with a disability to take part in sailing and boating activities.	Yachting New Zealand proposes the following amendments to the Plan: A new rule should be included as follows: Removal of the existing Dampier Bay Pile Moorings shall be for the purposes of the development of a new floating pontoon marina. We also submit that the development of an additional 850 marina berths in the inner harbour between wharf 7 and wharf 3 should be a Permitted Activity.
William Hall	Marina	4.3.1 and 4.1.2 - support. Recreational boating has been poorly served in the Christchurch area for decades. Compared to similar sized cities the facilities available are well below par.	None

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Dampier Bay Moorings Association Inc	Marina	A better marina would provide safe moorings which are in demand, attracting our boats back from the Marlborough Sounds, provide port facilities for visiting boats and encourage shore based facilities and attractive environment. Support the walk on marina in addition to the existing pile moorings not in place of them. Pile moorings are of historic significance and have been part of Dampier Bay culture and history for 90 years. The existing boaties may not be priced out of the floating marina. Over spray and dust from the dry dock are an undesirable feature for all boats at Dampier Bay but less of a problem for older boats on the existing pile moorings than newer boats with expensive paintwork. Existing piles and boats have survived tug wash over many years, we suspect this is to be a serious issue for the proposed floating marina.	Make the removal of the pile moorings and the construction of a floating marina a discretionary activity.
Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society	Marina	Both the Dampier Bay proposed marina and area designated for future development between wharves 3 and 2 can only be applauded as is the provision of public access which has been an issue of some magnitude for over 20 years.	This is supported and the logic of retaining No 4 becomes apparent! At some future time the old tug could be relocated here as part of the mooted heritage theme in the event of a relocation of the ferry at No4.
Alastair Suren	Marina	Dampier Bay has for decades provided cost effective pile moorings (with historic value) for private boats. While we support the potential future development there are a number of important issues that have not been considered in the Recovery Plan. These are: A. In the short term the existing piles need to be maintained (and proposed changes to the Coastal Plan do not permit this) and provision needs to be included to enable some or all of the piles to remain should this be the outcome of consultation. The piles are cost effective and not everyone will be able to afford a berth at the floating marina. The existing piles have historic value. This is not reflected in the Recovery Plan. This issue was also highlighted in the Greenaway Report	Amend the Recovery Plan to provide for maintenance and the potential retention of at least some of the pile moorings and recognise their existing historic value. Any subsequent changes to the Coastal Plan are to provide for the maintenance of at least some of the existing pile moorings.
Bruce Baldwin	Marina	Dampier Bay pile moorings should be retained to provide moorings at a reasonable cost to the boating community in addition to any marina development. This area is not suitable for redevelopment due to sandblasting dust and overspray from the dry dock. The sea floor in this area is polluted with heavy metals and should not be disturbed.	Dampier Bay pile moorings should be retained to provide moorings at a reasonable cost to the boating community in addition to any marina development.
Ms Victoria Murdoch	Marina	Executive summary, 1.2, 3.8.6, 4.3 - LPC propose 200 berth marina. I suggest this would not meet demand. 70 berths currently and 46 at Magazine Bay with a large waiting list. Marina could provide interface / transitional zone between commercial port activities and the public. Every major city in NZ except Chch has a marina. This would support the Lyttelton community and provide a transition between port activities and the public interface.	Suggest 200 berths would be too small. Long-term would need expansion.
Dr Chris Bathurst	Marina	I advocate for the retention of a significant number of the pile moorings in their present location for the following reasons: Practicality: the particular area on the South end of the existing pile moorings is subject to occasional wash from working vessels moving between the North of Dampier Bay and the slipways and fishing jetty to the South. The resulting waves can result in sudden large rocking of the moored lighter recreational vessels. We suspect this to be a serious issue for the proposed floating marina at the south-western end. Historical significance: The pile moorings and Godley Quay Rowing Club building have been part of Dampier Bay history and culture for 90 years. Community Well-Being: The existing boating community occupying the pile moorings include many who are of modest means. As the Dampier Bay area is still part of the City Council then it should not be automatically taken over by the LPC with lease fees being lost to the area. Car parking can become congested in the present area with vehicles of both berth holders and adjacent marine business employees, and there will not be much room for visiting members of the public.	That the LPRP direct changes to be made to the Regional Coastal Environment Plan (RCEP) for the following to be a discretionary activity to allow proper consultation with stakeholders for: Removal of pile moorings and Construction of a floating marina. That heritage issues are included in the LPRP and not left to the Canterbury Regional Coastal plan (for water issues) and the CCC district plan (for land issues). We believe that heritage issues are an integral part of the recovery for this part of the Inner Harbour and especially to take the opportunity to use existing heritage features as a focus for a heritage precinct concept.
Irene Hayward	Marina	I am absolutely in support of a planned marina and facilities at Dampier Bay. With a city the size of Christchurch not have a boating/marina facility is outrageous. There are places all round New Zealand and the world with far better access to recreational boating for a far lesser population.	The planned marina facilities are just what is needed
Gabriele Nyenhuis	Marina	I am in support of the development of a new marina and the rebuild and improvements to the port.	None - I support the proposed reclamation to allow for a marina to go in to the inner harbour

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Nicci Blain	Marina	I support a marina for the inner harbour as Christchurch is severely lacking safe mooring facilities. A marina will also attract a small commercial industry of boat retail, and cafes. A purpose built marina area also creates an interface for public access to the harbour that will benefit all of Christchurch. Therefore I support the zoning change to allow these facilities to go ahead. I am very disappointed at the approach taken by a minority of boat owners on the current pile moorings who appear to be resisting the redevelopment of this area. Clearly this is motivated by self interest because these owners already have a berth and don't care about all the others who don't. Currently I am on a huge waiting list for a permanent mooring and know of many others who would love to moor there boats in Christchurch. Removing all the existing piles and building up to 1000 marina births should be a Permitted Activity under the Plan.	Allow up to 1000 marina berths in the inner harbour as a Permitted Activity.
Ms Wendy Everingham	Marina	I support a marina in Dampier Bay and would like to see the possibility of at least one of the older wharves staying so that the public can have access onto at least one wharf.	At least one of the older wharves should stay so the public have wharf access.
Nick Rayner	Marina	I support bringing recreational harbour users into the inner harbour and creating more of a connection with Lyttelton itself, and access for the people of Christchurch. I would like to see an enhanced marina, with business and potentially residential options, as you would expect to see in any modern port city.	I support the development of a more modern pontoon marina at Dampier Bay.
Mr Peter McBride	Marina	I support the marina proposal contained within the plan.	No change or speed it up.
Wayne Nolan	Marina	I support the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company (together with any partners) to replace the Dampier Bay pile moorings with a pontoon marina of a minimum of approximately 180- 200 berths. The LPRP allows for a 180-200 boat marina in the inner harbour with a possible increase to 400 berths, but the projected demand is for in excess of 1000.(see attached Appendix. NZ Marina Fact Sheet).	I also submit that the development of an additional 850 marina berths in the inner harbour between wharf 7 and wharf 3 should be a Permitted Activity.
Ballingers Hunting & Fishing Ltd	Marina	I support the proposal to allow development of a new marina for 180-200 boats. I believe there will be demand for significantly more berths than this and flexibility should be provided in the Plan to enable further extensions for up to 1,000 berths as a Permitted Activity. I propose that removal of the old piles be a Permitted Activity with a requirement that removal shall be for the purpose of the development of a new floating pontoon marina. As a retail fishing business owner, I believe that the development of this marina will bring positive economic benefits to the Christchurch region.	I support the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company (together with any partners) to replace the Dampier Bay pile moorings with a pontoon marina of a minimum of approximately 180-200 berths. The existing pile moorings should be removed for the purpose of developing a new floating pontoon marina, and that additional marina berths should be added in between wharf 7 & 3. This should absolutely be a PERMITTED activity to make this process as simple as possible so this development can happen sooner rather than later.
Simon Henry	Marina	I support the proposal to allow development of a new marina for 180-200 boats. I believe there will be demand for significantly more berths than this and flexibility should be provided in the Plan to enable further extensions for up to 1,000 berths as a Permitted Activity. I propose that removal of the old piles be a Permitted Activity with a requirement that removal shall be for the purpose of the development of a new floating pontoon marina. I would be happy to see something positive and productive for the people of Lyttelton to evolve out of this opportunity.	None
Dr Peter Kempthorne	Marina	In a southerly it is dangerous to launch and retrieve at Magazine Bay. There should be another public boat ramp within the inner harbour for such conditions. It is hard to refuel recreational boats at the moment and the Dampier Bay development should correct this.	That there be a public boat ramp within the Dampier Bay development. That there be a boat refuelling berth for public use at the Dampier Bay development.
Francis Valentine McClimont	Marina	LPC have assumed that they should be the builders and managers of any marina in Dampier Bay. LPC should have no part in developing and managing a marina. The only legal connection they have with the waters of the bay is by way of owning the piles that make up the current berths.	Remove all mention of LPC building and managing a marina in Dampier Bay. Invite the displaced boat owners and representatives of Lyttelton township and representatives of Ngai Tahu to build and manage a marina in Dampier Bay under the navigation and safety supervision of ECan harbourmaster.
Mike Pearson	Marina	Lyttelton has lost a substantial number of moored boats since the loss of the previous proposed marinas. A 200 boat capacity is too small and will not accommodate those wishing to return and those wishing to relocate from swing moorings. Lyttelton port is a disgrace and as a public amenity must be improved to match other NZ ports.	Increase size of marina and advance the time to completion

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Naval Point Club Lyttelton; B Godwin	Marina	NPCL supports the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company (together with any partners) to replace the Dampier Bay pile moorings with a pontoon marina of a minimum of approximately 180-200 berths for the following reasons: a safe and convenient marina is desperately needed in Lyttelton; current pile berths in Dampier Bay provide safe mooring but provide no walk on access or services; a modern, pontoon marina people can walk to their boat, load and unload equipment, provisions etc. is safer and much more convenient; lack of modern marina facilities in Canterbury is a significant constraint on Naval Point Club Lyttelton, its activities and membership marina users also have access to fresh water for cleaning, resupply and fire fighting; the increased number of boats in Lyttelton as a result of the new marina will increase the availability and accessibility of recreational boating activities to a much wider section of the Canterbury community	We support the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company (together with any partners) to replace the Dampier Bay pile moorings with a pontoon marina of a minimum of approximately 180- 200 berths. We propose the following amendments to the Plan: A new rule should be included as follows: Removal of the existing Dampier Bay Pile Moorings shall be for the purposes of the development of a new floating pontoon marina. We also submit that the development of an additional 850 marina berths in the inner harbour between wharf 7 and wharf 3 should be a Permitted Activity.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Marina	p8 Development at Dampier Bay - In general, we are not opposed to development plans for Dampier Bay. We welcome plans for the new marina. We support development of landside facilities, including car parking, to support marina activities. Concern; that plans do not provide for haul out facilities for maintenance of vessels from the marina, proposes existing swing moorings at Dampier Bay be removed. Members of the Dampier Bay Moorings Association concerned; loss of local yachting heritage, new berths at the marina will be unaffordable for their members. We have some sympathy with their position. It might be possible to both build the new marina AND retain some swing moorings. In a town which lost so much heritage fabric in the earthquakes, we need to make the most of what remains to maintain a collective sense of the community's past.	
David Carter	Marina	People interested in boats have been disadvantage by the lack of facilities In the region for many years. This is an opportunity to give Canterbury boaties a facility and a choice other than Port Marlborough. having been a berth holder at Waikawa for the last 15 years, I am obviously one of those who realise that such facilities are expensive to develop, but what Marlborough Port Company shows is that boaties are prepared to pay realistic Marina fees, provided good facilities are provided. Furthermore, and of extreme importance to the Lyttelton Port Company, good Marina facilities provide good financial returns to Marina owner. The Dampier Bay Marina development should be a permitted activity and I fully support the sentiments in the Naval Point Club Lyttelton submission.	I support the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company (together with any partners) to replace the Dampier Bay pile moorings with a pontoon marina of a minimum of approximately 180-200 berths. The existing pile moorings should be removed for the purpose of developing a new floating pontoon marina, and that additional marina berths should be added in between wharf 7 & 3
Dave Munro	Marina	Please go ahead with marina berth as soon as possible	N/A
Ron Dards; G Johnson	Marina	Some of the existing pile moorings at Dampier Bay be retained for heritage, community well-being and industrial issues. A target of 150 - 200 berths with a mix of pile moorings and new floating berths within the marina area phase 1 shown in Fig 9 (p64) can still be achieved because the area covered is significantly larger than the existing pile moorings. The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (p19 Policy 17) charges ECAN to protect historic heritage in the coastal environment from inappropriate development. Heritage experts need to have a chance to consider the value of post 1900 structures i.e. the pile moorings for their 'seascape vista" and the Godley Quay Rowing Club and provide an appropriate mechanism for protection.	That the removal of pile moorings and the construction of a floating marina become a discretionary activity allowing ECan the discretion to decline consent, impose conditions and publically notify. That heritage issues are included in the LPRP and not left to the RCEP and the CCC District Plan.
Mr Daniel Petrache	Marina	That the LPRP direct that the removal of pile moorings and the construction of a floating marina be changed to a discretionary activity to allow proper consultation with Stakeholders. I note that for land based activities, any new public amenities are classified as restricted discretionary activities to allow developments to be considered for its design merits. I think that water based activities i.e. construction of floating marina, should have the same degree of protection under this plan. While I believe its necessary to develop a new floating marina I support keeping some of the existing pile moorings (2 double rows) at Dampier Bay for the reasons of heritage, community wellbeing and industrial issues.	That the LPRP direct that the removal of pile moorings and the construction of a floating marina be changed to a discretionary activity

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Young 88 Association of New Zealand Inc.	Marina	The Association enthusiastically supports the proposal that will permit the development of a marina in Dampier Bay in the inner harbour. It has become increasingly difficult to attract entries to the South Island Championships when the event is hosted in Lyttelton. This is primarily because of the lack of safe moorings in Lyttelton for visiting boats. With a new marina it is expected that the membership of the Young 88 Class will grow significantly in Canterbury and enable larger events to be hosted.	A new rule should be included as follows: Removal of the existing Dampier Bay Pile Moorings shall be for the purposes of the development of a new floating pontoon marina. We also submit that the development of an additional 850 marina berths in the inner harbour between wharf 7 and wharf 3 should be a Permitted Activity.
Tasman Young	Marina	The development of a pontoon style Marina would be the first stage of a larger development. Until the first new piles are driven to guarantee the permanent recreational status of the area, some of us will not rest. ECAN are the ones standing in the way of that happening - incredible	I support the development of Dampier Bay as a Marina.
Alastair Brown and Frances Young	Marina	The development of an accessible and locally affordable marina.	The development of an accessible and locally affordable marina.
Green Party	Marina	The proposed removal of the inner harbour mooring when there is no certainty over what mooring marina and related facilities will be established to provide for recreational boaties is strongly opposed. Plan is naive to assume that no consideration is required by consent authority. Existing use rights do not justify as different nature and scale. Previous attempt at marina was environmental disaster. Permitted activity status for a new marina in the Inner Harbour is strongly opposed as: failing to recognise the potential for adverse environmental effects and the need to avoid, remedy and mitigate these, failing to recognise that the coastal marine area is a public resource, not providing for any public input, giving LPC and/or any private partners excessive powers to develop whatever type of marina facilities they like regardless of impacts, size, scale, standard and whether these meet the needs of the public, boaties and other recreational users.	Make the removal of the existing historic wooden moorings a discretionary activity and the construction of any new floating marina in the Inner Harbour a discretionary activity.
Te Waka Pounamu	Marina	The shift of the operational focus will allow the western end of harbour for sheltered water access for Waka Ama training for youth and sprint events again. I support the proposal to allow development of a new marina for 180-200 boats. I believe there will be demand for significantly more berths than this and flexibility should be provided in the Plan to enable further extensions for up to 1,000 berths as a Permitted Activity. I propose that removal of the old piles be a Permitted Activity with a requirement that removal shall be for the purpose of the development of a new floating pontoon marina.	I support the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company (together with any partners) to replace the Dampier Bay pile moorings with a pontoon marina of a minimum of approximately 180-200 berths. The existing pile moorings should be removed for the purpose of developing a new floating pontoon marina, and that additional marina berths should be added in between wharf 7 & 3
Boat Safety Association	Marina	We support the concept of a marina at Dampier Bay. Christchurch the second largest city in New Zealand and does not have a marina as such. The facilities that exist for larger pleasure craft are very basic and are at best pile moorings. Greater Wellington has berths (pile moorings excluded) for at least 1000 vessels with support services. The proposed 500 berths is a start but hardly adequate.	NA
Andrew Stark	Marina	We support the proposal to allow development of a new marina for 180-200 boats. We believe that Lyttelton requires suitable marina facility, and that too much time has passed since the Marina Storm of 2000. We obviously believe that any development of a Marina at Dampier Bay must NOT negatively impact the Dry Dock Facilities as Commercial Activity MUST be allowed to continue at this very important facility.	None
Canterbury Yachting Association	Marina	We support the proposal to allow development of a new marina for the mooring of larger recreational craft in Dampier Bay. Christchurch, and the Canterbury Region, has been starved of the opportunity to provide facilities for mid to larger sized recreational craft. The waters of Banks Peninsula and Pegasus Bay are attractive to recreational boaties, but the development of the activity has been restricted by a lack of adequate moorings. Research into the provision of marina type moorings in New Zealand shows that Christchurch has a present ratio of 1 berth to 3750 pop. while the typical provision is 1 to 350 throughout the rest of the country. I believe there is a real potential for growth of this normal section of our sport.	I support the proposal that will enable Lyttelton Port Company to replace the Dampier Bay pile moorings with a pontoon marina of a minimum of approximately 180-200 berths. The existing pile moorings should be removed for the purpose of developing a new floating pontoon marina, and that additional marina berths should be added in between wharf 7 & 3

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Secretary Historic Places Canterbury	Marina	We support the enhancement of Dampier Bay and the opportunity it provides for reconnection of the Lyttelton Community to the harbour front. As part of that enhancement, we support the redevelopment of the marina. However we do not believe that the proposed new floating marina should be built entirely at the expense of the existing pile marina. We believe that some of the pile moorings should be retained for heritage reasons. Retention of some pile moorings along with other heritage features such as the Godley Quay rowing club would create a heritage precinct which would enhance the aim of creating a vibrant waterfront which people can use and which has greater connectivity with Lyttelton. The Plan recognises and articulates the history and relationship between the local tangata whenua and Whakaraupō/Lyttelton Harbour. This recognition is welcomed by Historic Places Canterbury but a similar recognition is needed for European heritage.	Change the removal of the existing pile marina and construction of a new floating marina from a permitted activity to a discretionary activity so that stakeholders have an opportunity to be heard on the specific proposal for the marina when it is put forward.
Ben Godwin	Marina	I believe that unless the time scale for the plan provides an early alternative to the facilities provided by the Magazine Bay Marina; essential and urgent safety improvements to the Magazine Bay marina should be incorporated into the initial stages of the plan.	I believe that unless the time scale for the plan provides an early alternative to the facilities provided by the Magazine Bay Marina; essential and urgent safety improvements to the Magazine Bay marina should be incorporated into the initial stages of the plan.
Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron	Other	Support the Dampier Bay development proposals	None
John McKim	Other	I wish to make my submission orally	I wish to make my alternatives orally
Christchurch City Council	Public access	The area identified on Figure 6 of the Plan as potential future public access is not discussed in the Plan or the recovery framework. The Council is supportive of this area being identified for public access as highlighted above.	Additional discussion within the Plan on the timing and expectation around public access to this area.
Diamond Harbour Community Association	Public Access	4.3.2 - Amend the last paragraph to provide that the whole area (not covered by buildings or safety restricted structures) will be public open space. This provides a measure of compensation for the taking of seabed and surface water space by the reclamation.	Add additional wording that the whole of Dampier Bay not covered by building or above ground structures will have public access.
A Duncan; A Ludlow; A Carter; A Bowater; A Herriott; A Lealand; A Taylor; A Farqyharson; A Graham; B Carrell; B Frederikson; B Gordon; B Moore; B Cowan; B Robinson; B Armstrong; B Keen; B Parker; B Anderson; B Lang; B Hawkins; C Gibbons; Canterbury Maritime Training; C Dodds; C Cameron; C Guy; C Lock; C McCulloch; D Atkinson; D Lindner; D Lake; D Bastin; D Munro; D Vile; D Haylock; D Miller; D Paterson; D Southwick; D Main; D Taylor; D Crosbie; E Riley; F Bowater; FitandAbel NZ Limited; F McLachlan; G Dixon; G Suckling; G Mentink; G Savage; G Irwin; G Perrem; G Armstrong; G Bowater; G Ronald; Groundswell Sports Ltd; H Sylvester; H Anderson; H Walls; H Wilkinson; I Scott; I Armstrong; I Atkinson; J Riddoch; J Hopkins; J Mann; J Vilsbek; J Hern; J Davis; J Hawtin; J Allott; K Selway; K Beatson; K Cowan; K Oborn; K Beatson; Kn Duncan; K Guy; L Hern; L Falconer; L Boyd; L Crawford; L Lilburne; L Duke; M Guy; M Ramsay; M Griffiths; M Wellby; M Oborn; M Shove; M Ferrar; M Hore; M Moore; M Brown; M Hitchings; S Knight; N Wilde; N Grant; N Matthews; Oborn's Nautical; O Corboy; P Beckett; P Lang; P Moore; P Savage; P Tocker; P Auger; P Folter; P Prendegast; R Atkinson; R O'Sullivan; R Lascelles; R Wellesley; R Gibb; R Norris; R Lee; R Hale; R Hofmans; R Eveleens; R Rodgers; R Connolly; R Miller; S Jones; Samarah; S Chisnall; S Hinman; S Oborn; S Moore; S Pierce; S Cameron; S Chester; S Coombe; T Wooding; T George; V Sue-Tang; V Williams; V Newman; Waitaha Paddling Club; W Keen; W Taggart; X Bowater	Public Access	5.2.3 - I support the proposal to allow public access to areas in Dampier Bay. I believe this should be secured by way of a legal instrument in perpetuity	None - I support public access to Dampier Bay
Yachting New Zealand	Public Access	5.2.3 - Yachting New Zealand supports the proposal that will provide public access to and off areas in Dampier Bay. We support this for the following reasons: Yachting New Zealand believe that popular and attractive publicly accessible areas can be created in Dampier Bay in conjunction with a marina and associated retail and commercial activities. We believe this will be an attractive feature in Lyttelton Harbour and will be enjoyed by the boating community, visitors, local residents and the wider Canterbury community.	None. We support the proposal that will ensure a legally binding agreement with Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury that will provide legal public access in perpetuity.

