

Jeffreys replacement water tank location and design Option 1 submissions

*Attachments included at the end of the document

Ref #	First name	Last name	Comments on the Jeffreys water tank replacement location and design
8393	Karen	Greenslade	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the CCC plan to build a replacement water tank in the Jeffreys Reserve.</p> <p>I found the turn around for comment after the Wednesday, October 18 information evening restrictively short, especially as there was a holiday weekend in between this evening, and any comments were due on the public holiday.</p> <p>I also find the sense of urgency puzzling as the damage to the existing tank happened during the Canterbury earthquakes some years ago.</p> <p>I do not understand why this is not a publicly notified consent as such a structure in a reserve affects the amenities of the area and thus has the potential to adversely affect property values. The new tank is a change of use on existing reserve land. I feel I am an affected party on that basis.</p> <p>The structure does not fit within the aesthetics of a reserve. It is oversized in terms of height and on that basis will dominate an attractive corner of the existing reserve. It does not appear to be a sympathetic design for a recreational area.</p> <p>The structure will also create a significant Health and Safety hazard as it is designed. The minimal timber veneer with its stairwell will easily be encroached and is far too high for youth or other unsanctioned people to be on should they decide to climb up.</p> <p>Existing attractive vegetation will have to be removed if the tank is placed as per plan.</p> <p>The plan appears to indicate a concrete panel structure. These panels will require some sort of crane to be erected. Access will need to be arranged and looks likely to be destructive to existing landscaping.</p> <p>I am concerned that the existing pump station and tank will be left as is and would like to see a completed plan for this existing area after the new tank is erected. I would like to see something more sympathetic to the ambience of a reserve designed for this area.</p> <p>I believe the new tank needs to be much more sympathetically designed to fit into a recreational reserve. Height should be lowered for both health and safety and aesthetic reasons. Reorientation and/or a new position would seem to be appropriate to accommodate a redesigned lower tank.</p> <p>New positioning may be more appropriate nearer to the Jeffreys Road carpark entrance. This would give ease of entry for heavy machinery and create a cluster of buildings in synch with the service centre, and in the one area, rather than spreading out across the park.</p>
*8217	Sarah	Watson	<p>Duncan Cotterill representing nine adjacent property owners representing eleven property owners as Jeffreys Reserve Residents Group</p> <p>Position: 1. The Submitter opposes the proposed site for the Jeffreys Road Replacement Tank (the Replacement Tank)</p> <p>Reasons: 2. The proposed site is opposed for the following reasons:</p> <p>2.1 the Replacement Tank will have significant adverse visual effects on residents whose properties back onto the reserve;</p> <p>2.2 the proposed site is adjacent to Wairarapa Stream and the ground conditions are unsuitable for the Replacement Tank;</p> <p>2.3 the proposed site is inconsistent with the guidelines for crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED principles);</p> <p>2.4 the proposed site is used by the local rugby club every Sunday morning all season to run drills and warm ups; and</p>

Ref #	First name	Last name	Comments on the Jeffreys water tank replacement location and design
			<p>2.5 there are other sites within the reserve that will not have a significant adverse visual effect on residents whose properties back onto the reserve or the public.</p> <p>Visual Effects</p> <p>3. The Replacement Tank will have a significant adverse effect on the view from the houses and gardens located at 45 and 45A Waiwetū Street. Both houses are two storied and have large windows looking out to the reserve. It is evident that the houses have been designed and sited to allow the occupants to enjoy the view of the reserve. The view from almost every room in the house located at 45 Waietū Street will be of the Replacement Tank. The trees between the proposed site and the houses looking out to the reserve will not disguise or shield the Replacement Tank and many of the existing trees are deciduous.