

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1977  
CHRISTCHURCH CITY DISTRICT SCHEME REVIEW

EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF  
CROSS OBJECTION : MINISTER OF WORKS & DEVELOPMENT

My name is Johnny Edmonds. I am the Planning Officer for the Department of Lands and Survey, Christchurch. My evidence is in support of the cross-objection lodged by the Minister of Works and Development against Objections 319-322, 324, 353, 358, 359, 363 and 387 in so far as they relate to the zoning of land in the Taylors Mistake/Boulder Bay locality.

The department has been undertaking a nation-wide investigation of New Zealand's coastline with the aim of encouraging the conservation of natural values, the provision of opportunity for public recreation and the retention of open space.

The department has carried out investigations along the Christchurch City coastline but the findings have yet to be published. However, in view of the objections lodged to the zoning of land at Taylors Mistake, the department considers it necessary to draw on these findings and to support the Minister's cross-objection. In addition to these investigations the department is responsible for the management of the Godley Head Farm Park. The Park adjoins Taylors Mistake and complements recreation activities occurring there and along the adjacent coastline.

There are, in fact, three issues which are of particular concern to the department. They are:

1. The need to maintain a stable dune system to stop the drift of sand inland and to act as a buffer between the sea and limited flat land adjoining the Taylors Mistake beach.
2. The need to ensure that coastal public lands are eventually available for public use.
3. The need to maintain a high standard of water quality for recreational use.

The department considers that the Taylors Mistake coastline, in addition to other parts of the Christchurch City coastline, is an important recreation resource for the people of Christchurch. At present, most of the recreational use is centred on the beach and the immediately adjoining flat lands but the department considers that the adjoining coastline, from Whitewash Head to the Godley Head Farm Park, while not as intensively used as the beach, is equally important for public enjoyment.

Land zoned "Recreation 4" in the City Plan at Taylors Mistake is perhaps the most intensively used by the public for recreation. The majority of the land is unformed legal road administered by the Christchurch City Council and a minor proportion is held in fee simple by the Council. The department considers that this zone coincides with that area of Taylors Mistake which requires attention to be given to dune stabilization and the retention of a largely unbuilt landscape. The flat land available for public use immediately adjoining the beach is limited and efforts should be made to stop the encroachment

of sand and the erection of additional buildings. As a consequence, the Scheme Statement and Ordinances for the Rec. 4 zone are supported by the department and any changes which might cause dune instability, water pollution and/or loss of open space are opposed.

In so far as public enjoyment of the coastline is concerned, the unformed legal road extending from Whitewash Head to the Godley Head Farm Park is seen to be an important opportunity for the public to gain physical pedestrian access along the coastline. Such access would, in fact, facilitate activities such as walking, enjoying panoramic views, spectacular rock formations and wildlife, swimming, fishing and picnicking. It also potentially provides a pedestrian link between Sumner and the Farm Park. Uses which deny the public such access over the unformed legal road or affect the public's enjoyment of the coastline are considered unacceptable.

It is noted that parts of the unformed legal road are occupied by private bach development and it is the Council's policy to seek their removal by March 1986. The department considers that implementation of this policy will facilitate the provision of public access and the maintenance of high water quality, public enjoyment of the coastline. The City Plan zoning does not recognize the continued existence of the baches and as a consequence is seen by the department to be consistent with Council's policy. While there may be scope for minor amendments to the scheme, any changes to the zoning over unformed legal road which frustrates the implementation of Council's policy of phasing out the private baches by 1986 are not considered to be in the public interest.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1977

CHRISTCHURCH CITY DISTRICT SCHEME REVIEW

CROSS OBJECTION : MINISTER OF WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT

1 My name is Rosemary Biss. I am a planner employed by the Ministry of Works and Development and I appear on behalf of the Minister at this objection hearing.

2 The Minister opposes Objections 319-322, 324, 353, 358-359, 363, 387 on the grounds that the existing zoning and designation recognises the need to safeguard the Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay areas from development incompatible with the coastal environment and their recreational value.

3 The Department of Lands and Survey is carrying out a nation wide survey of coastal areas and in the draft report for Christchurch City the recreational value of the Taylors Mistake area has been highlighted.

4 In addition the Department of Lands and Survey has recently taken over a former Military Reserve between Taylors Mistake and Godley Head and is presently preparing a management plan for the development of the area as a farm park. The farm park is designated as a recreational reserve and has an underlying zoning Rural 1. Between the farm park and the sea is a length of unformed legal road which broadens out to include the foreshore, dune and carpark area at Taylors Mistake. Recreational activities which occur at Taylors Mistake complement those which occur in the farm park. Taylors Mistake, although somewhat confined in area, is an extremely popular surfing and swimming beach and in addition it provides access to the Godley Head walkway, the coastal track from Taylors Mistake to Scarborough and diving and fishing and shellfish gathering opportunities along the rocky coast adjoining the farm park. These latter activities are dependent on the maintenance of a high standard of water quality and the provision of unimpeded access to the water.

5 The existing zoning provisions recognise the need to enhance and protect the coastal environment of Taylors Mistake and Godley Head/Boulder Bay for public recreation use and are generally supportive of s. 3 (c) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1977 - that is, it is a matter of national importance for a local authority to recognise and provide for

'the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment ..... and the protection of it from unnecessary subdivision and development.'

6 I will ask Mr Edmonds, a planner employed by the Department of Lands and Survey, to provide further evidence on behalf of his department.

7 The Minister's cross-objection would be met by Objections 319-322, 324, 353, 358-359, 363 and 387 being disallowed in so far as they seek to change the existing zoning provisions at Taylors Mistake.



Town and Country Planning Act 1977  
CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL  
The City Plan Second Review  
Town Planning Report

Hearing No. 23  
Date 23/3/81  
File No.

TOPIC

TAYLORS MISTAKE

PROVISION OF REVIEWED SCHEME INVOLVED.....

PROVISION OF OPERATIVE SCHEME INVOLVED.....

PROPERTY AFFECTED ADDRESS:.....

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:.....

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED:

ALTERATION SOUGHT	OBJN NO.	OBJECTOR	CROSS OBJECTOR	SUPPORT OPPOSE	DECISION
Create a special Recreation Zone for Taylors Mistake	319	Taylors Mistake Assn	Minister of Works (M.W.D.) J.L. Robb	O O	
	320	Taylors Mistake Surf Lifesaving Club	M.W.D. J.L. Robb	O O	
	321	M.K. McClurg	M.W.D.	O	
	322	E.A. Hunter	M.W.D.	O	

#### INTRODUCTION

Taylors Mistake is a long-established coastal recreation area of regional significance. The Bay is well known for its popularity, surf club, baches, the walking track to Boulder Bay and Godley Head, and the recreation opportunities afforded by its sand beach and sea frontage.

The objectors have all referred to the lack of recognition in the Reviewed City Plan of the existing social framework in the Bay and the contribution the community has made to the Bay area. They all request that Taylors Mistake be zoned a special recreation zone. There is no indication of the form this zone should take.

The Minister of Works has cross-objected in opposition to all four objectors on the grounds that the existing zoning and designation recognises the need to safeguard the Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay areas from development, incompatible with the coastal environment and their recreation value.

Mr. J.L. Robb has cross-objected in opposition to the Taylors Mistake Association and the Taylors Mistake Surf Life Saving Club on the grounds that the objections are imprecise.

#### PLANNING PROVISIONS

The Operative District Scheme zones the area Ru/1, Rec/1 or R/1 as shown on the accompanying scheme map 4A. The development of the Rec/1 zone is subject to an Appendix plan included in the scheme.

The Reviewed City Plan zones part of the area either Ru/1, Ru/4, Rec/3 or R/H as shown on the accompanying scheme map 4A/20. No special policies have been adopted for the Bay area in the Reviewed City Plan.

A Crown Grant Road is laid off along the length of the foreshore within the area covered by the objections.

#### DISCUSSION

It is difficult to discuss these objections because I am unaware of what the objectors are seeking by way of a special recreation zone. The Taylors Mistake Association have said that plans and a detailed report are to be submitted at this hearing. Rather than try to anticipate suitable planning provisions which may meet the objectors' objections I offer instead the following comments which are relevant to any final decision:

1. The Town and Country Planning Act 1977 includes as a matter of national importance in Section 3 (c):

*"The preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment and the margins of lakes and rivers and the protection of them from unnecessary subdivision and development."*

This section stresses the importance of public access, use and enjoyment of what are major areas for outdoor recreation. This has a direct bearing on the continued existence of the bach community at Taylors Mistake.

2. Council policy in regard to the future of the baches was finalised in August 1976. The existing baches on the legal road strips are to be removed by 31 March, 1986. This policy is based on health reasons, particularly the problems associated with the disposal of effluent and sullage. The Reviewed City Plan reflects Council policy with regard to the baches in the Taylors Mistake area. There would seem little point in recognising the baches in the City Plan up to 1986 other than for the purpose of reflecting present

land uses.