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
NZ Labour Party, Port Hills	Public Access	A key consideration in the Plan should be the current disconnect between the town and the Port and the opportunity to remedy that disconnect.	A simple walkway from Norwich Quay to a viewing platform at the start of an area around # 5 and #6 wharf would be a solution.
Young 88 Association of New Zealand Inc.	Public Access	Action 10: The Association supports the proposal to allow public access to areas in Dampier Bay. This makes sense as part of the development of the marina and associated commercial activities for the public to have some assurances around pedestrian access to this area.	The Association supports public access to areas in Dampier Bay as proposed in the Plan.
Pete Simpson	Public access	Amend the last paragraph to provide that the whole area (not covered by buildings or safety restricted structures) will be public open space. This provides a measure of compensation for the taking of seabed and surface water space by the reclamation.	Add additional wording that the whole of Dampier Bay not covered by building or above ground structures will have public access.
Linda Goodwin	Public Access	As a Lyttelton West, Dampier Bay, resident - I fully support the opening up and enhancement of public access to the waterfront on the western side of the port, as proposed. This includes the proposed ferry relocation, new marina, commercial development that compliments Lyttelton Township and providing places for people to sit and enjoy the harbour view in and around Dampier Bay.	None
Director General of Conservation	Public Access	As part of the Lyttelton Port transformation, it is important to improve public access to the Port area. The quid pro quo for developing to the east of the current Port should be that citizens of Lyttelton and New Zealand receive public access to Dampier Bay. This should include the giving effect to NZCPS policies 18 (Public Open Space) and 19 (Walking Access).	That enduring public access is provided to Dampier Bay as outlined in section 4 and figure 8 of the draft preliminary plan.
Coastguard Southern Region; Coastguard Canterbury Inc	Public Access	Supports the proposal that will provide public access to areas in Dampier Bay. This will enhance the required access link between Lyttelton town centre and Naval Point recreational area and encourage public to utilise this access way and experience the amenity value of proximity to the water and the outstanding natural landscapes the harbour offers.	None. We support the proposal.
Dampier Bay Moorings Association Inc	Public Access	Communities expect free access to some of the waterfront of a port. Boardwalks, shops and other facilities connected to the main town would be a huge boost for the community who, over the last decade or so, have felt alienated.	N/A
Herbie Mues	Public Access	Dampier Bay does not provide 'direct and convenient access'	Lyttelton needs easy and direct access to waterfront. This fosters harbour-based visitor attractions.
Marcia Bryant	Public Access	Easy public access to a marina and walkable waterfront area at Dampier Bay, whether or not a commercial development also occurs in this area. This needs to have a decent amount of car parking.	This needs to happen in the next 5 years, not 10 years or longer. We have waited long enough.
Mr Daniel Petrache	Public Access	Great to include public access	I support the proposal to allow public access to areas in Dampier Bay. I believe this should be secured by way of a legal instrument in perpetuity.
Tasman Young	Public Access	However, the issue of public access to the waterfront for Lyttelton residents and residents in general has to be dealt with because with the Dampier Bay development will come high fences, razor wire and increased security and no way will people want to sit in a Cafe looking out at razor wire etc. This public access needs to be an area on one of the older central Lyttelton wharves, maybe No. 4 which is seldom used, this is directly below the main town and could also cater for Diamond Harbour ferry terminal and charter boats and fresh fish sales from the wharf. Mobile ice cream and coffee vehicles could also access this site. Easy access from Sutton Quay is already in place until a designated access is provided.	I seek public access to an open (not razor wired) waterfront.
Mrs Ann Thorpe	Public access	I agree with the development of Dampier Bay, but argue that the time frame of 2012 is too slow.	That public access to the wharves be an urgent priority and public be encourage to interact with the inner harbour. That development of Dampier Bay needs to be accelerated to make Lyttelton Harbour similar to the attractive and busy Wellington and Auckland Harbours.
Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited	Public Access	I fully support enhanced public access to the waterfront through the proposed Dampier Bay changes. I think this is a wonderful opportunity to develop the Lyttelton community in conjunction with an improved port facility.	N/A
Michael Sandridge	Public Access	I support opening public access to Dampier bay and improving marina facilities. Lyttelton harbour is the unique feature here and public access to the water should be a corner stone to the townships re-development.	Public access should be the corner stone to redevelopment.
Jillian Frater	Public Access	I support the development of safe, convenient, high quality public access to the waterfront Dampier Bay.	I seek the retention of these provisions in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan.

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Mr Daniel Petrache	Public Access	I support the proposal that will allow retail and commercial development in this area. There are controls in the Plan which are designed to ensure development is complimentary to the marina and does not inhibit the recovery of Lyttelton's commercial area. These controls are sufficient to ensure this objective is achieved while allowing the Port Company some flexibility to ensure commercial development in the area is feasible and that there will be sufficient opportunity to accommodate the essential marina related commercial activities such as chandleries, marine services, boat brokerage, hospitality etc. I propose that additional controls are put on the commercial development to ensure sufficient car parking is provided to meet the needs of marina users.	Public access is important with small commercial activities - short time frame
Wayne Nolan	Public Access	I support the proposal that will provide public access to and enhancement of areas in Dampier Bay. I also support the proposal that will ensure a legally binding agreement with Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury that will provide legal public access in perpetuity.	N/A
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Public Access	Lyttelton is a port town which owes its existence to shipping. The strong desire among Lytteltonians to reconnect with their waterfront is tied up with the character and identity of the town and its people. Older residents talk of days as kids when they could wander down to the water's edge, roam around the wharves and maybe drop in a fishing line for something to do. Others can see the potential for an attractive waterfront precinct or water based recreation opportunities. This is what lies behind calls to both get the trucks off Norwich Quay and to re-open at least some of the waterfront which has been locked away behind security fences since shortly after 9/11. With our submission we have included two alternative concepts for public access to the inner harbour waterfront.	
New Zealand Transport Agency	Public access	Norwich Quay plays a key role in strategic transport network, key route to move freight. NZTA considers the desire to improve amenity and access for pedestrians and cycle movement along Norwich Quay needs to be considered against providing for freight movement through the safe and efficient operation of the state highway, key requirement is providing a safe environment for pedestrians. NZTA supports LPRP approach of providing improved public access to waterfront through Dampier Bay, primary access from Sutton Quay. Pedestrian access will need to be considered in context of changing environment. NZTA supports new pedestrian facility in short term, reassessing pedestrian and cycle access in the longer term.	
Naval Point Club Lyttelton; B Godwin	Public Access	NPCL supports the proposal that will provide public access to and enhancement of areas in Dampier Bay. We support this for the following reasons: Naval Point Club Lyttelton believes that popular and attractive publicly accessible areas can be created in Dampier Bay in conjunction with a marina and associated retail and commercial activities. We believe this will be an attractive feature in Lyttelton Harbour and will be enjoyed by Naval Point Club Lyttelton members, visitors, local residents and the wider Canterbury community.	None. We support the proposal that will ensure a legally binding agreement with Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury that will provide legal public access in perpetuity.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Public Access	NZTA concerned that effects of Dampier Bay development on the transport network cannot be determined until later in Port's recovery. NZTA considers that ITA provided by LPC cannot be relied upon for investment decisions, further ITA required to ensure effects on transport network are appropriately identified and addressed.	1) An amendment to the pRDP requiring an ITA and notification to the Transport Agency prior to the opening of Sutton Quay for public vehicle access (Rule 21.8.2.2.5 (NC2)); and 2) Action of the LPRP to develop a MoU, as discussed further below
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Public Access	p59 (Section 4.3) Dampier Bay - We completely agree that reconnecting Lyttelton community to the inner harbour waterfront will have positive social benefits. While we support the development proposed at Dampier Bay, particularly the pedestrian connection through to Naval Point, this development does not provide inner harbour access at the location which will bring the greatest social benefits. Option 2 Plan - Alternative Public Access to Inner Harbour Waterfront provides greater social benefit and better supports local recovery	Amend the Recovery Plan to enable implementation of Option 2 Plan - Alternative Public Access to Inner Harbour Waterfront

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Public Access	p8 Existing Inner Harbour Waterfront Access In addition to limited public access at Dampier Bay, public access to the inner harbour waterfront currently exists at B Jetty where the Tug Lyttelton, Diamond Harbour Ferry and several other small vessels are berthed. This location is accessible to pedestrians via the Oxford Street over bridge.	Add another paragraph stating: there is also existing public access to the inner harbour waterfront at B Jetty where the Tug Lyttelton, Diamond Harbour Ferry and several other small vessels are berthed. This location is accessible to pedestrians via the Oxford Street over bridge. As port operations move east, this public waterfront access will be closed off."
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Public Access	p9 Ensuring Public Access to Waterfront - Support the agreement and legal mechanisms to ensure that safe, convenient, high quality public waterfront access between Sutton Quay and Naval Point will be secured in perpetuity even if the Dampier Bay development does not eventuate for some reason. While we support the July 2021 deadline for implementation of this legal mechanism, physical access, which depends on progress elsewhere, may not occur until some time after 2021. It is uncertain how long it will be before the community can enjoy the benefits of the pedestrian link, if Dampier Bay is the only place where improved access to the inner harbour is provided and existing access at B Jetty is closed.	If provisions in the Recovery Plan regarding the ferry location remain unchanged, include a provision which prevents closure of the existing berth until after the Dampier Bay link is physically completed.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Public access	Section 5.2.2, page 85. The Transport Agency supports the development of a MoU. This is a critical element to the LPRP given the level of uncertainty that continues to exist regarding possible effects on the transport network. The Transport Agency suggests that some additional guidance on specific matters to be included in the MoU would provide certainty to the community and the MoU partners on the scope of matters to be addressed through the MOU. (See Mr Blyleven's evidence, paras 78 - 80).	Amend Section 5.2.2, third paragraph as follows: Particular priorities for the MoU will be: ensuring provision of quality connections from the redeveloped Dampier Bay onto the road network while not compromising the function of the state highway and freight access to the port; parking provisions and network performance; freight optimisation by road and rail; scope and content of the future ITA; and pedestrian and cycle connectivity. Action 8 provides for the identification of short term works ahead of a more comprehensive programme of works to be developed in the longer term, as more certainty of the Dampier Bay development and transportation effects becomes available.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Public access	Section 5.2.2, pages 85-86, Action 9 and explanation paragraphs on page 85. The Transport Agency supports the provision of a new pedestrian facility ahead of the development in Dampier Bay. The Transport Agency considers that Action 9 should be amended to focus on this immediate priority. (See Mr Blyleven's evidence, para 57).	Amend Action 9 to provide solely for the pedestrian facility to be completed by 2020: Amend the description above Action 9 as follows: A safe, convenient pedestrian facility across Norwich Quay will be needed in the short term to provide for the improved public access within Dampier Bay. Action 9 sets out a direction for various agencies to work together to achieve this upgrade. Consideration of a more comprehensive short term and longer term implementation programme will be developed through Action 8 above. Amend Action 9 as follows: new Zealand Transport Agency, Christchurch City Council and Lyttelton Port Company Ltd will follow the guidance of the Memorandum of Understanding required by Action 8, to confirm the works and how costs are to be met, to provide a new pedestrian facility across Norwich Quay. Pedestrian facility across Norwich Quay to be completed by December 2020 or prior to the opening of Sutton Quay for public access to Dampier Bay, whichever occurs first. Lead agency: New Zealand Transport Agency Goals: 3a, 5, 7a, 7b
Ms Victoria Murdoch	Public Access	Support providing safe and convenient access along with recreational facilities and opportunities.	N/A
Maike Fichtner	Public Access	That the area marked as potential future public access is opened up for public use to become a feature for mixed use	That the area marked as potential future public access is opened up for public use to become a feature for mixed use
Christchurch City Council	Public Access	The Council is pleased to see inclusion of reference to a safe, convenient, high amenity public access to and along the waterfront within Goal 3 and Action 10 of the recovery framework. This statement provides the three important criteria for a good outcome of public access. The Council supports Goal 3. The community expectation on public waterfront access has not been to Dampier Bay but to that area of the Inner Harbour directly in front of Norwich Quay. Options for such access were included in the Lyttelton Master Plan. In the Council's view these options illustrate better alignment with community expectations, align with the potential future public access area. The Council is supportive of Action 10 as it will secure this public access in perpetuity.	The Council is concerned with the timing and ensuring that the community will have quality public access. In response to this concern, amendments to Action 10 are sought to include more details around implementation in the agreement.

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Mark Watson	Public Access	The Dampier bay development is all very well but it is too far away from the town centre to achieve the close functional relationship that the communities need.	Easy and direct access to the water's edge
Governors Bay Amenity Preservation Society	Public Access	The Governors Bay people have a Saturday bus service that commutes to the Lyttelton Farmers Market. It would enhance the Lyttelton experience if the township were reconnected with its waterfront. We support a working port - a busy port provides entertainment and draws people to it.	Need to be reconnected to waterfront
Nancy Vance	Public Access	The LPRP has mistaken the communities long held desires of access to the waterfront to mean at Dampier Bay. The communities (of both Lyttelton and the southern bays) have longed for access to the waterfront in front of the township, across Norwich Quay. As the movement east progresses, there is possibility, in the long term, for further eastward development and additional marina facilities in the area currently occupied by jetties 4, 5 and 6. The Dampier Bay Development is wholly dependent on the ability of the Port to move east. Refer to The Publics Preferred Waterfront & Public Transport Access.	Public access needs to be in front of the township
Te Waka Pounamu	Public Access	The sheltered access and public access for competitors and spectators to participate in traditional Waka, Canoe and dragon boat events. These are safe successful and popular events on the Wellington and Auckland waterfront. I support the proposal to allow public access to areas in Dampier Bay. I believe this should be secured by way of a legal instrument in perpetuity.	None - I support public access to Dampier Bay shoreline and water access
Sarah van der Burch	Public Access	We get no pedestrian access to the waterfront until 2021 which seems too long.	
Lyttelton Community Association Inc	Public Access	We note that Dampier Bay is identified as a place for public access. We support this as a location for a marina. One of the reasons for wanting pedestrian public access is to avoid the forbidding environment created by razor wire enclosures, which define much of Lyttelton Port. We note that the first phase will be a marina, with little, if any pedestrian access. There are also questions over car parking and convenience of access even for limited marina use. We request that some pedestrian public access be granted soon, and that alternatives to LPC's proposals be sought. The proposed date of 2021 is too far ahead. An ice-cream van, a coffee cart and some park benches would be an inexpensive addition.	Public access prior to 2021
Andrew Stark	Public Access	We support the proposal to allow public access to areas in Dampier Bay - noting our comments about continued Commercial Activity at the Dry Dock.	None
G Nyenhuis; N Rayner; G Anderson; S Page; S Riddoch; S Schmacher; M Anderson	Public Access	I support the proposal to allow public access to areas in Dampier Bay	N/A
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Public Access	Lyttelton is a port town which owes its existence to shipping. The strong desire among Lytteltonians to reconnect with their waterfront is tied up with the character and identity of the town and its people. Older residents talk of days as kids when they could wander down to the water's edge, roam around the wharves and maybe drop in a fishing line for something to do. Others can see the potential for an attractive waterfront precinct or water based recreation opportunities. This is what lies behind calls to both get the trucks off Norwich Quay and to re-open at least some of the waterfront which has been locked away behind security fences since shortly after 9/11. With our submission we have included two alternative concepts for public access to the inner harbour waterfront.	
New Zealand Transport Agency	Public access	Norwich Quay plays a key role in strategic transport network, key route to move freight. NZTA considers the desire to improve amenity and access for pedestrians and cycle movement along Norwich Quay needs to be considered against providing for freight movement through the safe and efficient operation of the state highway, key requirement is providing a safe environment for pedestrians. NZTA supports LPRP approach of providing improved public access to waterfront through Dampier Bay, primary access from Sutton Quay. Pedestrian access will need to be considered in context of changing environment. NZTA supports new pedestrian facility in short term, reassessing pedestrian and cycle access in the longer term.	

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Naval Point Club Lyttelton; B Godwin	Public Access	NPCL supports the proposal that will provide public access to and enhancement of areas in Dampier Bay. We support this for the following reasons: Naval Point Club Lyttelton believes that popular and attractive publicly accessible areas can be created in Dampier Bay in conjunction with a marina and associated retail and commercial activities. We believe this will be an attractive feature in Lyttelton Harbour and will be enjoyed by Naval Point Club Lyttelton members, visitors, local residents and the wider Canterbury community.	None. We support the proposal that will ensure a legally binding agreement with Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury that will provide legal public access in perpetuity.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Public Access	NZTA concerned that effects of Dampier Bay development on the transport network cannot be determined until later in Port's recovery. NZTA considers that ITA provided by LPC cannot be relied upon for investment decisions, further ITA required to ensure effects on transport network are appropriately identified and addressed.	1) An amendment to the pRDP requiring an ITA and notification to the Transport Agency prior to the opening of Sutton Quay for public vehicle access (Rule 21.8.2.2.5 (NC2)); and 2) Action of the LPRP to develop a MoU, as discussed further below
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Public Access	p8 Existing Inner Harbour Waterfront Access In addition to limited public access at Dampier Bay, public access to the inner harbour waterfront currently exists at B Jetty where the Tug Lyttelton, Diamond Harbour Ferry and several other small vessels are berthed. This location is accessible to pedestrians via the Oxford Street over bridge.	Add another paragraph stating: There is also existing public access to the inner harbour waterfront at B Jetty where the Tug Lyttelton, Diamond Harbour Ferry and several other small vessels are berthed. This location is accessible to pedestrians via the Oxford Street over bridge. As port operations move east, this public waterfront access will be closed off."
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Public Access	p9 Ensuring Public Access to Waterfront - Support the agreement and legal mechanisms to ensure that safe, convenient, high quality public waterfront access between Sutton Quay and Naval Point will be secured in perpetuity even if the Dampier Bay development does not eventuate for some reason. While we support the July 2021 deadline for implementation of this legal mechanism, physical access, which depends on progress elsewhere, may not occur until some time after 2021. It is uncertain how long it will be before the community can enjoy the benefits of the pedestrian link, if Dampier Bay is the only place where improved access to the inner harbour is provided and existing access at B Jetty is closed.	If provisions in the Recovery Plan regarding the ferry location remain unchanged, include a provision which prevents closure of the existing berth until after the Dampier Bay link is physically completed.
Ms Victoria Murdoch	Public Access	Support providing safe and convenient access along with recreational facilities and opportunities.	N/A
Maike Fichtner	Public Access	That the area marked as potential future public access is opened up for public use to become a feature for mixed use	That the area marked as potential future public access is opened up for public use to become a feature for mixed use
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Public Access	p40 (Section 3.8.2) Public Access to Inner Harbour Waterfront - Proposed waterfront development associated with a new marina at Dampier Bay is too far from the town centre to achieve close functional relationship, or support recovery in Lyttelton's existing commercial area. Alternative plan proposed; reconnects Lyttelton to its inner harbour waterfront.	Amend the Recovery Plan to enable implementation of Option 2 Plan - Alternative Public Access to Inner Harbour Waterfront
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Public access	The regeneration of Dampier Bay will result in a significant improvement in public access relatively.	
New Zealand Transport Agency	Transport Provisions	21.8.1.3.1. The Transport Agency supports the general intent of this Policy, However, as discusses in Mr Blyleven's evidence (para 70) "efficient" has a particular meaning in transport planning. The Transport Agency suggests it is more appropriate to refer to a safe and effective connection.	Amend 21.8.1.3.1 Policy - Dampier Bay Development clause a. iv. as follows: iv. integration with public transport, including a safe and effective connection between the Lyttelton Town Centre
New Zealand Transport Agency	Transport Provisions	21.8.2.2.3 RD2 and RD3. The Transport Agency supports these activities being restricted discretionary. However, as both activities could have effects on the State highway (particularly in terms of spill-over parking, see Mr Blyleven's evidence, para 71), the Transport Agency submits that it should be notified of any application for consent under these rules.	Amend to provide that the Transport Agency is a notified party for any application for consent under these Rules.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Transport Provisions	21.8.2.2.3 RD6. The Transport Agency supports this activity being restricted discretionary, with the Transport Agency being a notified party, and the matters of discretion listed in 21.8.3.2.6 (b)-(c). As discussed in Mr Blyleven's evidence (paras 50-58 and 73) an ITA is necessary to ensure that the full effects of development in the Dampier Bay area can be assessed when more certainty is available. It is therefore critical that these effects are properly assessed and considered in any application for consent for an activity of this kind.	Retain RD6 and matters for discretion 21.8.3.2.6 Access