</p> <p>4. The visual assessment undertaken as part of the assessment of the proposed site does not accurately illustrate the effect the Replacement Tank will have on the view from adjacent houses. The views from the properties at 45 and 45A and 184/184A/190 Clyde Road will be completely compromised (refer to attached plan marked B)</p> <p>5. Additional planting has been proposed however this would be inconsistent with the CPTED principles (discussed below at paragraphs 10-12).</p> <p>6. The properties adjacent to the Wairarapa Stream all suffered severe damage as a result of the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes. The house at 184/184A/190 Clyde Road has not yet been repaired and it is likely it will be rebuilt closer to the rear of the sections (significantly closer to the proposed site) as this is the most stable part of the property.</p> <p>7. Due to the geotechnical issues affecting the proposed site the foundation design for the Replacement Tank is likely to need to be very robust. The works required to install the foundation pose a threat to the adjacent properties. When the two new wells were drilled to the east of the proposed site parts of the river bank fell into the Wairarapa Stream.</p> <p>Earthquake repairs had been completed on the house at 45 Waiwetū Street just prior to the well drilling. The drilling has caused cracks in the kitchen cabinets and stair joins and gib throughout the house now has hairline fractures. The outside concrete and boundary walls have also developed cracks.</p> <p>8. It is likely that works at the proposed site, which is much closer to the houses at 45 and 45A Waiwetū Street, will cause significant damage.</p> <p>9. The initial geotechnical assessment undertaken on behalf of the Council indicates that the risk of damage from lateral spreading in an earthquake decreases with distance from the Wairarapa Stream, however the report notes the risk will only be significantly reduced at a distance of 20 metres from the stream. Given this it is difficult to understand why the We would consider locating the Replacement Tank at the proposed site, which is only 13 metres from the Wairarapa Stream.</p> <p>CPTED principles</p> <p>10. The CPTED principles are used to deter crime by environmental design. The proposed siting of the Replacement Tank will create an area behind the tank which may lead to increased crime occurring in this area.</p> <p>11. In the past there was a problem with crime in the area when the foliage was much thicker and there were old sheds on the library car park. people often used to sleep rough and loiter in the reserve. The old sheds were burnt down in a fire caused by young people congregating behind them. A stretch of the boundary fence between the car park and the property at 184/184A/190 Clyde Road was also burnt in the fire.</p> <p>12. Residents are concerned that the siting of the Replacement Tank on the proposed site will increase the incidents of crime in this area. Together additional planting and the Replacement Tank would create an area which is shielded from the rest of the park potentially attracting people who want to be hidden from view. The park is currently a family friendly environment and the residents in the area partly attribute the improvements that have occurred in recent years to the fact there is less foliage at the edges of the park where people can be easily hidden from view.</p> <p>Alternative sites within the reserve</p> <p>13. It is understood that the initial site investigation only considered the proposed site, the area where the existing tank is located and one other site to the east of the existing tank. The Submitter considers there a number of alternative sites within the reserve which would better cater for the Replacement Tank without causing significant effects on adjacent residents or the public.</p> <p>14. It would be great if the Replacement Tank could actually be incorporated into the environment. For example, one side of it could be used as a tennis volley wall and another could have a basketball fixed to it. This would enable those enjoying the reserve to actually benefit from the location of the Replacement Tank. Attached as Annexure C are a</p>

Ref #	First name	Last name	Comments on the Jeffreys water tank replacement location and design