3. The proposed Recreation zones in the area reflect the special conditions relating to recreation activities and patterns there. The Rec/4 zone acknowledges the depleted or impoverished condition of the beach/dune system and provides suitable controls over building and other development so that the use of area is not jeopardised. This zoning ensures that beach stabilisation and improvement in this coastal buffer zone remain as the key planning concerns for the Bay. It will be recommended at another hearing that the proposed Rec/3 zone be changed to Rec/1. This will more appropriately reflect local residents' wishes for the use and development of the area.. As well such a zoning will help match use of the area to existing facilities and, hopefully, help retain the present character of the Bay.

It is my belief that the Reviewed City Plan provides appropriate planning measures for the Taylors Mistake area. It is consistent with national policy over use of coastal areas and Council policy with regard to unserviced residential uses in the area. A special recreation zone may be suitable for this area and may more adequately provide for local needs and conditions but in the absence of details the existing zonings taken together provide an appropriate mix of uses and protection of the coastline while providing for the continued recreation use of the limited area within the Bay.

March, 1981

R. JOHNSON  
Assistant Town Planner



OBJECTIONS Nos. 51B, C, D and E BY  
J.L. ROBB, 59 WIGGINS STREET, SUMNER

I have lodged several inter-related objections to the 1979 Review concerning:

- the Scheme Statement on Recreation
- the definition of place of assembly
- buildings on Reserves
- the Recreation 4 zone ordinances
- the particular Recreation 3 or 4 zoning in Taylors Mistake and Sumner.

I appreciate the complexities of reviewing your Scheme and that you are hearing all of the above matters separately. I would however ask that you consider their inter-relationship when coming to your decision on any one of them.

I have expressed my general concern on these first two pages so that, with your consent, I will not have to repeat it at the other hearings. On a separate page I have dealt with the specific aspect of today's hearing.

General Concern

My general concern as a citizen with some professional expertise in town planning is that much of the city's stock of what once was public open space has now become private, closed, and built on, and I would like the District Scheme to stop this.

It seems that the word 'recreation' has been used as a lever to allow buildings or major extensions to them to establish on publicly administered land. The sports pavilion and changing rooms, essential to the use of the parks (for that is what they once were) are now social and club rooms where dances, bingo, weddings, social functions and other club activities occur involving selected people only. These activities are a form of recreation but are only related to the park by a mutual interest in the users, be they members, guests or visitors, in the sport being played in the open. Dances, darts, drinking, table-tennis, or any indoor activity has no need to be in or on a park and can go anywhere, the outdoor sports activities themselves may be a different matter.

I believe that the Review is a little better than the Operative Scheme but is far too permissive on buildings in parks. Public apathy and unawareness and sports club pressure in the past has denied or reduced public access to many parks and will no doubt be applied to the new Scheme. My objections are an attempt to swing the balance towards the open-space-using public and away from the cheap building land which many irreplaceable parks and recreation areas have become.

The attached list prepared two years ago for a hearing speaks for itself, and my professional involvement in many of those applications and several since has prompted me to object to your Scheme.

## TAYLORS MISTAKE. CITY PLAN REVIEW.

1

I have already been heard on some of these matters, but would point out to the objectors whom I have opposed that the provisions for Taylors Mistake are but one part of a very complex town planning scheme. Because of this complexity and the statutory procedures this hearing is not in my view a suitable forum for discussing the Council's stance or policies on the baches, cave and cliff dwellings. Those policies involve far more than town planning but were obviously borne in mind when the City Plan was reviewed.

2

I am not sure quite what the objectors whom I have opposed want for Taylors Mistake so I must state what my objections and cross objections are aimed to achieve.

3

Firstly, I wholeheartedly support the Review statement on Recreation 4 zones and Taylors Mistake. Secondly I consider that the whole of Taylors Mistake except for the Residential zone and Rural zone requires a comprehensive management plan to retain the area as "an attractive regional recreation and open space resource" with "OUTDOOR RECREATION" as "the primary use permitted". In my opinion both of these would be almost achieved by leaving the Scheme as proposed. Extra safeguards would be provided if the Recreation 3 zone were re-zoned Recreation 4. This would guarantee that it would be developed together and give notice that that is what the Council intends within its Scheme statement on Rec 4 zones. The present Recreation 3 zone may not be strictly "physically sensitive dune and foreshore" but neither is the northern of the two beaches.

4

The scheme already supports the retention of the Surfclub building itself and I have therefore supported that part of their objection.

5

Because of my support for the Scheme as stated in

paragraph 3 above I am opposed to any "recognition and provision for the existing community" if it means residential zoning of any sort. There is more than ample provision for housing in the Residential H zones overlooking the bay. There are matters of public health, access, appearance and many other factors to be considered before the baches and cliff dwellings can be 'legalised'.

6.

I have supported objection No 323 seeking extension of the Recreation 4 zone because it is in line with my views and intentions as in paragraph 3. It raises the question of the future of the strip of land along the cliff top which is technically zoned Residential H. Such zoning is not realistic and it would make far more sense to zone it Recreation 4 from Taylors Mistake to Sumner beach. Thus an priceless public access and scenic feature would be protected. Whilst it remains R/H it is not secure against private development. It may of course be The Queens Chain or a similar statutory parcel, but the R/H zoning is not suitable. I do appreciate however the difficulty of zoning river and coastal strips, and their definition.

7.

My objection would be met by leaving the area zoned Recreation 4 so zoned, and add to it the area shown as Recreation 3 re zoned Recreation 4. Recreation 4 zoning should also apply to the strip of land along the cliff top from Taylors Mistake to Sumner.

Chairman City Plan Review,

From Mr & Mrs T. Rowe Nos.339-340

In view of the Plan in Recc 3 - It has been stated that a wide variety of public facilities will be provided in this zone, without any thought of how these facilities will be warranted or how they will be funded, as this valley floor is not suitable for the amenities which we have envisaged especially during the winter period.

In regard to Recc 4 mainly appertaining to Taylors Mistake, there is not sufficient areas to be set out for this purpose. We strongly object to the designated road built through a reserve which is highly illegal if investigated thoroughly. Already a permit has been granted to erect a garage on the foreshore. In this there is no thought to existing Bach community which already exists providing valuable assistance to Surf Club and to the public when necessary. We feel the City Planners did not look thoroughly into this and is breaking up a community which has existed for a century. We feel the loss of these dwellings and their surroundings should be provided for in this City Plan and future one's. They would be a sad loss to sightseers and tourists.

1872

TERENCE WEDGWOOD & COMPANY  
architects

March 1981

TAYLORS MISTAKE ASSOCIATION:

SUBMISSION OF EVIDENCE TO CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT SCHEME REVIEW,  
MARCH 1981.

1. Witness

My name is Paul Stanley Goldsmith, aged 32. I am a Registered Architect receiving my formal education at the Christchurch Technical Institute and the School of Architecture: University of Auckland 1974.

I now live and work as an Architect in North Taranaki. Previous to this I resided in Christchurch and throughout my life have spent many years visiting and living in Taylors Mistake Bay. To date I have had a life long interest in the New Zealand Coastline having travelled and lived on it extensively. Over my professional career I have carried out a variety of studies and compiled various reports, both voluntary and on a consultation basis, with the underlying goal of preserving the wilderness and beauty of the New Zealand Coastline, in conjunction with managing mans development in these areas. I am presently a CORBITT PARK BOARD MEMBER, which manages a three kilometres long coastal reserve in North Taranaki. That reserve is a rugged ocean coastline comprising several rivers, sand dune and reef wilderness areas, roadways, camping grounds and in part boarders residential development. The reserve is the most popular coastal recreation zone for at least 150 kilometres North or South along the coast.

I have been engaged as consultant by the Taylors Mistake Association to compile and present evidence related to the physical and social environment of the Bay in respect of the physical and social environment. It is to be noted at this point that when the writer refers to Bay or the Taylors Mistake that the area in concern is always the entire area from Giants Eye to the North Point and Boulder Bay on the South Point.

2. District Scheme Objection:

The Taylors Mistake Association's objection to the District Scheme states that:

"The zoning provisions of the Taylors Mistake Bay and its immediate valley and environment are inappropriate, and that they show no appreciation of the past, present, or future Bay Community."

.../2

TERENCE WEDGWOOD ECON. & ARCH. ANZ & A. AREA  
PAUL GOLDSMITH, B./ARCH. ANZIA  
CORNER GUYER / COURTENAY STREETS

And the following provisions be made:

"That a Special Recreation Zone be established for Taylors Mistake"

It is intended this would provide to preserve the present Community, while maintaining and developing the desirable natural and built features of the region.

For the purpose of this report the term community means: Local Residents both leasehold and freehold, institutions which exist within the Bay: namely Surf Life Saving Club, and the greater public; who visit for short and long term intervals.

3. Evidence:

3.1

To establish a consensus of opinion on these submissions a public meeting was held to obtain directives. Preceding this meeting the Taylors Mistake Association Committee had looked at and discussed the merits of the present Town Planning Proposal and had engaged Engineering Consultants: Eliot Sinclair & Partners, to report on sewerage disposal in the Bay, and this becomes an important part in the proceedings of the meeting.

