

1. NORTHWOOD FOUNTAIN/SCULPTURE REDESIGN

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment Group DDI 941-8656
Officer responsible:	Manager Transport and Greenspace
Authors:	Mary Hay, Consultation Leader, and Maria Adamski, Parks and Waterways Contract Manager Premier Parks

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the approval of the Council to remove the water component of the Nor' West Arch.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The Northwood fountain is located at the entrance to Northwood in a traffic island, which is intersected by Northwood Boulevard, O'Neill Avenue and Mounter Avenue. The fountain is part of a sculpture known as the Nor' West Arch, which was designed by John Marsh, for R D Hughes, the developer of the Northwood subdivision.
3. Since mid 2005 the local Northwood Residents' Association has been responsible for the maintenance of the fountain. However, in recent times, there have been some ongoing issues with the maintenance of the fountain, which requires a high level of service to maintain it appropriately. The Residents' Association, at its AGM held in March 2007, voted to discontinue the maintenance of the fountain and asked that it be decommissioned as a water feature.
4. In May/June 2007, the local community was consulted about a proposal that replaced the water with boulders. There was strong support for the proposal to change to the fountain's current use as a water feature into a passive sculpture. (see **attachment 1**)

Feedback	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
"Yes, I support the redesign of the fountain/sculpture"	389	82%
"No, I do not support the redesign of the fountain/sculpture"	82	17%
Position not indicated	5	1%

5. Given that a number of residents raised concerns about the proposed redesign of the fountain, these comments have been considered and the concept will be amended to reflect community views, where possible.
6. The designer has developed two new alternatives to the initial concept, while keeping to the original intent of the design, which was supported by the vast majority of submitters. The three options are outline below and included as **attachment 3**.

Option 1 - replaces the water with riverstone. This makes only a very subtle change to the existing picture by removing the water and replacing it with more riverstone to conceal the concrete weir structures. The Nor' West Arch/Canterbury Plains theme is essentially retained intact. This option is the cheapest and was proposed in the consultation. Cost approximately \$8,000.

Option 2 - replaces the water with the softer textures of planting. Plants proposed are Phormium 'Pepe' – a dwarf green flax and Chionochloa flavicans – a dwarf snow tussock with Toe toe like plumes. These will give a green textural contrast to the green Hebe ground covers behind, with their spiky or grass like foliage. The creamy plumes on the snow tussock will give some seasonal change to the planting as they are very 'showy' when they first appear. Riverstone would be used as mulch beneath these plants. Cost approximately \$18,000.

Option 3 - is a combination of the above options incorporating Chionochloa flavicans and the riverstone boulders. Cost approximately \$11,000.

7. The preferred concept is Option 3 the combination of plantings and riverstone boulders (refer to **attachment 3** - Option 3 'The Preferred Option'). This option is only moderately more expensive than the option that was proposed to the community and responds to the call for more plantings and/or colour within the sculpture, while maintaining the well supported braided river theme. This solution is in keeping with the original intent of the design and will have minimal requirements in terms of ongoing maintenance.
8. If the removal of the water component of the Nor' West Arch is approved by Council, and the redesign includes planting, then it is expected that work will be coordinated around the next planting season. Work would proceed around April 2008.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9. Funding from the Council is being provided from the Transport and Greenspace Capital Programme and operational budget. Specifically:
 - \$11,000 Transport and Greenspace Capital Programme (2007/08) 542/1178/2/8 Landscaping renewals.
 - \$700 Annual Operation budget 561/123/9 Fountains, Clocks and Statues.

Do the Recommendations of this Report Align with 2006-16 LTCCP budgets?

10. Yes. Funding is provided from within the Transport and Greenspace Capital Programme in the 2006-16 LTCCP and the Transport and Greenspace operational budget.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

11. Advice was sought from the Legal Service Unit about the appropriate delegations for the decommissioning and redesign of the Northwood fountain. This issue was researched and it was found that none of the delegations specifically refer to a power to redesign structures already erected on roads. However, it is likely that a power to erect or construct also implies a power to repair or reconstruct that same thing, and therefore any delegation of such a power would also include that implication.
12. The approval by the Council for the erection of the fountain on the traffic island followed the approval for the traffic island as part of the subdivision consent. This, and the fact there are no conditions, is confirmed by the report to the Council, which was adopted by the Council on 19 April 2000 without amendment. The actual recommendation adopted by the Council on 19 April 2000 was:

- “1. *That the concept of the construction of the architectural feature on a legal road be endorsed.*
2. *That care be taken that the water feature be well designed to reduce the need for maintenance in the future.*
3. *That the developers be congratulated for the proposal to enhance the round-about in this way.”*

Relevant legislation

Roads

1. Under the Local Government Act 1974 the Council's powers, in relation to roads, includes section 319, which provides:

“The Council shall have power in respect of roads to do the following things:

- (a) *To **construct, upgrade, and repair all roads** with such materials and in such manner as the council thinks fit:*
- (b) *Repealed.*
- (c) *To lay out new roads:*
- (d) ***To divert or alter the course of any road:...***”

2. Sections 333(1) and 334(1) have more specific powers, as follows:

“333...

- (1) *The Council may on any road construct, erect, or grow thereon or remove therefrom such barriers, dividing strips, guiding or sign posts, pillars or other markers, trees, hedges, lawns, gardens, and other devices as are, in the opinion of the council, necessary for separating, guiding, or warning traffic, intercepting glare, or for any other purpose.”*

“334 ...

- (1) *The Council may—*

- (a) *Construct and enclose any part of a road as a pedestrian safety area:*
- (b) *Lay out or plant grass plots or flower beds or trees on any road, and prohibit traffic, in whole or in part, on any such plots and flower beds laid out in roads (whether laid out before or after the commencement of this Part of this Act) by or under the authority of the council:*
- (c) *Erect on any road a monument, statue, or other such erection:*
- (d) *Construct or provide on, over, or under any road facilities for the safety, health, or convenience of the public, or for the control of traffic or the enforcement of traffic laws:*

Provided that no such construction, erection, laying out, or planting shall be carried out, unless in the opinion of the council the construction, erection, laying out, or planting will not unduly impede vehicular traffic entering or using the road (not being a road or part of a road that has been declared a pedestrian mall under section 336).”

3. The Land Transport Rule 54002: Traffic Control Devices 2004 defines a roundabout as “an intersection with 1 or more marked lanes or lines of traffic, all of which are for the use of vehicles travelling in a clockwise direction around a central traffic island” and traffic island means “a defined area within a roadway, which may be flush with the roadway or raised, and from which vehicular traffic is intended to be excluded.”
4. Section 7 of the Land Transport Rule 54002: Traffic Control Devices 2004 contains provisions specific to traffic islands:

“7.7 Traffic islands

7.7(1) *A road controlling authority may provide a traffic island to:*

- (a) *channel traffic;*
- (b) *provide protection for pedestrians, cyclists or other road users crossing a road;*
- (c) *give advance warning of an intersection to approaching traffic;*
- (d) *provide for, and protect, traffic control devices;*
- (e) *prevent undesirable or unnecessary traffic movements.*

Raised traffic islands

7.7(2) *When providing a raised traffic island, a road controlling authority must:*

- (a) *install, on the traffic island, reflectorised traffic signs complying with section 4 that the road controlling authority considers are necessary to guide drivers around the traffic island; and*
- (b) *place markings or delineators on the roadway beside the traffic island to inform drivers of the presence and extent of the traffic island.*

7.7(3) ***A raised traffic island must not have permanent growth, a traffic control device or other object placed on it (unless the device or object is protected) that presents a hazard to road users.”***

13. The decision maker for the redesign of the fountain, as a structure that was erected on legal road under the powers in section 334(1), is the Council.
14. The Council has delegated the power to approve the design of landscape plans on roads to Community Boards.
15. The safety considerations in section 7 of the Land Transport Rule 54002: Traffic Control Devices 2004, and the proviso in section 334(1), will need to be taken into consideration in the redesign of the fountain.

ALIGNMENT WITH LTCCP AND ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT PLANS

16. LTCCP 2006-2016

Parks, Open Spaces and Waterways – Page 123

Environment – By offering opportunities for people to contribute to projects that improve our city's environment.

Governance – By involving people in decision-making about Parks, open spaces and waterways

Streets and transport – Page 151

City Development – By providing a well-designed, efficient transport system and attractive street landscapes

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIES

17. Registration and Maintenance of Statues, Fountains, Clocks, Memorials and Other Public Artworks and Structures Policy.