			<p>number of photographs illustrating two alternative sites, which should be considered.</p> <p>14.1 C1 the current playground site; or 14.2 C2 near Jeffreys Road.</p> <p>15 The existing playground site would arguably be the most suitable site as;</p> <p>15.1 direct views of the Replacement Tank would only be from the tennis court and the car park</p> <p>15.2 there are large trees in this location which would mean additional planting would not be required;</p> <p>15.3 it could be used as a tennis volley wall and / or to attach a basketball hoop to;</p> <p>15.4 residents with properties adjacent to the reserve would not have lose their views; and</p> <p>15.5 foundation works would not cause damage to houses adjacent to the reserve.</p> <p>16 A site closer to Jeffreys Road would also be suitable and this would not necessitate the relocation of the playground. There a large trees which would obscure the view from the road.</p> <p>Outcome Sought 17 The Submitter seeks that the proposed site be abandoned and the We consider alternative sites.</p> <p>See attachments at the end of this document</p>
*8214	James	Mortlock	The new tank should be partly underground. It should be possible to have about 1/2 above ground and 1/2 underground
8213	Christine	Coster	<p>I have been a resident opposite the park for 20 years so hope my concerns are considered. The present tank has coped adequately so why change it?</p> <p>1. Blot on the landscape. The larger tank will of course be seen from residents including myself around the park. The 2 white marking posts indicate the height and breadth of space taken. No amount of planting will camouflage it and does it contravene height restrictions. The size of it will be exploited by the freedom campers and homeless and truants that plagued the park for years and recently abated with the banner at the front of the car-park we residents requested. The proposed tank will be a beacon for illegal behaviour.</p> <p>2. The proposed 4 wells will overburden the source of water in the area. You will get a severely depleted water table and stream level affecting all stream life and enjoyment.</p> <p>3. Access to 4 wells will mean that the residents watering their berms x2 daily will think nothing of watering x3 daily. Use water wisely.</p>
8154	Marette	Wells	<p>What will happen to the old water-tank?</p> <p>What will happen to the old site?</p> <p>I think it is VERY important to think about the consequences of throwing away old tanks and old sites.</p>
8153	RJ	Hudson	<p>I consider the proposed positioning of the replacement water tank is going to be far too intrusive. I feel this could be made less so by:</p> <p>1. Positioning closer to the southern & western boundaries. There is a very good existing screen of largely evergreen shrubs & trees between the neighbours to the South & West. You refer to a 10 metre setback from boundaries. I measured 11.4 m from the outlined proposed site to the southern boundary. I suggest this measurement could be reduced 3-five metres making for a less intrusive structure & enabling the retention of the existing pathway.</p> <p>2. Reducing the height of the proposed tank by placing a proportion, say one half in ground. This will be a very obtrusive structure if built to the proposed height of 5m</p> <p>I was appalled by the time taken to repair the existing tank & pumping equipment post the 2011 earthquake. As a result, appalled also by the amount of water wasted by being</p>

Ref #	First name	Last name	Comments on the Jeffreys water tank replacement location and design
			diverted into the neighbouring stream. Along with many ratepayers I will be watching with interest & concern the position and configuration of the new structure & the construction process once the former have been satisfactorily established
8152	Paul	Smart	The proposed site spoils the park like feeling and look. Hopefully the old tank will be demolished and disposed of. A better site would be by the entrance to Thornycroft St
8135	Jude	Gray	Having been a regular visitor to one of the properties adjacent to the new structure position I think it would be better placed away from residential properties to minimize the incidences of anti social or criminal activities in the area between the tank and the residential properties. There have been incidents in the past when the area had trees and shrubs between the park and the fence with undesirable behaviour which was addressed by clearing the area to a thin border approximately 5 years ago. The new structure position proposal and surrounding greenery would encourage a renewal of these activities which had included lighting of fires creating danger to neighbouring properties. Therefore positioning the structure away from the houses would be preferable.