The report with resolutions from that meeting is as follows:

3.2

Public Meeting to obtain clear directives for Town Planning Submissions

The meeting was chaired by Mr Peter Hill and the writer, . . . was the guest speaker. Special invitations were extended to Christchurch City Councillors, Members of the Town Planning Department, the Local Member of Parliament, Martin Sinclair, and Mr A. Hearne. Several apologies were received, and those special guests who were present included one Christchurch City Councillor and one representative from the Town Planning Department. There was a good turn out of local freehold and leasehold residents and surf club members.

The writer led the meeting with poster type information pinned to the walls, which gave a complete breakdown on the physical and social environment of the Bay: Pre 1900 to the Present, report enclosed. I explained to the meeting that where there were subjective comments, that these were in fact my personal views and not necessarily the views of the Association. General discussion followed in respect of my presentation. Criticism was fairly general and all concerning matters were freely aired.

The meeting stopped for an informal lunch and in the afternoon I presented a very general sketch plan, enclosed, describing the nature of development which I considered would be suitable in the Bay yet not detrimental to those desirable aspects of the present overall environment: namely nature and size of the community, the sparceness and rural atmosphere of the hill slopes, while recognising the limitations of:

- 1: Access Road
- 2: The low sunshine hours that the valley areas receive during Winter;
- 3: The considerable expense involved if any further development was carried out on the hill slopes and suitability of the slopes and valley for building sites.

# PLANNING & COMPANY architects

In presenting the plan, the meeting members recognised that the proposal is idealistic and does not relate to present planning or title boundaries. Following considerable discussion on the nature of development the following resolutions were passed in the order as stated 1,2,3 and 4.

## 3.3 RESOLUTION 1.

"We wish to retain the present character of the Bay. We would like to see an improvement and enlargement of the recreational facilities available so that more people are able to enjoy the environment that the area within Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay afford the public in general."

This is a broad statement giving support to the principle that the overall public spaces and facilities in the Bay are of a low standard and that there is considerable room for improvement in the physical arrangement: namely improved picnic and parking facilities, planting, sign posting, dune retention, not withstanding the necessary health improvements relating to the dwellings.

## RESOLUTION 2.

"That if the sewerage/sullage problem is a barrier to being given permanent tenure of the baches on Crown Land, then the Association would participate in the capital costs of a suitable scheme."

This resolution is passed in respect of Eliot, Sinclair & Partners sewerage Report. The meeting accepted in principle that if this is the most suitable, then it would be the accepted scheme. All persons at the meeting were fully conversant with that Report.

## RESOLUTION 3.

"Subject to satisfactory arrangements being made for sewerage disposal, this meeting approves the limited additional developments shown on Paul Goldsmith's plan."

The meeting accepted the sketch plan proposal that the writer presented, and it should be noted that the work "limited" is of prime importance.

While the residents did not wish to appear selfish in their outlook they do recognise that the size of development of the Bay is significant in the overall atmosphere and that this should be protected. Consequently there was a considerable amount of discussion as to how the surrounding rural areas could be maintained as rural spaces and not be subject to residential development. It was explained to them that the green belt was in fact fundamental in the overall scheme and that special ordinances would be necessary in respect of the concept. Several people doubted that such restraints could be imposed. There was another suggestion that controls may be able to be implemented by limiting access rights to the sewerage pumping system.

A further desirable feature of the plan proposal, was the aspect that any new dwellings in the area could subsidize the monetary contribution referred to in Resolution 4.

## RESOLUTION 4.

"That the Christchurch City Council be advised by the Taylors Mistake Association that we are prepared to contribute \$200,000.00 to a sewerage scheme.

The amount of \$200,000.00 (Two Hundred Thousand Dollars) was the amount which the meeting considered would be attractive to the Local Authorities concerned, and would convey the anxiety and genuine attitude of the residents in their concern for the area. The amount of money was established in respect of the consultants report. It was also considered significant that the Drainage Board will probably never receive a better opportunity of upgrading the sewage facilities.

3.4

### Physical and Social Environment Appraisal:

The following is the appraisal referred to the public meeting 3.2.

<u>DATE</u>	<u>PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</u>	<u>SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</u>
PRE 1900	Little or no development 'Natural Formation' Bay, grassland, beach, Good fish stocks.	Maori and Pakeha. Fishing for living and leisure.
1900 to 1920's	Back development in bay and cliffs to 'Boulder Bay', all on Crown Land  Natural formations maintained.  Good fish stocks.  Access road to top of Sumner hill only.	Formation of small social groups with mainly weekend - holiday visits.  Development relaxed and informal under Sumner Borough Authority.
1920's to 1940's and 50's	Subdivision of Northern slopes 30's - 40's.  Some servicing Roads Power Water Stormwater? No Sewer  Natural formations maintained with mixture of exotic planting.  Fish stocks remain.	Period of major residential growth with further back's on Crown Land - 40's  Majority of Crown Land resi- dents and approximately 60% of private land residents being weekend and holiday occupants.  Overall demand increasing for leisure use, particularly Sumner.  Surf club activities closely tied to community.



# PERKINS & COMPANY architects

<u>DATE</u>	<u>PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</u>	<u>SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</u>
1950's to 70's	<p>Some road upgrading. Increased parking at the expense of natural valley setting.</p> <p>No improvements made to public spaces.</p> <p>General refurbishing of dwellings throughout entire area with further planting.</p> <p>New surf club building and shop following fire.</p> <p>New public toilets and changing sheds.</p> <p>Fish stocks diminishing.</p>	<p>Only minor development of new dwellings (10-15) increased use of bachs within Bay with decrease of those more remote. Boulder Bay dwellings in regular use.</p> <p>Overall use of area increased with increased social mobility (Transport) and leisure hours.</p> <p>Summer weekends (Say 10 days/summer) Experiencing peak population loading with crowded beach, well used fishing areas, congested road and parking facilities.</p> <p>Some criticism of poor servicing: Road - Parking and General Health</p> <p>Local residents make 2 or 3 attempts to maintain natural valley setting but largely futile due to private and public inertia.</p> <p>Town Planning is starting to make noises with 2 District Schemes which appear as mere lip-service to the community; naive in dealing with the rather unique area.</p> <p>(Probably justifiable because of low community input into Town Planning Submission).</p>
1970's to 1980's  ?	<p>General Bay area receives no physical improvements in 10 year period.</p> <p>Significant decline of natural setting with dune remnants being further reduced by increased vehicle - pedestrian load.</p>	<p>Bay population remains fairly stable with some minor increase in permanent residents (Mainly on privately owned land.)</p> <p>Increase in use of area as leisure zone with load spreading into week days. <u>But</u> peak loading of summer days remains constant due probably to size and vehicle access.</p>

<u>DATE</u>	<u>PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</u>	<u>SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</u>
1970's to 1980's  ?  Cont'd	<p>Dwellings within Bay remain static. 2 or 3 caves in area are lost in storms in early 70's (History Repeated) eventually: majority of cave type dwellings between Bay and Boulder Bay are demolished for dubious reasons?</p> <p>Servicing remains largely as in 60's except Crown Land dwellings introduce high technology toilets.</p> <p>Farm park concept introduced to Godley Head Region in late 70's.</p>	<p>Surf club community involvement active as previous. Criticism: from within and without of general health and valley - beach setting.</p> <p>Tenure of Crown Land dwellings challenged by C.C.C. with deadline for their removal.</p> <p>Subcommittee of Taylors Mistake Association puts considerable effort into getting picnic - parking - dune area redeveloped liaison with C.C.C. but efforts frustrated?</p> <p>Town plan: scheme review 1979 with vague details of what the future holds? No apparent acknowledgement of present Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay community. Some provisions for camping ground possible?</p>

### 3.5 Sketch Plan: Proposed Development

See Plan attached.

It is to be recognised that this plan is idealistic in nature, being intended primarily to show what the public meeting considered as suitable in respect of their resolutions. It is to be recognised that the plan was compiled prior to the meeting and based on input from Association members, knowledge of the region and naturally the writers design skills. The plan has evolved around the shape and climate of the Bay rather than the legal or planning boundaries. Discussions have not been had for the property owners in the respect of such a proposal.

### 3.6 Reasons behind proposed development plan

#### 3.6.1 Introduction

Taylors Mistake is a coastal Bay on Banks Peninsula 15 miles from the Christchurch City centre. The adjacent land uses are:

1. An established suburban area Summer.
2. Rural farm land.
3. A farm park on the South side of the Bay extending to Godley Heads.

For some seventy years, Taylors Mistake has been a leisure resort for Christchurch people. It is a small region and therefore serves only a small proportion of the Christchurch population at any one time. Previously the district scheme has recognised its function and zoned it (Special Recreational). This acknowledgement and the changing demands of society have naturally brought about pressure for changes at Taylors Mistake. It is feared by many users of the area, that the planning changes could be detrimental to the desirable features of the overall environment in the area. This fear exists because these changes are an unknown quantity. The preceding plan and these following comments are submitted in order to have the Local Communities ideas recognised.

### 3.6.2. Social Patterns

The section 3.4: Physical and Social Appraisal deals with this topic but the following conclusion applies:

3.6.2.1 Taylors Mistake was originally only a leisure zone, today occupants can mix leisure and home life and travel to their work if they wish. There is a tendency for increased use within the Bay for the following social occasions:

- Young people, families etc. for day trips.
- Holiday makers for short stays, weekends or one week.
- Families in permanent residence.
- Retired people in permanent residence.
- Individual enthusiast of Taylors Mistake permanent residence
- Persons employed there.