DAMPIER BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
New Zealand Transport Agency	Transport Provisions	21.8.2.2.5 NC2. The Transport Agency supports this rule. If a new public transport facility is provided with a new ferry terminal in a position west of Canterbury Street, prior to the provision of public vehicle access to the terminal via Sutton Quay, this will have significant effects on the local transport network, in particular Godley Quay and the roundabout.	Retain
New Zealand Transport Agency	Transport Provisions	21.8.2.3.9 (c). As discussed in relation to the Recovery Plan provisions (submission point 7 above), the Transport Agency submits that an adequate level of car parking should be provided in Dampier Bay as part of the marina development in phase 1 of the Dampier Bay development. LPC have included an assessment of car parking in their ITA and this indicates up to 150 parking spaces are required for the marinas expected growth up to 2041. This provides the starting point for consideration. (See Mr Blyleven's evidence, para 71).	Amend the transport standards to provide that adequate parking facilities are provided in Dampier Bay as part of the marina redevelopment in phase 1.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Transport Provisions	21.8.3.1.1 (c) and (d). The Transport Agency supports the matters of discretion and control for provision of adequate car parking as it is likely to be a primary mode of travel to the port. The Transport Agency notes that the approach of considering parking on a consent by consent basis for each new building does not ensure an integrated approach as a master planning approach would. There is also a risk that there will be a lack of general visitor parking for visitors to the open space areas of Dampier Bay. Given the context of enabling recovery the Transport Agency will work with partners through the MoU to provide coordination for car parking but maintains that the provisions included here are necessary to ensure a minimum level of parking and certainty. (See Mr Blyleven's evidence, paras 71-72, 79).	Retain Amend MoU explanation to identify car parking as one of the matters for partners to consider in relation to the Dampier Bay development.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Transport Provisions	21.8.3.2.6. The Agency supports the matters of discretion relating to access. In particular, the requirement under 21.8.3.2.6(c) for a new ITA.	Retain
New Zealand Transport Agency	Transport Provisions	21.8.1.1.4 (b) Terms re access vs freight. The Transport Agency supports the policy of ensuring that access and movement networks provide for provision of all transport modes, however, in respect of pedestrian/cycle access in particular, it will not always be possible to provide both safe and direct access. For example, the most direct route, may not meet safety concerns. The Transport Agency suggests direct should be amended to effective. This will provide for the intent of the original wording and will also enable safe and practicable options to be consistency with the policy. (See Mr Blyleven's evidence, para 70).	Amend 21.8.1.1.4 Policy - Access and movement network, clause b. as follows: .. safe effective and accessible..."
New Zealand Transport Agency	Transport Provisions	NZTA supports LPRP approach to enabling development within Dampier Bay. NZTA considers more certainty should be provided for; public parking - implications for surrounding roads including Norwich Quay, potential movement of ferry terminal - NZTA suggest that LPRP set timeframe by which LPC confirms location.	

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Diamond Harbour Community Association	Consent Process	Support the development of a berth pocket and cruise ship wharf structure to be considered as an activity with public notification. Opportunity is provided for public to comment on its design features.	N/A
Green Party	Consent Process	I support public notification of the application for the development of a berth pocket and cruise ship wharf structure. The Plan needs to ensure that public recreational access and use is not compromised if the Naval Point site is chosen.	
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Consent Process	Change the activity status to the Regional Coastal Environment Plan rule to be a restricted discretionary activity.	Change the activity status to the Regional Coastal Environment Plan rule to be a restricted discretionary activity.
Pete Simpson	Consent Process	4.2 - Support the development of a berth pocket and cruise ship wharf structure to be considered as an activity with public notification. Opportunity is provided for public to comment on its design features.	N/A
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Consent Process	The cruise berth envelope includes the berth pocket but does not need to be in the plan as it is restricted by the 175m distance.	Remove berth pocket restrictions
Canterbury Maritime Developments Limited	Economic	Given the significance of tourism to Canterbury's economy and the cruise industry to Lyttelton, we are surprised that the draft LPRP has not taken a more proactive position on this matter. Before the 2011 earthquakes, LPC had brokered a deal for a levy on cruise ship passengers to help pay for a terminal development and Cruise NZ's General Manager, Raewyn Tan has stated (June, 2014) that this conversation with LPC can be reopened. This would be helpful in investigating the timing of any new terminal facility and may not be necessarily be solely dependent upon LPC's funding capabilities.	Reopen discussion re funding
Mr Keith Nuttall	Economic	Cruise ships need to be brought back to Lyttelton as soon as possible as they are good for the economy	N/A
Christchurch City Council	Economic	The return of cruise ships to Lyttelton provides benefits for the recovery of Lyttelton and Christchurch, and economic benefits to the wider Canterbury Region and the South Island. Lyttelton is an important stop for the cruise ship industry. The Council is pleased to see recognition of cruise ships in the Plan and the identification of dedicated cruise berth options.	The Council would like to see stronger direction within the Plan to progress the cruise berth as we consider this a key contributor to the local and regional economy, and the wider South Island, and obviously the economic recovery of Christchurch. Council seeks that an additional action be included in the recovery framework to facilitate the timely return of Lyttelton as a cruise ship berth with the creation of a fit for purpose facility, including quality on-shore services. The timing around the action will need to meet with cruise industry schedules and planning, which are understood to be based around a three year window.
Governors Bay Community Association	Economic	The Plan states that if cruise ships are to return to Lyttelton a new purpose built facility is required. It does not state what LPC intends to do with regard to a cruise ship berth. The Plan is very clear about the port's regional economic significance for activities that directly affect the income of the Port Company. The LPRP discusses freely the need for the expansion of the port in relation to regional economic activity but appears to exclude or be noncommittal with regard to regional economic activity that does not directly benefit the port. Such activity will, however, benefit the local community. The Port is not taking into account the needs of Lyttelton businesses should cruise ships be lost.	That the Plan is clearer and more direct about how a cruise ship berth is included in the plan.
NZ Labour Party, Port Hills	Economic	With the continued shift by Air New Zealand of flights through Auckland rather than Christchurch, and the negative impact on South Island economic development, the need for Lyttelton to have an attractive and effective cruise ship facility is even more important than ever.	
Mr Dale Coulter	Economic	I do not support the spending of ECAN funds of the order \$30 M to \$40M to support the establishment of a cruise ship terminal. You need to stop trying to attract cruise ships like we did with building rugby stadiums for rugby world cup. It makes no difference to the overall NZ economy if the benefits go to another port.	Leave them at Akaroa. No changes required - don't build a cruise ship terminal.

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Mr Stuart Beswick	Economic	Cruise ships first started calling at Lyttelton on a regular basis in the mid 1980s. The industry has grown significantly from this time, whereby today, if it had not been for the recent earthquakes, the number of per season port calls would be in the region of 90 calls, the passenger count has risen to approx. average of 1800 per vessel. No other part of the tourism industry has grown so much in such a time frame. Since the recent earthquakes the cruise ship port calls at Lyttelton have been approx 5 per season, and these have been small, low count, vessels, of between 150 and 1000 passengers. During the past season Akaroa had approx 80 vessel anchorages, this is traffic that was unable to utilise a facility at Port of Lyttelton. From a Port Company berth utilisation and revenue earning perspective, then it is probably marginal. But from a consideration for the net worth to the wider community (Christchurch catchment) then yes it does need some sort of facility. The potential approx net worth to the wider community would be: 60 - 90 vessels per season at approx 1800 passengers per vessel times \$143 per passenger (Australasian industry passenger spend per Port figures) equals \$15,444,000 to \$23,166,000 net worth to the Christchurch area per cruise season mid November to mid April. An established berth (structure) could earn revenue from "layups" and other non working vessels in the (cruise) off season.	Keep provisions for a cruise berth
Ms Victoria Andrews	Economic	I support the Port of Lyttelton constructing a purpose built facility to accommodate cruise ships as part of the Recovery Plan. New ships are now larger (5,000 passengers) and Akaroa will no longer be a suitable port of call. Lyttelton could presently accommodate cruise ship by constructing a pop up wharf facility with pontoons for tenders. Tourism operators must now drive roughly 300 kilometres a day, making two round trips to Akaroa, simply to pick up and return passengers visiting Christchurch and points beyond. The wider Canterbury region would benefit economically if cruise ships returned to Lyttelton because access is faster and easier for tourism operators and travel time would be reduced by many hours. Small ships of 80-200 passengers could continue to visit Akaroa since they have little impact on the streets, toilets and rubbish collection. Akaroa residents were promised that accommodating cruise ships would be a temporary measure while the Port of Lyttelton rebuilt facilities. Many residents do not want cruise ships to continuing using Akaroa as their main port of call. Christchurch Canterbury Tourism and the CCC should be actively working in association with the Lyttelton Mt Herbert Community Board and LPC to ensure the speedy return of cruise ships for the long term benefit and economic recovery of Christchurch and the wider Canterbury tourism industry. With regard to funding the estimated \$45-40 million to construct a new facility central government or a business partner should be sought to fund the cost as soon as possible.	The Port of Lyttelton construct a new cruise ship facility in conjunction with CCT, CCC, central government and a business partner as soon as possible. Cruise NZ and the cruise ship industry could assist financially towards the construction of a custom built facility by paying a passenger fee. I also wish to note that the cruise industry made \$37.1 US billion last year.
Amy Carter	Economic	I support the proposal for a cruise ship berth. It would be a valuable asset for the community and provide benefits for the local and wider economy.	N/A
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Location	p10 Cruise Ship Options - We generally support provisions in the plan which provide for return of cruise to Lyttelton, particularly if the facilities are located and designed to enable a contribution to the local economy. For this reason we do not support the Naval Point cruise berth location because it is too far from Lyttelton's town centre, although we can see how this location would support the business case for proposed Dampier Bay development. We have other reservations about the Naval Point cruise berth location (refer Submission Points 23, 27 and 30).	Delete provisions which enable development of a cruise berth at Naval Point.
Alastair Brown and Frances Young	Location	Gladstone Pier in the Inner Harbour for use as a cruise ship berth as a permitted activity. Gladstone Pier in the Inner Harbour for use as a cruise ship berth MUST become a priority for LPC. There is an ethical responsibility to reinstate tourism opportunities for Lyttelton township, Christchurch city, Canterbury and South Island wide back to the levels enjoyed prior to the EQs. Mooring the ships within the inner harbour will ensure there is an easily accessible relationship between the tourist visitor and the Lyttelton community. Also cruise ships are a quieter use of the inner harbour mooring facilities than the heavy container ships. This is better for our wellbeing at our home property as well as all our neighbours living on the Eastside of the township.	Gladstone Pier in the Inner Harbour for use as a cruise ship berth MUST become a priority for LPC.

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Alastair Suren	Location	Support is provided for a cruise ship berth as it would be a valuable asset for the community and provide benefits for the local and wider community. A berth at Naval Point will have significant adverse impacts on recreational boating and shore fishing due to the loss of a valuable and frequently used area, both for race starts and for activities such as kayaking, which often stick relatively close to the shore to avoid easterly waves. The alternative location is the inner harbour at Gladstone Pier. We understand that if this were to occur it may be necessary to remove part of the Eastern Mole. This may have adverse effects on wave dynamics in the inner harbour and specifically on the moorings at Dampier Bay.	Any cruise ship berth activity at Naval Point should be a discretionary activity. If the Eastern Mole is removed, there is a need to provide wave attenuation to protect boats and the marina structure proposed for Dampier Bay, and in the inner harbour in general, especially during southerlies.
Andrew Stark	Location	We support the proposal for a cruise ship berth in Lyttelton at whatever location is deemed most suitable - we believe this is probably the Outer Harbour Option.	We are also strongly of the opinion that any berth should be a multi user berth.
Andy Cockburn	Location	I am strongly opposed to the Naval Point Cruise Berthing option. This proposal will have a severe negative impact on recreational use of a *key* part of the harbour. Today is Sunday 10th May, one day before termination of submissions. Looking from my home at Gilmour Terrace, Lyttelton, I can see ~30 yachts enjoying the exact piece of water that the proposal intends to use. I have windsurfed on the harbour for over 20 years. In the summer months (when cruise ships will be visiting), my friends and I use the Eastern Naval Point ramp (constructed by windsurfers for windsurfers) for access to the harbour. This ramp provides the only practical access to the harbour for windsurfing. We require a ramp that is exposed to the Easterly because we rely on a steady breeze for effective floatation. A cruise ship moored in the proposed area will block the NE and make this point of access substantially more risky than it is at present. Furthermore, safe access from the harbour to the ramp requires a substantially downwind approach to overcome the localised tidal flow and decrease in wind that occurs near the shore. The mooring of cruise ships will negate the possibility of this approach for two reasons: 1. we would need to enter the 200m exclusion zone; 2. The cruise ship will block the wind on which windsurfers depend for safe progress.	Rather than using the Naval Point Cruise ship mooring location, I support a Cruise mooring on either the inner- or outer-harbour location on Cashin Quay.
Boat Safety Association	Location	We support the concept of commercial development including a cruise ship berth but not off Naval Point to the west of the harbour entrance. The proposal to develop a cruise ship berth off Naval Point conflicts with the existing activities in the area and seems to be contrary to the intentions of point 2 (refers to pdLPRP p.52 reasons for location of reclamation second bullet point). Transport infrastructure at Naval Point is not adequate to support cruise ship berth, with potential hazards and safety concerns. Parking space for other users of the area would be compromised. Naval Point location would compromise Yacht Club activities and safety.	Cruise ship berth suggested either side of Gladstone Pier, preferably on seaward side of Cashin Quay
Caleb Te Kahu	Location	Support the wharf just not in an area used by so many different sports on nearly every night.	Move it further up the Harbour towards the heads
Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron	Location	Oppose the proposal for a Cruise Ship berth at Naval Point.	Limit the proposed berth for cruise ships to the inner harbour
Canterbury Trails	Location	As a tour operator in Christchurch I feel that the cruise ships should be linked to the port and the town. It means we can make use of the town facilities when picking up passengers from the ship. If cruise ships are berthed away from the inner harbour I feel the town would be bypassed as we would head directly through the tunnel both leaving and returning passengers to the ship. The proposed marina facilities would also be easily walked to from an inner harbour berth by passengers choosing to stay within the port itself, not unlike Akaroa at present.	Make a berth in the inner harbour specifically for visiting cruise ships.

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Canterbury Yachting Association	Location	We strongly oppose the proposed cruise ship berth at Naval Point. This will have a significant adverse impact on all recreational harbour users due to the loss of a valuable and frequently used area of water. Development in this area would restrict access to the space on the harbour which is the regions best water for major competitive events. The Cruise Ship proposal would severely restrict the possible development of access for small craft at Naval Point. Naval Point provides the only Lyttelton Harbour access facilities suitable for larger events. Typically Lyttelton Harbour is the venue for four National events and 6 Regional events each year providing for up to 200 sailors in an event.	We support the cruise ship berth in the Inner Harbour. We strongly oppose the cruise ship berth at Naval Point as it will have a significant adverse impact on recreational boating and would like to submit the following changes to the plan: Either: Remove the Naval Point cruise berth option making such an activity in this area Non Complying and select the inner harbour cruise ship berth location or, Find an alternative cruise ship berth location not at Naval Point (For example Cashin Quay outside the Eastern Mole or Gollans Bay), Substantially modify the position and extent of the proposed cruise ship berth location to mitigate the detrimental impacts on recreational boating above and make such an activity Restricted Discretionary requiring any applicant for Resource Consent for a cruise ship berth to assist the Naval Point Club Lyttelton to provide an alternative shore based start/finish line and yacht racing area and provide such other assistance as reasonably required to mitigate the impact on Naval Point Club Lyttelton.
Coastguard Canterbury Incorporated; Coastguard Southern Region	Location	We support the proposed cruise ship berth location at Gladstone Pier inside the inner harbour for the following reasons: Locating the cruise ship berth in the proposed position inside the inner harbour would have minimal impact on Coastguard operations. We oppose the proposed cruise ship berth adjoining land at Naval Point for the following reasons: The proposed location and the area of water that would be affected by this proposal would have very significant detrimental impacts on recreational boating, Naval Point, Lyttelton and the general public access to the eastern waters of Lyttelton Harbour. It is important from a search and rescue perspective that line of sight to the East up Lyttelton Harbour be retained if at all possible so that the location of vessels in peril in that area can be quickly established. Concerns about the tourist buses impacting on travel to emergency callouts.	We support the proposed cruise ship berth location in the inner harbour. The following changes are necessary to avoid a very significant adverse impact on recreational boating and Naval Point Club Lyttelton; Either: Remove the Naval Point cruise berth option making such an activity in this area Non Complying and select the inner harbour cruise ship berth location or, Find an alternative cruise ship berth location not at Naval Point (For example Cashin Quay outside the Eastern Mole or Gollans Bay) or, Substantially modify the position and extent of the proposed cruise ship berth location to mitigate the detrimental impacts on recreational boating above and make such an activity Restricted Discretionary.
Frances Therese James	Location	I support the alternative option proposed allowing cruise ships in the inner harbour as a permitted activity. I think this is an integral part of the recovery.	None
Glenda Anderson	Location	I support the proposal for cruise ship berths in the inner harbour. It brings the ships closer to Lyttelton and a better connection between ship and the Lyttelton township and is much more scenic for the passengers. I strongly oppose the proposed berth at Naval Point! As a sailor and Yachting NZ Race Officer who uses the Naval Point Club Lyttelton start box, it would have huge implications for me. It is safety issue, I could not see most of my fleet with a ship in the way, with a massive area taken up by any structure built to berth a ship. We use this water all the time, dinghies, windsurfers, trailer boats and keelboats. This affects a large amount of the Canterbury recreational fleet. My kids learnt to sail here. I submit that any cruise ship berth activity at Naval Point be a Restricted Discretionary Activity requiring any adverse impact on Naval Point to be mitigated as condition of any consent.	I support the cruise berth in the inner harbour. I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE CRUISE SHIP BERTH AT NAVAL POINT. This would have a huge and significant adverse effect on all recreational boating in Canterbury. My alternative, either remove the Naval Point cruise berth making such an activity in this area as Non Complying and use the Inner harbour option or find another cruise ship berth possibly Cashin Quay, outside the Eastern mole or Gollans Bay. Or substantially modify the position and extent of the Naval Point berth to mitigate environmental impacts on recreational users. To make such an activity as Restricted Discretionary requiring the applicant for Resource Consent of the Cruise ship berth to assist Naval Point Club Lyttelton to provide an alternative shore based start/finish line and yacht racing area. Also a provision to provide any other assistance required to mitigate the impact on NPCL.
Governors Bay Amenity Preservation Society	Location	We support the inner harbour option	None

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Groundswell Sports Ltd	Location	The western end of Naval Point is the sole entry point for windsurfing on the North side of the harbour, & is the only all tide deep water launch area in Canterbury for open water windsurfing. The restricted zone around a ship in berth will severely limit ALL recreational activities in this area, creating congestion & generate unsafe conditions for all recreational water users, on the water & on the land. The area in which the berth is located acts as a safe zone if sailors have issues or need to get to shore in an emergency. By having the berth in this position, will create enormous pressure on health & safety regulations around those activities & may cause some sailing & windsurfing classes not to participate in holding events in Canterbury. The cruise berth will also require a large area of land to service ships in port. I believe the cruise berth will be a commercial operation that will take up large areas of the public recreational area. From a passenger/tourist point of view on a cruise ship, the berth will be in a very unappealing area of the port, with no real connection to Lyttelton or the city of Christchurch. For the reasons above I submit that any cruise ship berth activity at Naval Point be a Restricted Discretionary Activity requiring any adverse impact on Naval Point to be mitigated as condition of any consent.	I support the cruise ship berth in the Inner Harbour. I strongly oppose the cruise ship berth at Naval Point as it will have a significant adverse impact on recreational boating and would like to submit the following changes to the plan: Either: Remove the Naval Point cruise berth option making such an activity in this area Non Complying and select the inner harbour cruise ship berth location or, Find an alternative cruise ship berth location not at Naval Point (For example Cashin Quay outside the Eastern Mole or Gollans Bay).
Julia Allott	Location	I support the cruise ship berth in the Inner Harbour. I strongly oppose the cruise ship berth at Naval Point as it will have a significant adverse impact on recreational boating.	I would like to submit the following changes to the plan: Either: Remove the Naval Point cruise berth option making such an activity in this area Non Complying and select the inner harbour cruise ship berth location or, Find an alternative cruise ship berth location not at Naval Point (For example Cashin Quay outside the Eastern Mole or Gollans Bay) or, Substantially modify the position and extent of the proposed cruise ship berth location to mitigate the detrimental impacts on recreational boating above and make such an activity Restricted Discretionary requiring any applicant for Resource Consent for a cruise ship berth to assist the Naval Point Club Lyttelton to provide an alternative shore based start/finish line and yacht racing area and provide such other assistance as reasonably required to mitigate the impact on Naval Point Club Lyttelton.
FitandAbel NZ Limited	Location	I support the cruise ship berth in the Inner Harbour. I strongly oppose the cruise ship berth at Naval Point as it will have a significant adverse impact on recreational boating.	I would like to submit the following changes to the plan: Remove the Naval Point cruise berth option making such an activity in this area Non Complying and select the inner harbour cruise ship berth location or, Find an alternative cruise ship berth location not at Naval Point (For example Cashin Quay outside the Eastern Mole or Gollans Bay) or, Substantially modify the position and extent of the proposed cruise ship berth location to mitigate the detrimental impacts on recreational boating above and make such an activity Restricted Discretionary requiring any applicant for Resource Consent for a cruise ship berth to assist the Naval Point Club Lyttelton to provide an alternative shore based start/finish line and yacht racing area and provide such other assistance as reasonably required to mitigate the impact on Naval Point Club Lyttelton.
Helen Chambers	Location	I support the alternative option proposed in the LPRP, that it could be constructed as a permitted activity in the Inner Harbour.	None
Jill Morrison	Location	LPC acknowledge that Lyttelton is the desired port of call for cruise ships, an important part of culture in Lyttelton, the visitors enjoy and the businesses benefit. I support the proposed berth for cruise ships at No.1 wharf. Unfortunately I have been told that this is not the favoured berth. I oppose the option at Naval Point. Having a marina in the same area will be a dismal failure - prevailing winds/currents; intervenes with recreational use; essentially bad.	None
Juliet Neill	Location	The option of berthing the cruise ships at Naval Point fails to take into account the amount of room necessary for security and turning around. This will result in lack of public access to the area	Retain cruise ship berthing at Cashin Quay.
K L Henderson	Location	It is vital that the location of a cruise ship berth is close to the centre of Lyttelton and that adequate provision is made for buses to pick up and drop off at ships side. A terminal building is not required as Lyttelton is only a transit port.	The Naval Point option will not meet cruise ship passengers needs and in any case a very expensive option for a facility that may only cater for 70 ship visits per year.