8132	James	Fleming	<p><u>Submission on Jeffreys Reserve - Replacement Tank Location Options</u></p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p>The following is a submission on the proposed replacement water tank at Jeffreys Reserve.</p> <p>This is a limited submission but seeks in a short time of writing seeks to raise matters that should be considered in the process and in conclusion raises a number of objections.</p> <p><u>Consultation</u></p> <p>Firstly, the timing of the leafleting received does not seem to represent a reasonable period for a full submission, leafleting having been received on Monday 9th October, with a closure date for submissions of 24th October. In addition, it is understood that signage at the reserve, which notifies of the proposed works, was only erected more recently.</p> <p>Secondly, the content of the leafleting received does not represent the options available. In particular, the alternative of burying the tank, which is covered in the PDF online, is not represented in the leafleting or within the main website outline.</p> <p><u>Visual Representation</u></p> <p>Thirdly, representation of the visual impacts of the tank by Council, online and in hard copy, are poor, to the extent of being misleading. Online, the tank is shown at a distance and the figures shown in the foreground are distracting. In addition, the front (longer) wall of the tank is shown in shadow. A closer view of the tank showing the figures in that context is considered more appropriate.</p> <p>In fact, in the visual representation by Council, figures are actually shown adjacent to the tank, or on the new path in front of it. These are so far distant as to not be clearly visible, or accurately represent the scale of the proposed works. Figures should also be shown next to the tank elevations included at the base of the website page which would better put the scale in context.</p> <p>While within the District Plan requirements, the height of the structure should be represented online in the context of nearby properties, the adjacent library and related buildings and the current pathways. It is considered that the proposed structure should be clearly represented in context from a range of different perspectives.</p> <p><u>Options Available</u></p> <p><u>Option 2: Above Ground Tank</u></p>

Ref #	First name	Last name	Comments on the Jeffreys water tank replacement location and design
			<p>The proposed structure is effectively two and a half storeys height and as such will be visually imposing on the landscape from a range of different perspectives. In addition, there has been no clear indication of final height (5 metres approximately plus railings). This structure is substantial in elevation compared with properties in the surrounding residential zoning and for that reason is not considered acceptable.</p> <p>There are no clear measures in place (or in outline) for visual treatment of this option, or related landscaping, or setting out the timetable for any planting to become effective. The measures shown in the visual representation are poor and fail to show any attempt at screening. In addition, maintenance of the screening provided by the existing trees may not be successful. For these reasons this option is not considered acceptable.</p> <p>Thirdly, the proposed tank represents a substantial change compared with the existing tank, and in that context is not considered a reasonable alternative.</p> <p>Fourthly, the option of a buried or partially buried tank at the site would appear to be a preferable option from a visual, environmental and residential perspective.</p> <p><u>Option 1: Below Ground Tank</u></p> <p>Option 1, or a similar appropriate alternative, is able to design out and mitigate the unacceptable aspects of Option 2 above.</p> <p>It would have been helpful, perhaps necessary, to set out the details of Option 2 in more detail online, in terms of footprint options (size, depth, setback) and overall context and treatment.</p> <p>It would also seem appropriate to consider the option of a partially buried tank in conjunction with appropriate treatments. This option has not been included.</p> <p><u>Clarification Sought</u></p> <p>In terms of the reasoning given in the document "Additional information about options considered for the replacement tank", as included on the website, some points noted include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The tank may be made water-tight by design and / or internal protection (tanking)? ➤ Construction risks can be mitigated to a reasonable extent by scheduling construction at the appropriate time of year? ➤ There is no background on founding conditions for a buried tank so these are apparently not limiting ➤ It would be expected that the tank can be buried with appropriate treatment and ground cover and so extend into the fields to the north? ➤ The cost should be represented in the context of the overall cost including bores and related works? ➤ The comparison of options implies that this option is the only option with which nearby residents have concerns? Is this the case? <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The option of a buried or partially buried tank requires further consideration and representation.</p> <p>The option of an above ground tank needs to be represented in the context of clearly set out buried or partially buried options.</p> <p>Both options require clearly set out visual and landscaping treatments.</p>
8131	Lesley	Joyce	I have concerns about the risk of criminal activity created by the secluded space between the water tank and trees. An alternative location, reducing this risk and eliminating the eyesore for any residents, should be sought.

Ref #	First name	Last name	Comments on the Jeffreys water tank replacement location and design
8130	Brenda & David	ANDERSON	<p>Adjoining resident for over 47 years</p> <p>As affected residents –at XXXXX - we have been involved in the consultative meetings/discussion from the outset.</p> <p>Building - We have no objection to the design of the building.</p> <p>Location - In hindsight and after further discussion & consideration with our riverside neighbours, we would endorse the relocation of the tank to that submitted in the submission by Sarah Watson, Solicitor, for and on behalf of the "Jeffreys Reserve Residents Group".</p> <p>Relocation of the Tank to either of the proposed sites near Jeffreys Rd (as per that submission).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This would not affect any residents on the park boundaries. 2. Would/could serve as a dual purpose sports facility alongside the tennis court. 3. The Councils proposed site, would then be retained and preserved as a delightful tree lined corner of the Park facility with all its peacefulness for all to enjoy.