Obviously, mobility and its changing social patterns have increased the demand for using the area.

3.6.2.2 Social framework: Surf club, community groups, shop and public facilities.

Located in a commanding position on the foreshore is the Surf Life Saving Club building. Appropriately located for its function as a lookout - guarding of the blue - it double as a community centre and symbol for many Taylors Mistake users. Its origin may be traced back 63 years and has direct ties with Taylors Mistake pioneers. Once again this emphasises the bond which exists between the sea and the occupants.

Today a similar association exists; initial interests in the Surf Club have often proved the motivating force for many Taylors Mistake enthusiasts to come and remain.

Within the total social arrangement there are about 5 or 6 sub-groups evolving from reasons of:

- A. Location
- B. Common interests
- C. Age

These groups usually remain as separate identities, although they do collaborate for certain activities if there is some mutual gain.

Adjoining the Surf Life Saving Club there existed a shop which served the weekenders and holiday community up until the summer of 1980 - 81. Its major purpose was to provide

day trippers with confectionary goods. It was closed this summer to permit Surf Club extensions and the poor economic viability of the Surf Club maintaining the facility.

The Bay is now not served by a shop of this nature and the nearest servicing is in Summer.

Public toilets and changing sheds are provided in the carpark area, for short term visitors.

### 3.6.3 Physical Environment

#### 3.6.3.1 Leisure Dwellings and their Value:

Most of the dwellings reflect a strong unselfconscious image, free of the restraints of suburbia, and this is seen as a desirable quality in holiday baches of this nature; perpetuating the essential relaxed atmosphere which is conducive to leisure and encompasses Taylors Mistake.

The "nature" of these baches:

\* Christopher Alexander, in his theory of the bach, analyses their form and concludes that it is derived from two basic forces -

1. TRADITION of building systems and styles.
2. DIRECTNESS in the need and urgency to build the dwelling for shelter and the DIRECTNESS involved in building this shelter employing minimal methods to save time and expense, so that the more essential goals of living and enjoying oneself can be fulfilled.

Most Taylors Mistake dwellings have these qualities and while Taylors Mistake remains a leisure zone of this unselfconscious nature, it is argued that they should be retained.

For the purpose of this report UNSELFCONSCIOUS NATURE refers to the type of dwelling which presently exists in the Bay. Whereas SELFCONSCIOUS NATURED development refers to coastal development along rigid guide lines of: straight line subdivisions, rigid ordinances which mimic normal suburban developments.

The origin of this unselfconscious nature:

Is derived from the leisure-goal which users of the area have extracted from the environment of Taylors Mistake. Those dwellings on public leasehold property are "squatters" and the consequent insecurity of land tenure has, in most cases, kept the material value minimal ever since their humble beginnings 50 or 60 years ago. This does not mean the standard is poor. The quality of life and pleasure rewards are undoubtedly high.

The other dwellings are freehold property have, on the whole, had humble bach-type beginnings. In comparison with normal city standards, land values have been relatively cheap and tend to keep material standards down. Today, a dozen or so (20%) of these dwellings have substantiated their plan form beyond bach level. At the moment, 40-50% of these freehold properties are permanently occupied, their residents freely mixing leisure and traditional home in a less formal manner.

# LENN BLOOM & COMPANY architects

## APPEARANCE, COMPOSITION AND FORM.

Materials are usually of minimal value, easy to obtain and constructed by laymen.

For example: Traditional timber frame  
Corrugated iron  
Asbestos sheet  
Flat iron  
Stucco  
Weatherboards

In some instances, due mainly to locality, labour and feeling, natural resources have been utilised:

Rock walls  
Stones  
Sand (cement)  
Drift wood

Appearances Traditional suburban techniques have been employed in most cases:

Rectilinear plans  
Pitched and flat roofs  
Gables and hips  
Colour schemes are usually contrasting.

Consequently most of the buildings present themselves more as separate entities than as components of the natural landscape. Their varied styles and forms are a conglomeration of all colours, shapes and sizes, mixed freely, yet somewhat consolidated by recent modifications. The relationship of internal and external living spaces, in most cases, is not very strong and reflects the climate and living activities. When the sun is out most activities take place outside, conversely, when the sun goes in, so do the residents.

Enclosure is sought as refuge from the easterly convection wind in the summer and is clearly significant in planning. Where the enclosure isn't sufficient, man-made methods have been employed; embankments, walls and specially cultivated vegetation. Most dwellings are appropriate to their locations and the overall Bay environment; nestled into nooks on the cliffs, perched on the edges or located along the sides of the hills. All but a few of them strive for a view of the Bay and the beach. Undoubtedly, the view strengthens the feeling of belonging to and identifying with Taylors Mistake, "The Bay" and enables the participant to feel that he is part of it. The fascination of water obviously has great appeal for the leisure makers; living by it, hearing, smelling, seeing and touching all these connections help to generate a relaxed atmosphere.

## CONCLUSION:

When considering the development of any further dwellings in the Bay, the community considers that the present manmade shelter help extensively to generate this relaxed lifestyle for which the place is well known. The buildings are the epitome of this unselfconscious, uninhibited leisure concept and therefore it is considered important that any new work should have ordinances to reflect this goal accordingly.

### 3.6.3.2 Suitability of Valley for Urban Development:

A close look at the suitability of the natural features is the clearest indication of whether or not this is urban suitable land and likely to receive urban development.

1. Beach bathing conditions are suitable for about 16-20 weeks in the year. This fact therefore cuts down the appeal of the area due to loss of the primary leisure activity.

2. Suitability of climate:

The climate during summer and its adjacent periods is good. Winter is cool but is slightly improved on the temperature of Christchurch, owing to its coastal location. The sunshine hours in the Bay are far less than Christchurch or even Sumner as the surrounding hills cast shadows over much of the area. During the winter months of May to August, most of the valley with a South-Eastely aspect, which forms the immediate Bay enclosure, loses the sun around 2.00 p.m. To avoid this, one would need to build on the slopes with a northerly aspect. It is considered that the likelihood of this occurring in the next 30 or 40 years is slight for two reasons:

1. Equivalent land for homes is more readily available nearer Christchurch.

2. The land in Christchurch is far more suitable with regard to topography and amenities. Sub-division of -and building on Taylors Mistake land would not be feasible because of the excessive expense, therefore, at present the immediate land is not considered to be urban suitable.

It is apparent that the sunny, north-orientated parts of the Taylors Mistake valley are more suited to permanent habitation than their opposite counterparts and this is most significant in considering future dwelling development.

In concluding, the above evidence implies that Taylors Mistake will remain as a leisure resort serving Christchurch residents for many years to come. To some enthusiasts it will mean a combination of home and leisure. The sketch proposal shows what the present inhabitants consider to be a realistic and ideal development in this regard.

### 3.6.3.3 Roads and Connections:

The access road over the hill from Sumner is the vital link between Taylors Mistake and the city and is a strong transitional element; orientating the traveller to the Bay beyond. It is simply what it is because of the shape of the land and the demands placed upon it. It climbs and winds to the top, flattens at the summit and descends via an exhilarating filter of bends, twists, corners, views, embankments and straights. You know when you are there amongst the securing comfort of the valley floor.

# TERRY BOON & COMPANY architects

The road as it now exists, is tight and sometimes dangerous, particularly with heavy summertime traffic. The road is constructed on solid peninsular rock and it

would appear difficult to upgrade to cater for a large increase in population, should the occasion arise. At present the road would appear to have a natural filtering affect thereby limiting users to the Bay. It is difficult to envisage any variation upon this theme.

## 3.6.3.4 Valley Bottom and Beach Frontage:

At the bottom of the valley is a resting space which is not. This amenity is intended to serve the majority of visitors to the area but suffers enormous conflict in use by car and humans, being suited to neither. Approximately 15 years ago there was a separation of activities in carpark and sandhills but this was destroyed by the thoughtless annihilation of the sandhills and the formation of an aesthetically lifeless carpark - what now exists is in urgent need of landscaping as suggested on plan. When reviewing the development of the valley floor it is obvious that there is enough area to quadruple the combined picnic and parking space. In applying functions to this area of the valley floor, there appears to be no need for formal sports grounds: Rugby fields etc. With regard to camping and caravan areas: with the road in its present form transporting caravans would be a major difficulty. Tent camping or cabins would appear feasible, although they would have only limited use in the summer period.

The beach frontage, approximately 600 metres long at low tide, and 370 metres long at high tide has the ability to sustain probably twice the load it takes at maximum peak nowadays. To cater for such numbers and still preserve a natural physical environment with pleasant surroundings would require well designed landscaping. The sketch proposal is planned to cater for this loading.

## 3.6.3.5 Services:

**PUBLIC SERVICE BUILDINGS:** Such buildings are inadequate: At present only public conveniences changing sheds and telephone booth exist. The changing sheds are of a poor quality and require obvious upgrading and or replacing.

A shop service has been a standard facility for the past forty years and is in need of replacement now that the Surf Club facility is no longer available.

