

Alternative option - Jeffreys tank replacement location and design Consultation feedback- overview and project team response

70 submissions were received

Support for options including 'Residents Option 9':

PREFERRED OPTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
TOTAL	4	35	4	1	5	5	13	5	21	3

Note: some submitters indicated support for more than one option, and three did not indicate any preference

Option 2

Key support comments Option 2	Key concern comments Option 2
<p>35 submitters support Option 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for combining with existing pump station (13) • Pleasing to look at and unobtrusive (11) • Support cost-wise (6) • General improvement on Option 1 	<p>15 comments - Adverse effect on neighbours especially visual effects</p> <p>Concerns about the size, location and design of the tank and its effect on the park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still too high and/or bulky (12) • Spoils entrance and visual appeal from Waiwetu side of park (10) • Visually unappealing design (6) • Reduces useable space in the reserve (2) • 'Open space park' not appropriate for this – needs to be near other buildings/utilities (2) <p>Environmental concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and ecological concerns about the effect of the tank on the stream (10) • Costs and risks building on stream bank including EQ damage e.g. lateral spread (8) • Site is an environmental hazard area (2) • A number of concerns about potential issues related to ground conditions near the stream <p>CPTED concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eight submitters indicated concerns about increased risk of crime/ antisocial behaviour based on the Option 2 location and design, also to pedestrians coming from Waiwetu Street <p>See table below for project team response to key issues raised and project team response</p>

'Residents' Option 9'

Key support comments 'Option 9' (the additional option put forward by residents during consultation)	Key concern comments 'Option 9'
<p>21 submitters support ('Residents' Option 9') -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't affect the park, including the entrance from Waiwetu • Doesn't affect the residents • Doesn't affect the stream • More appropriate to be located in utility area of park • Easy access for construction • Better ground will make construction easier and cheaper 	<p>Three submitters commented in opposition to 'Residents Option 9'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes parking • Interferes with popular uses within park • Obstructs views into park for general public as with Option 7 • Not close to existing pump station

Option 7	
Key support comments Option 7	Key oppose comments Option 7
<p>13 submitters support Option 7 (7 acceptable, 6 first choice) Majority from Waiwetu St, one Jeffreys Rd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is away from houses • Is away from waterway • Would be screened more easily • Would provide an area for sports spectators • Close to library and other utilities • Construction ease of access 	<p>Nine submitters from Jeffreys or Chepstow, 1 from Waiwetu opposed Option 7 Seven were concerned that the tank would be highly visible from many viewpoints - ugly visual barrier to park</p> <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPTED risks • Too far from pump station

Key submitter issues and project team response	
Issue	Project team response
<p>Response to Site Option 2 proposal</p> <p>Adverse effects on neighbouring properties especially visual effects Unfairly intrusive to neighbouring residents as with Option 1 - 15 comments</p> <p>Doesn't meet requirements in relation to adjacent property's amenity rights.</p>	<p>The height and density of trees to the Northern and Eastern boundaries of 51 Waiwetu St and the location of the tank behind the existing pumping station means that from the perspective of 51 Waiwetu St the tank will either not be visible or be only slightly visible from this property.</p> <p>The proposed tank location is compliant with all CCC and ECan planning requirements including setbacks. The distance of the tank from the boundary means that it will not affect the natural light or sunlight cast on to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Visual amenity is one aspect that contributes to the overall amenity of an area. Other aspects of amenity, such as aesthetic coherence and recreational attributes, are relevant to the proposed Option 2 in the context of the reserve. The loss of reserve views and feelings of openness and spaciousness for 53 Waiwetu Street cannot be avoided. However, proposed mitigation methods and the positive effects of the proposal will lessen any potential adverse effects on natural character and visual amenity for all users of the reserve. The landscape plan for Option 2 proposes large grade trees (2-3m high when planted) on council property that will grow to a height to provide softening and screening of the tank.</p> <p>The architectural and landscape design includes natural materials to clad the structure, a pergola, trees and colourful planting, trees and a pergola that will help mitigate the effects of the tank size. The removal of the barbed wire fencing around the compound will improve the aesthetics of the pump station site.</p> <p>We will work with adjacent property owners during the detailed design phase to agree and finalise boundary planting along with any other suitable screening.</p> <p>See also below – size and location of tank</p>
<p>Several submitters raised concerns about potential diminution of property value to the immediately adjacent properties and were concerned that insufficient weight was given to the effects on neighbours</p>	<p>The Council's property team advises there is unlikely to be any change to any of the immediate neighbours' property values resulting from any of the site options, except Site Option 3 which is within the 10m open space boundary setback.</p>