8128	Amanda	Loeffen	<p>I do not support the proposed location of this tank for the following reasons:</p> <p>There has been no proper consideration of the effects on the landscape, local residents, amenity of the park, crime prevention or the earthquake risk next to the river</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Landscape - the tank is very high and ugly, and does not blend into the environment. There are other sites that could fit more architecturally with the library buildings, for example, and a reduction in height is recommended to blend in to other buildings. 2. Local residents - the position of the tank will block and spoil the open park view for several residents (ourselves especially), and we have houses that are designed with full height glass to look over the park. There are other sites that do not affect anyone's view from their homes, and could be more acceptable 3. Amenity - the current site reduces the available usable park area for users of the park without bringing any advantages to mitigate. A site near the current car park and playground could provide additional sporting amenity with sports walls and extra court space that might be a benefit to the local park users. 4. Crime prevention - the proposed location will create a dangerous secluded environment to attract local vagabonds and drug users, and will replicate the problem that was seen in this corner a few years ago before the bushes were removed. An alternative site without the need for surrounding bushes would not be a risk. 5. The proximity to the river, where the land is known to be earthquake prone (see damage to all the houses along this stretch of river) will create unnecessary risk both for the sustainability of the tank, and a concern for the immediate residents which are downhill from the tank, and 6m below the water level. The tank needs to be at least 20 metres from the river to reduce the risk. <p>Additionally, I think the consultation process has been very deceptive, especially since the leaflet that was circulated to our houses (those directly affected by the new location) made no mention that the site had been moved from the existing location, and it was only by luck that we happened to hear about it through our neighbour. Additionally, the drawings are not to scale and misrepresent the size and effects of the proposal. We have the impression that the We are trying to rush through a planning permission quickly and are trying to avoid proper consultation and consideration of the alternatives, as they think that the current plan is clearly the easiest option, without much thought. I suggest that the extra costs related to countering the crime, and the potential earthquake damage will more than offset this poor advantage.</p>
8122	Don	Mackenzie	<p>Jeffreys Reserve - Replacement water tank</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I support the general placement shown for a large "suction tank" for the water supply system. 2. The draft concept plan identifies the tank volume needed is 500m³. However, the volume of 14.5m x 11.3 m x 5m is 819m³. I do not believe the walls will be 2m thick. Why are the dimensions so large for the specified required volume? 3. A round tank would fit better into the same corner. Why is a round tank not being considered?

Ref #	First name	Last name	Comments on the Jeffreys water tank replacement location and design
			<p>4. There is security fencing around the existing tank. Why is there no similar secure fencing proposed?</p> <p>5. What Detailed provision is proposed to restrict access to hidden areas behind? Planting with dense spiked vegetation may be better than simply 'more planting'. This needs to be a no-go area.</p> <p>6. Why is a handrail needed around the whole roof when access only appears needed to a limited area? Why not an industrial building access suitably isolated?</p> <p>7. If there is to be a rectangular building, the east elevation wall has potential as a tennis practice area if provided with an appropriate sealed area.</p>
8114	Paige	Begley	The proposed fence-line structure recreates an environment conducive to undesirable behaviour in this park.
8099	Simon	Hollander	<p>Whilst I'm all for progress the five metres height of the proposed water tank is not fitting in with the current environment. Why not place it half underground and half above ground. The location marked on the actual ground in the park is not as per the visuals created. The visuals have it blending into the corner better but the reality is that the tank is very close to the tennis courts. The proposal also says this is a replacement tank implying that the existing tank will be replaced. This however doesn't seem to be the case as all the visuals show that the existing tank is staying.</p> <p>In summary I think the information and visuals have used somewhat an artistic license and my support would be limited to something more like 2-2.5 metres high.</p>
8098	Barry	McDonald	In the past there has been a lot of anti-social activities in the park. This was reduced by removing some of the planting. This change will introduce a new area of seclusion which will attract people who are inclined towards unlawful night time activities and increase the likelihood of nasty debris. This will be an unwelcome eyesore for the residents and consideration should be given to locating the tank to blend with the existing library building.
