

Ainslee Brown

From: Ainslee Brown
Sent: Thursday, 24 October 2019 6:16 PM
To: Ainslee Brown
Subject: Opus peer review comments Eastern Bays Shared Path LVA addendum to include assessment of project with safety barriers

From: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 22 October 2019 9:08 AM
To: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>
Subject: RE: Eastern Bays Shared Path LVA addendum to include assessment of project with safety barriers

Hi Shannon,

I believe we discussed this on site, but it wasn't included in my formal report on mitigation measures. My view is that creating the environment for this to occur requires sufficient width for passing, good design and visual demarcation.

Cheers

Catherine

Catherine Hamilton
Technical Principal - Landscape Architecture



Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com

WSP
The Westhaven Building
100 Beaumont St
Auckland 1010
New Zealand

wsp.com/nz

From: Shannon.Watson@ghd.com <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>
Sent: Monday, 21 October 2019 3:48 PM
To: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>
Subject: RE: Eastern Bays Shared Path LVA addendum to include assessment of project with safety barriers

Thanks Catherine that's very helpful and I'm sure will provide more context for those who are interested in path widths and the barriers during the notification/submission process. Did you have a reference for the ability to sit on the seawall as mitigation? or was this one of your own considerations (you consider the ability to be able to sit on the edge of the path as alleviating some of the effects of the proposal).

Many thanks
Shannon

From: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>
Sent: Monday, 21 October 2019 12:53 PM
To: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>
Cc: Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>; Grinlinton-Hancock, Michelle <Michelle.Grinlinton-

Hancock@wsp.com>

Subject: RE: Eastern Bays Shared Path LVA addendum to include assessment of project with safety barriers

Hello Shannon,

- The single most important point I want to make is that providing adequate scale of space to move along the path without perceived or real constraints of being squeezed hard up against a live lane (70km at that) is, in my opinion, fundamental to a quality recreation experience. I support the evidence that 3.5m is the required clear space width for a quality recreation experience.
- The introduction of a fence in this context serves to reduce the sense of real and perceived available space, and constrain people against the live lane. Reducing the available width to 2.8 will, in my opinion, result in a reduction of recreation amenity when compared to no fence.
- For people to stop and sit on the edge, there needs to be a good width to create a sense of comfort and remove any sense of threat from people moving at speed behind the sitting persons' back (the basic principles of human comfort - 'prospect and refuge' apply here). It is not so much a matter of the size of the kerbs, but the width of the space.
- Ideally people will sit on a bull-nosed top of wall with feet hanging down in front – with sufficient passing space behind. The other optimum scenario is to have raised seats at the refuge (break-out) locations for people of all ages and abilities including more frail individuals.

Warm regards

Catherine

Catherine Hamilton

Technical Principal - Landscape Architecture



T: +64 9 353 2960

M: +64 27 244 7849

Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com

WSP

The Westhaven Building

100 Beaumont St

Auckland 1010

New Zealand

wsp.com/nz

From: Head, Jeremy

Sent: Monday, 21 October 2019 12:18 PM

To: Shannon.Watson@ghd.com; Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>

Cc: Grinlinton-Hancock, Michelle <Michelle.Grinlinton-Hancock@wsp.com>; dan.kellow@huttcity.govt.nz; Jo Frances <Jo.Frances@gw.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: Eastern Bays Shared Path LVA addendum to include assessment of project with safety barriers

Hi Shannon,

The recreation comments are written by me following telephone discussion with Catherine. Apologies if anything got lost in translation...

Kind regards,

Jeremy Head
Senior Landscape Architect



Jeremy.Head@wsp.com

WSP Opus
12 Moorhouse Avenue
Christchurch
8011 New Zealand

wsp-opus.co.nz

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

From: Shannon.Watson@ghd.com <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>
Sent: Monday, 21 October 2019 12:09 PM
To: Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>; Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>
Cc: Grinlinton-Hancock, Michelle <Michelle.Grinlinton-Hancock@wsp.com>; dan.kellow@huttcity.govt.nz; Jo Frances <Jo.Frances@gw.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Eastern Bays Shared Path LVA addendum to include assessment of project with safety barriers

Thanks very much Jeremy and Catherine for your comments.