Key submitter issues and project team response	
Issue	Project team response
	<p>The proposed suction tank complies with all district plan requirements.</p> <p>The loss of reserve views cannot be avoided. The Council's proposal will help mitigate the effects through the architectural, urban and landscape design of the tank and pump station compound to positively integrate with the amenity of the reserve. Boundary planting adjacent to private property is proposed and will provide softening and screening of the tank.</p> <p>The Council is required to replace the existing water tank in Jeffreys Reserve with a larger tank to meet new drinking water standards and requirements, and to protect and future-proof the water supply to residents in the area.</p>
<p>Concerns about the size, location and design of the tank and its effect on the park</p> <p>Still too high and/or bulky - 12 comments</p> <p>Spoils entrance and visual appeal from Waiwetu side of park - 10 comments</p> <p>Visually unappealing design – 6 comments</p> <p>Reduces useable space in the reserve - 2 comments</p> <p>'Open space park' not appropriate for this – needs to be near other buildings/utilities – 2 comments</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can height be reduced? • Needs to be adequately screened with suitable plantings • Numbers on building aren't needed or should be smaller • Façade could be lower/less dominating and doesn't need so much screening from the park • Allow for adequate vehicle circulation areas • Retain asphalt in park 	<p>See also above visual effects on neighbouring properties</p> <p>We are now proposing to reduce the tank height by placing 0.5 m of the tank below the ground level, reducing its overall height by half a metre.</p> <p>The architectural design and landscaping at the proposed Option 2 location will visually soften and integrate the tank with the amenity of the reserve. Proposed small scale public space and multifunctional use promotes positive community interaction.</p> <p>The slope of the pergola and cladding creates a sense of movement and interest to the façade that would otherwise be quite static and plain.</p> <p>The proposed tank cladding is sloped in two planes with the lowest height of 4m closest to the immediate neighbours, a maximum height of 5m and an average height of 4.5m. Details of the design including the roof have not been developed beyond the concept stage. An east elevation can be generated if required, but is similar in appearance and height to the proposed north elevation.</p> <p>The north tank elevation slopes from 4.5m to 5m height. The south tank elevation slopes from 4 to 4.5 m height. The pergola in front slopes from 3 to 3.5 m in height</p> <p>The proposed Option 2 location maintains the 20m wide Waiwetu Street road corridor into Jeffreys Reserve.</p> <p>Burying the tank deeply has earthquake resilience issues (as demonstrated by the current below ground tank), constructability issues owing to groundwater levels, and risks water contamination (through water ingress). The proposed tank is to be buried no more than 0.5 m deep, which will ensure it is well above the water table.</p> <p>Sites appearing on the LLUR list for potentially contaminating activities are not necessarily contaminated. This site's listing comes from its previous use as a workshop depot and the use of pesticides and fertilisers on the playing field. A site investigation report will confirm the extent and concentrations of any contaminant, and the National Environmental Standards will dictate what if any mitigation will be required to manage the site.</p> <p>Reasons for the larger tank requirement include :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Sufficient additional buffer capacity for peak demand and emergencies (firefighting) (ii) Additional capacity for sand settlement/removal (iii) The larger suction tank enables more chlorine contact time (when chlorination is required) (iv) Better flow equalisation from 4 wells, facilitates smoother operation (v) The 500 m³ tank would future proof the network requirements for the next 50-100 years