**Public Shelter:** Various forms of public shelter i.e. shade house related barbeque areas & the like would be desirable if the area is to cater for larger numbers.

**Stormwater:** At present this is catered for primarily by Natural means with the contours falling to the valley floor with water flooding on to the beach, lagooning and filtering through to the beach. The south facing slopes of residential development carry water in a similar manner along natural galleys and valleys. During peak storms these particular drains are heavily taxed, the quality of these facilities are questionable.

In conclusion, the valley, if it is to sustain heavier development, would require surface draining and general upgrading. Care would be required to assure that flooding and discharge on the beach face did not occur as this would most definitely cause significant sand erosion. The sketch development plan envisages using the contours to the maximum ability and then handling flood waters through an open basin system. It would hold flood waters at peak periods and permit more natural soaking after storms. It is suggested that soakage materials and filter fabrics be employed to produce a result that would work effectively with sand materials.

ELECTRICAL SERVICING: This is presently reticulated over head and would ideally be carried under ground where ever possible.

TELEPHONES: Treat as for electrical.

SEWERAGE: Treat as per Consultants report.

#### 3.6.3.6 Historic Value

The association has correspondent with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Canterbury Regional Committee. They have shown some interest in the area and its squatter dwellings and caves but on the information they presently have they conclude as follows:

" I had raised the matter of advocating retention of a small number of the baches (In particular the cave ones) but when I was last over in Taylors Mistake for the most interesting bach of all had been destroyed. "

At this stage it would appear feasible that the Trust should again review the situation and look to preservation of the Boulder Bay Settlement as this area is basically still completely intact.

#### 3.7 Public Land - Squatters:

Today the baches on public land exists with the threat of removal but the reasons for this thinking unclear. It is the feeling of the majority of users of the Bay, that these dwellings and their residents in no way restrict the public access or limit the quality of the public amenity. This along with the fact that the buildings have existed for some 50 to 60 years leads or to conclude that there appears to be no harm in there retention for the future provided certain health requirements can be met. With this in mind the development plan shows their retention with further dwellings proposed for public land. Obviously a suitable tenure would be required in this respect.

#### 4. Conclusion:

I believe I am representing the group of genuine and ordinary people who at present are caretakers of an environment and way of life that is rare, unique desirable, yet sadly diminishing: This situation exists, I believe, because administration and planning methods are unable and or unwilling to recognise and manage this unique situation.

The technique of problem solving to date would appear to be one of (Sweeping the problem under the carpet). I believe the Christchurch City Council has the duty to recognise and assist to maintain these desirable features for



PAUL GOLD  
& COMPANY  
architects

future generations and I trust that this will be recognised.

PAUL GOLDSMITH

Paul Goldsmith





# Canterbury United Council

P.O. Box 1997, Christchurch, New Zealand

Telephone (STD 03) 791-660

OUR REF: A.2782

23 March 1981

## CHRISTCHURCH CITY DISTRICT SCHEME REVIEW:

Cross-objection to objections seeking alterations to proposed provisions for Taylors Mistake.

### STATEMENT BY DAVID W. COLLINS, Planning Officer:

1. The United Council lodged cross-objections to these objections giving the following reasons.

*"It is not clear what alteration to the Proposed Review is requested. Any zoning which would allow further housing development of any type would be contrary to the Operative Regional Scheme - Section One and the Proposed Review of that Scheme (see Objectives and Policies for the Green Belt Area)."*

2. The objectors ask that the Proposed Review be altered to "recognise and provide for the existing community." In my view this is too vague to form the basis of a valid objection. As I read the Act and Regulations the intent is that objectors should specify what alteration to the Scheme is sought so that this can be advertised and be open to cross-objection. The specific alterations wanted by the objectors have not been specified and therefore other interested parties have not had the opportunity to examine them and consider cross-objection.
3. Zoning proposed for Taylors Mistake is in my view appropriate. It recognises the recreation value and limited area of the beach and flat area behind by limiting development to facilities accessory to recreation. The zoning rightly distinguishes between what is appropriate development for the beach itself and what is acceptable further back. It could be argued that the provisions for public and organisation-controlled facilities are too generous; it depends how they will be interpreted. The intention however is clearly to prevent public or club developments which could be located elsewhere, and to prevent the monopolising of any parts of this valuable area by individuals.

4. The proposed zoning appears to support the broad objectives of the Proposed Regional Scheme Review. Under "Objectives and Policies for the Green Belt Area" the Regional Scheme refers to the need to protect areas of high amenity or recreation value from other uses. The area from Godley Head to Tai Tapu is specifically mentioned. Also relevant to Taylors Mistake is the objective of consolidating urban development so as to encourage efficient use of land and minimise servicing costs.



Town and Country Planning Act 1977

Christchurch City Council

The City Plan Second Review

Town Planning Report

Hearing No. 22

Date 23/3/81

File No.

TOPIC TAYLORS MISTAKE

PROVISION OF REVIEWED SCHEME INVOLVED... REC.3, REC.4, R/H, RU/1

PROVISION OF OPERATIVE SCHEME INVOLVED... REC.1, R.1, RU/1

PROPERTY AFFECTED

ADDRESS:.....

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:.....

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: (\* indicates those not wishing to be heard)

ALTERATION SOUGHT	OBJN NO.	OBJECTOR	CROSS OBJECTOR	SUPPORT OPPOSE	DECISION
That the existing Community be recognized and provided for.	323A	M. Snoop	MWD Canterbury United Council (CUC)	0	
	324	J.P. McDermott			
	325 *	A.T. Dorreen			
	326 *	S. Scott			
	327 *	M.E. Dorreen			
	328 *	G.P. Dorreen			
	329 *	M.T. Dorreen			
	330 *	I. Scott	CUC	0	
	331	J.O. Turpin + ✓			
	332	R.G. Beer			
	333	C.S. Roscoe			
	334	B.A. Anderson ✓			
	335	W.C. Timms			
	336	H.F. Timms ✓			
	337	S. Anderton ✓			
	338 *	L.H. Anderton ✓			
	339	T.O. Rowe ✓			
	340	I.J. Rowe ✓			
	341 *	D.W. Anderson ✓			
	342	A. Anderson ✓			
	343 *	J.B. Anderson ✓			
	344	G.H. & R.E. Searle			

Written Submissions  
Received

ALTERATION SOUGHT	OBJN NO.	OBJECTOR	CROSS OBJECTOR	SUPPORT OPPOSE	DECISION
	345 *	W. Matthams			
	346 *	W.C. Pool			
	347 *	T.M. Green			
	348	D.E. Purse	CUC	0	
	349	H.T. Dean	CUC	0	
	350	G.A. Storey	CUC	0	
	351	W.A. Clark	CUC	0	
	352	P.A. Pool	CUC	0	
	353	L.J. Hunter	CUC	0	
			MWD	0	
	354	I.C. Brownie	CUC	0	
	355	W.R. Green			
	356	B.S. Carter	CUC	0	
	357	H.G. Goldsmith	CUC	0	
	358	M.B. Campbell	CUC	0	
			MWD	0	
	360	T.S. & D.B. Graham	CUC	0	
	361 *	R. Gilpin			
	362 *	E.C. Clayson			
	364	E.E. Hobson	CUC	0	
	365	B.V. Dickey	CUC	0	
	366	P.G. Hill	CUC	0	
	367 *	R.B. Prattley			
	368	A.R. Moore	CUC	0	
	369	J. Moore	CUC	0	
	370	B. Roberts	CUC	0	
	371	H.A. Roberts	CUC	0	
	372	H.L. Roberts	CUC	0	
	373	R.A. Roberts	CUC	0	
	374	O. McKinley	CUC	0	
	375	S. Sherriff	CUC	0	
	376	A.L. Pearce	CUC	0	
	377	H.E. Eastwick	CUC	0	
	378	H. Chapman	CUC	0	
	379	J.E. McDonald	CUC	0	
	380	B.M. Stewart	CUC	0	
	381	D.J. Stewart	CUC	0	

ALTERATION SOUGHT	OBJN NO.	OBJECTOR	CROSS OBJECTOR	SUPPORT OPPOSE	DECISION
	382	R.M. Clark ✓	CUC	0	
	383	M.R. Bell ✓	CUC	0	
	384	J.D. McKeown ✓	CUC	0	
	385	D.H. Scott	CUC	0	
	386	K. Stewart	CUC	0	
	846 *	J.K. Snoep			
	847 *	M.N. Sinclair			
	848 *	G.R. Sinclair			
	849	R.R. Hudson	CUC	0	
	850	A.E. Hudson	CUC	0	
	851	E.M. & B.J. Rahurahu			
	852 *	N. Sinclair			
	853 *	N.E. Sinclair			
	854	I.N. Scott	CUC	0	

#### INTRODUCTION

Taylor's Mistake is a popular coastal recreation area. In the area covered by the objections, outdoor recreation activities include swimming, surfing, fishing, walking, surf carnivals, and general passive use of the beach and foreshore. The area from Giants Eye to Godley Head is well used by the regional population. Several features are synonymous with the Bay: the baches, the Surf Club, the twisting access road and the weekend traffic congestion.