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Kate Smeele	Location	I am general agreement with the Port Oliver Yacht Club.	I have some concerns about the cruise ships plans and that this will seriously affect the yacht club. Can it go somewhere else?
Learn2Sail	Location	Cruise ship berth needs a lot more consideration	The cruise berth effects the main sailing area for the Naval Point club, also for spectators viewing the racing for larger events. The proposal blocks the look out for the Coastguard too, this effects over 600 members activities.
Liquigas	Location	In general, the provisions of the draft Recovery Plan that provide for the construction of a cruise berth as a controlled activity at Naval Point and related passenger handling structures and activities are: contrary to, and will not achieve, the purpose and the principles of the RMA, inconsistent with the principles in Part 2 of the RMA, do not assist the Council to carry out its function of achieving the integrated management of the effect of the use, development or protection of land, contrary to good resource management practice.	The decision sought by Liquigas is: (a) That the provisions in the draft Recovery Plan that provide for the construction of a cruise ship berth and related passenger handling structures and activities at naval Point be withdrawn; and (b) Such consequential and/or other relief and amendments to the draft Recovery Plan as may be necessary to address Liquigas' concerns, as outlined above.
Liquigas	Location	Liquigas opposes those parts of the draft Recovery Plan which relate to and provide for the construction of a cruise ship berth at Naval Point (and related passenger handling structure and activities) including (without limitation) the amendments sought to the relevant Resource Management planning documents as detailed in the Appendices to the draft Recovery Plan and listed below; RCEP Rule 10.2(b) which provides for any new Wharf Structure located within the Naval Point Cruise Ship Berth Area as a controlled activity, RCEP Map 5.7 which provides for the Naval Point Cruise Ship Berth Area, pCRDP Rule 21.8.2.2.1 P1 which provides for Port Activities as a permitted activity - Port Activities defined to include the use of land, building and structures for passenger handling, including cruise ship terminals, pCRDP Chapter 2 Definitions - Port Activities.	The decision sought by Liquigas is: (a) That the provisions in the draft Recovery Plan that provide for the construction of a cruise ship berth and related passenger handling structures and activities at naval Point be withdrawn; and (b) Such consequential and/or other relief and amendments to the draft Recovery Plan as may be necessary to address Liquigas' concerns, as outlined above.
Liquigas	Location	The provisions that provide for cruise ship berth and related passenger handling structures and activities are not appropriate for the following reasons: (a) potential impact the location of a cruise ship terminal at Naval Point will have on continued operations, need to protect from reverse sensitivity risks (b) inappropriate and contrary to sound resource management practice and sound hazard management to locate sensitive high occupancy activities in close proximity to hazardous facilities (c) a cruise ship terminal in Naval Point will not provide a safe or welcoming location for tourists, health and safety of visitors and workers (d) the provisions (i) fail to adequately provide for assessment of potential adverse effects (ii) fail to adequately provide for consultation (iii) are inconsistent with the recognition elsewhere in the draft Recovery Plan of the storage and handling of hazardous substances in the identifies 'Bulk Liquid Storage Area' at Naval Point.	The decision sought by Liquigas is: (a) That the provisions in the draft Recovery Plan that provide for the construction of a cruise ship berth and related passenger handling structures and activities at naval Point be withdrawn; and (b) Such consequential and/or other relief and amendments to the draft Recovery Plan as may be necessary to address Liquigas' concerns, as outlined above.
Lyttelton Community Association Inc	Location	4.1 indicates alternative locations for a cruise ship berth, but gives the responsibility of deciding where, or whether it is provided at all to LPC. An issue such as this which has widespread implications for revenue from tourists throughout Canterbury should not be left to LPC. Past indications are that LPC considers cruise ships an irritation rather than a benefit.	We request that the requirement for the provision of cruise ship facilities be the responsibility of CCC and ECAN.
Lyttelton Harbour Business Association	Location	We support the inclusion of a new cruise ship facility to facilitate cruise ship activity through the port and Lyttelton, and feel that this needs more certainty and direction. We appreciate that economic drivers that will decide this outcome, and therefore encourage LPC to take a collaborative approach with key stakeholders that will provide more resource and certainty. We appreciate the logistic challenges surrounding a suitable location for the facility, but would support a location that encourages passengers to pass through Lyttelton and frequent its amenities and businesses	NA

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
<p>M Anderson; Canterbury Maritime Training; Oborn's Nautical; Waitaha Paddling Club; S Hinman; A Lealand; D Bastin; V Sue-Tang; P Folter; S Jones; M Oborn; T George; B Keen; A Herriott; F McLachlan; N Grant; R Hofmans; S Chester; H Walls; G Perrem; Ka Beatson; I Atkinson; M Brown; P Tocker; J Riddoch; M Moore; B Moore; S Cameron; Ke Beatson; C Cameron; K Oborn; H Anderson; T Wooding; O Corboy; G Bowater; G Dixon; J Hern; D Haylock; D Lake; I Armstrong; D Taylor; G Armstrong; A Ludlow; P Prendegast; N Wilde; M Guy; C Guy; G Burney; K Guy; K Duncan; M Hitchings; D Crosbie; W Taggart; J Vilsbek; M Hore; R Gibb; B Frederikson; J Hopkins; R Rodgers; E Riley; K Selway; A Graham; P Auger; R Miller; F Bowater; L Crawford; A Duncan; D Lindner; B Gordon; R O'Sullivan; D Southwick; L Boyd; R Norris; D Munro; J Hawtin; R Connolly; A Taylor; H Sylvester; J Mann; D Paterson; G Irwin; D Vile; V Newman; X Bowater; A Farqyharson; B Parker; D Main; L Falconer; B Hawkins; M Ramsay; B Cowan; K Cowan; R Eveleens; D Atkinson; R Atkinson; D Miller; P Beckett; V Williams; G Suckling; R Wellesley; G Mentink; M Ferrar; B Carrell; L Duke; C Dodds; R Lascelles; B Anderson; R Lee; L Lilburne; G Ronald; A Bowater; W Keen; I Scott; M Griffiths; P Savage; S Knight; S Chisnall; G Savage; B Armstrong; L Hern; Te Waka Pounamu; V Moore; R Hale; S Riddoch; S Moore; P Moore; S Pierce; C Lock; C Gibbons; S Oborn; B Lang; P Lang; M Wellby; S Page; S Schumacher; South Island Finn Association; Samarah; H Wilkinson; N Rayner; B Robinson; A Beaton; Ballingers Hunting & Fishing Ltd; Groundswell Sports Ltd; S Coombe</p>	<p>Location</p>	<p>Support the proposal for a cruise ship berth in the inner harbour as it would be a valuable asset for the community and provide benefits for the local and wider economy. Strongly oppose the proposed cruise ship berth at Naval Point as will have a significant adverse impact on all recreational harbour users due to the loss of a valuable and frequently used area of water and that includes the Naval Point Club Lyttelton shore based start/finish line. There are concerns regarding the impact of the berth on the safety of many smaller craft, waka ama, windsurfing and small boat navigation in the area due to altered sea and wind conditions plus the narrowing of the waterway. Cruise ship berth activity at Naval Point be a Restricted Discretionary Activity requiring any adverse impact on Naval Point to be mitigated as condition of any consent.</p>	<p>Support the cruise ship berth in the Inner Harbour. Strongly oppose the cruise ship berth at Naval Point as it will have a significant adverse impact on recreational boating. Either: Remove the Naval Point cruise berth option making such an activity in this area Non Complying and select the inner harbour cruise ship berth location or, find an alternative cruise ship berth location not at Naval Point (For example Cashin Quay outside the Eastern Mole or Gollans Bay) or, substantially modify the position and extent of the proposed cruise ship berth location to mitigate the detrimental impacts on recreational boating above and make such an activity Restricted Discretionary requiring any applicant for Resource Consent for a cruise ship berth to assist the Naval Point Club Lyttelton to provide an alternative shore based start/finish line and yacht racing area and provide such other assistance as reasonably required to mitigate the impact on Naval Point Club Lyttelton.</p>
<p>Matthew Shove</p>	<p>Location</p>	<p>Support the proposal for a cruise ship berth in the inner harbour as it would be a valuable asset for the community and provide benefits for the local and wider economy. I strongly oppose the proposed cruise ship berth at Naval Point as will have a significant adverse impact on all recreational harbour users due to the loss of a valuable and frequently used area of water and that includes the Naval Point Club Lyttelton shore based start/finish line. The area is used by many smaller craft and the possible impact on windsurfing and small boat navigation in the area due to altered sea and wind conditions plus the narrowing of the waterway. Cruise ship berth activity at Naval Point be a Restricted Discretionary Activity requiring any adverse impact on Naval Point to be mitigated as condition of any consent.</p>	<p>I support the cruise ship berth in the Inner Harbour. I strongly oppose the cruise ship berth at Naval Point as it will have a significant adverse impact on recreational boating.</p>
<p>Michael Sandridge</p>	<p>Location</p>	<p>I support the development of a cruise ship berth in the inner harbour at Gladstone Pier. I oppose a cruise ship berth on the south side of naval point. A dictated cruise ship pier should encourage tourist trade for Lyttelton and the greater Christchurch area but the without negative impact an outer berth at naval point would have on recreational activities.</p>	<p>Support the berth at Gladstone Pier.</p>
<p>Mr Daniel Petrache</p>	<p>Location</p>	<p>I support the proposal for a cruise ship berth in the inner harbour. It would be a valuable asset for the community and provide benefits for the local and wider economy. I strongly oppose the proposed cruise ship berth at Naval Point. This will have a significant adverse impact on all recreational harbour users due to the loss of a valuable and frequently used area of water and the Naval Point Club Lyttelton shore based start/finish line. I have concerns about the impact on windsurfing and small boat navigation in the area due to the impact on wind and sea conditions. I submit that any cruise ship berth activity at Naval Point be a Restricted Discretionary Activity requiring any adverse impact on Naval Point to be mitigated as condition of any consent.</p>	<p>Public notification and consultation</p>

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Mr Stuart Beswick	Location	<p>Naval Point - has no land side facilities and would position vessels very close to "Parsons Rock". The proximity to such a hazard may preclude some of the larger vessels. Gladstone Pier - Demolish earthquake damaged western end of eastern mole (appendix A) at the entrance of the inner harbour. This will give a wider track for longer and wider cruise vessels. Cruise vessels require only minimal back up area landside, and will almost always be transit calls, thus there is no requirement for; bunkers, grey water or sludge disposal, husbandry stores, fresh water, embarkation or disembarkation of passengers, spare parts etc., as a result no hard stand wharf area is required alongside vessel. A simple and relatively cost effective option is to establish a pile and dolphin berthing structure on the seaward side of the present condemned Gladstone Pier, see attachments for examples. No cruise terminal (covered) is required for such an operation. There is already a roadway in place on the eastern side of Gladstone Pier and this can be used to accommodate coaches for passenger shore side tours. Gladstone Pier is within the Port Security Area, as required under International Ship Port and Safety requirements. Cruise ships have gangway port doors on most decks - to take into account the rise and fall of tides. Some ships will use their own gangways, but in the case of Lyttelton, with the height of the rise and fall of tide, a simple fore and aft type gangway could be constructed either side of the walkway. This could be a floating (barge type) option as noted in Appendix 4.</p>	<p>Naval Point is not a suitable location and provisions should be made so that cruise ships can berth at Gladstone pier.</p>
Ms Wendy Everingham	Location	<p>I support the plans for a cruise ship berth at Gladstone Quay. I think this will link to the township better. The other location will interfere with Naval Point activities and will also mean more public land is taken from the people of Lyttelton.</p>	<p>Cruise ship berth to be developed at Gladstone Quay.</p>
Naval Point Club Lyttelton	Location	<p>NPCL supports the proposed cruise ship berth location at Gladstone Pier inside the inner harbour for the following reasons, they oppose the proposed cruise ship berth adjoining land at Naval Point. The suggested location and size of the proposed facility would create a very significant restriction for small craft when the berth was not in use, additional dredging could alter wave and tidal movements, significant impact on windsurfing, loss of NPCL shore based yacht racing start/finish line. The club would not have the volunteer personnel or the financial resources to be able to run the events it does without the continued access to a good shore based start/finish.</p>	<p>We support the proposed cruise ship berth location in the inner harbour. The following changes are necessary to avoid a very significant adverse impact on recreational boating and Naval Point Club Lyttelton; Either: Remove the Naval Point cruise berth option making such an activity in this area Non Complying and select the inner harbour cruise ship berth location or, Find an alternative cruise ship berth location not at Naval Point (For example Cashin Quay outside the Eastern Mole or Gollans Bay) or, Substantially modify the position and extent of the proposed cruise ship berth location to mitigate the detrimental impacts on recreational boating above and make such an activity Restricted Discretionary requiring any applicant for Resource Consent for a cruise ship berth to assist the Naval Point Club Lyttelton to provide an alternative shore based start/finish line and yacht racing area and provide such other assistance as reasonably required to mitigate the impact on Naval Point Club Lyttelton.</p>
Nicci Blain	Location	<p>Although I am in support of enabling cruise ship activity, I cannot support the location for this activity at Naval Point. This level of infrastructure will severely effect boating in Canterbury by narrowing the harbour at the area where recreational power boats, dinghies, and yachts commonly congregate and pass through. It will also limit spectator access to the water and ruin the ability for voluntaries to start yacht races from the shore. Severely compromising sailing as a sport in Canterbury. Therefore I enthusiastically support the cruise ship berth within the inner harbour.</p>	<p>Make Cruise Ship berth a Non Complying Activity at Naval Point</p>

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Peter Smeele	Location	I strongly oppose the cruise ship berth at Naval Point as it will have a significant adverse impact on recreational boating.	Either: Remove the Naval Point cruise berth option making such an activity in this area Non Complying and select the inner harbour cruise ship berth location or, Find an alternative cruise ship berth location not at Naval Point (For example Cashin Quay outside the Eastern Mole or Gollans Bay) or, Substantially modify the position and extent of the proposed cruise ship berth location to mitigate the detrimental impacts on recreational boating above and make such an activity Restricted Discretionary requiring any applicant for Resource Consent for a cruise ship berth to assist the Naval Point Club Lyttelton to provide an alternative shore based start/finish line and yacht racing area and provide such other assistance as reasonably required to mitigate the impact on Naval Point Club Lyttelton.
Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited	Location	I agree that a cruise ship berth would be an asset for the Lyttelton and Canterbury communities	My preference is for a cruise ship berth to be placed to the southern side of Naval Point and linked to the Dampier Bay proposed development. This will ensure pedestrian traffic is kept separate from commercial operations at the port.
Simon Henry	Location	I strongly oppose the proposed cruise ship berth at Naval Point. This will have a significant adverse impact on all recreational harbour users due to the loss of a valuable and frequently used area of water and the Naval Point Club Lyttelton shore based start/finish line. I have concerns about the impact on windsurfing and small boat navigation in the area due to the impact on wind and sea conditions.	I submit that any cruise ship berth activity at Naval Point be a Restricted Discretionary Activity requiring any adverse impact on Naval Point to be mitigated as condition of any consent.
Tasman Young	Location	I wish to speak on the possibility of the return of cruise ships already past due date promised by LPC and it now seems it is time for the NZ Government to step in and proceed this issue, as the Christchurch City Council seems incapable of demanding this to happen. The simple job of removing about 100 metres from the Cashin Quay mole would allow all cruise ship sizes to enter the harbour firstly to No. 2 Wharf and then to Gladstone Pier after it is rebuilt. I oppose the site ECAN has on their plan (outside the Oil Wharf).	N/A
Timothy Hughes	Location	I am very concerned about the option shown in the plans of a cruise ship berth at Naval Point. I launch and race a trailer yacht near this location and it will have a significant adverse impact on my use of this area especially as this is the current location where races start and finish by the building established for this purpose.	Please remove the Naval Point cruise berth option, and give more consideration to alternatives.
Wayne Nolan	Location	I fully support the cruise ship berth being established in the inner harbour or on the outside of the eastern mole as an extension of Cashin Quay. I strongly opposed the cruise ship berth being built at Naval Point because of the safety issues for small sailboats, sail boards, trailer yachts dinghy and waka members of NPLC. Also the club would lose its onshore start/finish facilities and would be forced to sail the other side of the harbour (if they can get there) because of the wind shadow effect of a large cruising ship.	I support the cruise ship berth in the Inner Harbour. I strongly oppose the cruise ship berth at Naval Point as it will have a significant adverse impact on recreational boating and would like to submit the following changes to the plan: Either: Remove the Naval Point cruise berth option making such an activity in this area Non Complying and select the inner harbour cruise ship berth location or, Find an alternative cruise ship berth location not at Naval Point (For example Cashin Quay outside the Eastern Mole or Gollans Bay) or, Substantially modify the position and extent of the proposed cruise ship berth location to mitigate the detrimental impacts on recreational boating above and make such an activity Restricted Discretionary requiring any applicant for Resource Consent for a cruise ship berth to assist the Naval Point Club Lyttelton to provide an alternative shore based start/finish line and yacht racing area and provide such other assistance as reasonably required to mitigate the impact on Naval Point Club Lyttelton.
William Hall	Location	Support cruise berth in the inner harbour. Strongly opposed to Naval Point location.	Strongly oppose: Naval Point cruise berth but support inner harbour location or Cashin Quay.