Key submitter issues and project team response

Issue	Project team response
	<p>(vi) The cost benefit of the larger tank outweighs that of the smaller tank.</p> <p>The requirement for an air gap between tank roof and the maximum water level means that tank dimensions are always larger than the 500 cubic meters volume of water storage. The net volume of the storage tank is approximately 660 cubic metres,</p> <p>Round and rectangular tanks have been considered for the replacement tank. A rectangular tank was considered most suitable for this site because it allows for the longest flow path for better sand removal and the longest contact time in case chlorination is required.</p> <p>Option 2 will return approximately 196 m² to the park by using space in the existing pump station compound. . Most of the other options will need to take additional space from the park.</p> <p>Minimum setback distances are maintained. The landscape plan for Option 2 proposes large grade trees (2-3m high when planted) on council property that will grow to a height to provide softening and screening of the tank.</p> <p>As the suction tank is a critical piece of community infrastructure, the proposed scheme complies with the open space planning rules, and does not require a land use consent.</p> <p>Consideration of the edge definition for the vehicle circulation will be included in the detailed design. The focus of vehicle circulation away from the field should also help reduce the impact on the adjacent playing surfaces.</p> <p>Unfortunately the alternative leaflet was circulated by several residents without fact checking with Council. We can confirm that only a small part of the footpath (in front of the current compound) will be affected by Option 2 and this will be reinstated.</p> <p>Except for the footpath in front of the existing compound, all the other hard standing areas will be maintained. Some may be driven on during access to the construction site but they will be maintained to ensure continued use by local residents and park users.</p> <p>The size of the lettering PS1076 will be reduced. This will be finalised during the detail design stage.</p>
<p>Why not bury the tank?</p>	<p>The Council has agreed to bury the tank to reduce the height of the tank by 0.5 m.</p> <p>The following security and resilient reasons are why the tank will not be buried deeper than 0.5m:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintenance/ Repair – harder access to the tank and connections. - Design – increased detail of design required to allow for seismic forces, buoyancy, earth pressure etc. - Access – excavation required to inspect / repair tank and connections - Cost – high excavation and construction cost. - Anchoring – required to counteract buoyancy in an earthquake when the tank is partially or completely empty. - Any leaks or cracking can go unobserved if not able to be inspected for the possibility of contamination if there are any breaks and leaks.

Key submitter issues and project team response	
Issue	Project team response
<p>Environmental concerns Environmental and ecological concerns about the effect of the tank on the stream - 10 comments Costs and risks building on stream bank including EQ damage e.g. lateral spread – 8 comments Site is an environmental hazard area – 2 comments</p>	<p>The information in the private pamphlet distributed by several residents was not accurate. There is no plan or any need to stop the creek at any time during the construction of the tank, and there will be no adverse effects on the waterway resulting from the proposed construction activities.</p> <p>Any risks to the stream will be mitigated. For example, the stream flows will not be affected during or after construction. Also, the water quality in the stream will not be affected even during dewatering as any dewatered flows are treated prior to returning to the stream. The discharge quality will be with the limits specified by ECan regulations.</p> <p>The Council will fully comply with the Environment Canterbury Regional Land and Water Plan which has strict requirements to control the adverse impacts on waterways. This includes the effects of flow in the waterways and discharge of sediments during construction activities. If required, the Council will seek any necessary consents from the regional council.</p> <p>A site-specific Environmental Management Plan will be prepared and closely monitored during the construction period to address issues such as noise, dust, dewatering, storm water, contaminated land, effects on the creek and other environmental factors.</p> <p>Dewatering will be done within the Environment Canterbury's Land and Water requirements. This sets out strict conditions around the water quality and water quantity. The dewatered water is passed through treatment tanks to remove sediment before being discharged into Wairarapa Stream again, cleaner than the normal flow in stream.</p> <p>The scour pipe is primarily for emptying out the tank. Sediment in the tank is collected in a sump and the bottom of the tank. The scour pipe outlet will be 200-300 mm above the bottom of the tank and when it is being emptied out the sand will remain at the bottom to be vacuumed out into a tank and removed from the site.</p> <p>Discharge of any stormwater into the stormwater network has the same effect as discharging into the Wairarapa Stream as the stormwater network discharges into the Wairarapa Stream before it joins the Avon River.</p> <p>Sites appearing on the LLUR list for potentially contaminating activities are not necessarily contaminated. For this site the listing comes from its previous use as a workshop depot and the use of pesticides and fertilisers on the playing field. A site investigation report will be carried out to confirm the extent and concentrations of any contaminants and the National Environmental Standards will dictate what if any mitigation will be required to manage the site.</p>
<p>Concern about potential issues related to ground conditions near the stream</p> <p>Unsuitable location near river including potential for EQ related lateral spread – could further threaten properties</p> <p>Additional expense to install tank near in these ground conditions</p> <p>Well drilling caused damage to nearby properties and this will cause more</p>	<p>Proximity to a waterway does increase the possibility of lateral spread. However, the proposed design will factor this into account and the tank will be designed for an 80 year life or an Importance Level of 3 or 4.</p> <p>From an engineering perspective, proximity to the stream does not preclude a site from possible use and the preliminary geotechnical assessment indicates that construction within 50 metres of the stream is feasible.</p> <p>The engineering design and construction methodology will take this into account. The geotechnical report indicates that a similar foundation system is required for all sites, although the risk of lateral spreading in Option 7 is lower than Option 2.</p>

