

Kōrero mai | Let's talk

## **Submissions on Proposed demolition of Woodham Park Caretakers House**

May 08, 2026 - May 29, 2026

**Please note: these are all accepted submissions on the proposed demolition of Woodham Park Caretakers House. The views are those of the submitters and may include mis- or disinformation, hearsay and offensive or discriminatory language.**

Response No:  
1

Contribution ID: 43633

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice On behalf of a recognised organisation or business

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text Tennis Canterbury and Wilding Park Foundation

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text General Manager

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Bevan Allan Johns

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text Derelict housing creates unsafe neighborhoods

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice On behalf of a recognised organisation or business

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text Historic Places Canterbury

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text Secretary

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Lynne Lochhead

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice No

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text Historic Places Canterbury feels that if the Council has listed a building as recently as 2022 and commissioned a Conservation Plan for it (dated June 2024) it should not now be seeking to demolish the building because it is in a deteriorating condition and numerous complaints have been received about the state of the building. It had already been vacant since 2009 when the decision was made to list it so the state of the building must have been taken into account at that time. The Council as the owner of a listed building needs to be setting the best possible example and not allowing demolition by neglect to become a justification for demolition. If the house were restored it would be possible to lease the property as a family home in the short term. It is within walking distance of a primary school. The conservation plan indicates that it would be possible to improve heating, insulation and ventilation without impacting on the authentic 1940's character of the building. Although a largely unmodified house from this period would clearly not be to the taste of everyone, the advantages of an attractive location within a park setting and proximity to a school would surely ensure that it could be tenanted. The estimated prices for restoration seem excessive based on personal experience of restoring and extending a slightly older property nearby on Woodham Road (see comments in the Historic Places Canterbury submission on the Sexton's Cottage). In the longer term it would be desirable to restore the garden to the style typical of the period when the house was built. This might be in association with a sympathetic tenant. Alternatively the house and garden might become an interpretation centre highlighting the importance of the garden city concept in the development of the city as well as providing an example of a typical home of this period. As domestic buildings of this vintage become scarcer in the city, with the rapid intensification that is occurring, the value of the house as a typical example of its period will increase. Such a use would be compatible with the property becoming a base for community groups and potentially it could be run by an interested community group or charitable trust. The example of the Sutton House and Gardne Trust comes to mind.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Response No:  
3

Contribution ID: 44016

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice On behalf of a recognised organisation or business

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text Planner

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Mitzie Bisnar

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Don't know / Not sure

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text Insufficient information available as to whether all alternatives have been fully assessed before demolition proposed. Please see attached submission.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text Please see attached submission.

Please see attachment on the following pages.



HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND  
POUHERE TAONGA

28 May 2026

Paris Porter  
Engagement Advisor  
Christchurch City Council  
PO Box 73012  
Christchurch Central  
Christchurch 8013

Tēnā koe,

### **PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF WOODHAM PARK CARETAKER'S HOUSE**

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) is an autonomous Crown Entity with statutory responsibility under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA) for the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of New Zealand's historic heritage. HNZPT advocates for the ongoing use including adaptive reuse, continued maintenance and longevity of New Zealand's historic heritage items.

HNZPT has an interest in the Christchurch City Council's (the Council) proposal to demolish the Woodham Park Caretaker's House. While the building is not listed on the New Zealand Heritage List/Rārangi Kōrero, the Former Woodham Park Caretaker's House and its Setting are scheduled as a Significant historic heritage item, (Item no. 1455, Setting no. 679), under the Christchurch District Plan.

The former Woodham Park Caretaker's House, more commonly known as 'Woodham House', comprises historical, cultural, spiritual, social and architectural values. The building was associated with the former Woodham Homestead and the Palaiet, Shands, Whitcombe and Ivimey families; as well as its later use as the home of caretakers for the adjacent Council owned public reserve Woodham Park.

Woodham House comprises significant heritage values which warranted its protection in the Christchurch District Plan and the more recent Plan Change 13.

Given the heritage values of Woodham House and its site, HNZPT encourages the Community Board to consider alternative options before proceeding with their current proposal to demolish. The information available to inform public consultation on this demolition proposal is currently limited and does not detail alternative options considered and/or exhausted by the Council to protect the building from demolition.

The protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development is a matter of national importance, pursuant to Section 6F of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). If the proposal to demolish Woodham House proceeds to a resource consent application, sufficient information should be provided to demonstrate consideration of alternative options including efforts to repair or retain the building, to justify demolition. Recovery of any salvageable heritage fabric or materials, such as those taken from the original Woodham homestead, should also be considered.