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Willie Newman	Location	The building of a wharf for cruise ships at Naval Point is going to totally interfere with the safe use of the water around the berth area. It will mean that all the water users are forced to go outside the reef which gives no sheltered water for dinghies, board sailors, paddle boarders, to sail in. It will also block the start box for the Naval Point Club which would mean no more land based starts for there races. It also will reduce the ability for the public to watch racing on Lyttelton Harbour.	None
Yachting New Zealand	Location	3.4 - Yachting New Zealand supports the proposed cruise ship berth location at Gladstone Pier inside the inner harbour for the following reasons: Locating the cruise ship berth in the proposed position inside the inner harbour would have minimal impact on recreational boating on the harbour. Yachting New Zealand opposes the proposed cruise ship berth adjoining land at Naval Point for the following reasons: The proposed location and the area of water that would be affected by this proposal would have a significant and detrimental impact on recreational boating, Sea Scouts, Naval Point Club Lyttelton and general public access to the eastern waters of Lyttelton Harbour. The suggested location and size of the proposed cruise ship facility would create a very significant restriction to small craft when the berth was not in use, and more so when the berth was occupied by a cruise ship and particularly during shipping movement. Additional dredging of this area could alter the wave and tidal effect on sea conditions. Currently tidal movement forces a considerable volume of water between the reef and the Naval Point breakwater which can cause a strong tidal current and a steep sea. On-water race starts and finishes are not appropriate or feasible for all activities.	We support the proposed cruise ship berth location in the inner harbour. The following changes are necessary to avoid a very significant and adverse impact on recreational boating and Naval Point Club Lyttelton; Either: Remove the Naval Point cruise berth option making such an activity in this area Non-Complying and select the inner harbour cruise ship berth location or, Find an alternative cruise ship berth location not at Naval Point (For example Cashin Quay outside the Eastern Mole or Gollans Bay) or, Substantially modify the position and extent of the proposed cruise ship berth location to mitigate the detrimental impacts on recreational boating above and make such an activity Restricted Discretionary requiring any applicant for Resource Consent for a cruise ship berth to assist the Naval Point Club Lyttelton to provide an alternative shore based start/finish line and yacht racing area and provide such other assistance as reasonably required to mitigate the impact on Naval Point Club Lyttelton.
Young 88 Association of New Zealand Inc.	Location	The Association shares the grave concerns expressed by Naval Point Club Lyttelton about the impact that the proposed cruise ship berth location at Naval Point would have on recreational boating in the area. The Young 88 Association and its members would be adversely impacted if this proposal were allowed to go ahead. The Association fully supports the proposed cruise ship berth location in the inner harbour.	The Association supports the proposed cruise ship berth location in the inner harbour. A proposed cruise ship berth at Naval Point should be a Non Complying, Discretionary or Restricted Discretionary Activity requiring any adverse impact on recreational harbour users and the Naval Point Club Lyttelton to be mitigated as a condition of any consent.
Z Energy Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd	Location	Naval Point cruise ship option strongly opposed by Oil Companies. Appears to be clear intent to actively facilitate significant increases in numbers of people in area in close proximity to major hazardous facilities and where access constrained. Introduction of significant numbers of people will significantly changes the risk profile of the area, have implications on the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of oil industry infrastructure. Cruise ship visits would have significant service requirements. Likely demands; cafe, buses, bus depot or queuing area. Significant numbers of people and congestion on the land side of the terminal berth can be expected and, once established, the pressure for further development will be there.	
Z Energy Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd	Location	Only one access to Naval Point reclamation via Godley Quay. Further constrained as identified as subject to risk from Cliff Collapse in RDP. Naval Point recreational proposals potentially result in significant additional vehicles. Cruise ship terminal will significantly increase local recreational traffic. Existing recreational facilities already create parking and access issues. Increased traffic likely increase risk of incident with aboveground pipeline. Incident on Godley Quay - potential to 'lock up' Naval Point area. No secondary access for emergency services/evacuation. Woolston pipeline located under part of Godley Quay - constraints on access for maintenance or upgrades within road reserve.	

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Z Energy Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd	Location	Port area is dynamic. Storage facilities need to change to meet demand. Demand for products expected to grow - therefore more storage demand. Oil Companies do not want to be in a position where future development is likely to be opposed or inappropriately limited as a result of the risk profile arising from other users - no other location for fuel facilities. No risk assessment has been undertaken of whole area - considered necessary before any decisions on cruise ship terminal or adjacent recreational facilities. New regulations for major hazard facilities proposed - include need to develop safety cases for approval, will have to factor in sensitivity of receiving environment. Potentially improved and greater safety requirements as a result. CCC and ECan need to consider implications for decisions on developments in the area. Oil Companies accept appropriate to mitigate risk, remain opposed to having to mitigate risks resulting from planned introduction of more sensitive land uses / activities.	
Z Energy Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd	Location	The consideration of risk is the most critical issue for us and it seems there is insufficient consideration of this matter in LPC's information. Risk is the combination of the consequences and likelihood of a particular event or combination of events occurring. Effects of a serious event occurring in tank farm area, while low probability, have potential for very high potential impact. Only provisions relating to risk assessment in PDLPRP are identified in hazardous substances provisions 21.8.3.2.7 - reasonable but only one way assessment of risk, no countervailing provisions to protect existing hazardous facilities. Without balance there is a risk oil industry infrastructure will be compromised in the short to medium term and unable to meet the fuel demands of the region. Controlled activity for new storage above permitted levels - concern that will ultimately result in a compromised bulk liquid storage area and compromised oil industry facilities. Oil Companies consider that a cruise ship terminal at Naval Point is more than likely to be incompatible with the operation of the Bulk Liquids Storage Area, that full risk assessment should be undertaken before potential introduction of significant numbers of people/activities sensitive to bulk hazardous facilities.	Recommends Quantitative Risk Assessment if Naval Point option pursued to ascertain risks, 250m separation from developments involving significant numbers of people.
Z Energy Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd	Location	The principal issue for the Oil Companies is that part of the PDLPRP seeks to locate or enable a cruise ship berth/terminal in the Naval Point area as a controlled activity. A cruise ship terminal at Naval Point is considered to be contrary to the principle of avoiding avoidable risk as it introduces large numbers of people into an area of bulk liquid fuel facilities. Alternative location available. No consideration or assessment of risk issues; servicing facilities and infrastructure and whether level of risk is acceptable, potential adverse reverse sensitivity effects and constraints, implications for wider regional fuel supply chain from constraints, potential transport and servicing implications from single access point already subject to natural hazard risk, exposure of existing pipelines to increase risk of impact, emergency services access and capabilities and evacuation issues, changing regulations for bulk fuel storage. Proposal to locate or enable a cruise ship berth/terminal in the Naval Point area does not represent or promote sustainable management of the environment and is therefore contrary to the purposes of the RMA.	A. Ensure that before there is further development that is likely to increase the number of people within the Naval Point area that appropriate consideration is given to the full suite of issues of risk in relation to the hazardous facilities in the area and their ability to meet future demands. This should include an appropriate quantitative risk assessment in the first instance. No development should proceed if the risks from infrastructure are not deemed to be acceptable as defined by agreed risk acceptance criteria. B. Ensure that the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the oil industry and other bulk fuel and chemical and fuel storage facilities and associated infrastructure is not at risk of or constrained in any way. This should include an assessment of potential reverse sensitivity effects arising from increasing numbers of people or intensification (e.g. from cruise ships or recreational activities), and of the potential traffic impacts, including in respect of access, parking and the risk of accidents and emergency planning. C. Give effect to the relief sought in the other Schedules of this submission. D. Make any additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary as a result of the matters raised in this submission. E. Adopt any other such relief as to give effect to this submission
Green Party	Other	The Plan fails to adequately consider the future of rail passenger services. The Tranz Alpine has picked up cruise ship passengers from the port in the past and could do so again.	Amend the plan to provide for the future location of a rail passenger terminal and a walkable ferry jetty and bus terminal for the Diamond Harbour ferry service.

CRUISE SHIPS

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
KiwiRail	Other	Rail excursions for cruise ship passengers are very popular - currently passengers coming ashore in Akaroa are bused to Rolleston to join excursions to Arthurs Pass. In Dunedin, cruise ship passengers can board rail excursions directly alongside their ships. Whether this would be desirable at Lyttelton could be considered through the MoU - Action 8. KiwiRail acknowledge that decisions on cruise ship berth and terminal is a matter for consideration at a later time.	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p35 (Section 3.4) Cruise Ships - Support inclusion of provisions for return of cruise ships to Lyttelton, except at the Naval Point location. Purpose built facility is desirable but important to get cruise ships back to Lyttelton as soon as possible - temporary or transitional arrangements. In the past cruise ships used Cashin Quay when available. Some cruise operators are unlikely to return to Lyttelton because the town is now so unattractive - we need to develop an inner harbour open space/ heritage precinct which makes a new attraction. Attachment 2 includes a visitor walking circuit which takes in many places of interest in the town. However none of this will be enough to attract people to Lyttelton if depressing empty lots and security fences continue to predominate. Undesirable to have a Recovery Plan which undermines the town's recovery by prolonging uncertainty; Norwich Quay freight traffic, Diamond Harbour ferry location.	Delete the sentence: A new purpose built facility will be needed if the larger cruise ships are to return to Lyttelton and replace with: While a new purpose-built cruise facility is desirable in the long term it may be necessary to consider temporary or transitional facilities to enable larger cruise ships to berth at Lyttelton in the short term.
Mr Peter McBride	Other	I support the cruise berth plan	No change or speed it up
Sarah van der Burch	Other	You are leaving the decision of building the cruise ship terminal up to LPC which does not seem appropriate on its own.	
Mark Watson	Other	A cruise ship berth designed to enable a contribution to the local economy and not put constraints on existing recreational use of the harbour.	N/A

NAVAL POINT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Ballingers Hunting & Fishing Ltd	Zoning	Figure 6 - I oppose the rezoning of Port Company owned land at Naval Point from Boat Harbour Zoned to Port Activities. This land, adjoining the Reserve and forming part of Charlotte Jane Quay, is approximately 1.4ha. We believe there is no justification in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan to rezone this land. Doing so would be a significant loss of land available to support recreational activities at a time when a considerable area has been lost from potential development due to rock fall hazard. The Christchurch City Council is also proposing to rezone the Boat Harbour area to Open Space Metropolitan Facilities in its just released Draft Replacement City Plan. I will oppose this and submit that the Boat Harbour Zoned land should all be included in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan with a zone similar to the existing Boat Harbour Zone but with Permitted Activities that include: Club, Coastguard and community building, boat storage and maintenance buildings, launching ramps, wave attenuation and associated structures and the removal of the old Lyttelton Marina piles.	Include all the Boat Harbour zoned area and adjoining coastal marina area in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. I submit that all this land should retain its existing purpose in support of recreational boating within the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan with Zoning and Rules similar to the existing Boat Harbour Zone.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p42 (Section 3.8.5) Naval Point Recreation Area - Local groups currently working with CCC staff on a development plan for all the Council-owned land in the Naval Point area. This whole area is a well used recreational asset which has been much neglected by successive councils since a public marina was destroyed in a southerly storm. It has become clear that improvements at Naval Point are greatly constrained by both the cliff collapse hazard and the amount of contaminated land.	
Alastair Suren	Other	We acknowledge that for the port to grow additional land is needed. It also allows other areas to be freed up for potential recreational development (e.g. Dampier bay). The reclamation is of a significant scale and will no doubt benefit the activities of the LPC. However, without adequate protection from southerly winds, the current existing public facilities at Naval Point cannot be safely used. This matter requires considerable further discussion between ECan, LPC and CCC, as the creation of a breakwater could be seen as a form of offset mitigation for a loss of port area to recreational activities from the actual reclamation and likely increased shipping activities in the harbour. We do not think that the proposed Dampier Bay Marina addresses all of the issues faced by boating in Lyttelton, and in particular the ability to safely launch and retrieve vessels during southerly weather. The proposed Dampier Bay facility will still not allow boats to be safely hauled out even in the lightest southerly wind. This situation needs to be addressed.	Strongly urge ECan, LPC and CCC to work together to develop a more focussed recovery strategy for boating facilities within the Naval Point Area. Amend the Recovery Plan to include ways that the public slipway can be used during southerlies e.g.. some form of wave attenuating structure, as this whole area will continue to languish as an apparent after-thought for recreational boat users throughout Canterbury.
Alastair Suren	Other	Public access to Naval Point needs to be identified and clarified. It is not clear from the descriptions and plans provided in the Port Recovery Plan whether the existing access is legal.	Amend the Plan to provide for legal public access to Naval Point. Without this certainty, there is little incentive for any future developments to occur.
Linda Goodwin	Other	We support the redevelopment of the 'old Mobil contaminated site' on Godley Quay, to include (i) native plantings appropriate for the area and to enhance native bird life, which includes fantails, kingfishers, kereru and bellbirds, (ii) a fun and inspiring play area for children and adults including utilising water in the landscaping, outdoor benches and seating, fun play activity structures. The Wellington Waterfront Development has been successful on this front. It would be worthwhile to consider what has worked well and what hasn't with the Wellington Waterfront Development and to incorporate these learnings within the future development plan for the Lyttelton Port.	Include the use of native plantings local to the area.
Z Energy Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd	Other	Location of the coastguard/Naval Point Club and associated recreation development being addressed by CCC - occurring adjacent to Oil Companies' facilities, has potential implications for the oil industry infrastructure and merits consideration in terms of cumulative effects.	
Mrs Ann Thorpe	Other	That public use of Naval Point be urgently encouraged through landscaping, pathways and cycleway, seating, green areas and beautification of the coastline there.	That public use of Naval Point be urgently encouraged through landscaping, pathways and cycleway, seating, green areas and beautification of the coastline there.

NAVAL POINT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Christchurch City Council	Recreational Area Development	Council has identified a number of constraints on future site development, including cliff hazard, coastal erosion, restricted site access, limited land area available and contaminated land. As a result of these constraints, accommodating all users will be difficult. Should the cruise berth be developed at Naval Point there will be limited opportunity to provide for additional facilities for passengers within CCC owned land, which may have flow on effects to the efficiency of Godley Quay. It is also noted that the road reserve of Godley Quay does not extend to the coastal marine area edge and access is required across reserve land.	The proposed new action sought in relation to cruise ships as outlined above (paragraph 3.22) will accommodate discussions between the Council and LPC in relation to landside infrastructure requirements.
Willie Newman	Recreational Area Development	The area of land owned by the CCC must be kept for the use of recreational water users. This is the ONLY access for Christchurch residents to access the salt water. The facilities should be an embarrassment to the council. This area should be for the storage of boats, the parking for water users, clubs facilities, there should be NO port activities in this area.	
Boat Safety Association	Recreational Area Development	Outlines proposed development of Naval Point recreational area: a) breakwaters to protect slipways and ramps, b) segregated launch ramps for trolleys and road trailers to avoid collisions, beach concept proposed, c) development of road plan to improve efficiency, minimise planting and other vegetation d) parking for vehicles with and without trailers, segregates trolley launching traffic from trailer launched boats, e) short and long term storage for trailer-able vessels, f) haul out storage facilities for moored vessels so maintenance can be carried out by the owners on shore.	See above
Alastair Suren	Recreational Area Development	We acknowledge that for the port to grow additional land is needed. It also allows other areas to be freed up for potential recreational development (e.g.. Dampier bay). The reclamation is of a significant scale and will do doubt benefit the activities of the LPC. However, without adequate protection from southerly winds, the current existing public facilities at Naval Point cannot be safely used. This matter requires considerable further discussion between ECan, LPC and CCC, as the creation of a breakwater could be seen as a form of offset mitigation for a loss of port area to recreational activities from the actual reclamation and likely increased shipping activities in the harbour. We do not think that the proposed Dampier Bay Marina addresses all of the issues faced by boating in Lyttelton, and in particular the ability to safely launch and retrieve vessels during southerly weather. The proposed Dampier Bay facility will still not allow boats to be safely hauled out even in the lightest southerly wind. This situation needs to be addressed.	Strongly urge ECan, LPC and CCC to work together to develop a more focussed recovery strategy for boating facilities within the Naval Point Area. Amend the Recovery Plan to include ways that the public slipway can be used during southerlies e.g.. some form of wave attenuating structure, as this whole area will continue to languish as an apparent after-thought for recreational boat users throughout Canterbury.

NAVAL POINT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
N Blain; Coastguard Canterbury Incorporated; Coastguard Southern Region; Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron; W Hall; B Robinson; N Rayner; V Moore; Canterbury Maritime Training; A Herriott; M Shove; G Anderson; S Riddoch; Te Waka; D Petrache; Groundswell Sports Ltd; Oborn's Nautical; Samarah; Waitaha Paddling Club; A Lealand; D Bastin; P Folter; J Allott; FitandAbel NZ Limited; S Jones; R Hale; S Hinman; South Island Finn Association; M Oborn; T George; B Keen; G Perrem; K Beatson; I Atkinson; M Brown; P Tocker; J Riddoch; H Walls; S Chester; R Hofmans; N Grant; F McLachlan; S Moore; P Moore; M Moore; S Pierce; B Moore; C Lock; C Gibbons; S Cameron; K Beatson; C Cameron; K Oborn; S Oborn; B Lang; P Lang; M Wellby; S Schumacher; J Davis; H Wilkinson; H Anderson; S Coombe; T Wooding; O Corboy; G Bowater; G Dixon; J Hern; D Haylock; D Lake; I Armstrong; D Taylor; G Armstrong; A Ludlow; P Prendegast; N Wilde; M Guy; C Guy; G Burney; K Duncan; K Guy; M Hitchings; D Crosbie; W Taggart; J Vilsbek; M Hore; R Gibb; B Frederikson; J Hopkins; R Rodgers; E Riley; K Selway; A Graham; P Auger; R Miller; F Bowater; L Crawford; A Duncan; D Lindner; B Gordon; R O'Sullivan; D Southwick; L Boyd; R Norris; D Munro; J Hawtin; R Connolly; A Taylor; H Sylvester; J Mann; D Paterson; G Irwin; D Vile; V Newman; X Bowater; A Farqyharson; B Parker; D Main; L Falconer; B Hawkins; M Ramsay; B Cowan; K Cowan; R Eveleens; D Atkinson; R Atkinson; D Miller; P Beckett; V Williams; G Suckling; R Wellesley; G Mentink; M Ferrar; B Carrell; L Duke; C Dodds; R Lascelles; B Anderson; R Lee; L Lilburne; G Ronald; A Bowater; W Keen; I Scott; M Griffiths; P Savage; M Anderson; S Knight; S Chisnall; G Savage; B Armstrong; L Hern; S Page; A Beaton; Canterbury Trailer Yacht Squadron; W Hall; M Sandridge; W Nolan; P Smeele; Young 88 Association of New Zealand Inc.	Zoning	Boat Harbour Zone at Naval Point: I oppose the proposal to rezone land at Naval Point owned by the Port Company from Boat Harbour Zone to Port Activities. There is currently a shortage of land for the use of recreational boating activities. This is only going to get worse in the future. There has been no reason given why rezoning will assist in recovery of the port. The zone should remain available as current for recreational boating activities. As the Naval Point area is also in recovery along with the port I would prefer that this area was a part of the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan, and not included in the City Council's Replacement City plan. It would seem that one of the reasons the City Council would like to rezone the boat harbour area to Metropolitan Facilities zone is so that it can develop cruise ship berth terminal facilities on this land. This would be a double blow to recreational boating as this would remove more land from the area available for the support of recreational boating.	Incorporate all of the Boat Harbour Zone area in the Port Recovery Plan. Retain Boat Harbour zoning for Port Company land at Naval Point. Modify Boat Harbour Zone rules to allow community buildings and associated activities (max height 15m) and new or modifications to launching ramps and break water structures as Permitted Activities.
Naval Point Club Lyttelton	Zoning	The Club submits the following: The area of land owned by Christchurch City Council zoned Boat Harbour under the existing Banks Peninsula District Plan should be included in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan and retain its Boat Harbour zone (with modifications as submitted below) and, the area of land owned by Lyttelton Port Company in the Naval Point area currently zoned Boat Harbour should retain its existing purpose in support of recreational boating and retain its Boat Harbour zone (with modifications as submitted below) or be excluded from the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan and retain its existing Boat Harbour zone.	Include all the Boat Harbour zoned area and adjoining coastal marina area in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. The Club submits that all this land should retain its existing purpose in support of recreational boating within the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan with Zoning and Rules similar to the existing Boat Harbour Zone but with amendments specifically enabling a number of permitted activities (ref to submission) or If some of the existing Boat Harbour Zone area is not to be included in the LPRP then the Club submits that the Plan should exclude all of the existing Boat Harbour Zone land (including that owned by LPC) from the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan.
Timothy Hughes	Zoning	The Plan reduces the land area available for recreational boating at Naval Point. All this land should retain its existing purpose in support of recreational boating, and if anything will need to be expanded	Provide more land for recreational use at Naval Point and don't take it for other port purposes.
Lyttelton Community Association Inc	Zoning	The Port Overlay Zone is a feature of the District Plan, though it is not clear whether the Port Recovery Plan will remove this. LPC currently have powers normally exercised by a local authority which enable them to grant or prohibit activities in the town, but which lie outside their land.	We request that such powers be removed and be re-vested in the local authority.