CONSULTATION FULFILMENT

18. Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the local community via a letterbox drop and comment form to the local community. (see **attachment 2**) In addition the original developer, sculpture and landscape designer, the Transport and Greenspace Unit and the Council's Arts Adviser have been consulted.

BOARD RECOMMENDATION

That the Council grant approval for the removal of the water component of the Nor' West Arch.

(Note: Separate resolutions adopted by the Board under delegated authority in relation to the replacement landscaping in the water race are detailed in clause 12 of the Board's report.)

BACKGROUND

19. The Nor' West Arch provides a significant 'sculptural' landmark at the entrance to the community. The original sculpture was designed as a stand alone concrete structure with the green back drop of poplars and the sky. The addition of the water element, in the form of the relatively passive 'water race', provided a sense of movement and light. The Nor' West Arch/Canterbury plains theme behind the concept was embellished by riverstones around the 'waters edge' in reference to braided rivers. The various elements of the composition draw inspiration from the Canterbury climate, the alluvial shingle fans that lie beneath the plains, the water races that sustain production and the shelter belts that previously criss-crossed the site providing shelter from the nor' west winds.

20. Water is recycled by pumping from the lower ponds back to the top ponds. The ponds are an element that requires ongoing maintenance to ensure water quality is kept at satisfactory levels to prevent algae growth. To do this efficiently, in a closed system such as this, it requires similar monitoring, chemical dosing and filtering, to that of a small swimming pool. Where these resources are not available, the water will become contaminated putting the pumping system under stress, which in turn needs further maintenance and monitoring. The level of maintenance carried out at present, in addition to the inability to chemically dose, is not sufficient for the sculpture to operate in a clean, presentable and fully functional way.
21. Since mid 2005 the local Northwood Residents' Association have been responsible for the maintenance of the fountain. However, in more recent times, there have been some ongoing issues with the maintenance of the fountain, which requires a high level of service to maintain it appropriately. The Residents' Association, at its AGM held in March 2007, voted to discontinue the maintenance of the fountain and asked that it be decommissioned as a water feature.
22. Given that the fountain is located within a larger sculpture, it is possible to remove the water component, while retaining the original intention of the work by highlighting its sculptural elements. An alternative design for the Nor' West arch, which includes replacing the water with boulders, has been drafted by the sculpture's architect. In this design the water is an implied element, as it is replaced by river stones, which are always associated with water and braided rivers. Visually this proposal is not significantly different from the present sculpture/fountain, without the water. Practically, this proposal would involve turning off the water supply, draining out the water and filling the ponds with river stones. The electrical outlet would remain because this is used annually for Christmas lights.
23. In May/June 2007 a letter was distributed to approximately 1560 residences and key stakeholders. This letter included a summary of the concept, an artist's impression of the proposal (refer **attachment 1**) and a feedback form, asking whether they supported the decommissioning of the water feature and the proposal to replace the water with river stones. The purpose of this consultation was to determine whether the community supported the option of removing the water component of the Nor' West arch and determining acceptable landscaping to replace the water. Therefore a design proposal that replaced the water with boulders was drafted by the sculpture's architect and presented to the community.
24. There was a very strong response to this request for feedback with the receipt of 476 responses, which is a 31% response rate. There was strong support for the proposal to change to the fountain's current use as a water feature into a passive sculpture.

Feedback	Number of responses	Percentage of responses
"Yes, I support the redesign of the fountain/sculpture"	389	82%
"No, I do not support the redesign of the fountain/sculpture"	82	17%
Position not indicated	5	1%

25. Community feedback was generally very positive about the proposed redesign of the Northwood fountain/sculpture. While comment on the proposed redesign was not specifically sought as part of this consultation, a number of submitters (42) did offer feedback on the design (refer consultation feedback in **attachment 2**). Half of the comments that were provided sought an amended design, predominantly suggesting the inclusion of plantings or more colour. The following issues were raised by the community:
 - amended design (flowers/colour, plantings, less stones, tiles)
 - vandalism (loose boulders)
 - waste of money (should not come out of rates)
 - query cost of decommissioning
 - keep water in fountain
 - conserve water (need more flow in the Kaputone Stream)
 - remove sculpture
 - query name of fountain
 - maintenance issues