Further to the above, if the Community Board proceeds with demolition, regard must be made to archaeological obligations pursuant to the HNZPTA. An archaeological site is defined in the HNZPTA as any



HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND  
POUHERE TAONGA

place occupied prior to 1900 that may provide archaeological information on the history of New Zealand. An archaeological authority is required to modify or destroy an archaeological site.

The project area was historically part of Woodham Estate, which formed part of Rural Section 125. The land containing the project area came into Palaiet's ownership in 1875, when Woodham Estate was established. By 1895, the property was advertised for sale as containing a substantial residence with associated outbuildings, including stabling, and by 1900 sale notices described a 14-bedroom house with additional structures including a gardener's cottage, stables, cowshed, and glasshouses. Historic aerials and survey plans indicate that the main dwelling, gardener's cottage, and glasshouses were located outside the project area. However, associated infrastructure such as drainage may have extended into the setting. While the locations of the stables and cowshed are unknown, an aerial from the 1940s appears to show two small structures within the setting which may relate to the former estate. As such, there is potential for subsurface archaeological remains associated with 19<sup>th</sup> century occupation, including structural remains, drainage features, rubbish pits, latrines, and wells.

While demolition of the existing building would not in itself require an archaeological authority, any associated ground disturbance, such as site clearance, foundation removal, or other earthworks, may affect archaeological remains. As such, HNZPT recommends that any ground disturbance or earthworks for this proposal be assessed by a consultant archaeologist. This assessment would consider the historical occupation of the site, the nature and extent of the proposed works, and whether an archaeological authority is required. If required, the assessment would form the basis of an authority application.

HNZPT also recommends that consultation with Ngāi Tahu is undertaken to discuss the proposal and pathways for ensuring appropriate monitoring, notification and participation where necessary, in the event that cultural material is discovered.

Ngā mihi,

**Arlene Baird**  
**Area Manager Canterbury/West Coast**  
**Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga**

**Address for service:**

Mitzie Bisnar  
Planner Canterbury/West Coast  
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga  
Ph: 03 363 1885  
Email: [mbisnar@heritage.org.nz](mailto:mbisnar@heritage.org.nz)

Response No:  
4

Contribution ID: 43717

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Peter Galbraith

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text It has no heritage value and is causing negative effects on local residents

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Response No:  
5

Contribution ID: 43689

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice

As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text

Niall Kearney

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice

Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text

I don't believe the restoration costs provided are accurate and seem inflated but the cost of demolition will still be incredibly less.

At current the land is in accessible and unusable, restoration would provide a good community amenity but in reality it is unlikely to be utilised or used.

Demolition also provides a community amenity as it removes an antisocial space and will increase the park area

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Response No:  
6

Contribution ID: 43694

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice

As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text

Steven Armstrong

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice

Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text

I believe the money could be spent better elsewhere in the city. For the price to repair this building you could build something new and fit for purpose ( whatever that may be ) and has lower future ongoing maintenance costs. The building is also just a standard design for that period, there is nothing special about it. They are a dime a dozen all over the city. The significance of this building could be captured by a plaque, and the grounds should be returned to green space for all to enjoy.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Response No:  
7

Contribution ID: 43696

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text angeline wadsworth

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text Not that exciting looking house.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Response No:  
8

Contribution ID: 43700

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice

As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text

Myles King

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice

Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text

The house has no significant architectural value.  
The site could be better utilised eg carparking as the street parking around the main entrance next to the house is very limited due to parking restrictions and design of the pedestrian island etc. Or as a interpretation area for Woodham park. What's really needed is a maintenance budget to restore the Woodham park gardens back to the standard they used to be maintained to.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Response No:  
9

Contribution ID: 43710

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Sandra Kennedy

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text This amount of money shouldn't be wasted in the current cost of living crisis. The building is unattractive and obviously not valued. It would be good to get rid of the problems associated with it and open up that part of the park.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text Not that I can think of.

Response No:  
10

Contribution ID: 43713

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Susan Eleanor Peake

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text  
The cost to repair is too high and  
To what end/use would the building be restored?  
Also it's not that old and  
It would great to open up the space to the public

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text What about offering it for \$1 cost for someone to relocate?

