

IN THE MATTER OF the Town and Country  
Planning Act 1977

AND

IN THE MATTER OF Change No.32, Taylors  
Mistake Residential Holiday  
Zone and Recreation Zones.

My name is Lawrence Robert McCallum. I hold the qualification of MA (Geography) from Massey University and MSc (Resource Management) from the University of Canterbury and I am a Member of the New Zealand Town Planning Institute. I am employed by the Canterbury Regional Council as the Land and Water Resources Planner in the Planning and Resources Division. I have worked as a local authority and consultant planner since 1972 and since January 1985, when I commenced work with the North Canterbury Catchment Board, have been involved with water and soil planning.

1. The Canterbury Regional Council is pursuing objections lodged by its predecessors, the North Canterbury Catchment Board and the Canterbury United Council. The two objections are not in conflict with each other. The NCCB objection is only relevant if Change No.32 proceeds, and seeks various modifications to the zone boundary and a building line restriction along the boundary adjacent to the hillside.
2. Mr. Holmes, an engineer with the Council, will explain the reasons for this and also outline the results of a soil stability assessment he has made of the Taylors Mistake valley. He will also cover the cross-objection lodged by the Canterbury Regional Council itself against the objection of O. and M.J. Snoep which sought the alteration of the siting of the proposed Residential Holiday zone to the northern side of the valley. For reasons of land stability this is opposed.

A cross-objection by the Taylors Mistake Association Land company Ltd. to the objection of the NCCB, states that the scale of the map included in Change No.32 does not allow exact definition of the boundary on the ground and that the intention was to include the track but not the hillside. An aerial photo with zone boundaries overlain obtained from the Council shows the boundary extending up the hill. If this plan is incorrect and the plans attached to the scheme change of an unsuitable scale, the question is posed, how are the zone boundaries to be determined on the ground?

3. The Canterbury United Council objection runs to the heart of the Residential Holiday zoning proposal. It seeks that the Change be withdrawn in that it is contrary to the provisions of Regional Scheme Section 1, in particular the following objectives and policies for the Green Belt Area.

**Objective 14.2(c)** To protect areas possessing high amenity value or being of actual, or potential, value for recreation, from change which would detract from that amenity or inhibit the realisation of that value.

**Objective 14.2(i)** To prevent unplanned settlement and to avoid the spread of uses having urban characteristics into areas adjoining the main settlements.

**Policy 14.2.1** The creation of additional lots should be prevented except where necessary to improve the utilisation of the land for the purposes of agriculture, forestry, recreation, mineral extraction or the conservation of areas of ecological importance.

**Policy 14.2.8** Except as provided for above, the erection of further dwellings and the erection or material extension of commercial, industrial, institutional, public utility and community uses should not be permitted:

**unless**

- (a) necessary to the operation of local agriculture, forestry, mineral extraction or recreation and likely to remain so and not likely to add to or create a nucleus for the formation of an unplanned settlement; or
- (b) where the necessity to erect or extend such uses is adjudged to be of greater national and regional interest than the prevention of further settlement and promotes the achievement of other objectives and policies of this Scheme.

The objection also contains the proviso that the Change be withdrawn unless it can be demonstrated that the benefits to the community of the proposed zone outweigh the costs to the recreational and landscape amenity of Taylors Mistake and that the zone is the best solution in landscape terms. It is not intended to pursue this proviso in that the landscape and recreation assessments made by the Canterbury Regional Council indicate that the Change should be withdrawn.

4. Evidence will be given by Mr. Miskell, a landscape architect and Mr. McGahan, a recreation and tourism consultant.

5. The rationale for the Residential Holiday zone is put forward in the explanation to Change No.32 as being *"it is accepted that there is a need for holiday accommodation to enable the recreational opportunities of the area to be fully utilised"*. This is linked to the need to remove the existing foreshore baches so that this land can be used by the general public for recreation. The sensitive open and natural environment of Taylors Mistake is noted and this is why the development is limited to 40 holiday units, their garages and, depending on one's interpretation, 40 travellers' accommodation units and their garages.

When one reads the explanation it was clearly the intention to limit the zone to 40 units. However, that is not clearly what the wording of the Scheme Change states.

6. It is accepted that the removal of the existing baches will open up an area for informal picnicking, sunbathing and other such types of recreation. However, as Mr. McGahan and previous Christchurch City Council officer reports have identified, the location of the Residential Holiday zone will have an inhibiting effect on the recreational use of adjacent land. The creation of the zone will detract from one of the key outcomes sought through the removal of the baches.

With the exception of those baches adjacent to the southern end of the beach, which have an inhibiting effect on the recreational use of that end of the beach and, to the extent mentioned in the above paragraph, the existing baches are not viewed as compromising the landscape and recreational values of Taylors Mistake.

7. The justification for the Residential Holiday zone is not detailed in the scheme change beyond the points noted above. Taylors Mistake is already accessible to the population of Christchurch (both permanent and visitor). A short drive (15-20 minutes from the centre of Christchurch), admittedly up and down a narrow winding road, allows any person to partake of the amenities of the area. Ownership or rental of property within the existing residential zone at Taylors Mistake allows even closer access to the recreational amenities of the beach and its surrounds.

The link between the Residential Holiday zone and the needs of the surf club, which I understand has been promoted in the past, is a doubtful one. Surf clubs elsewhere, including those in the Christchurch area, exist and operate satisfactorily without residential accommodation close at hand.

The holiday huts-type experience is widely available in other parts of Canterbury at beaches, lake and rivermouth settings. In view of this I do not see provision for the experience at Taylors Mistake as a justification for Change 32.

**8. Conclusion**

- (a) The site chosen is, with the modifications and measures outlined by Mr. Holmes, physically suitable for development.
- (b) The evidence of Mr. Miskell and Mr. McGahan shows that overall, the Residential Holiday zone will have a detrimental impact on the landscape and recreational values of the Taylors Mistake locality. Rather than there being a need for holiday accommodation to enable the recreational opportunities of the area to be fully utilised, the proposed zone will have a negative effect on such opportunities, particularly through its landscape impact.
- (c) The proposed Residential Holiday zone is contrary to the Green Belt provisions of Section 1 of the Regional Scheme, particularly those policies and objectives outlined above.