8078	Jill	Alexander	I think the main one is the risk of criminal activity created by the secluded space between the water tank and the trees. We used to have real problems in the park before they took out a lot of the planting, with vagabonds, fires, and nasty debris related to night-time activities. We think it should be moved to a location where it doesn't cause criminal problems, or create an eyesore for any residents, and we have some ideas that would blend in well with the library, without reducing green space, while creating some sporting amenities along its walls.
8062	Megan	Lamberg	I am against the current proposal, and support the residents plan to relocate the water tank away from their properties. If there is to be an above ground water tank, surely it can be incorporated into Jefferies Park in a way which is more beneficial to all.
8045	Carl	Crowe	NO TO THE CURRENT PLAN
8023	John	Tracy	This We should explore entirely different sites for this tank. It doesn't belong in the reserve. It's unsightly and detracts from its surroundings. It is occasionally an attractor of people who have no business there.
8010	Suzanne	Conley	I am against the suggested location of the replacement water tank because of the adverse effects this will create to homeowners bordering the park who purchased their properties with every expectation that they would continue to have a view out over the park rather than a view of the replacement water tank. I understand an alternative location has been suggested and this makes sense to me.
7989	Ben	Gough	<p>I write to express my concerns regarding the proposed new 500 cubic metre suction tank.</p> <p>For clarity my submission is supportive of the upgrade or replacement of a new tank but not for the proposed location.</p> <p>Therefore my submission is only supportive if a more appropriate location is proposed or found.</p> <p>My family and I are regular users of the park, utilising the facilities in a multiple of ways. My 3 children use the paths for scooting, the playground, the fields and library. My wife and I regularly exercise at the park, walk our dog and enjoy the green open space. I would describe our family as heavy users of the park and facilities.</p> <p>The proposed location looks to be the easy option and one focused more on cost than the long term benefits for the community. For a number of reasons I believe serious consideration should be given to locating the tank at alternative locations: - Firstly I believe the tank as proposed takes away valuable parkland space. I would not like to see a precedent set of new buildings and plant consuming existing parklands. - With the existing tanks and buildings becoming redundant then I would like to see the We consider using the existing compound. I appreciate this may have cost implications, however I believe the long term benefits to the community outway short term cost. -A second alternative is utilising the existing carpark at the rear of the library. The new tank being 500m2 would comfortably fit in the space leaving plenty of parking spaces in the rear and many more car parking facilities alongside Jeffreys Rd.</p>

Ref #	First name	Last name	Comments on the Jeffreys water tank replacement location and design
			<p>The rear car parking space must be greater than 500m². Therefore the 500m² required for the building is less than 1/5th of the current space.</p> <p>The CCC holds a strong view of encouraging the community to move from car to cycles. This could be a good example of CCC leading by example and moving the parking dependency away from its staff. Even if just a small percentage of the overall parking requirements.</p> <p>-I do not believe that a 6metre high, concrete structure will "blend" (CCC description) into the environment nor will it "nestle" into the southwest corner. - Visually a 6 metre high concrete structure, including handrails, will be visually imposing and detract from the green environment currently enjoyed.</p> <p>Lastly I believe the large structure will be inviting to undesirables who may choose to drink, smoke, graffiti, and sleep in the bushes.</p> <p>Bringing rubbish, broken glass, condoms, and other natural consequences as a result of supplying out of sight areas, behind the building, that invite such inappropriate activity to a family dominated community environment. Ultimately the community pay's either way, therefore the community voice should hold significant weight in any decision made. I trust the Board will represent and consider the communities voice with the appropriate authority as its elected representatives.</p>
7978	Thomas	Loeffen-Gallagher	<p>I am against the current proposal. Firstly, the current 6 meter high design will reduce the amenity of adjacent properties by having access and view of the park impacted.</p> <p>Secondly, the existing trees provide an area along the fence line in which an adult is able to easily stand and groups are often seen loitering there. Placing the structure with its extra planting would further seclude this area (which is currently partially visible from the field and wouldn't be if this plan goes ahead) and would go against CPTED standards and create a problem which is only currently being managed.</p> <p>Other options that do not impact adjacent properties and does not increase the risk of crime would be more amenable, such as an underground tank.</p>