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice

As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text

Christine McPhail

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice

Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text

I would prefer the money to go towards green space/play equipment  
Close to areas where there are townhouse blocks and no close areas to play and gather.  
In I apartment areas of Vancouver there are many parks where children and parents gather during the day and in the before evening meal hours. Great when you have no backyard and helps sense of community

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Iveta Sota

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text Too expensive to restore and money could be used to improve existing park, tidy up lights, lanterns, gazebo etc

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text Park is very dark in the evenings :) we could really do with some more light there to keep it nice and safe for everyone passing through

Response No:  
13

Contribution ID: 43686

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Matt Belcher

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text 1940s is not a particular character period in my opinion, if it was pre 1900 it would be another story. I sympathise with the neighbouring family

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Response No:  
14

Contribution ID: 43723

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Vaughan James Kirkland

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text The stated refurbishment price is far too much and not affordable given the strains on council finances .  
Additionally the building holds very little obvious heritage value. It has few, if any rare design elements and not particularly old. There are many houses that are being pulled down every week to that are older and have rarer design elements.  
The removal of this house will open up a larger recreation area -which is what parks are about and not houses.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Response No:  
15

Contribution ID: 43729

**Q1** Are you responding:

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2** Name of organisation/business

Short Text

**Q3** Your role

Short Text

**Q4** Full name

Short Text Kevin McSweeney

**Q8** Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9** Why/why not?

Long Text It is not historic or significant

**Q10** Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?

Long Text

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Edward Michael Ward

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice No

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text

I was raised opposite Woodham Park at 138 Woodham Road.  
The caretakers house along with the majority of properties was always well maintained.  
I remember Mr Chesney, the caretaker mowing the lawns, immaculate gardens and his love of birds.  
The fact that it now in the current state is the result of someone at the council "going to sleep at the wheel".  
This situation hasn't happened overnight and whom ever is to blame should be fired.  
This building is an asset that should have been maintained well before now.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Like a lot of suburbs in Christchurch we seem to be hellbent on destroying our heritage.  
Avonside has also lost a lot of history as result of earthquake damage.  
Please consider this fact.  
I have also written a letter to The Press published 22/05/26 deailing my disgust at the thought of demolition.  
Could this property not be restored and used as a community house of some sort?

Response No:  
17

Contribution ID: 43999

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Jessica Copplestone

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text

The house has been eyesore for years and it definitely needs tidying up, I did not realise it was a council owned building with historical value, I assumed it was a private residence that never received it's earthquake repairs. I always thought it would be lovely to see a cafe in the building with easy access into the park.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Rick Pinnone

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text It looks like a crackhouse. I think it draws degenerates to the park. Generally makes the neighbourhood look bad.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text I like the park and would like to see it expanded into the space that house is in.

Response No:  
19

Contribution ID: 43428

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Cheryl Johnstone

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text There are more worthy projects deserving of the ratepayer money.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice

As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text

Karen Terris

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice

No

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text

To restore this building to be used by/for the community would be much better than demolition of a historic building that is part of the local communities history.

This restored building could be used as a community centre or be hired out for use much like Avebury House, but on a smaller scale. It is worth considering keeping it as part of our local Avonside/Linwood community and a way to bring people together to connect in their own community.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Consider how much has been lost due to earthquakes, how much community matters and how this building could be part of helping to connect and grow relationships and offer services to the local community that currently we have to travel to other suburbs to find.

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Helen Heigold

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice No

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text We have lost too many listed properties.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text Linwood has very few places for community use in this area.

Response No:  
22

Contribution ID: 43681

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Charlotte Nicholl

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text Not worth spending money on. Attracts unwanted behaviors

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text Drain on resources, get rid of it and the behaviour it attracts.

Response No:  
23

Contribution ID: 43680

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Ashley Campbell

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text I didn't even know what was there, so I'm not going to miss it! The plan of opening it up to add to the public parkland is a good one. This area is intensifying significantly, and every bit of public green space is welcomed!

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Aimee Whalley

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice No

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text

Because I believe the council should uphold their responsibility to a property that they have deemed to be a 'Significant Heritage Item'. One might argue that a house built in the 1940's is not as historically significant in comparison to houses from the late 19th/early 20th century which are much older. However, we don't get 100 year old houses by demolishing them in their 80th decade!