NAVAL POINT

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Alastair Suren	Zoning	The Recovery Plan has an appendix the changes to the regional and district plans. It was not clear that a rezoning was to occur I had to go online to the CCC District Plan maps to find this out. It was not in any of the Appendices. Oppose the rezoning of Port Company owned land at Naval Point from Boat Harbour Zone to Port Activities. This land adjoining the Reserve and forming part of Charlotte Jane Quay, is approximately 1.4ha. No justification was given in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan to rezone this land. Doing so would be a significant loss of land available to support recreational activities at a time when a considerable area has been lost from potential development due to rock fall hazard. The Christchurch City Council is also proposing to rezone the Boat Harbour area to Open Space Metropolitan Facilities in its recently released Draft Replacement City Plan. This is also opposed the Boat Harbour Zoned land should all be included in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan with a zone similar to the existing Boat Harbour Zone but with Permitted Activities that include: Club, Coastguard and community building, boat storage and maintenance buildings, haul out yards, launching ramps, wave attenuation and associated structures.	Delay decision making on Dampier Bay until the CCC Naval Point development plan is progressed and the two are integrated. Further investigation may show that development of Naval Point is more suitable than Dampier Bay. Remove the proposed rezoning. Provide a slipway, also suitable for haul out, that are suitable for use in all weathers. Amend the Recovery Plan and Coastal Plan to provide a wave attenuating structure to protect existing facilities at Naval Point.
Canterbury Yachting Association	Zoning	We support the inclusion of this land in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan with a zone similar to the existing Boat Harbour Zone but with Permitted Activities that include: Club, Coastguard and community building, boat storage and maintenance buildings, launching ramps, wave attenuation and associated structures and the removal of the old Lyttelton Marina piles.	Include all the Boat Harbour zoned area and adjoining coastal marina area in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. I submit that all this land should retain its existing purpose in support of recreational boating within the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan with Zoning and Rules similar to the existing Boat Harbour Zone.
Andrew Stark	Zoning	We support the rezoning of Port Company owned land at Naval Point from Boat Harbour Zoned to Port Activities.	None
Yachting New Zealand	Zoning	Yachting New Zealand submits the following: The area of land owned by Christchurch City Council zoned Boat Harbour under the existing Banks Peninsula District Plan should be included in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan and retain its Boat Harbour zone (with modifications as submitted below) and, the area of land owned by Lyttelton Port Company in the Naval Point area currently zoned Boat Harbour should retain its existing purpose in support of recreational boating and retain its Boat Harbour zone (with modifications as submitted below) or be excluded from the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan and retain its existing Boat Harbour zone.	Include all the Boat Harbour zoned area and adjoining coastal marina area in the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. The Club submits that all this land should retain its existing purpose in support of recreational boating within the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan with Zoning and Rules similar to the existing Boat Harbour Zone but with amendments or If all the Boat Harbour Zone area is not to be included in the LRP then the Plan should exclude all of the existing Boat Harbour Zone land (including that owned by LPC) from the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan.

CONSTRUCTION

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Southshore Residents	Compliance	SRA has complained to ECan about washed up material, ECan staff have inspected, LPC responded by explaining quality control regime. Members of association toured reclamation site. Clear that current regime is not fool proof.	Ensure monitoring and permitting regime for reclamation material is continued for future reclamation activity.
Governors Bay Amenity Preservation Society	Noise	The initial noise from the construction of the reclamation area and the ongoing noise from cranes and vehicles affect the people of the Harbour Basin depending on wind direction. The current LPRP plan seems to focus more on mahinga kai, but little consideration given to the other marine life occupying our harbour. There does not appear to be enough information regarding the effect of storm water, turbidity, dredging on the marine environment and how this will be managed.	Would like more information
Matthew Ross	Noise	I submit that the preliminary draft Recovery Plan is amended to preclude piling activities at the weekend. The noise associated with recent piling activities has been particularly noticeable in Diamond Harbour (please find attached video to illustrate the particularly intrusive nature of this activity) and is often audible indoors. It has disturbed pets and detracted from the amenity value of outside spaces including private gardens, reserves, cliff track, and beaches.	Providing for a weekend free of piling noise would positive contribute to the well-being of people in Diamond Harbour during the 10-15year construction period.
Maike Fichtner	Noise	The noise and water pollution from the current work is a substantial negative influence on the quiet and clean surroundings in Diamond Harbour and Purau. For it to carry in for a further 9 years is not acceptable.	N/A
Green Party	Other	The length of the plan period and the construction works means that LPC and ECan should consider establishing a Liaison committee where all the harbour basin communities are represented and construction impacts such as noise can be dealt with.	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p10 Management of Construction Effects - We note this paragraph contains no reference to communities of Diamond Harbour and the other southern bays. For residents and visitors, especially those enjoying coastal walking tracks, construction effects will be significant. In particular, noise effects are likely to be quite intrusive at times (they already are). Moreover adverse effects look likely to continue for many years.	Include a sentence which specifically acknowledges the significant and ongoing adverse effects of construction on southern bay communities.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Traffic	Section 3.9, page 44. There is no mention of Construction Traffic effects. LPC indicated in its Information Package, November 2014, Appendix 12, that peak construction traffic volumes in 2020 could reach similar levels to those predicted for heavy vehicle freight in 2026. The effects of this construction traffic will need to be managed.	Amend section 3.9, second paragraph, as follows: Construction activities affect the community mainly through noise, vibration, and discharges to air and disruption caused by construction traffic .
New Zealand Transport Agency	Traffic	21.8.1.2 (i). We support this policy and considers it is consistent with the Transport Agency's request that LPC provide a Construction Traffic Management Plan as part of its CEMP. (Refer submission point 15). (See Mr Blyleven's evidence, paras 52 and 65).	Amend the proposed amendments to the pdLPRP to include a requirement for Construction Traffic Management Plan as part of the CEMP.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Traffic	Section 4.7, page 67. The Transport Agency agrees that the effects of construction include effects on traffic movement. These effects will largely be generated by construction traffic and can be adequately controlled and mitigated. However the CEMP referred to in the LPRP does not include the requirement for construction temporary traffic management plan(s). The Transport Agency suggests that the proposed amendments to the pdLPRP should be amended to require the CEMP to include a construction traffic management plan. (Refer submission point 23).	No change to this clause. However, amendments are required to the proposed amendments to the pdLPRP to require the adoption of a construction traffic management plan as part of the CEMP.
Maike Fichtner	Water Quality	The noise and water pollution from the current work is a substantial negative influence on the quiet and clean surroundings in Diamond Harbour and Purau. For it to carry in for a further 9 years is not acceptable. I am especially concerned about plans for extension, as they do not fall under the term of recovery. The constant hammering and is very distracting and difficult to listen to, as it is very constant. Maintaining and improving water quality is very important to me, as a swimmer and bird watcher.	N/A

GOLLANS BAY

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Access	p42 (Section 3.8.5) Recreation Opportunities at Gollans Bay - Opportunity - make use of exiting public access rights to access the small sandy beach at Gollans Bay for recreation. When the Sumner Road Re-Opening Project is completed, it could be re-opened to pedestrians. Although it is a formed legal road it was always locked to vehicles, but was open to pedestrians outside quarry operating hours. The Recovery Plan appears to incorporate a length of Old Sumner Road into the new haul road between the quarry and reclamation. If existing public access rights are to be taken away by port recovery activity, we ask that replacement access rights be provided as compensation along	Amend Recovery Plan to include provisions which secure alternative public access to the foreshore at Gollans Bay beach.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage	Battery Point is entered on the NZ Heritage List and is the only site in Canterbury where coastal defence structures were set up to protect the country against three different threats of invasion, during the 1880s Russian scare, World War 1 and World War 2. Heritage NZ is uncertain whether this area will be impacted by quarrying activity or what environmental measures will be taken to ensure that adverse effects on development will be mitigated.	That the LPRP provides clarity regarding the future use and management of Battery Point Historic Area.
Green Party	Other	I oppose the provision that the quarrying application not be publicly notified. There is still too much uncertainty about the management of the quarry and the use of rock from the cliff faces above Evans Pass Road. How the road re-opening and rock blasting and benching is to occur will have a significant impact on the cliffs and harbour landscapes and natural character. Noise from blasting and quarrying, and its hours of operation will potentially affect harbour communities and harbour users.	Amend the plan so that an application for quarrying in Gollans Bay Quarry is a discretionary or restricted discretionary activity that will be publicly notified.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p56 (Section 4.1.3) - The operation of the Gollans Bay Quarry depends on other projects, including the Sumner Road Re-Opening Project.	At the end of the brown text entitled "Timing," add: ...including the Sumner Road Re-Opening Project
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Stormwater	p56 (Section 4.1.3) Gollans Bay Quarry Storm water Management - Extra care is needed to ensure storm water from the Gollans Bay Quarry area is not discharged to the stream running down to Gollans Bay beach. The stream runs under the former Lyttelton Borough Council rubbish dump, which could contain almost anything including substances toxic to living organisms. Increased storm water volumes passing through the landfill could scour out the contents and result in contaminants entering the stream's lower reaches and the coastal marine environment at Gollans Bay beach.	If not already accounted for, include specific provisions in the Gollans Bay Quarry storm water management plan to prevent storm water from the Gollans Bay Quarry area to be discharged to the stream running down to Gollans Bay beach.
Frances Therese James	Visual	Gollans Bay is an eye sore at the moment and further excavation is likely to worsen it.	The CCC comply with their responsibility to control matters such as slope stability, natural hazards, ecology and rehabilitation.
Juliet Neill	Visual	The potential visual pollution from quarrying is not mentioned. Also, beyond the use of quarry rock, and rock from the Sumner Road repair, no mention is made of what sort of additional fill will have to be trucked in.	Provide evidence of what can be done to mitigate visual pollution from quarrying, and what will be used to complete the vast area of reclamation.
Diamond Harbour Community Association; Pete Simpson	Visual	4.1.3 - Oppose the provision that the application not be publicly notified. There is still too much uncertainty about the management of the quarry and the use of rock from the cliff faces above Evans Pass Road. This has a significant landscape effect on the residents of Diamond Harbour.	An application for quarrying in Gollans Bay Quarry will be publicly notified.
Green Party	Visual	The Plan fails to consider the adverse impacts of blasting and quarrying of the bluffs on public conservation land above the Lyttelton Evans Pass - Sumner Road and the impacts this will have on biodiversity and landscape values. Rock from here will presumably be used to provide fill for the reclamation so it is a consequential effect of the plan. The bluffs are in two DOC scenic reserves. They are habitat for threatened species including lizards and plants such as the Canterbury forget-me not. The resource consent application to re-open the road was pushed through by the City Council under emergency legislation without proper public consultation. That application did not suggest that the rock would be used in the proposed new 27 ha reclamation. If the bluffs, and not just the Gollans Bay quarry, are to be used as a rock source for the reclamation, the effects of this should be addressed in this Plan. The bluffs are a strong remaining element of natural character in part of the harbour which has been modified by the port and deserve greater recognition and protection.	Amend the Plan to strengthen the protection which objectives, policies and methods provide for landscape features in the vicinity of the port. Amend the geographic area covered by the Plan to include the land to Evan Pass as being directly affected (as potential rock source) by the Port's reclamation plans. Require the City Council and LPC to apply for a publicly notified resource consent under the RMA if any rock from the bluffs above the Lyttelton-Evans Pass is to be taken and used in the proposed reclamation.

WHOLE OF HARBOUR ISSUES

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lesley Shand	Environments Effects	Over the years I have noticed ongoing port related developments and significant changes on the harbour's natural environment. The proposals identified in The Proposed Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan are the greatest in extent, beyond anything which has occurred before. I am concerned at these new proposals as the consequential impact will have very significant adverse effects on the Harbour's Natural Environment.	To say the effects are minor or able to be managed, indicates more assessment of effects Work should be done.
Diamond Harbour Community Association	Intergrated Management Plan	Support the Integrated Management Plan for the harbour. However there is no commitment by Environment Canterbury and the LPC to fund implementation of the plan. This is an important compensatory measure for the loss of natural amenity, public space and disturbance to the marine area and wildlife from the reclamation.	Add a provision that Environment Canterbury and LPC will commit funding to the implementation of the Integrated Management Plan for the harbour. The sum LPC to commit, to be tied a percentage of the value of increased container traffic from the reclamation.
Matthew Ross	Intergrated Management Plan	I support the commitment to develop an integrated management plan for Whakaraupō/Lyttelton Harbour - section 8.	I submit that Action 7 is amended to include a commitment that Environment Canterbury, LPC, Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu will sign off on the completed integrated management plan prior to any hearings process on the Te Awaparahi Bay Reclamation. This will help to ensure that the cultural, social, environmental and economic well-being of the wider harbour is addressed in parallel with the consideration of the effects of Te Awaparahi Reclamation.
Pete Simpson	Intergrated Management Plan	Support the Integrated Management Plan for the harbour. However there is no commitment by Environment Canterbury and the LPC to fund implementation of the plan. This is an important compensatory measure for the loss of natural amenity, public space and disturbance to the marine area and wildlife from the reclamation.	Add a provision that Environment Canterbury and LPC will commit funding to the implementation of the Integrated Management Plan for the harbour. The sum LPC to commit to be tied a percentage of the value of increased container traffic from the reclamation and also the total fees received from passenger shipping lines for their use of Port facilities.
Juliet Neill	Intergrated Management Plan	Claims about retaining the harbour health are vague. Who monitors this, and what action is taken if the health of the harbour is badly affected?	More information is needed on how the plan will protect the health of the harbour.
Rewi Couch	Intergrated Management Plan	I submit my support for a whole harbour approach as it was intended. The whole Harbour approach was intended to address concerns about too greater focus on localised environmental impact and that peripheral and accumulative effects were not being adequately addressed. It was intended that Environmental and Cultural Restoration opportunities be given consideration before the event not monitoring lost opportunity's after the event. It was intended that increased biosecurity risk be negated not monitored. In the past some significant Biosecurity breaches have been contained within the inner harbour, when shipping moves to outer harbour a biosecurity breach will rapidly contaminate the whole harbour .	The plan needs to provide Certainty, i.e.; Can LPC provide certainty around Bio security concerns?
Governors Bay Community Association	Intergrated Management Plan	The Plan states that it records an agreement between Environment Canterbury, Rāpaki and LPC to develop a whole of harbour management plan to improve the health of the Harbour and that interested parties will be invited to participate. It is not clear how it will do this. It is not considered satisfactory to merely refer to such a whole of harbour management plan without providing some details. Given that the CER Act allows widespread exemption from existing legislative requirements any such whole of harbour plan will have to be developed after the effects of the LPRP are a fait accompli. A whole of harbour management plan should be being developed as an integral part of the LPRP.	Environment Canterbury with support from the Lyttelton Port Company provides the financial and staff assistance to prepare a Catchment Management Plan with full engagement with the communities of the harbour. That the development and implementation of a Whakaraupō/Lyttelton Harbour Management Plan be driven by the community with financial and staff support from Environment Canterbury and LPC.
Lyttelton Harbour / Whakaraupo Issues Group	Other	The Group partially supports the Integrated Management Plan. LHWIG long promoted need for integrated approach - difficultly in getting ongoing party commitments in past. Note that CCC not a party in current proposal, they have significant role. Non-statutory undertakings often have high time and cost, but do not always provide effective long term benefits. CCC/ECan commitment in 2005/6 abandoned. LHWIG support and promote integrated approach but this should not be instead of parties meeting statutory responsibilities.	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p7 We fully support development of a Whakaraupō/Lyttelton Harbour Management Plan with wide community involvement.	No change

WHOLE OF HARBOUR ISSUES

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Greg Clydesdale	Other	If the local runanga or any other community group want to restore water flows for the purpose of mahinga kai, traditional use, recreation or conservation, they will have to apply for a resource consent that could cost at least \$250,000. This represents such a formidable barrier that many worthy goals regarding the environment cannot be achieved. For example of future dredging needs might include the dredging between Quail Island and Moepuku peninsula. This is desirable for two reasons. First, this entrance is important for water to flush and maintain the health of the upper harbor. This in turn affects the quality of seafood. Secondly, rodents can run across the mud-flats from Moepuku Peninsula to Quail Island.	LPC should acquire resource consent to dredge areas of the harbor for community groups so that the dredging can be done as concern arises without the need for community groups to apply for a resource consent. However, there would be strict restrictions on this: The consent is for community groups not individuals. For example, it could include the runanga at Rapaki, Quail Island Restoration trust, Orton Bradley Park, etc; It will not be done for profit or solely commercial enterprises. The dredging must not exceed the depth of the soil that existed before human activity occurred in that particular area. In other words, the dredging can only restore the depth prior to the introduction of human activity on the harbor and hills.
Juliet Neill	Pollution	Natural Environment and Contamination. Contamination of the harbour through pollution and noise is unacceptable. There is insufficient evidence in the plan that these will be well monitored and that wildlife, recreation and fishing will not suffer. On Page 55 it mentions that dolphins will be monitored, but if they are found to be affected, no action is suggested.	Clear evidence should be provided to show that there will be no further water or noise contamination of the harbour. Regular monitoring should be engaged in, and the plan for a course of action in the event of pollution must be made. It is not enough to merely monitor wildlife, but a guarantee of action to mitigate negative effects, should they occur, must be made.
Governors Bay Amenity Preservation Society	Sedimentation	We see conflicting evidence of continued sedimentation in the upper harbour, especially on the northern side of the upper harbour. Conclusions reached by Environment Canterbury, Appendix 14 seem to dispute Hart etc. (2008). This is also supported by the anecdotal evidence obtained from interviewing local residents about changes they have observed in the harbour (a report commissioned by the Lyttelton Harbour/Whakaraupō Issues Group.	N/A
Governors Bay Community Association	Sedimentation	Concerns: continued sedimentation in the upper harbour, in particular accumulation on northern side. Notes ECan conclusion on reclamation effects. Notes Hart et al. (2008) conclusion - catchment erosion main source of sedimentation. While no hard evidence to dispute the conclusions, think it is relevant to note possible link between sediment accumulation asymmetry and construction of Cashin Quay and breakwater. Notes Hart (2004) figures for accretion and compares to Goff (2005). The asymmetry in deposition rates in upper harbour is probably related to the asymmetry in tidal circulation, likely that the quay and breakwater have further strengthened the asymmetry, notes Hart (2013). Anecdotal evidence from local residents documented in a report (Opinions Market Research Ltd 2013) is consistent with these comments. We therefore submit that while the proposed reclamation may have little further effect in worsening the continuing intertidal mudflat accumulation in Governors Bay, the present conditions and continuing trends represent a partial legacy from earlier port developments. Support commissioning of studies by LPC, provide contributions to understanding harbour. Improvements could be made in assessment of wind-driven circulation.	We seek as part of the Ports normal operation that the Port dredge the upper end of the harbour at regular intervals to provide a sink for sediments recognising the liquid nature of the sediments in the harbour. This would not only create a better water flow at the south end of the harbour but would also give an extra boost to potential use of a restored jetty given its poor condition was in part due to neglect when owned by the Harbour Board.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Sedimentation	p20 (Section 2.4.1) Sedimentation In Harbour - The quantity of sediment entering the harbour with every rain event is a concern for everyone living here, not just tangata whenua - most pressing environmental problem. Concerned not just about infilling in the upper harbour but also the long term adverse effects of turbidity on marine ecology, particularly biodiversity, and water quality for recreation. This is why we support the Recovery Plan's statement that none of the port's activities should worsen existing problems such as sedimentation (refer Submission Point 2). In past written statements, the port has argued that most sedimentation is caused by land use (which is probably true) and consequently the small contribution made by port activities does not matter. This attitude does not help as only if every landowner works to reduce their input will the problem of sedimentation begin to improve.	Address sedimentation as a separate issue rather than a sub clause of 2.4 Tangata Whenua Association With and aspirations for Whakaraupō / Lyttelton Harbour.