Key submitter issues and project team response	
Issue	Project team response
	<p>After taking into account the design and construction costs to ensure an 80 year life for Option 2, Option 2 was still the second cheapest option after Option 1, which was rejected by the community.</p> <p>The next stage will include detailed geotechnical investigation as part of detailed design. We will take due care to ensure that the construction methodology will not have an impact on existing properties' structural integrity.</p> <p>The nearest house is 40m from the Option 2 construction site.</p>
<p>CPTED concerns 8 submitters indicated concerns about increased risk of crime/ antisocial behaviour based on the Option 2 location and design, noting also concerns about its effects on people walking from Waiwetu Street to the library</p> <p>Suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't put the tank at the entrance to Waiwetu Street – put it at one of the alternative sites • Change the design so there are no places for loiterers/ criminals to hide 	<p>CPTED principles and the Seven Qualities of Safer Places are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access: Safe movement and connections, • Surveillance and Sightlines: See and be seen, • Layout: Clear and logical orientation, • Activity Mix: 'Eyes on the street', • Sense of Ownership: Showing a space is cared for, • Quality Environments: Well designed, managed and maintained environments, • Physical Protection: Using active security measures. <p>The CPTED report for Option 2 does not identify any potential concealment areas for antisocial behaviour.</p> <p>Option 2 provides good visibility to the built edges of the suction tank from both the park and Jeffreys Rd.</p> <p>Of all the sites, option 2 has the advantage of minimising the area on the reserve where anti-social activity may occur, by reducing the size of the existing compound and containing it within secure fencing to exclude public access. The CPTED report for this option does not indicate any significant concerns.</p> <p>Option 2 maintains a 20m wide circulation corridor for people walking from Waiwetu St to Jeffreys Road. The CPTED report for Option 2 recommends enhancing the path network around the tank and pump station compound and 'preferably' through the centre of the 20m corridor for easy and safe movement. Detailed design will include this.</p> <p>Security fencing will prevent access to the site. The proposed metal rod design of the fence is transparent and will allow the compound behind the pump station and tank to be observed by park users, in case of any antisocial intrusion.</p> <p>Detailed Design will further take into consideration the recommendation of the CEPTED Report, which are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The existing path network within the reserve to be enhanced around the facility to allow for the easy and safe movement of path users, preferably through the centre of the space. b. Existing or new vegetation adjacent, or close to the path network should be kept to a maximum height of 1.2m, or pruned so that there are no opportunities for concealment. c. Existing or new trees should be pruned so that their lowest limbs are a minimum of 2.5m from ground level to provide for sightlines underneath the tree canopy.