7959	Pam	Smart	<p>I am not keen on the idea. Its a shame to take up that corner as it is often used for picnics.</p> <p>There has never been any attempt to disguise the old tank which is a terrible eye sore so I would like to know whats planned for that area. Your "after" photo shows the old tank area looking the same!!</p> <p>Why cant you put a new tank in the park area near Thornycroft Street?</p> <p>A lot of planting was done in this park about 1 year ago but many of the shrubs, trees etc have died through lack of attention (wasted rate payer money) so I am not confident with these new plans.</p>
7945	Debbie	Willis	<p>AGAINST:</p> <p>Proposed location would increase the risk of criminal activity created by the secluded space between the water tank and the trees.</p> <p>Preferred location would be in keeping with the existing Jeffreys Reserve structures (Library)</p>
7906	Wendy	Carpenter	<p>I am opposed to the prospective revamp of the water tower as it is too intrusive (read too tall) for the houses backing onto the park. Can it no be flatter and wider or moved to the 'service' side of the park - ie near the current playground</p>
7904	Alexandra	Weston	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>I am AGAINST the placement of the proposed water tank at Jeffreys Park. I believe the size and position will detract from the dwellings in the area.</p>
7902	Caroline	Inkson	<p>A 6 metre high structure will have a huge impact on the river boundary residents who bought their properties with the opportunity for a parklike outlook. Surely this structure could be moved closer to the library where it will have less impact on residents. Tucking it in the corner of the park I would have thought would invite crime. It is a big structure to be able to hide behind, light fires, smoke, drink alcohol, commit rape etc. Why not place it in the current position of the playground using the walls as another opportunity for</p>

Ref #	First name	Last name	Comments on the Jeffreys water tank replacement location and design
			children to play i.e a tennis volleyboard or basketball hoop or both and relocate the playground to the otherwise very wet area of the park. You would be able to clearly see all sides from this aspect.
7882	Prudence	Willis	I do Not support the current city We plan. I do support the proposal to place the tank by the playground and build the volley board and half basketball court.
7867	Mark	Gallagher	This is a poorly chosen location - it will lead to crime/vandalism between the tank and boundary.
7813	Elizabeth	Dodd-Terrell	I vote no to the proposed water tank replacement as it will encourage people to sleep rough, undesirable behaviour which is not a safe environment for people using the park especially children. It has been a lot safer and cleaner with no rubbish or condoms around the existing area.
7704	Sandra	Miller	I am against the proposal of the Replacement Watertank. It blocks the views from the properties behind the tank. We understand that this can be relocated and actually used constructively over by the playground. It could become a great sports resource with a tennis volleying wall and a half basketball court. In the time I have lived in Waiwetu St, I have seen the increase in users at Jeffreys Park. The tennis court is used a lot and basketball is the fastest growing sport in NZ and I know it would be a fabulous resource.
7666	Barbara	Anglem	Alternatives need to be considered. Suggest adjacent to library on current children's playground
7664	Lucy	Mathewson	I am against the proposed height and location of the water tank. By locating a high sided structure away from boundary fences, neighbouring properties will be unfairly impacted as well as encouraging anti social behaviour in the area around the water tank. This would pose a risk to the high number of groups of children that use the park for sporting and recreational uses. Why is the tank not being located closer to the library in the current playground area where the only impact will be on car park users and the library. The current playground is in need of an upgrade anyway and it would be more logical for long term spending to run the 2 projects in tandem.
7598	Holly	Jamieson	I agree with the placement of the new water tank. It is tucked away in the corner, and it is near other utilities such as the carpark, tennis court and library. It is also away from both playgrounds. It will also be an easy place for construction workers and maintenance workers to access the tank, without having to go down an alleyway or across a bridge. The chosen location is the best possible location in Jeffrey's Reserve for a replacement water tank.