WHOLE OF HARBOUR ISSUES

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Sedimentation	p39 (Section 3.7) We support the statement €œ... it is important to ensure that the port's rebuild and reconfiguration do not worsen sedimentation problems in the harbour€œOur community needs a Recovery Plan which guarantees reclamation and dredging will not contribute to further modification of harbour circulation patterns and sedimentation problems. LPC argues the reclamation will make no difference to the above and ECan's experts agree, but we know there is plenty of anecdotal evidence that port activities have contributed to changes in the past. We need to be certain what is proposed in the Recovery Plan will improve the harbour environment, not worsen it.	No change
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Sedimentation	Included should be a direction to explore the possibility of dredging in areas of the harbour that would benefit mahinga kai.	Included should be a direction to explore the possibility of dredging in areas of the harbour that would benefit mahinga kai.
Helen Chambers	Sedimentation	Opinions vary as to what has caused the build up of sediment in the upper harbour especially on the northern shore. Some evidence points to the building of the Cashin Quay breakwater as being the cause. (Conclusions reached by Ecan, Appendix 14 seem to dispute Hart et al(2008) If that is so then the building of the reclamation area to the extent of the breakwater with the added€œto angle of repose beyond could add to sedimentation. I am concerned that the effect on the cockle beds at Rāpaki, the effect on fish and other marine life in the harbour will be further effected. There is no management plan put forward as to how this will be dealt with.	Reduce the area of reclamation to ten hectares remove the outer extent of the breakwater and use it for fill in the new area.
Melanie Dixon	Sedimentation	There is a large amount of anecdotal evidence around the adverse effects of harbour reclamation on tidal patterns and sedimentation. The Lyttelton Harbour/Whakaraupō Issues Group study has documented many of the anecdotal historical records regarding the effects of the building of Cashin Quay and the Breakwater. The impacts of the reclamation have not been fully studied in light of this report.	I would like to see Ecan further its studies into potential changes in water flow and sedimentation, in light of the LHWIG report and to put in place remedial action for the damage done to the harbour environment to date.
Juliet Neill	Sedimentation	No evidence provided to show that the sedimentation patterns will not change.	Provide evidence to show that sedimentation patterns will not change.
Rewi Couch	Sedimentation	As a long term resident and mahinga kai (food gatherer) of Whakaraupō (Lyttelton Harbour) I can testify to some of the detrimental effects that have occurred in this harbour over the last 55 years, that I attribute to the construction of Cashin Quay. When Cashin Quay was built sediment appeared on our foreshore, smothering 90% of our Kai Moana, it has stayed that way ever since. Reclamation and breakwaters have dramatically changed the way water flows in and out of upper Lyttelton Harbour.	Uncertainties highlight the critical need for further research. Some research is still being completed and not yet available for consideration. The timeframe of this process has not allowed for the full attention permanent and irreversible require.
R M (Max) Manson	Sedimentation	I am eighty and have lived here a large part of my life. Because of silt build-up in the inner harbour and with removal and no replacement of shell from our beaches, all of this caused by tidal changes since Cashin Quay was built. Wearing away of clay banks e.g. between No.1 and No.8 Charteris Bay Road. The build up of silt and pollution in the harbour has severely restricted new shell growth.	I oppose further reclamation.
Green Party	Water Quality	LPCS storm water management is poor. The Plan notes that repair work provides an opportunity to upgrade storm water treatment but fails to require it.	Include new plan provisions or amend ones in existing statutory plans to require: Significant improvements in storm water management and quality through installation of sumps and storm water treatment. Require hard surfaces to be regularly swept and kept clean to minimise material being washed into the harbour. Greater monitoring and enforcement of management plans by ECan to ensure that consent conditions are adhered to.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Water Quality	p68 (Section 4.8) Integrated Catchment Management Plan - We support the intention of the Recovery Plan to address water quality issues, especially sedimentation, in Lyttelton Harbour. We need a Recovery Plan which helps us restore and maintain ecological health of the harbour, not just for mahinga kai but also so dolphins, seals, penguins, crayfish and all sea life can thrive.	No change

WHOLE OF HARBOUR ISSUES

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Water Quality	Water quality of the wider Lyttelton Harbour is within the scope of the Recovery Plan. The water quality standard for Whakaraupō o excluding the Inner Harbour area, should be Mahinga Kai (Class Coastal SG). Environment Canterbury, shall as part of the work of the Joint Committee, be directed to consider the desirability of setting rules in the RCEP which provide for minimum standards of water quality, and the desirability of reviewing conditions of existing consents.	Action 7 be amended to direct Environment Canterbury and the Christchurch City Council to establish a Joint Committee, must provide funding for the Joint Committee in their Long Term Plans. Action 7 should be part of the statutory directions. The Committee should be directed to consider the desirability of setting rules in the RCEP to provide for minimum water quality standards, and the review of existing consents to meet those standards.
Mark Watson	Water quality	Restore and maintain the ecological health of the harbour not just for mahinga kai but also so dolphins, seals, penguins, crayfish, and all sea life can thrive.	N/A

GENERAL

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Green Party	Air quality	LPC's consent conditions controlling the discharge of dust from bulk cargo handling appear to be breached regularly. Bulk handling operations regularly result in nuisance dust settling on cars left overnight in Lyttelton and obvious water contamination in the inner harbour. Bulk cargo unloading work is not always stopped when windy weather conditions cause dust movement despite recent ECan reports that state LPC staff are monitoring and controlling this issue closely. LPC management plans (accepted by ECan) allow bulk unloading at wind speeds that cause breaches of the consent conditions.	Include new plan provisions or amend ones in existing statutory plans to require: proper containment of bulk materials to ensure no air or water pollution.
Governors Bay Community Association	Air Quality	Plan skirts around important air quality issues, e.g. dust control and management of ships. Measures are not listed to mitigate many of known toxins in dust emissions from trucks, ships and coal trains. Health effects not discussed. Coal dust health effects not addressed. Only new action to reduce effects of emissions is moving activities, dependent on reclamation. This is not a true effort to mitigate. The CEMP chapter on dust management is missing. Meteorological effects not discussed, any increase in dust pollution will result in increased effects due to prevailing winds. Air quality monitoring referred to was short term and occurred in 2003, suggest monitoring to occur as baseline. Policies for air quality focus on environmental effects, LPRP must address potential effects for health, plan has not done that. Large ships contribute significantly to air pollution around ports, can observe this in Lyttelton, there needs to be a strategy to address emissions from large ships. Recommend LPC and ECan enforce engine and fuel standards. Health effects from diesel emissions have not been discussed. Recommend LPC enforce MARPOL Annex VI programme.	That LPC with policy support from Environment Canterbury enforce international engine and fuel standards for ships entering and berthing within the port and that the Port is designated as an Emission Control Area for air quality. A chapter on the management of dust and pollution is added to the Plan and is implemented.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Air quality	LPC generally supports the LPRP provisions to be contained in the proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan, subject to amendments:	Amendments to pCARP: (a) including a new policy in section 6; (b) to Rule 7.29A; (c) to notification provisions; and (d) any other changes to give effect to the intent of this submission.
Mr James Crook	Economic Benefit	I support all the provisions of the plan. The economy of Canterbury (and NZ) is dependent upon the Port working to capacity.	Provisions for harbour dredging and wharves for longer ships should take priority if their is problems with funding the whole plan.
Mr Ernesto Henriod	General	I fully support the proposed improvements to the Port	N/A
Solid Energy New Zealand Limited	General	Solid Energy exports coal through Lyttelton Port, is a regular user of the Port and interested in its timely recovery, including expansion to cope with future freight demands. Solid Energy largely supports the framework that the LPRP provides for that recovery in relation to the Coastal Plan and District Plan. Solid Energy considers that the other amendments will result in LPRP that is in accordance with the Minister's Direction under the CER Act 2011 and the CER Act 2011 itself.	The amendments and relief sought by LPC, with the exception of those changes that relate to notification provisions.
Director General of Conservation	General	The Director-General is neutral on the preliminary draft LPRP.	
Lyttelton Harbour / Whakaraupo Issues Group	General	The Group supports: the concept of a LPRP, requirement of a robust and transparent process to achieve an approved plan as a basis for agreed outcomes and recovery; the principle that the LPRP should not be limited to only repairing the existing infrastructure damaged in the earthquake but within reason can consider the foreseeable needs and improvements for the port's operational activities.	
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	General	LPC seeks some amendments to the LPRP. Detailed information on the relief sought by LPC, notated as tracked changes to the LPRP provisions, is included as appendices to submission. LPC generally supports the addition of Chapter 10 to the Regional Coastal Environment Plan, subject to amendments.	
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	General	LPC supports the LPRP provisions to the proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan.	Retain the proposed LWRP provisions.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	General	LPC considers that the Natural Resources Regional Plan and the Land and Vegetation Management Regional Plan apply and should be amended.	LPC also seeks amendments to the Natural Resources Regional Plan, to include Rules WQL106, WQL49, BLR9 and corresponding advice notes, and to the Land and Vegetation Management Regional Plan, to include Rule 7 and a corresponding advice note.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	General	LPC generally supports the introduction of a standalone chapter providing for Port recovery (excepting with regard to natural hazards and heritage buildings), but seeks amendments as detailed.	

GENERAL

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	General	LPC seek amendments to maps included in LPRP to show full navigational channel	Map 5.7 - differs to maps provided to ECan in 2014, reclamation envelope 80m less in width than required, seek amendment to provide for dimensions included on Appendix D. Map 5.3 - LPC seeks amendment to include full length of navigation channel extension Map 5.6 - amendment to include all wharf structures
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	General	We completely support Lyttelton Port Company (LPC) having the ability to "build back better" to make the structures stronger and more resilient, to build in modern storm water treatment systems, and reconfigure the layout so it works better. We accept the repairs need to happen and quickly, we accept a simplified process is justified, and we see many benefits, particularly for the Lyttelton community, in the "Port to the East" concept.	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	General	Community needs for recovery: heavy port traffic off Norwich Quay, public access to the inner harbour waterfront, make the most of what heritage remains then build anew, cruise ship terminal facilities designed to enable a contribution to the local economy.	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	General	p33 (Section 3.3) Larger Container Ships - We note the qualifier: "It is expected that more ships in the 5,000-7,000 TEU range will be visiting New Zealand ports in the future, although the actual size of future ships and likely timing of this deployment is difficult to forecast". All development comes at a cost to the community. It particularly concerns us that the scale of development enabled by the Recovery Plan will have significant environmental and social costs but may turn out to be unnecessary. This is one of the reasons we are uneasy about all the provisions in the Recovery Plan which facilitate larger ships. Given uncertainty around size of future ships and timing of deployment, we support a precautionary approach to providing infrastructure for larger ships.	Amend provisions to use a precautionary approach to providing infrastructure for larger ships, which considers environmental and social costs of development alongside uncertainty of size and deployment of future ships.
New Zealand Transport Agency	General	The Transport Agency has worked collaboratively with ECan in the development of the LPRP and supports its enabling approach as necessary for the recovery of the Port. The Transport Agency seeks a range of amendments to ensure readability and clarity for users and to address a number of technical issues.	Retain with the amendments detailed below and any consequential amendments required to give effect to those amendments specifically noted below.
New Zealand Transport Agency	General	Section 5.1.3, pages 76 to 81. There are a variety of key terms used in section 5.1.3 and the LPRP as a whole, however, there are no definitions of these terms in the Glossary and it is not clear how these relate to the defined terms set out in the proposed amendments to the pRDP. These terms include: non-port marine related Port related Port activities Port operational activities	Consider whether key terms should be defined in the Glossary, ensuring that definitions are consistent with defined terms in the proposed amendments to various plans.
New Zealand Transport Agency	General	Section 6, page 88. The Transport Agency agrees with the inclusion of the funding table and level of detail provided. The costs associated with the Transport Network upgrades cannot be clarified until more information is available (likely to be in more than five years' time).	Retain
New Zealand Transport Agency	General	The Transport Agency supports the enabling approach of the proposed amendments to the pRDP, and other planning documents. This approach is consistent with recovery.	Retain with the amendments detailed below and any consequential amendments required to give effect to those specifically noted below.
Z Energy Ltd, Mobil Oil NZ Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd	General	The Oil Companies' are generally supportive of the intent of the Preliminary Draft LPRP. Facilities affected by earthquake, proved resilient, some damage at the terminals. Mobil's Naval Point terminal has suffered from landslide - potential further cliff collapse risk to part of Z Energy diesel terminal and Godley Quay. Oil Companies support the upgrade of the dangerous goods wharf over which all fuels supplies pass.	
Mr Peter McBride	General	I support the plan overall	No change or speed it up
Christchurch City Holdings Limited	General	CCHL considers that the LPRP generally provides for the recovery of the Port.	CCHL seek the amendments and relief sought by LPC.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	General	Too many controlled activity rules requiring public notification	Some of the controlled activiteis could be processed as non-notified.

GENERAL

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Governors Bay Community Association	Geographic Scope	LPRP does not appear to adhere to the direction given by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery. Geographic scope has been reduced to Lyttelton and the inner working harbour. The direction is clear - scope must consider the issues and effects outside of the geographic extent of the RP. Plan isolates port - produces 'bubble plan', does not take into account ongoing, long term effects on whole harbour. Not convinced that environmental effects of Port recovery are minor or can be managed, plan does not state how effects will be managed.	The Plan's geographic extent is broadened to include all the communities of the Lyttelton Harbour. And with this that something is offered to surrounding communities. We seek that the Lyttelton Port Company are directed to create an environmental fund using profits that are directed toward remediating and improving the effects, including historical effects of the development and operation of the Port on the harbour environs.
Lyttelton Harbour / Whakaraupo Issues Group	Geographic Scope	The Group opposes, has serious concerns, and seeks amendments on many aspects of the pdLPRP, including: 3) Scope of the Recovery Plan - note the pdLPRP limited to clauses 4.1 and 4.2, not addressed 4.3 of Minister's direction. Very significantly confines geographic extent of pdLPRP and ensures other aspects of plan not properly addressed - considered negligent, needs to be fully rectified.	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Geographic Scope	p13 (Section 2.2) Sumner Road Re-Opening Project - Accept the Recovery Plan specifically excludes Sumner Road / Evans Pass due to the scope of the Minister's Direction. Do not think the effects of the Recovery Plan can be considered in isolation from works; Sumner Road, the crater rim, Gollans Bay - cumulative effect. Accept that receiving landscape modified pre-earthquakes, the Recovery Plan and Sumner Road Re-Opening Project - change in the landscape of Lyttelton Harbour and a significant reduction of landscape quality. Greatest effect on residents of Diamond Harbour and the other southern bays, recreationalists around the harbour, and for visitors arriving by cruise ship. Do not accept that the Recovery Plan should be completely silent on the Project	Amend to acknowledge there is a cumulative landscape effect from the Sumner Road Re-Opening Project and landscape changes proposed in the Recovery Plan.
New Zealand Transport Agency	Geographic Scope	Section 2.2, page 13; Figure 1, page 14-15. It is not clear from the discussion in Section 2.2 or Figure 1, that the LPRP has scope over Godley Quay and Simeon Quay. However, these roads have been included in transport discussions in developing the LPRP and are referred to in the proposed amendments to the pRDP (see Rule 21.8.3.2.6(b) and (c)). The Transport Agency considers these roads should fall within the scope of the LPRP because they are directly adjacent to and provide access to Dampier Bay, Naval Point and Norwich Quay.	Amend text in Section 2.2 and Figure 1 to clarify that the LPRP has scope over Godley Quay and Simeon Quay.
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Geographic Scope	The entire harbour is properly and legally included in the Recovery Plan. If this is not the case, then the proposed reclamation, the capital dredging and the main channel must also be excluded from the draft Recovery Plan.	The entire harbour is properly and legally included in the Recovery Plan. If this is not the case, then the proposed reclamation, the capital dredging and the main channel must also be excluded from the draft Recovery Plan.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage	The archaeological assessment recognises the commitment of the port to recognise and identify pre-1900 archaeological sites and structures within the operational area of the Port. Whilst some of the wharf structures are pre-1900, none are individually identified as items on the heritage list.	Heritage NZ notes that an application for archaeological authority for the modification of pre-1900 structures has been granted to LPC to enable earthquake recovery. No relief is sort in relation to this submission point.
Paul Ensor	Heritage	Heritage and evaluation of the relationship of the inner harbour to the Lyttelton Town Centre. It is imperative that any repair and development plan cherishes and enhances what heritage remains of the inner harbour of Lyttelton Port. Noting the proposed plan permits the demolition of the three inner harbour wharves 4, 5 and 6.	That the wharves 4, 5 and 6 be retained and repaired (in accord with heritage values). The surrounding area and the wharves because of direct access (walking distance and direct visual connection) be opened for public access, used for the Harbour ferry and charter boats and integrated into the proposed Dampier Bay development. This would enhance the development and commercial integrity of Lyttelton Town Centre.
Mark Watson	Heritage	A plan which makes the most of what heritage remains and build on it. Not a plan which permits the demolition of the three pre-1900 wharves 4, 5, and 6. These are part of our maritime heritage. They are not used much for port operations these days.	With a bit of investment public access to the waterfront could be provided here right now without having to wait for an unknown length of time for port operations to move east.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage	Supports policy 10.1.14	That policy 10.1.14 protection of historical structures is adopted into the plan.

GENERAL

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Heritage	p8 Pre-1900 Wharves We are opposed to demolition of pre-1900 finger wharves 4, 5, and 6 as these have heritage value. Even though the pre-1900 wharves may not be nationally or regionally significant they are crucial to a town where so much heritage has been lost. The pre-1900 wharves would add great value to a public open space/maritime precinct as shown in Attachment 1 - Option 1 Plan - Alternative Public Access to Inner Harbour Waterfront. Option 1 meets Recovery Plan Goal 3(c) (page 11), Complementing the re-development of the Lyttelton town centre, Better than the proposed Dampier Bay development.	Delete provisions which make demolition of pre-1900 wharves 4, 5 and 6 a permitted activity. Make their demolition a discretionary activity and include in the matters for assessment: "potential to add value to inner harbour public open space provisions."
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Heritage	p54 (Section 4.1.2) The Recovery Plan permits repair, rebuild and demolition of existing inner harbour port structures. We support this EXCEPT for the demolition of pre-1900 wharves 4, 5 and 6. We oppose provisions in the Recovery Plan which permit demolition of these three wharves.	Delete provisions which make demolition of pre-1900 wharves 4, 5 and 6 a permitted activity. Make their demolition a discretionary activity and include: "potential to add value to inner harbour public open space provisions" in the matters for assessment.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Inner Harbour	We seek clarification on the permitted activity status for repairs or replacement of the Dry Dock. It is a Category 1 historic place. The executive summary makes reference to a suite of activities which can occur as permitted activities in the Inner Harbour. These documents do not contain provisions which explicitly allow 'replacement' of the Dry Dock as a permitted activity. The appendices do not contain provisions which explicitly allow 'replacement' of the Dry Dock.	That the LPRP clearly indicates the intended activity status for activities relating to the Lyttelton Graving Dock and site.
Norwich Quay Historic Precinct Society	Inner Harbour	Our submission is it would be difficult to argue for the retention of wharves 5 and the remains of 6. However a good case for the retention of No 4 , being as it is from London St -a straight line down from Canterbury St. This could be connected to by a pedestrian bridge over the roadway and railway lines and is a visual connection between the town and the waterfront- just as Oxford St is at present. It could be used as a maritime heritage area at some time in the future.	Any changes to incorporate the retention of No.4 wharf for potential future use.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Inner Harbour	Rule 10.1 requires wharves built in replacement of old wharves to be used for the same purpose as the old wharf. This is problematic for the Port as the Port is not a static organisation and the use of wharves changes depending on demand.	Remove 'must be used for the same purpose as the original'
Green Party	Light	The Plan fails to consider adequately the adverse effects of light spill from port lighting on the natural environment of the harbour, the night sky and harbour communities. Light spill may also be affecting marine life and seabirds yet there is no assessment of these effects. The lights at the container terminal spill light some distance beyond Cashin Quay and are very visible from Diamond Harbour. This is not efficient use of energy.	Require LPC to prepare and submit an assessment of the effects of light spill. Amend Plan provisions to limit maximum light spill onto residential properties to no more than 1 lux for port lighting that operates throughout the night, and that port operational lighting be required to have a 70 degree cut-off angle. Require all LPC lighting towers to be upgraded to a 70 degree light cut-off angle and <1 lux light-spill outside its operational areas.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Lighting	LPRP sets a height rule to facilitate recovery of port operations. Cranes are exempt from this.	Propose to amend the height limits of lighting as they have a clear functional need for health and safety requirements. Propose to exclude container stacks from this as well as they are not readily visible from the township.
Green Party	LPRP process	The limited time (four weeks) allowed for submissions is opposed as inadequate given the major impacts of the Plan proposal on the harbour basin, the hundreds of pages of technical documents and the considerable time which the Lyttelton Port Company Ltd (LPC) and the regional council have had to prepare the plan. The consultation appears somewhat cynical given the very limited time (two weeks) proposed to consider and analyse public submissions before the hearing and the likely absence of an officers' report on which submitters can comment in the hearing.	Ensure that the Minister provides at least six weeks for submissions on the draft Recovery Plan.
Green Party	LPRP structure	Plan format: The clear language and the use of aerial photos with overlays of the port infrastructure is supported. It makes the document accessible and easy to read. The effort that has gone into preparing a readable document in plain English with a minimum of planning waffle is appreciated.	
Director General of Conservation	Marine mammals	Lyttelton Port is within the Banks Peninsula Marine Mammal Sanctuary, established to protect the endangered Hector's Dolphin (see enclosed map 1).	That all reasonable and practicable steps are taken in the draft preliminary LPRP to address adverse effects of Lyttelton Port redevelopment and operation on marine mammals.
Green Party	Noise	The plan noise provisions appear to be a carryover of those agreed through Environment Court mediation to protect the amenity of Lyttelton residents. The expansion of the port to the east and the new container terminal is likely to have noise effects on southern bay communities.	Widen the application of the noise provisions to other harbour communities so that they can access funding for double glazing, sound insulation and are represented on the liaison committee.