Key submitter issues and project team response	
Issue	Project team response
	<p>d. Pedestrian level lighting be reviewed to ascertain that the new facility would not compromise safe lighting levels, and to explore opportunities to enhance pedestrian lighting levels.</p> <p>e. A further CPTED review should be undertaken at key stages of post-construction (e.g. 6 months and 12 months).</p> <p>f. A review may also be triggered by any reported incidents that may occur. Reported incidents to be captured and monitored in regular incident reports.</p> <p>g. CPTED and wider crime prevention solutions are likely to be more effective if undertaken in partnership with local communities, businesses, neighbourhood support groups, residents associations, local schools and emergency services. Inclusion of these groups in the sense of ownership and maintenance of the reserve will have positive outcomes for safety and security.</p>
<p>Landscaping Suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Native trees instead of introduced species • Other including tree planting suggestions? 	<p>The plant species around the tank have not been finalised. Planting will generally be a mix of native and exotic plants in keeping with the existing amenity and planting throughout the reserve.</p> <p>In this case the planting of medium sized, (at maturity,) exotic trees instead of native tree species was chosen for their form and in keeping with the existing mature trees within the reserve. They will also provide scale and softening to the proposal.</p> <p>The preferred Option 2 will result in 4 existing trees being removed from the park and the existing park seat in front of the compound area. The proposal includes nine new trees, new low level amenity planting and a new seat.</p>
Other options	
<p>Consider additional site proposed by several residents (referred as 'Residents Option 9')</p>	<p>While Residents Option 9 was not part of the original feedback request, we have now redone the Multi Criteria Analysis options assessment taking into account Residents' Option 9. Option 2 still scores the highest of the nine options assessed. The following are some of the issues that affected the performance of Residents' Option 9 in the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The land on which it is proposed to sit is a separate land parcel belonging to the library, and there are strict requirements for the number of library car parks. Removing the car parks for the tank would therefore compromise planning compliance for the library. - The site is a considerable distance from the existing well and the pump station building and the wells. This would result in significant operational issues, such as loss of surface pump suction and would cost significantly more to make it work. - There are significant CPTED issues to be dealt with (see below)). For example, some of the existing carparks and the footpath entrance would be shielded from view by the tank. <p>While Options 5 and 7 scored well using the MCA, their capital costs are 13-17% (i.e. \$361K-\$465K) higher than Option 2.</p> <p>Comments below compare and contrast Option 2 and Residents' Option 9: The stormwater network discharges into the Wairarapa Stream before it joins the Avon River. Any flows discharged into Wairarapa Stream will be treated and the water will be cleaner than the normal flow in the stream.</p>

Key submitter issues and project team response	
Issue	Project team response
	<p>The hydrogeological information available indicates that the groundwater is approximately the same across the area. Therefore, no one option has an advantage over another with regards to mitigating the effects of groundwater. As Option 2 is closer to the waterway lateral spread is likely to be more of an issue than the other sites including Residents Option 9. However, this can be resolved through design.</p> <p>The Residents Option 9 proposal generates a number of CPTED issues for car park and path users, shielding visibility from the service centre workroom, northern reserve and Jeffreys Rd. It also has a number of significant planning issues spanning boundaries and district plan zones.</p> <p>The area for construction is minimised by Option 2 as this provides a more compact compound for all the required infrastructure including pipes, tanks, and pumps etc. will also be in one place. Residents Option 9 takes a large area of library carpark space. Using the dimensions given above the area needed for the tank would be 150 m². This is space for several (8-12) carparks. The use of the tennis court was considered in detail with Options 5 and 8 and the benefits were not sufficient to outweigh the negatives.</p> <p>The Residents Option 9 proposal does not solve the issue of proximity to neighbours as it is located approximately 15m from the immediate Clyde Rd neighbour's property boundary, directly to the north of their site.</p>
<p>Other alternative option/s still need to be considered Why do this when better options are available? 6 comments Suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be near other utilities and away from residences instead of using park space – 5 comments Alternative locations - see summary of key comments for Options 2, 7 and Residents' Option 9 at the top of this table. 	<p>It appears that wherever the tank is sited there will be some residents and/or the wider community that will be affected. After extensive investigation, we are putting forward an option that has achieved the highest score across a range of key criteria providing the best overall benefits for the immediate neighbourhood and the wider community.</p> <p>Option 2 was preferred or acceptable to the highest number of submitters (see graph) The detailed options assessment comparing all the available options also led Council staff to conclude that Option 2 was the most feasible option. The following was the order of preference based on the weightings used in the Multi Criteria Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 2 – at the existing pump station. Option 7 – next to Jeffreys Road. Option 5 – next to the tennis court. <p>While Options 5 and 7 scored well using the MCA, their capital costs are 13-17% (i.e. \$361K-\$465K) more than Option 2. See Options Report (Section 7) for information to support selection of site Option 5 as the second preferred option now recommended by the project team.</p> <p>There is insufficient room to locate the tank in the car park while meeting boundary setback requirements and maintaining the existing number of car parks. Any displaced car parks may need to be relocated into the park.</p> <p>These sites were assessed using the MCA methodology and Option 2 remains the best possible option given the area/site specific issues analysed.</p> <p>Option 3 does have significant issues as it is within the 10m boundary setback, located amidst protected trees, and situated on a gazetted reserve (Waiwetū Reserve). A gazetted reserve has strict controls and protection stated in the reserve management plan. Jeffreys Reserve is not a gazetted reserve.</p>

