

Submission regarding Proposed Lease of Nunweek Park land for a third Hockey Field.

From Brian Hitchon, 8 Kilmuir Lane, Harewood, Christchurch Ph 366 6143 (weekday), email address brian@topmaq.co.nz

17th January 2012

I have lived in the Burnside/Harewood area for over 50 years including 7 years in my current property, sharing a boundary with Nunweek Park.

I object strongly to the proposed lease for the following reasons:

1. The granting of the lease will result in the loss of a significant area of park land, currently available for the use of the general public. Hockey already has EXCLUSIVE use of a sizeable area and the granting of the lease will increase that area to about 10.5% of the entire Park.

Because it is fenced, no person other than a member of the Hockey Club will be able to use it. Unlike sports such as rugby, soccer, cricket and touch rugby, where the playing surface is available to the general public at the conclusion of any game, the fenced Hockey Fields are not.

2. In making the request to lease additional Park land, Canterbury Hockey has had no regard for members of the general public who will be denied access to land they have used for many years. While it may be expedient and convenient for both Hockey and the Christchurch City Council to seek and grant a lease allowing Hockey exclusive use of more of Nunweek Park, it would be at a further cost to people who lost considerable Park land to Hockey in 2011. Imagine the public outcry if Hockey was to seek exclusive use of part of Hagley Park to establish a new Field. With two fenced Fields, Hockey has enough of Nunweek Park in its possession.
3. Hockey, because of its need for a sizeable area of Park land, its EXCLUSIVE use of that land, and its need to build unattractive fences, lighting poles and viewing towers, is a very intrusive activity. It would be sensible to minimise the impact on the Nunweek Park and the surrounding community by constructing the third Field at another location such as the Wigram Sports Park. The expanding Wigram community would probably welcome the construction of a local Field and reduced travel distances, limiting the burden on the Nunweek Park community.
4. If the lease is granted and the Field constructed there will be no opportunity for a review of its impact or suitability. Removing or relocating it, will not be an option.
5. The visual impact of a 2.4m high fence and 8 x 18m high lighting poles cannot be underestimated. While the first Field fencing and buildings were not particularly noticeable,

the impact of the second Field fencing, lighting poles and viewing tower, because of the proximity to Wooldridge Road, is much more obvious and visually undesirable. A third Field with a separation from Wooldridge Road of only a few metres will result in the Southern end of the Park being dominated by fencing, lighting poles and artificial surface, impacting detrimentally on the Park's aesthetic appeal.

The removal of existing trees along Wooldridge Road and their replacement with smaller bushes is not acceptable. A pleasing feature of Nunweek Park is the existence of large trees and the requirement of Canterbury Hockey to construct another hockey Field does NOT justify their removal. Instead of destroying part of an excellent Park, why does Hockey not establish another Field elsewhere?

6. The volume of traffic carried by Wooldridge Road has increased markedly since the earthquake and any further increase regardless how modest, will exacerbate the congestion and potential for accident or injury during peak times. Many of the conclusions of the VIASTRADA traffic assessment dated Nov 2011 are meaningless as they have been based on traffic count information collected in 2008. Current post earthquake volumes are well in excess of the 2008 counts. It would appear that the report authors have not bothered to visit the Hockey car park entrance on Wooldridge Road at peak traffic times nor during weekday touch rugby games nor Saturday rugby games to establish the true traffic volumes.

The report gives no consideration to the traffic implications on Wooldridge Road of the NZTA four lane planning and removal of Wairakei Road roundabout on Russley Road. The NZTA report states "Traffic from Wairakei Road that wishes to turn right into Russley Road (SH1) may divert onto Wooldridge Road and left turn onto Harewood Road. NZTA are considering a left turn lane on this approach. <http://www.nzta.govt.nz/projects/russley-road-four-laning/faqs.html>". When implemented, the traffic volume on Wooldridge Road is likely to increase significantly. The Nov 2011 VIASTRADA report is both inaccurate and misleading and must be disregarded.

While Canterbury Hockey, like many sports, has been disadvantaged by the earthquake, they should not, for reasons of convenience be granted exclusive possession of additional land which is currently available for the use ALL members of the public. Other sports grounds are available and Hockey already has exclusive possession of a large portion of Nunweek Park. This lease should not be allowed to proceed.

I am available to answer any questions that may arise in connection with this submission.



Brian Hitchon