The objectors share a common objection: that the Reviewed City Plan does not recognise the existence of the present community. They all seek planning provisions that recognise the community but do not indicate the form these should take.

Cross-objections have been received by the Minister of Works who states that the existing zoning recognises the need to safeguard the Taylor's Mistake and Boulder Bay areas from development incompatible with the coastal environment and their recreation value, and the Canterbury United Council, which states that the objection is unclear but that any zoning which would allow further housing development would be contrary to the Operative Regional Scheme - Section One and the proposed Review of that Scheme.

#### PLANNING PROVISIONS OF THE REVIEWED CITY PLAN

The Reviewed City Plan contains planning measures for the Godley Head - Moki Point area which provide appropriate controls over building and land use in a coastal environment.

The Rec/4 zone reflects Council's concern to see the impoverished beach and sand dune areas controlled in such a way that the re-establishment and maintenance of a healthy vegetated dune system may be encouraged. It has been recommended in another hearing that the Rec/4 zone extend into Hobsons or Little Bay. This zoning seeks to retain the use of the foreshore for outdoor recreation activities serviced by suitably sited and designed buildings and structures.

The Rec/3 zone has also been objected to and it will be recommended at another hearing that this zoning be changed to Rec/1. Such a zoning better reflects the wishes of the community and will ensure that the beach orientated focus of activities in the Bay remains the dominant use. Informal open space best matches the present undeveloped nature of the zone and provides an appropriate complementary recreation space to the beach and sea.

The land between Taylors Mistake Road and the coast has been zoned Residential Hills. This zone is common to most of the hill suburbs and best meets the particular problems of residential development there.

Many of the baches in Taylors Mistake are located on legal road and these roads are designated as such in the City Plan. It is the Council's policy, both as the land owner and designating authority, to ensure removal of the baches by 31 March, 1986.

It is also national policy to reserve foreshore areas for the use and enjoyment of the general public.

The Rural zones cover those areas presently farmed. They will ensure the retention of open, undeveloped rural landscapes on Godley Head and elsewhere.

#### DISCUSSION

I find it difficult to discuss the objections because the objectors have not indicated the particular ways in which the Scheme could be amended so that their objection would be met. Although I believe the planning provisions outlined above adequately provide for the Taylors Mistake area I do accept that there may be other approaches to providing planning control there. The question of recognising the bach community is obviously at the heart of the objections. I am aware that the idea of a Taylors Mistake community relates to both permanent and temporary residents, and I appreciate that both types of resident contribute to the character and welfare of the Bay.

The dependence of the Surf Club on bach owners for its surf patrols is an often-cited

example of the important contribution bach owners make to the Bay. However the over-riding factor in this matter is the national policy contained in S. 3(c) of the Town & Country Planning Act (1977) and the fact that the baches are on Crown Grant Road set aside permanently for access along the Coast. The sites are occupied by way of licence from the Council and remain there at the Council's pleasure.

I cannot make any recommendation on the objections because I am aware that the objectors are intending to present other planning options before the Hearings Panel. This evidence will hopefully give some clarity to the objections and suggest specific possibilities with regard to the zoning of the Taylors Mistake area.



CH.CH. City Council,  
P.O. Box 237,  
CHRISTCHURCH.

334  
RE: CITY PLAN REVIEW NO. 334 342 ~ 343

Our objection to the developement of Taylors Mistake come into two categories.

The first being the removal of batches.

The Second being the proposed developement.

Batches have been in existance for some 50 years and as a result a community has been created by the residents that must surely be the envy of many other communities in New Zealand. For example \$46,000 of rate payers money has been spent in Bromley to try to create what we have here in Taylors Mistake and that is Community Spirit and a genuine desire to help ourselves create a life style that is considered to be desirable in a society where suburban neurosis, wayward children, crime and social problems are forever on the increase. One has only to read the newspapers and to look at the efforts of the City Social Services to substantiate that statement.

Money can never buy a community lifestyle such as we have at Taylors. The surf club is mostly manned by batch owners and their children, the fellowship of the residents, the willingness of residents to assist each other - something that is rare and to be treasured in this modern society - the developement of young persons character and attitudes to each other can be readily seen at anytime in our community. Man has a lot to answer for in this world, by what is commonly called progress, Taylors Mistake community should not become a victim of the "destroy to modernise" syndrome.

With regards to the proposed developement -

It would certainly attract hundreds more people, thereby giving them some of the benefits that we have enjoyed for 50 years.

However we must not overlook the fact that this can be a dangerous beach and can be hazardous to life to the uninitiated, the present community treat our environment with a healthy respect and have been instrumental in saving lives of day trippers. The proposed plan exposes more people to the dangers we have come to know so well.

Our forefathers created a reserve for future generations, to put a road through it is sheer bad planning and totally undesirable a clear repetition of the road that almost went through Hagley Park - it must not be allowed to go through.

The road into Taylors is inadequate to cope with the additional traffic and car parking would certainly need to be created, or we would create another hazzard to life.

I submit that our planners should not destroy to create but should build on to the good things that exist to enable more people to experience a way of life that is unique to Taylors Mistake - retain the batches and retain a desirable community.

*JB & B.A. Anderson*

## The Chairman of City Planners

Mr & Mrs Anderton Nos. 337 & 338

Recc 3: Concerning the valley at the back of Taylors Mistake.

This Plan has had not much thought put into it as for the fact that the Valley floor is not suitable for the amenities suggested as we have seen in past years through the damage of storms. For all the work that would be involved in the making of playfields, picnic facilities it would not take long to be swamped. Ornamental gardens and other planted areas and landscape features would also be destroyed throughout the winter months. As for the cycle tracks I feel that there is no suitable area for development of this kind in this plan. Walkways for enjoyment have already been provided for around the existing community of Baches. The historic buildings and monuments of any value to the area have already been taken down or demolished. In conclusion I think the environment should be left unchanged in this zone.

Recc 4: Foreshore at Taylors Mistake.

In this there is no provision made on the map for the Buildings already sited at the Bay - Baches and Surfclub. As for availability and suitability of land there is plenty of area left behind the existing Bach sites to develop these amenities. With the practice proposed there would be extra road usage and since the road is already narrow in places it would need to be upgraded considerably, thus causing more problems. Concerning the foreshore and dunes, I feel that landscaping of this area would be a waste of time hence the freak tides we often get at the beaches.

In conclusion I feel that if it is left unchanged it would be of more benefit to the close community as it has been for 80 years or so. As for helping to keep the Beach clean and helping with activities for the Surf Club etc the owners of the Baches have been more help than a hinderance to the Bay, so I feel it would be a great shame to see it all changed for lack of thought on the part of the council planner.

Recc 3: Pertaining to the Valley situated at Taylors Mistake

In the zone statement it quotes "The zone is intended to provide for active recreation and consists mainly of large recreation reserves used for active sports and organized games".

This land is not suitable for sports fields because of the wind which comes down the valley and because the area is far to cold and exposed to be used in the Winter, therefore any facilities provided would only be able to be used for part of the year. The area on both sides of the valley floor is very steep and not suitable for walkways or cycleways. During storms several years ago and including the "Wahine Disaster Storm" sea water flowed up through the lagoon and some of this land was flooded. Any facilities or sports grounds could be affected by this type of action occurring again. The area also acts as a natural catchment area of water coming down from the surrounding hills. The inclusion of picnic shelters, more play equipment and more parking would not be a very wise move because of the problem of sewerage and ability of the existing road to handle more traffic. The sewerage at the moment stops at the top of the hill and would have to be brought down. On the subject of historic buildings and monuments the council has already demolished a number of Baches built into caves which were examples of Pioneers ingenuity and expertise. The sun dial which stood on the Surf Club premises has not been replaced since the damage was done to it in the last big storm, when the actual Surf Club was damaged.

I feel that this valley should remain in its present condition and that money spent developing this area would be better spent on an area that could be utilized all the year around.

Recc 4: Foreshore area of Taylors Mistake

I feel this area is as well developed at the moment as is possible. Any development in the area could be detrimental to the environment. The existing area is well serviced with toilet and changing facilities, a Surf Club, which is one of the strongest in N.Z, existing walkways around the foreshore which continue to link up with Godley Heads walkway and the existing car parking facilities provided. The council has never bothered to provide any storm protection or stabilization of the sand dunes in this area before now and I feel it would not be of any use now. Tides are so unpredictable that it would only take one unusually high tide to wash any improvements away. An example of this would be the work that was carried out at Sumner. All the Marran Grass that was planted plus all the sand it was starting to collect has been washed away. There is no provision in this plan for existing buildings or the community which is already in existence and has been there since 1902. These baches provide the man power to service the Surf Club and many bach holders are honorary ranges appointed to look after the councils interests. Bach holders spend many hours cleaning up after the public has left e.g. cleaning the beach of rubbish and collecting empty bottles before they are broken. Many of them have built walls to keep back the tide and some have planted iceplant etc to help keep the erosion back. They also keep all the walkways around the foreshore clean of weeds and trim back the vegetation to help keep them tidy.