Key submitter issues and project team response

Issue	Project team response
	<p>Options 4-8 will partially block the view of Jeffreys Reserve from the road, and are more difficult to fence, with the potential for antisocial activities in the lesser observed areas behind the suction tank.</p> <p>Option 7 would affect the outlook of neighbours across the road to the park. The visual impact of Option 7 is least to the Waiwetu St neighbours, but greatest to the Jeffreys Road neighbours whose views over the park would be blocked by the mounding, along with any member of the public in Jeffreys Road Option 7 sediment discharge goes into the stormwater network, which then flows into Wairarapa and other streams. Sediment controls will need to be the same on all sites.</p> <p>Option 7 vehicle access is at close proximity, but access to the tank lid and walls for maintenance inspection is more difficult and more costly owing to the surrounding mounding.</p>
<p>A tank this size is not needed for the water supply network or storage</p>	<p>We appreciate the effort that has gone into this assessment by one of the submitters. However, our concern is that it is not based on the full understanding of the Council water supply network and the fluctuating demands across the year, and for network management and ensuring security of supply it would be inappropriate to use a smaller volume tank as the Council's ability to meet the minimum levels of service will be compromised.</p> <p>Here is further explanation: Jeffreys Pump Station feeds into the North West Zone water supply network. The suction tank is necessary for more effective operational flow control of the four new deep wells; peak load buffer; firefighting demand and sand removal.</p> <p>Post-earthquake, we needed to prioritise urgent repairs; including damaged wells, replacement works in many pump stations, and connections (temporary and permanent) to water supply network. Most of the works have been completed and we are now working through projects with temporary connection, such as Jeffreys suction tank, to ensure the design is compliant for water security and community requirements.</p> <p>The four new consented wells at Jeffreys pump station wells were drilled as part of the post-earthquake prioritisation and planning. At over 100 metres, they are very deep. The water take allocation is also controlled by Environment Canterbury consents.</p> <p>The suction tank volume needs to be based on the larger of the volumes estimated to meet each of the requirements discussed in the suction sizing memo. The current tank size does not comply with the minimum design standards and does not provide the minimum storage volume required to meet the security of supply and the level of service that needs to be provided to the wider community.</p> <p>There are several reasons for the 500 m3 tank in favour of the existing smaller tank We have highlighted the following key points in sections above:</p> <p>Here are further reasons to justify the tank size</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 500 m3 suction tank would have sufficient buffer storage to make the most of the potential flow capacities from the Jeffreys Pump Station wells. This could not be achieved with a 250 m3 suction tank. • A 500 m3 suction tank would allow for more sand settlement than a 250 m3 suction tank, providing better water quality. • While the 250 m3 suction tank could, depending on the baffle design and dosing rate, achieve the minimum contact time required for effective chlorination (if needed), the larger suction tank will provide even

Key submitter issues and project team response	
Issue	Project team response
	<p>more effective chlorination results at lower dosing rate than a 250 m3 suction tank under similar operating conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 500 m3 tank is needed to future-proof the network requirements for the next 50-100 years than a 250 m3 suction tank would. Future proofing includes additional capacity associated with any future legislative requirements for fluoridation. The cost benefit of the increase in size is considered sufficient to justify the investment in a larger suction tank to be made.
Other concerns	
<p>Construction concerns Concern about noise/ disruption/ contamination during the consultation period including access from Waiwetū Street</p>	<p>Noise and dust are the potential effects from construction for all the sites. However, measures such as specific working hours and wetting for dust suppression will be put in place to reduce these.</p> <p>An independent dilapidation study will be carried out on nearby residences both pre and post construction to determine whether any damage has been indirectly caused during construction. Any damage to the grass will be fixed. The Environmental Management Plan will be put in place. Construction noise will be mitigated by carrying out the works during normal working hours and avoiding weekend work. Noise and dust will be subject to District Plan performance requirements, as for all construction.</p> <p>The construction specifications will require protection of the remaining mature trees, and their root plate.</p> <p>A site-specific site Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will also be prepared to manage the site during construction. Dust will be managed e.g. by keeping the site wet. No asbestos is anticipated from the construction of the new build.</p> <p>Construction access will be from Jeffreys Rd, and the existing path connections will be managed to maintain public access from Jeffreys Rd through to Waiwetū St. Construction specifications will require the contractor to make sure there is a protected pedestrian route from Waiwetū St through to Jeffreys Rd during construction.</p>
<p>Maintenance and operational concerns</p>	<p>The suction tank will be supported by new pipework, electrical and landscaping works. There will be no additional noise generated from the site post construction</p> <p>Access to the site will be from Jeffreys Road and it is unlikely on-going operation and maintenance work will affect the neighbours in any way.</p>
<p>Two submitters indicated process, information and viability concerns:</p> <p>Flawed weighting system - insufficient weight given to immediate neighbours' concerns about how their property will be affected</p> <p>Flawed consultation process</p> <p>Legal challenges will cost the Council and slow the process</p> <p>The status of the reserve does not allow for the tank installation</p> <p>Suggestion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal needs to be changed 	<p>Flawed weighting system</p> <p>Option 2 is recommended for implementation. It should be noted that while Options 5 and 7 scored well using the MCA, their capital costs are 13-17% (i.e. \$361K-\$465K) more than Option 2. Any departure from the adoption of Option 2 will need to be supported by a very strong case in order to justify the expenditure of an extra \$361-\$465K of the ratepayers' money. Option 8 costs \$107K more than Option 2. The additional site suggested during the Have Your Say community consultation period costs \$124K more than Option 2.</p> <p>It is important to note that as part of the MCA a total weighting of 50% was allocated to the Social Criteria. Of the 4 social sub-criteria the impact on neighbours (VA1) had the highest weighting compared to the impact on other park users (VA2) or community enjoyment of the park (VA4) or the impact of noise and traffic on various people (VA4).</p>

