

14. MID HEATHCOTE RIVER/OPAWAHO LINEAR PARK MASTERPLAN STAGE 1 – REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8608
Officer responsible:	Transport & Greenspace Manager
Author:	Consultation Leader, Ann Campbell

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to respond to a request for further information by the Community Board at their meeting of 3 December 2010, in regard to item 12 on the agenda, “New Playground Development and Naming – Hunter Terrace and Sloan Terrace Roadway Enhancements”.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. At the 3 December 2010 meeting of the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board, staff presented a report seeking approval for the final landscape plans for the new playground at 54 Colombo Street, Hunter Terrace Roadway Enhancement, and Sloan Terrace Roadway Enhancement. This report also sought approval for parking restrictions that will be implemented following the completion of construction.
3. The Community Board resolved to approve the staff recommendations, but also requested further information to be provided in relation to this project. The information requested and the staff response is below.
4. *How the funding will be provided for inclusion of the Graham Bennett sculpture which is included in the first stage of the Masterplan.*
Staff response: The artist has estimated that based on seven more pieces (which will complete the artwork), each unit will cost \$9,000. This estimate includes artists fees, assembly, delivery and installation. This estimate does not include any permits, concrete footings, site restoration or lighting (if required). It should also be noted that this cost is based on February 2011 prices for stainless steel which are anticipated to rise. Some additional installation costs may arise depending on specific locations and accessibility of each piece. The total for all seven pieces could be \$90,000.
5. There is the potential to stage the installation of the pieces, with perhaps the first set of three to four pieces, being those closest to the path, creating a gateway effect.
6. There is currently no allowance in the funding for this project, however, a bid will be going forward in the next round of LTP. The design has allowed for this project to be constructed at a later date once funding becomes available.
7. *Whether or not the Malcolm Avenue bridge underpass could be included in the first stage.*
Staff response: The underpass was identified for investigation in the Masterplan, as it would provide an alternative access along the waterway. It removes the need to cross Malcolm Avenue and provides a different experience passing under the bridge.
8. The constraints identified with this project are that there is already a “Kea Crossing” for safe crossing at this intersection and further build outs for additional safety could be a possibility in the future. There would only be room for a narrow path, about 1.2 metre width maximum, and there is also minimal headroom – approximately 2.1 metres (although this does comply with the Building Code for access routes).
9. The northern approach to the underpass comes off a very steep bank, which would require steps down to the underpass. This would preclude pushchairs and children with bicycles utilising this option. After moderate rain, this underpass would be inundated with water for brief periods.

10. CPTED issues have been considered and the underpass would not be a CPTED safety issue during daylight hours. This is because the path would only be 20m long and there is good visibility along the length of the path. At night this path would be unsafe and would not be lit, discouraging use during the hours of darkness.

The experience this would offer in relation to getting close to the water is being replicated further north along the river, with new paths coming down to the water's edge.

11. The construction would be a rock toe support with metal backfill and a loose grit path on top. This would be the cheapest to construct and have the least impact upon the waterway. A Resource Consent is unlikely to allow a solid structure such as a concrete or timber retaining wall to be placed within the waterway invert.
12. The cost estimate for this project could be approximately \$50,000, which would include the approaches to the underpass, and following thorough investigation by the Project Team, and due to the number of constraints identified, it has been decided not to include this option in the project.

13. *An investigation of whether or not a gravel path treatment on the desire line, either side of the Cashmere Club carpark, in addition to the Hunter Terrace road edge treatment, can be included.*

Staff response: In the Masterplan the concept was drawn with the Cashmere Club carpark no longer on the riverbank, and the path network going through this area. Once the Masterplan was adopted new information was provided to staff which supported the Cashmere Club's original submission that the carpark belonged to them and they wished to retain it. A new 2.5m path adjacent to Hunter Terrace is proposed for this section which will contain most pedestrian and cycle movement along the river side of Hunter Terrace. There is proposed new landscape planting surrounding both ends of the carpark and elsewhere along the riverbanks which will result in a change in desire lines for pedestrians.

14. New paths at either end of the Cashmere Club carpark would direct pedestrians into the path of manoeuvring vehicles which would be an unsafe practice. There will be narrower secondary paths proposed for the section further upstream for those pedestrians wishing to take the option of walking closer to the water's edge.
15. Additional gravel paths in this area were not indicated in the Masterplan and have not been allowed for in project cost estimates.
16. *An investigation of carpark availability and options at the No.1 pump station, to include consideration of the future use of the building currently being used as the Council Distribution Centre. This report is also to include an update on the future use of this building.*

Staff response: The future use of the Council Distribution Centre is not part of this project brief, however at this stage, the Distribution Centre will be remaining. Should the Board wish for further information on this building, a request would need to be sent through to the Community Support Unit.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

17. The construction funding for this development project set aside in the 2009-19 LTCCP has been deferred in response to the September and February earthquakes, and due to the reserve area being required as a temporary depot site for the rebuild.
18. However, sufficient funding has been approved in the 2011/12 Annual Plan to complete the consent work for the Hunter and Sloan Terrace sections and also to progress the planning and design work for Waimea and Aynsley Terraces.
19. The construction funding for these and future stages will be reprogrammed in to the next LTCCP.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2009-19 LTCCP budgets?

20. Yes, The budget for this work is held within the Waterways and Land Drainage – Natural Waterways Renewals programme.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

21. No legal issues have been identified.

Have you considered the legal implications of the issue under consideration?

22. Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

23. LTCCP 2009-19

Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Page 116.

- (a) Safety – by ensuring our parks, open spaces and waterways are healthy and safe places;
- (b) Community – by providing welcoming areas for communities to gather and interact;
- (c) Governance – by involving people in decision-making about parks, open spaces and waterways;
- (d) Health – by providing areas for people to engage in healthy activities;
- (e) Recreation – by offering a range of recreational opportunities in parks, open spaces and waterways;
- (f) City Development – by providing an inviting, pleasant and well cared for environment.

24. Parks and Open Spaces Activity Management Plan

Council's objective with urban parks is to provide and manage Community Parks, Garden and Heritage Parks, Sports Parks, and Riverbanks and Conservation areas throughout the city that provide amenity values, areas for recreation and organised sport, garden environments and green corridors, that contribute to the city's natural form, character, heritage and Garden City image.

Do the recommendations of this report support a level of service or project in the 2009-19 LTCCP?

25. Yes, as per above.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

26. Aligns with:
- (a) Parks and Waterways Access Policy;
 - (b) Safer Christchurch Strategy;
 - (c) Youth Strategy;
 - (d) Recreation and Sport Strategy.

Do the recommendations align with the Council's strategies?

27. Yes, as per above.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

28. Consultation for this project was undertaken in June and July 2010 and formed part of the report to the Community Board on 3 December 2010 where approval was sought for the plans.
29. This report is a request for further information from the Community Board, therefore, no consultation is required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board receive the information.

CHAIRPERSONS RECOMMENDATION

For discussion.