GENERAL

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Noise	p68 (Section 4.7) Noise - Noise is dealt with under the existing Christchurch District Plan framework, which involves LPC working through a Port Liaison Committee. We do not support this approach as we have reservations about the effectiveness of the Committee. Owners of both commercial and residential properties within the Port Overlay Area who seek resource consent to build or alter their buildings have to obtain LPC approval and are required to sign a "no complaints" clause. Over time fewer and fewer residents are able to make complaints about noise and other port related nuisances.	Amend.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Noise	p68 (Section 4.7) We do not agree with the statement. Noise that is generated in the coastal marine area is generally an issue only in landward residential areas. It is a significant issue for communities on the south side of Lyttelton Harbour. It is an issue for marine mammals.	Delete this statement.
Mrs Ann Thorpe	Noise	That noise monitoring and the noise insulation programme be extended above the lower level of Reserve Terrace, given the rapid and continued projected growth of Port activities.	That noise monitoring and the noise insulation programme be extended above the lower level of Reserve Terrace, given the rapid and continued projected growth of Port activities.
Matthew Ross	Noise	I submit that the hearings commissioners seek specific assurances that the LPC information package relating to operational noise and construction noise has adequately addressed reflection of sound towards Diamond Harbour from the cliff faces and hills to the east of Lyttelton Township.	N/A
Director General of Conservation	NZCPS	A large number of New Zealand Policy Statement (NZCPS) Objectives and Policies are relevant. The area covered by the LPRP is partly within the Canterbury coastal marine area, which is covered by the Canterbury Regional Coastal Plan. The Regional Coastal Plan must give effect to the NZCPS. Consideration should be given to any cross boundary issues between the area covered by the Port Recovery Plan and the rest of the Canterbury coastal marine area.	That all relevant New Zealand Policy Statement objectives and policies are carefully addressed in the draft preliminary plan.
Director General of Conservation	NZCPS	The preliminary draft LPRP should also facilitate and integrate the management of historic heritage as outlined in Policy 17 (Historic Heritage identification and protection) and as far as practicable, control harmful aquatic organisms Policy 12 (Harmful Aquatic Organisms).	
Green Party	Operational area	The Plan fails to provide adequate information to enable submitters and the panel to compare the size of the existing operational area and the new one. It fails to provide adequate explanation of the implications of the extension on public access and use rights. Nor does it provide accurate information or maps on the difference between the current and expanded operational area and how much sea space is involved. The extension is strongly opposed.	Not proceed with any extension of the port operational area and clearly map the extent of the existing operational area.
Jillian Frater	Operational area	Figure 5 - My reasons for seeking this change are that the proposed line for the ports operational area is significantly greater than the area currently within its operational area. The proposed extension will greatly enlarge the harbour area within which the Port can undertake its activities as permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activities without the ability of the controlling authorities to decline consent.	That the area shown in figure 5 as the Operational area of the Port of Lyttelton be reduced to only include the inner harbour and an area that extends seaward to a distance of no more than 50m from land shown on this figure as being for Port land use.
Governors Bay Community Association	Other	Although the Port is run as an independent company, we would like to remind both Environment Canterbury and Christchurch City and that, under the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy, to which both organisations are signatories there are specific actions that ensure such organisations work with and for their communities. The Greater Christchurch UDS is clear about the vision for the city and local communities and the role council owned organisations play in complementing the aspirations and goals of the community and not be in conflict with them.	
Governors Bay Community Association	Other	We welcome the excellent cultural assessment completed, however, there has been no attempt to assess or even reference the cultural significance of the harbour and surrounds to local or Canterbury communities outside of Ngai Tahu. We find this very disappointing.	The LPC carry out a cultural significance assessment of the Harbour for residents and the people of Christchurch.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p5 (Foreword) Please acknowledge the fact that the port and town evolved together, alongside each other and interdependently, since 1850.	At the end of first paragraph add the sentence: "During this time the port and town evolved together."
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p7 (Executive Summary) We completely agree with the statement: "...it is important to ensure that the Port's recovery activities do not worsen existing problems.... "	No change

GENERAL

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p8 We support repair / replacement of the following inner harbour structures: oil berth, dry dock, number 2, number 3, number 7 and the number 1 breastwork.	No change
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p11 (Vision and Goals) Vision - We support the vision statement but would like to see it amended to incorporate wellbeing of other harbour side communities affected by the recovery / redevelopment.	Change the vision statement to read: "The rebuilt Lyttelton port is resilient, efficient, and contributes positively to the environmental, social, cultural and economic wellbeing of all harbour side communities and greater Christchurch."
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p11 Goals We support the goals with amendments to acknowledge effects on harbour communities other than Lyttelton and on the ferry.	Amend Goal 3: "The recovery of the port makes a positive contribution to the recovery of Lyttelton township and the wellbeing of all affected harbour side communities, by: Amend Goal 3(d): Reducing adverse environmental effects of port operations on all harbour side settlements. Add Goal 3(e): Providing for a short, direct, and safe pedestrian link between Diamond Harbour Ferry and Lyttelton town centre together with improved public transport facilities. Amend Goal 7(b): Provide safe routes and a more attractive environment for pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport in Lyttelton Harbour.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p19 (Section 2.4) Tangata Whenua Association With and Aspirations for Whakaraupō / Lyttelton Harbour - We support inclusion of this section.	No change
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p21 (Section 2.5) Relationship Between Port and Town - We support inclusion of this section.	No change
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p54 (Section 4.1.2 - Cashin Quay) - We support the repair or replacement of structures at Cashin Quay being a permitted activity.	No change
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p55 (Section 4.1.2 - Inner Harbour) - We support repair or replacement of the inner harbour structures listed by bullet point as a permitted activity.	No change
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Other	p56 (Section 4.1.3) Old Sumner Road - If Old Sumner Road is used as the haul road, alternative public access to the beach at Gollans Bay is to be secured, preferably close to the foreshore and on a route including the gun emplacements at Battery Point	Amend Recovery Plan to include provisions which secure alternative public access to the foreshore at Gollans Bay beach.
NZ Labour Party, Port Hills	Other	Lyttelton was the first community, post-quake, to start developing a Master Plan. This document, now ratified by the Christchurch City Council, was the result of many very large meetings, with well facilitated contributions to the future of the town, including the Port. It is my view that the Master Plan should be considered as part of the deliberation in regard to the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. They are inter-linked.	Include the Master Plan in part of the deliberation.
Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited	Other	Agree that health and safety needs to be a major focus of the recovery, and in particular the Recovery Plan should include provision to enable the full segregation of public and commercial interests within the Port area.	Enable full segregation of public and commercial interests
Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited	Other	As an importer of bulk cargo, I agree that repairs to the inner harbour wharves need to be completed in a timely manner. We are economically disadvantaged with the current restrictions in place.	None
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Other	Any decision on an application for resource consent for an activity in the LPRP is subject to Section 69(1)(c) of the CER Act.	Amend relevant plans to specify that any decision on an application for resource consent is subject to Section 69(1)(c) of the CER Act.
William Hall	Other	Boat Harbour and Coastal Marina area included into the Lyttelton Port Recovery. Any plan revision needs to take into account the needs of all recreational users: fishermen; kayakers; windsurfers; dingy sailors; trailer yachts; keelers; power boats; jet skis and other actual or potential users. The current plan may assist keeler owners but limits the options available to other users.	
Nancy Vance	Other	The west end of the Dampier Bay site has always been referred to as the "Mobil Land" due to past use by the petroleum company. This report does not identify possible soil contamination to this site as an issue and, should contamination be present, how this would be remediated or removed for this land to be safely used by the public (with regard to recreation, soil quality, storm water management, planting success rates, etc.).	None
Peter Smeele	Other	I am in overall support of this Recovery Plan to Lyttelton Port excluding Naval Point cruise ship option and Boat Harbour Zone.	N/A

GENERAL

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
David and Heather Bundy	Other	The plan is supposed to address 5.1.2 of the Minister's Direction. The Port operation adversely affects the town at the interface between the two. For the last 25 years (at least) the interface has been troublesome.	Unless there is a separation of the Port and Town activities the existing problem will get worse with the increase in trade.
Mark Watson	Other	Some port operations continue in the inner harbour. If all the activity moves out to Cashin Quay, the inner harbour will be dead boring.	N/A
Christchurch City Council	Other	Section 2.5 of the Recovery Plan outlines the relationship between the Port and Lyttelton township, including a list of the goals of the Lyttelton Master Plan. The Recovery Plan fails to explain how this has been acknowledged in the Plan and recovery framework, and how ECan addressed the Master Plan goals as part of the Recovery Plan.	Council seeks the inclusion of a similar discussion to that contained in section 2.4 in relation to the cultural assessment and how ECan has taken the Master Plan into account, particularly the matters that are outlined in the Council submission.
FitandAbel NZ Limited	Other	My submission is made as the director of FitandAbel NZ Ltd - a swim coaching company. In the last few years we have been participating in and witnessing the significant growth in appreciation that Lyttelton Harbour provides to all users, recreational and business. The Harbour is currently developed well below its current potential and in my opinion is a jewel and key asset of Christchurch. Development of Lyttelton harbour is long overdue. However it is essential we get it right. The development needs to provide a balance for all users and ensure that Lyttelton rightly becomes a location that the Christchurch populace can direct visitors to with a sense of pride. Naval Point Club has become a key focal point for a large number of recreational groups. We want to see this encouraged and fostered in the Port Recovery plan. Because of this relationship we support the Naval Point club and their endeavours to ensure the harbour is developed in a well considered and visionary manner that not only provides for a place that visiting tourist ships berth and the Port Company operates but also a place that visiting tourists will actually want to spend time and enjoy along with the local populace.	N/A
Mrs Ann Thorpe	Other	That log storage is moved from in front of Norwich Quay, so that public views of the harbour are unimpeded.	That log storage is moved from in front of Norwich Quay, so that public views of the harbour are unimpeded.
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Port Operational Area	Move the Port Operational Area inward to exclude the area of existing rocky reef habitat at Battery Point.	Move the Port Operational Area inward to exclude the area of existing rocky reef habitat at Battery Point.
Te Hapū o Ngāti Wheke, Te Rūnanga o Koukourārata, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Review	Review all aspects of the LPRP in collaboration with the strategic partners by March 2016, or sooner if directed by the Minister for CER. The review will identify whether it's necessary to amend or add to the LPRP to enable recovery.	That a requirement be inserted that ECan will formally review all aspects of the LPRP in collaboration with the strategic partners by March 2016, or sooner if directed by the Minister for CER. The review will identify whether it's necessary to amend or add to the LPRP to enable recovery.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Scope of Recovery	LPC is supportive of the framework that the LPRP provides for the recovery of Lyttelton Port. Subject to the minor amendments requested below, LPC considers that the LPRP is: in accordance with the Minister's Direction, reasonably necessary for achieving the purposes of the CER Act.	Minor amendments as detailed.
Thomas Kulpe	Scope of Recovery	I have objections against the basic premise of the LPRP, that the increase in trade volume over the next 26 years necessitates the expansion component. The application of the CERA legislation and the suspension of the RMA must be constrained by two conditions. The activity covered by CERA legislation has to be in line with the purpose of the Act and that is recovery. The activity has to be necessary i.e. needed or required under the circumstances. Projecting compound annual growth rates of the past into the next 25+ years is both misleading and flawed. The expansion component of LPRP is portrayed without any alternatives.	Reduce port expansion to what is necessary and appropriate for the recovery.

GENERAL

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Green Party	Scope of Recovery	Plan proposes expansion in port's operational area and the private commercial occupation of another 27ha of public space in CMA. Potentially significant impacts on amenity values in Lyttelton and harbour - traffic, noise, light, landscape from quarrying, ecological health from dredging and changes to current flows. Will prevent recreational use by boaties, permanently alienates and deprives public of access to area. No compensation for loss of public space from current reclamation, no compensation proposed by LPC or ECan for 27ha reclamation, not even rental for the occupation of CMA. No commitment to remove heavy traffic from Norwich Quay or improve pedestrian and cycle facilities. The access agreement is not available for public to consider and comment. No specific proposals to improve pedestrian/public access to waterfront, no policies and no implementation date. Plan maximises commercial opportunities for LPC. Plan does not adequately investigate alternative configurations which meet community needs. Need a Plan and port configuration which better recognise community needs and wider economic drivers including cruise ships returning, recognises heritage values, reconnects township with waterfront, provides public access, supports rebuilding commercial premises in town centre and Norwich Quay, retains parts of the inner harbour as active working port.	Amend plan to provide for the ports rebuild and repair and a recovery period of 5-10 years. Stage proposed reclamation so only a portion (10ha) is provided for in the plan. Require LPC to develop mitigation package to compensate for loss of public space and heavy traffic on Norwich Quay. Amend Plan and statutory documents to include objectives, policies and methods which provide detailed proposals and timelines for public access to waterfront around Wharf No.7, irrespective of any development that may or may not occur in Dampier Bay.
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Scope of Recovery	p34 (Section 3.8) Effects on Community Wellbeing - Surprised and disappointed the plan omits reference to community wellbeing - Minister's direction. No mention of landscape effects of port, only passing mention of construction noise for Lyttelton, no mention on southern communities. Argue that the Recovery Plan does not address [direction clause 5.1.2] - failure to provide certainty freight on Norwich Quay and ferry berth. Argue, except through marina and promenade, recovery plan does not adequately address [direction clause 5.1.4] - Naval Point cruise berth will reduce area for recreational users. Board has two alternative plans for public access to inner harbour which better support recovery,	Add Section 3.8(a) Community Wellbeing, which addresses the effects not only of inner harbour proposals but of all development proposed by the Recovery Plan, including the reclamation and development associated with larger ships.
Christchurch City Council	Scope of Recovery	The Council is concerned with how the Recovery Plan addresses matters 5.1.2, 5.1.3 and 5.1.4 of the Direction, relating to the wider social, economic and cultural well-being of the Lyttelton community and surrounds, transport implications and the needs of users of the Port and environs.	The plan does not strike the right balance between the four matters contained in the Direction with the balance strongly in favour of matter 5.1.1.
Green Party	Scope of Recovery	Use of CER Act to prepare a plan which provides for major expansion of the port, 27ha reclamation, increase in size of ships, is opposed as being contrary to the purposes and provisions of the CER Act. Appear to be using CER Act as convenient fast track process to avoid application of RMA, NZCPS, RCEP and public scrutiny and judicial oversight. Providing for port expansion for next 25 years is inconsistent with purposes of the CER Act, realistic recovery period is 5-10 years.	
Lyttelton Community Association Inc	Scope of Recovery	Many 'community aspirations' have been duly recorded in 3.8. We are disappointed to note that our main aspirations are excluded from the draft plan itself. The 'Executive Summary' mentions such issues as access to the waterfront, but introduces enough negative remarks for the reader to assume that nothing is going to happen. It seems to us that the thrust of the draft plan omits, or glosses over, some of the key issues which the Minister directed to be include.	We request that plan be reworked to give due prominence to the issues of wellbeing and amenity, just as the Minister directed.
Lyttelton Harbour / Whakaraupo Issues Group	Scope of Recovery	The Group opposes, has serious concerns, and seeks amendments on many aspects of the pdLPRP, including: 1) Scope of repair/recovery - many of plan's long term proposal in development/anticipated well before the earthquake. Preceded the scope of 'earthquake recovery'. LHWIG opposes the 'pushing through' of the full extent of pre-earthquake proposals under the guise of earthquake recovery. Opposition not against including more than repair work, more than process issue, it is out of concern for consequential effects. Seek plan to include more robust process for addressing concerns.	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board	Scope of Recovery	p13 (Section 2.2) Capital Dredging / Bigger Ships - We are not entirely convinced that work to make the port capable of handling bigger ships is earthquake recovery, not just because LPC planned to do this work before the earthquakes and had already taken the reclamation proposal to the Environment Court, but also because we think the lines between enhancement, rebuilding and development are blurred. However we accept we are probably powerless to influence this.	No change

GENERAL

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Jeremy Agar	Scope of Recovery	A port recovery plan should limit itself to port operations affected by quakes.	omit opportunistic items unconnected to earthquake recovery.
Mark Watson	Scope of Recovery	The plan fails to adequately address a number of Gerry Brownlee's official instructions to Ecan. It does not cover the social, economic, cultural, and environmental well-being of surrounding communities; the resilience and well-being of people and communities including the facilitation of a focused timely and expedited recovery; the needs of users of Lyttelton port and its environs including recreational users and public enjoyment of the harbour and well-being of communities.	A plan that integrates the recovery of the port with the recovery and well-being of our local community. I had hoped it might resolve some of the ongoing tensions such as the freight on Norwich Quay and the location of the Diamond Harbour ferry berth.
Helen Chambers	Scope of Recovery	Does research into the biodiversity in the marine environment encompass all Marine life? There does not appear to be enough information regarding the effect of storm water, turbidity, dredging on the marine environment and how this will be managed. How will the runoff from such a large industrial area be handled? No management plans are given.	Request -Provide management plans for dealing with run off involving oil, dust, discharge from vessels ,spill from unloading etc
Matthew Ross	Scope of Recovery	I do not support: 1. The Vision and 1.2. Goals because: They do not explicitly provide for or address the environmental, social, cultural, and economic well-being of Diamond Harbour. The preliminary draft Recovery Plan does not include an explicit assessment of how proposals will affect the environmental, social, cultural, and economic well-being of Diamond Harbour. In many instances the LPC information package fails to specifically consider or adequately evaluate the potential impacts on Diamond Harbour, with conclusions mostly being written from the perspective of impacts on Lyttelton Township. The vision and goals of the preliminary draft Recovery Plan however only make specific reference to Lyttelton Township. This establishes an unfair situation where the plan gives particular emphasis to the potential benefits for one community of interest over the potential impacts on another.	The finalised draft Recovery Plan should explicitly provide for and address the environmental, social, cultural, and economic well-being of Diamond Harbour. 1. Vision - The vision is amended to include specific reference to Diamond Harbour. 1.2. Goals - Goal 3 is amended to include specific reference to the recovery of Diamond Harbour with further explicit reference to reducing adverse environmental impacts of port operations on Diamond Harbour. A separate report is prepared as an annex to the draft Recovery Plan to provide dedicated analysis of the potential social, cultural, environmental and economic impacts of on Diamond Harbour. The report should recommend any necessary amendments to the preliminary draft Recovery Plan to ensure that there is a positive contribution to the environmental, social, cultural and economic well-being of Diamond Harbour. The report process should also provide an opportunity for the Diamond Harbour community to comment on the dedicated analysis.
Governors Bay Amenity Preservation Society	Sea level rise	We would like to see it documented how the LPRP plans for future sea-level rise associated with climate change.	N/A
Governors Bay Community Association	Sea level rise	Although the CER Act exempts the Plan from giving effect to National Policy Statements such as the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS), the text of the Plan says that it does give effect to the NZCPS. In the opinion of the GBCA any congruence with the NZCPS isn't minor and there are clear matters, such as climate change and associated sea-level rise, which it would be advantageous to the long-term future of the Port to give effect to. There is no evidence that the Plan has considered such an important issue or how the Plan and the Port intends to take into account sea level rise on existing and new infrastructure.	That the LPRP incorporates reference to, and plans for, sea level rise associated with climate change.
Mr John Riminton	Sea level rise	"Science Alert," 27 November 2014 reports that 'Flooding and erosion from rising sea levels are likely to significantly impact on New Zealanders in our lifetimes, warns the latest Report from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment' adding that sea levels are expected to rise by 30cm by 2050.' During the intervening years there will, of course, be incremental rises. The Key Topics listed on your presentation chart at the public meeting in Diamond Harbour on 20 April does not mention climate change effects though 'the whole project is due for completion by 2024.' Thus, enormous capital expenditure would appear to be at risk within two decades of the project completion unless planning includes provisions combating 'the intensified king tides, storm surges and coastal erosion across NZ' mentioned in the Commissioner of the Environment's Report.	Planning provisions need to be in place.
Helen Chambers	Sea level rise	I would like to see documentation as to how the Port plan is going to plan for sea level change.	None
Juliet Neill	Sea level rise	There is not plan for sea level rise which is now a fact, not just speculation.	Alter this plan to compensate for sea level rise.

GENERAL

Full Name	Issue	Reasons	Decision sought
Dr Chris Bathurst	Sea-level rise	Serious consideration should be given to the future resitting of the present oil terminal and tank farm. The tankage ground level will need to be raised in the medium future due to sea level rising caused by global warming. At the same time as raising the level of the storage reservoirs, the Tank farm and the oil wharf could be resited in the Naval Point area and the Naval Point Yacht Club resited on the present tank farm area.	N/A
Christchurch City Council	Zoning	Council does not support the interim use of the Port owned land fronting Norwich Quay (Commercial Banks Peninsula Zone) for port activities until 2026. The use of this commercially zoned land for port activities will provide longer term arguments against its use for a broader range of commercial activities and re-inclusion in the Lyttelton Town Centre.	
Lyttelton Harbour Business Association	Zoning	Strongly support the southern side of Norwich Quay retaining its Town Centre zoning. The ongoing, albeit temporary, use of the commercially-zoned land to the south of Norwich Quay for port operations is likely to inhibit the recovery and development of commercial activity along Norwich Quay. We support an early review of this to facilitate commercial redevelopment	
Ms Wendy Everingham	Zoning	I support Norwich Quay remaining as part of the town centre zone. I do not support LPC having the use of their town centre zone for a further 10 years.	I would like to see that area in public usage much sooner.
David and Heather Bundy	Zoning	There is a significant group of heritage buildings around the area of the intersection of Norwich Quay and Oxford St. Some have damage but are repairable. Due to heavy traffic roaring through the middle of this group owners are reluctant to repair due to the extreme loss of amenity value and nuisance that accompanies these trucks. The telegraph office is of most risk, it was built in 1865 and is where the first telegram in NZ was sent. If the use of the Town Centre Zone for port activities is confirmed this historic building may be lost. Pilgrims rock is incorrectly included in the Port Operational area.	Do not let LPC conduct port activities in the town centre zone
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Zoning	With the exception of the proposed Commercial Zone for the Norwich Quay area, the approach to zoning set out in the LPRP is supported. Noted that LPRP does not address zoning of council-held recreation ground and yacht club area at Naval Point – to be considered through wider district plan review process.	If zoned through LPRP – support open space/ recreation zone that provides for sporting activities on recreation ground and continuation of recreational boating and associated ancillary activities.
Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Zoning	Main commercial street is London Street rather than Norwich Quay. No need for the south side of Norwich Quay to have commercial zoning in order to meet unmet need or provide for the retail needs of the community. Urban design – north side provides clear edge to commercial town centre with land below the terrace clearly differentiated and associated with Port Activities. Following earthquakes commercial buildings demolished and land acquired by LPC.	Considers proposed Commercial zoning is counter to enabling the recovery of the Port and does not reflect the existing use of the land. Availability of usable flat land is critical for recovery of the port. Port Zoning is more appropriate.