Furthermore, I believe the council should be setting an example for private owners of properties that are historically significant. It was irresponsible for the council to neglect the property entirely since 2009, and doing so should not mean you take the easy way out of demolishing it. If the council had not turned their back on the property for so long, it would not be in this state. If we are just going to allow people to neglect properties that are listed as being of 'significant heritage' until they are in disrepair, then what is the point in having any heritage listing at all? If even the council can disregard such a thing, clearly it holds no real weight or consequence. As was seen with the result of the heritage home next to Mona Vale.

If you are going to demolish this property, then I argue that you should simultaneously scrap any council plans which list any buildings to be of significant heritage. Because it will be clear that such a categorisation holds no weight.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

You have a responsibility and duty to set an example for everyone who lives in this city.

If you are allowed to neglect a property like this, then what gives you the right to issue warnings to home owners who have also neglected their property?

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice

As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text

Hazel May

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice

Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text

If it's causing distress to neighbours and isn't going to be restored, use it for the park and turn it into something that is useful for the community. Having old ass abandoned houses around just encourages rubbish dumping.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

It would be cute to turn it into the Caretakers Garden, maybe with a gazebo, a lil pond (I think this is something lacking in Woodham Park - there is already cool birdlife there and a pond would provide more habitat for birds and native skinks etc) or picnic tables in the future. You can honour the history of the site and acknowledge the heritage of the site whilst turning it into something for the community to enjoy. Could plant things that were originally grown at the caretakers home and put some signage up sharing the history of Woodham Park.

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Amber Smith

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Somewhat

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text The considerable damage to the property has me leaning towards demolition. But I have a proposed idea of a small community garden area, im aware we have the Richmond community area which has seen success recently, why not bring this idea into a small area, community run and led. Parts of the house could even be used in the creation of garden beds etc.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text Not sure just food for thought here.

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Maria E J Cavanagh

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text The house has been sitting unused for 17 years. There are numerous homeless in Ōtautahi that may have / could have used the house in that time, but it was boarded up. So people used it for whatever purposes they did (according to the information provided). 17 years of a wasted building, that some family could have been housed in. Tut tut Christchurch City Council. 17 years!!!!!! Now it is too badly damaged for anyone to live in. Remove it and use the area for one of the many community needs that council has been canvassed for.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text The most cost effective option.

Response No:  
28

Contribution ID: 43671

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Molly

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text Because could be built and used for essential services and needs

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text No

Response No:  
29

Contribution ID: 43670

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Caitlin Turner

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text The building is taking up desirable space which can be better used for leisure by our community. I don't feel comfortable in our park due to undeniable behaviour by squatters who frequently occupy the space. I'd like the area to feel safer for our children.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text It would be great to extend the grounds to Woodham Park and perhaps have an area for a market of community events

Response No:  
30

Contribution ID: 43669

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Jenny Hargreaves

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text Woodham Park is a treasure of the east and unfortunately the derelict house at the entrance creates an unwelcoming atmosphere and feels unsafe. It is great to know the history and I'd welcome signs about the history of the park but I don't think restoring this building should be a priority.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

Response No:  
31

Contribution ID: 43656

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Rebecca Clarke

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text It's old and rundown and no significance, no real heritage value in my eyes. Attracts unwanted attention. Not worth rate payers money.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text No, why did it even get heritage status, demolish it.

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Michael Anthony Hurrell

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice No

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text I agree with the Woodham House Heritage Assessment and the Woodham House Conservation Plan documents. This dwelling needs to be preserved because of its historical significance.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text Having it rented out once restoration is complete would help keep the cottage habitable and offset the costs of restoration.

Response No:  
33

Contribution ID: 43505

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice

As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text

Dianne Archie

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice

Yes

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text

I support the plan as long as the grounds become part of the park, and not sold to private developers for building townhouses. Please consider keeping any suitable building materials that could be reused for part of the park. Please consider creating a heritage "story" on the land telling the history of the house and who lived there. Some of the materials from the demolition might be able to be reused. You could also consider creating a photo story like the one on the corner of Pattern street and retreat road.

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text

**Q1 Are you responding:**

Multi Choice As an individual

**Q2 Name of organisation/business**

Short Text

**Q3 Your role**

Short Text

**Q4 Full name**

Short Text Sonia Terry Bell

**Q8 Overall, do you support the plan to demolish Woodham House?**

Multi Choice Somewhat

**Q9 Why/why not?**

Long Text Instead of demolishing move to Red zone for homeless temporarily so social services can connect with intent to rehabilitate.  
Some shelter is better than none

**Q10 Is there anything else the Council needs to consider?**

Long Text Doing the same with other unused buildings