26. Given that a number of residents raised concerns about the proposed redesign of the fountain, these comments have been considered and the concept will be amended to reflect community views, where possible.
27. As a result of the public consultation, the Northwood Residents' Association advised that a number of residents had expressed concern regarding the 'blandness' of the proposed design and sought more colour in the area. In terms of the design they felt that further planting of grasses and natives would not add to the impact of the entrance way and suggested flower beds or flowering shrubs such as Camellias. The results of the public consultation run by the Council indicate that only eight submitters specifically sought flowers or colour planting and one respondent specifically asked that flowers not be included in the design. The vast majority of submitters (76%) supported the design, as proposed. However, as a number of submitters sought changes to the design, the request for colour will be considered alongside other community feedback and project constraints, such as budget, design and maintenance requirements.
28. The maintenance issues that have been raised will be considered by the maintenance team. In particular, consideration has been given to the potential hazard raised by using unattached boulders in the redesign. The boulders in the existing sculpture are not fixed. There has been some disturbance of these by vandals, who have removed them and put them in the water race. This is expected to diminish with the removal of the water component. The sculpture is located on a highly visible roundabout, which is not designed for recreation and it not a legitimate space to be used by the public. Reporting by local residents to the police and/or Council staff would be the best way of combating these problems.
29. A number of submitters queried the cost of decommissioning. An approximate breakdown of the cost of the original proposal, to replace the water with riverstones, is included below.
- | | |
|---|--------|
| • Decommissioning of plant/drainage | \$1500 |
| • Remove/replace/ transport riverstones | \$3000 |
| • Remediate site | \$2500 |
| • Administration | \$1000 |
30. Feedback was also sought from the original developer of the site, RD Hughes. The view of the developer was that they were disappointed to see their attempts to create a point of difference in landscaping design removed by a Local Authority. However they also noted that *"if it is was an overwhelming vote by the Northwood Residents' Association to replace the water with river stone there is little left for the developers to say."* The developer also noted that the annual \$15,000 maintenance cost was not significant in relation to the rating revenue taken by Council.
31. In response to the advice supplied by Legal Service Unit, consideration was given to the need for a new safety audit of the traffic island. However, it was determined by the Asset Policy Engineer that an additional safety audit was not required due to there being no change in the physical shape of the island and minimal impact to traffic.
32. The designer has developed two new alternatives to the initial concept, while keeping to the original intent of the design, the braided river theme, which was supported by the vast majority of submitters. The three options are outlined below and included as **attachment 3**. The suggested options for replacing the water race are both restrained in character to allow the Nor' West Arch to remain the dominant element, while adding a 'quiet' textural contrast to the setting.

Option 1 - replaces the water with riverstone

33. This makes only a very subtle change to the existing picture by removing the water and replacing it with more riverstone to conceal concrete weir structures. The Nor' West Arch/Canterbury Plains theme is essentially retained intact. This option is the cheapest and was proposed in the consultation. Cost approximately \$8,000.

Option 2 - replaces the water with the softer textures of planting

34. Plants proposed are Phormium 'Pepe' – a dwarf green flax and Chionochloa flavicans – a dwarf snow tussock with Toe Toe like plumes. These will give a green textural contrast to the green Hebe ground covers behind, with their spiky or grass like foliage. The creamy plumes on the snow tussock will give some seasonal change to the planting as they are very 'showy' when they first appear. Riverstone would be used as mulch beneath these plants. Cost approx \$18,000.

Option 3 – Combination of the above

35. Is a combination of the above options incorporating Chionochloa flavicans and the riverstone boulders. Cost approximately \$11,000.

PREFERRED OPTION

Option 3

36. The preferred concept is Option 3 the combination of plantings and riverstone boulders (refer to **attachment 3** - Option 3 'The Preferred Option'). This option is only moderately more expensive than the option that was proposed to the community and responds to the call for more plantings and/or colour within the sculpture, while maintaining the well supported braided river theme. This solution is in keeping with the original intent of the design and will have minimal requirements in terms of ongoing maintenance.
37. If the removal of the water component of the Nor' West Arch is approved by Council, and the redesign includes planting, then it is expected that work will be coordinated around the next planting season. Work would proceed around April 2008.