In the 28 years I have been associated with Taylors Mistake I have rescued many children left unsupervised in the water, helped to fight the odd outbreak of fire on the surrounding hill area, helped the public in the cases of minor injuries and supplied information on the area to the inquiring public. If nobody was there who would carry out these duties? Hopefully the Council will consider my suggestions and give a little consideration to the existing community which I feel this area cannot do without.

# TAYLORS MISTAKE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES

## TOWN PLANNING REPORT

### A. INTRODUCTION

This report covers the houses built at the toe of the steep hills on the southern side of Taylors Mistake Beach. The report proves that there are good town planning grounds and social grounds, to residentially zone the land.

### B. PRESENT SITUATION

The houses are privately owned. The sites are not precisely located, but are leased from the Christchurch City Council. They are nominally on a coastal access strip, but the beach has built up in front of them and they are a substantial distance from the beach.

Houses are reasonably maintained inspite of the discouraging effect of temporary leases. A more secure tenure would undoubtedly lead to a higher standard of maintenance and development. Even now the unformed nature of the development lends a charm and atmosphere suited to a beach resort.

There is a substantial sand area in front of these houses and the area is not subject to erosion, nor does this presence affect the sand-dune system needed for coastal protection as they are sited largely on the toe of the hill slopes.

The precise location is difficult to determine on plan 4A of the proposed 2nd review of the City of Christchurch District Planning Scheme. For this reason the above scheme could be claimed to be deficient in terms of Section 22 (3) of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1978. This section requires:

"Every district planning map and inset map shall be drawn on a base which includes sufficient detail to enable the areas or properties, to which particular ordinances, designations, or proposals for development apply, to be ascertained."

Because of this doubt it has been necessary to test the validity of the 2nd Review Scheme proposals on the basis of the properties of the objectors being on land either zoned Recreation 3 or Recreation 4.

### C. TAYLORS MISTAKE

Taylors Mistake is a unique area of Christchurch City. It is a relatively isolated area separated from the urban areas by a spur of the Port Hills. The only access is a narrow winding and steep road. The development is limited by the topography, and the geology of the area, and the poor access. Any improvement to the latter would be difficult and expensive -- and cannot be foreseen as likely.

The lack of further development potential is recognised in the proposed planning scheme by zoning the hills Rural 1. The scheme statement states "Further subdivision in these areas is prohibited". The zone statement for Rural 1 says "The purpose of the zone is - - - - to contain the urban uses of the City". These ideals are not challenged. They are considered to be wise prudent and imaginative planning.

The point is that the residential community is unlikely to expand to become an outlying suburb of the Christchurch City. Some minor resubdivision is all that is likely. The potential of the present residential zoning would allow development to a population of about 400 that could look towards the Taylors Mistake area to provide for their active recreation requirements. This would be satisfied by an area of 1.6 ha - using the parameter of 4 ha per 1000 as stated in the scheme statement. Even this could be better provided at Sumner where the better access would mean the provision could be of use to a greater area.

Taylors Mistake serves the City and the Christchurch Metropolitan Area for sea orientated recreation, particularly surfing and surf life saving, but also general swimming, and coastal rambling. The, at times hazardous nature of the beach for swimming means the presence of supervision such as that provided by the surf life saving club is essential for safety.

Although it could be going too far to say the presence of the surf life saving club is dependent on the houses in question, it is noteworthy that a large proportion of the house owners ( out of the ) are members of the club. The ability to stay close to the club is a major factor of their membership, and because of this they are able to give their services for beach patrol duties for much longer periods than if they stayed elsewhere in Christchurch.

#### D. RECREATION 3 ZONE

The Zone Statement of the 2nd Review Scheme gives as the purpose of the Recreation 3 Zone "to provide for active recreation and consists of large recreation reserves used for active sports and organised games". Also a number of incidental purposes are given for these areas, such as "areas of amenity value" or "the protection of the natural environment" - matters open to considerable licence in interpretation.

The houses of the objectors are most likely on a narrow leg of this proposed reserve. This leg is of no practical use to the balance of the proposed active reserve. They do not impede access, in fact the residents maintain the area and access in a tidy condition, and this is used by the public without let or hindrance. The pressures of use would be effective in preventing the area being as "natural environment" even if the houses weren't there.

A very large area is being set aside for recreation -

That zoned Recreation 3 scales 6.4 ha., and that zoned Recreation 4 scales 3 ha. Also shown is a very extensive coastal access strip and the Godley Head land is shown as recreation reserve and farm park. The small strip of land under question is not essential to any recreational use by the public at large. The use of this land for housing does not impede public free use and enjoyment of the adjoining reserve areas.

#### D. RECREATION 4 ZONE

The purpose of the Recreation 4 Zone, as set out in the zone statement, is to "cover the physically sensitive dune and foreshore areas of Summer, Taylors Mistake, and Brighton".

There is no doubt that the protection of such areas is an essential part of the planning scheme for Christchurch where such a restriction is necessary. The land occupied by the houses that are the subject of this objection does not come into this category because they are not on foreshore, being built on the toe of the hill slopes with substantial sand dunes and beach formation between them and the defined foreshore. Therefore it is reasonable to assume these houses are not on the area shown as Recreation 4. Even if they were, their siting and existing use does not detract from the purpose of that zoning.

#### E. RESIDENTIAL USE

Modern town planning practice is now recognising the need to provide a variety of residential opportunity to meet the wishes and aspirations of the people. This is recognised in the proposed 2nd Review for Christchurch City wherein it is stated in the scheme statement - that the General Planning Objective for Residential Choice is "to provide opportunities for the widest possible choice of housing types and environment."

The residential enclave on the foot of the hills at the southern side of Taylors Mistake is one such place of choice. The group is a community in its own right with a special community spirit and interest in the protection and well being of the Taylors Mistake beach. Such groups need to be encouraged particularly where, as in this case, they do not detract from the public enjoyment of an area. In this case the presence of the houses, and their occupants, has advantages to the public use of the Taylors Mistake area. This is by their actions in maintaining pedestrian access around the south side of the beach, and by the very necessary surveillance of the beach. This latter is both officially as members of the surf club, and for much greater coverage and time by their very presence close to the beach. This adds very much to the safety of the beach for general public and as a deterrent to vandalism and rowdiness which is unfortunately so common in other public areas.

A claim has been made that the appearance is less than desirable. The present informality has some charm to many, but the present very restrictive terms of lease, and the present lack of surety of tenure is to blame. All of the tenants who are party to this objection are desirous of upgrading their properties.

#### F. PROTECTION OF THE NATURAL COASTLINE

"The protection of the natural character of the coastal resource is a planning matter of national importance, as is the wise use and management of New Zealand's resources".

The above sections of this report prove that the retention of these houses would meet both of these requirements, sited as they are adjacent to the coast they are a means by which the use of the coastal resource of Taylors Mistake beach can be managed to the general welfare of the people of the district and region.

Those units that did not fully meet this criteria have since been removed. The remaining existing use for residential purposes is not only not contrary to good town planning practice, it meets all of the tests as set out as matters of national purposes and the purposes of district schemes as set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1977.

#### G. SUMMARY

In summary there is ample proof of the contention that the zoning of the area of these houses for residential purposes is good town planning practice, and is in the general interest of the Christchurch District as a whole. The zoning for recreation is unnecessary.

The bases of these claims are:

- (a) There is a more than ample provision for recreation at Taylors Mistake for local, district, and regional needs.
- (b) The presence of the houses assists in the safety of use of the beach, the maintenance of order, and the pedestrian access around the coast.
- (c) The present appearance is the result of insecurity of tenure. Security of tenure will result in a greatly improved appearance without destruction of the charm and fitness of scale that already exists.
- (d) Zoning of this land for residential purposes is good town planning practice in compliance with the requirements the Act, is to the enhancement of the social environment of the area, and of benefit to all legitimate uses of the beach.

## The Chairman of City Planners

Mr D.W. & Mrs A. Anderson Nos: 341 & 342

Recc 3: In this plan we are dealing with aspects of developing amenities to incorporate recreation reserves, pedestrian links, playgrounds etc. Concerning the land in relation to Taylors Mistake that is to be used for these ideas, as we all to well know the sea itself has a mind of its own and the risk of wave erosion will occur as it has done in the past. It does not matter how much landscaping is done, the sea through winter freak tides will take all i.e. Summer. Also the area mentioned for development is basically a moisture area through rains and high tides causing lagoons. It is also very exposed to winds and I feel it would be unstable for building on because these facts will reoccur at Winter as it always does. Buildings of Historic interest are of value to the community because of scarcity of such items and these should be retained as they now stand on the foreshore for all to see and admire, as they add character to the area. Cyclist tracks will have to be very steep and cyclists themselves will be a nuisance as the area is very confined and this will create problems with pedestrian and motor vehicles causing injuries. Walkways have already been developed successfully for years around the community and people can enjoy and enhance the sights which involve the group of Baches as they now stand - we provide a subject matter with visitors. The area mentioned is already a playground, we as children made our own enjoyment of the natural resources of the area by enjoying grass tobogganing, skate boarding, building huts in surrounding tree areas, there was always plenty of walks around the Bay, seacastle competitions, hide and seek in the sand dunes etc. so why spend money on what is already a natural playground.