Key submitter issues and project team response

Issue	Project team response
	<p>If we hadn't given the Social Criteria a higher weighting this would have gone to another criteria. Doing this would have minimised the potential adverse impacts of the project on the local residents and other people who use the park.</p> <p>Process:</p> <p>The intention of a meeting with adjacent residents who had submitted via their lawyer as 'Jeffreys Reserve Residents Group' was to introduce and explain the new proposal as a courtesy before going out to the wider community. In addition to the meeting invitation arranged with and sent via the lawyer, all residents were provided with the consultation leaflet and feedback form at the start of the three week consultation period, and were given the opportunity to meet with the staff at a public information session during the Have Your Say consultation period</p> <p>One adjacent property owner who did not directly receive an invitation to this 'heads up' meeting then attended a meeting with Council staff at an adjacent property where staff listened to all their concerns and provided response supported by meeting notes.</p> <p>Corflute signs and leaflet holders were put at the proposed site and in the reserve with enlarged visual representations which were concept designs only. The site was marked with the dimensions of the proposed tank including its proposed height.</p> <p>All feedback is being considered by staff and the Board (and responded to by the project team).</p> <p>The Council is required under section 78 'in the course of its decision-making process in relation to a matter, give consideration to the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by, or to have an interest in, the matter.' The Council has done and is doing that through the previous consultation processes and its current process.</p> <p>There was no requirement for the Council to consult anyone, including any adjacent residents, before reaching a view on a preferred option (note this is only a preferred option and no final decision has been made). In fact, section 78(2), which formerly required a local authority to consider community views at four different stages of the decision-making process was repealed in November 2010.</p> <p>In addition, section 78(3) provides that a local authority is not required by this section alone to undertake any consultation process or procedure. Whether or not the Council carries out any consultation depends, in part, on the significance of a matter. The consultation that has been undertaken in this instance is consistent with the significance of this decision.</p> <p>Option 2 is a preferred option at this stage and this has been based purely on Multi Criteria Assessment report described above. This report has been independently reviewed and has been found to be robust.</p> <p>Use of Open Space land</p> <p>Option 2 will return approx. 192 square metres to the park compared with the current situation. The proposal is a permitted activity and will comply with all the relevant rules and standards for the applicable zone (Open Space Community Parks) of the Christchurch District Plan (CDP). On this basis there is no requirement to assess the proposal against the objectives and policies relevant to the zone or matters of discretion within the CDP</p>

Key submitter issues and project team response	
Issue	Project team response
	<p>Reserve status</p> <p>Jeffreys Reserve is not a gazetted reserve. On this basis it is not subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977. The proposal has been assessed and complies with all the relevant rules and standards for the applicable zone (Open Space Community Parks) of the Christchurch District Plan (CDP).</p> <p>As the design meets all District Plan rules and the Resource Management Act 1991, there are no other statutory restrictions on the Council, under the Reserves Act or any other Act.</p>