I feel that this valley is not a suitable choice and that money spent developing this area could be better spent on amusement areas where a larger percentage of people could utilize this development throughout the whole of the year not just the summer months.

Recc 4: Foreshore area with regard to Taylors Mistake. I feel that this area is already developed enough and it will be the same in 10 years or so even if landscaping etc takes part. The improvements I feel would not have a detrimental effect as the community have always taken the effort to establish plants and buildings walls to keep back the sea but to no avail the sea and people will destroy what effects are made. We use our own time to repair work that may have an effect on the area i.e. concreting steps, walls, drainage problems etc. Yet with more people coming and going we are going to run into problems such as the risk of Fires. It becomes increasingly dry over the summer months and then you have to think of the difficulty of Fire Engines arriving in time from the nearest Station. This leads to another problem of road usage. The road is not up to standard and will have to be upgraded and widened. The area itself is so close to Christchurch but yet so far for people to recognize as being a recreational area and I feel that it would have only a seasonal use in summer months only.

In conclusion I think that since the Planners have encountered upon building other amenities why not incorporate the existing community as an essential part to any development. We have over the past contributed to rescue, fought surrounding hill fires, helped at accidents, given guide and assistance to the Public and knowledge about the area, so if redeveloped it would destroy a worthy sector of the community.



66 Matlock Street,  
Christchurch 6  
17th March, 1981

The Chairman,  
Town Planning Committee.

Dear Sir,

Re - Objections Town Planning at Taylors Mistake

As a member of the Taylors Mistake Association I list my reasons for objecting to any changes in this area.

REC 3.

Pertaining to the valley and proposed sports area. In the winter this area is flooded from water coming down the valley and would cover the proposed sports arena which would have to be maintained frequently, also by having a sports area the road would be used more and at the present time it is not wide enough to take the flow of traffic both ways and on many occasions there is a congestion of cars and motor cycles at the bottom of the hill and existing car park which also gets flooded in wet weather.

The proposed building of a caretakers residence and outbuildings for which building permits would be required, at the moment no permits are being issued because of toilet facilities not being available.

With the existing toilets in the car park how do they expect to cope with the increased patronage, even now with the walkway going from Taylors Mistake to Godley Heads there are no toilet facilities after they leave the car park at Taylors Mistake.

The Surf Club has been there for many years and its membership is made up mainly by bach holders families and friends for which we have a great record of no drowning fatalities.

REC 4.

The Council have formed a road across a Reserve which allows motor vehicles to use and many cars park there and have broken up the foreshore which up till then did not need maintenance and now the Council has put heavy shingle and metal down which is breaking up the foreshore further.

The existing maps show no provision for the baches already on sites, in fact they are not even shown on the current plans.

CONCLUSION:

In conclusion I wish to say that the Council has not thoroughly looked into the breaking up of a community which has been in existence for a century and I would like to see this area left as is.

Yours faithfully,

*F.M. Green*

F.M. Green

Bach Holder 62 - Taylors Mistake.

66 Matlock Street,  
Christchurch 6.  
17th March, 1981

Chairman.  
Town Planning Review.

Dear Sir,

As a member of the Taylors Mistake Association, the following are my objections to changes planned for that area.

Rec 3.

Pertaining to the sports and recreational grounds, caretakers cottage and equipment sheds in the valley.

All these would end up in the sea after a heavy downpour, as this area is a torrent at these times.

The road to Taylors Mistake would have to be widened as it is not even wide enough now. With cars parked at various points it is virtually a one way road.

REC 4.

Maintenance of sand dunes and water front. The Council does the opposite by pushing the car park into what once was sand dunes. Council formed a Reserve and then promptly formed an illegal road across it. What was once a sandy foreshore is now a mass of clay and metal.

In conclusion I feel that the Council would not be able to afford the changes necessary for the plans they have for this area. Therefore I would like to see Taylors Mistake left as a community as it exists at present.

Yours faithfully,

*W R Green*

W.R. Green  
Bach Holder 62 - Taylors Mistake.

Christchurch City Council,  
P.O. Box 237,  
Christchurch 1

23 Westerleigh Street,  
Bishopdale,  
Christchurch 5,  
18/3/81.

attention: Mr Johnson

Quote No TP/9

City Plan Review - Taylors Mistake

My objection is to the Councils policy in the rezoning of Taylors Mistake with regard to the removal of the baches around the foreshore but support its views in the overall development of the valley.

My parents purchased our bach, No 46, in 1941 and our family has had close association with the bay ever since, visiting nearly every weekend summer and winter. The existing community has assisted the public in many ways over the years, supported the surf club and helped to patrol the beach so I cannot see what would be achieved by the removal of the present dwellings.

Yours faithfully.

R B Pratley

R. B. PRATLEY.

5 Cardiff Avenue,  
Christchurch 2

9 March 1981

The Town Clerk,  
Christchurch City Council TP/9

Dear Sir,

In reply to your letter dated 3 February 1981 re  
City plan review.

I do not like the planning provision because it  
fails to recognise the present community, which should  
be recognised in some way.

Should it not be possible to include the baches  
in the new planning act, would the council then con-  
sider revising the plan for the removal of the baches  
in 1986 and allow the baches to remain until such time  
as the City Council has the money available to develop  
the bay as suggested in the town and country plan.

Yours faithfully,

(H. E. Eastwick)

*H. E. Eastwick*

# Chairman City Planning Scheme

Mrs Black.

NO 5914

Sec 2

In reference to the above section, I would like to state my opinion of the suggested statement. Having been a holiday resident for many years I have studied the Vally floor of Taylor's Mistake from Godlyhead to Summer. Periodically the seas have been unusual, & have destroyed many things there. Your plan is to provide reserves, community centres, & gardens etc. To my mind I see it is only a waste of time & money. In the Winter months it is very unattractive. Very high tides, & the sun does not penetrate most of the bay. Rain & mud comes down the valley like a river & will cost a great deal of money to upgrade it. The Pavilion has also been undermined & the sand dunes been washed away. Altogether when the sea is angry there, it can be a sorry sight.

Sec 3

Recreation & active sport is alright if it can be continued all the time, but knowing the seas as I do other than it would be a waste to do the things you have suggested. A good deal of money would have to be spent to widen & upgrade the road to the bay, as it is in a shocking condition now. As for historic things, there have been those things, but have been destroyed already. Such as quaint caves & the sun dial. People have walked down the beach & gazed in wonderment at the quaint bay.

that still exist there. They are not an  
obstruction to anybody. If anything the back  
owners provide tidy tracks which the council  
don't maintain for them to get access to  
the other small bay at high tide.  
There is already a walkway there &  
people come & enjoy the walk without  
being harassed. One big factor is a  
great many back owners have at least one  
in the family in the Surf Lifesaving Club.  
Take them away & you have no team  
to man the beach.

In conclusion, I do not agree to  
the Town Planning Scheme, as it will  
deny the tourists of something quaint  
& different

# Objection to the Christchurch City Council Future plan to remove Taylors Mistake from RT & OJ McKinley Reasons

1 The reasons for objecting to the proposed future rezoning of Taylors Mistake are because the future plan does not allow for existing batches to remain after March 1986.

2 The future plan does not take into account the fact that right now and for a very long time past <sup>there</sup> ~~that is~~ and has been a recognised community of batch owners.

Under the future plan the council makes no provision for batches in the area around the Forshaw and in my view this would destroy a great part of the character of the bay, just as it would destroy a great part of the people who would be affected by this plan.

3 The loss of the batches in the bay in my mind would be a great disadvantage to the bay as a place of recreation because the surf club I am sure would suffer in the future in so much as that the club in the past, at the present time and in the future, has done, does now and will need to in the future, draw a lot of its active members from the batch holding community. Taylors Mistake can be a very dangerous beach and therefore needs a good, strong, large, active, surf life saving team to patrol and maintain the beach.

4 Taylors Mistake was developed in the past by a group of people who had a great many things in common in that they had a love for this beach and its surrounding environment and they all shared in building the bay and community into what it is today and many of the same families are

still carrying on that common interest three or four generations later, so by removing the batches a great community interest would be lost and I feel that it would be a great pity.

6 I am sure that there is a great deal of scope for the future development of the bay and its existing community and surrounding environment and not to include the batches in this future development would be a great tragedy to those families that have put so much into building up the bay into the popular place that it is today.

7 I P Tylors Mistake were to be opened up I doubt very much if the environment and ecosystem could handle too many people and I am sure that in a short time a lot of the features of the bays ecosystem would be destroyed. The batch owners have planted and developed a good ground cover of plants and trees which in a harsh environment such as Tylors Mistake has is very hard to maintain and if a great amount of people were to start using the area it would be destroyed in no time at all.

Good evidence of this can be seen in the sand dune area which is in a very poor state and part of this can be put down to the number of people who walk over that area and slowly and surely destroy it.

8 In the past the council has had no regular plan to develop or maintain the bay just as the batch holders have not had any security in the future of their batches with the result being that the community and the environment have become run down to a fairly poor state.

So if in the future a common development plan was to come about between the batch holders and the council I am sure that a much improved environment and community



would evolve and I am sure that this would  
be to everyone's advantage.