Catherine, I have some follow up questions based on your comments:

- the full barrier will only be used in sections where the path width is 3.5m and not in any areas where the path width is 2.5m – therefore the useable space of the shared path in sections where the full barrier is used will reduce to at worst 2.8m (based on your reference to a loss of 700mm below). Where this is the case do you see any major conflicts/areas for concern?
- You raise a good point about all locations where the fence is used resulting in the loss of the ability for sitting on the sea wall, which you consider part of the mitigation for effects on recreation amenity. However, I have had a look through the various reports and cannot find any reference to sitting on the side of the seawall as mitigation? Can you please confirm where you found reference to the edge of the seawall being used for sitting being discussed as a mitigation option or explain where your assessment of sitting on the seawall as mitigation has come from?
- Do you have any concerns with wheel stoppers being used or do you expect these to not be an issue and, given their small size, for people to just sit over the top of them where they are used?

Many thanks

Shannon Watson
Environmental Planner

Connect



[WATER](#) | [ENERGY & RESOURCES](#) | [ENVIRONMENT](#) | [PROPERTY & BUILDINGS](#) | [TRANSPORTATION](#)

Please consider our environment before printing this email

From: Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>

Sent: Friday, 18 October 2019 4:56 PM

To: Shannon Watson <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>; Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>

Cc: Grinlinton-Hancock, Michelle <Michelle.Grinlinton-Hancock@wsp.com>; Dan Kellow (InTouch) <dan.kellow@huttcity.govt.nz>; Jo Frances <Jo.Frances@gw.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: Eastern Bays Shared Path LVA addendum to include assessment of project with safety barriers

Hi Shannon,

Catherine and I have the following comments (Catherine is away today and asked me to include her comments in my email).

Recreational comments (from Catherine):

- The fence adds a vertical structure which effectively narrows the available psychological width. People will keep back to avoid handlebars touching the fence. People will already keep back from the 'sleepers' on the opposite side therefore a net loss of usable width of up to 700mm will occur.
- The effective cycleway width will reduce from 2.5m to 1.8m little more than a standard urban footpath.
- Being able to sit on the edge of the sea wall was considered part of the mitigation. This is no longer valid.
- Loss of feeling connected to the sea, replaced with feeling contained within the roading environment.
- The visualisations don't tell the full story. Preferable if similar situations could be cited by the applicant which could be visited (by us or the client) on a busy day to better understand how people respond to such structures.

Landscape comments:

- Typically a cycleway requires a 1400mm barrier, although in special circumstances this can be reduced to 1200mm if sightline issues come into play. The proposal is for a 1100mm high barrier which may not comply. The applicant needs to confirm this.
- If a barrier is required for compliance reasons, I question whether it is required where the fall height is less than 1m. The applicant needs to confirm this by citing the relevant rule.
- The proposed barrier will appear very urban which will be particularly at odds with the sometimes wild sea conditions. This is regardless of whether the barrier is opposite residential development or more natural areas.
- The barrier will be a visual distraction, particularly from oblique views when travelling along the shared user path or road where the vertical elements will visually 'overlap' causing the structure to appear more solid than it actually is.
- I generally agree with Ms William's comments in Appendices 1 - 3.
- If a safety barrier is ultimately installed as shown, it should be visually 'light', and, if painted avoid the cliché 'blue' which will jar when seen against the surrounding natural sea and rock colours. A preference would be for a recessive grey/brown hue (eg 'Ironsand').

- The barrier would need to be sufficiently strong to avoid distorting if struck by cyclists, vandals etc. If the uprights for example became bent out of plumb, the unsightly effects would be highly noticeable.
- Visual impact from the sea will be less than from the land as the barrier will be backdropped by visually 'busy' colours, textures and moving elements. From the land the barrier will appear prominent particularly at times of day/year when it catches the light (even dark colours will have this effect).
- My original conclusions were that the proposal had adverse landscape, visual and natural character effects that would fall between 'low' and 'moderate'. In light of the proposal to include a barrier, my conclusion are that the effects would increase to '**moderate**' as the barrier will be a prominent feature around this highly defined landscape 'edge'.
- The design of the barrier needs to be carefully considered/selected, and appropriately coloured.

Kind regards,

Jeremy Head
Senior Landscape Architect



Jeremy.Head@wsp.com

WSP Opus
12 Moorhouse Avenue
Christchurch
8011 New Zealand

wsp-opus.co.nz

This message, including any document or file attached, is intended only for the addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any other person is strictly prohibited from reading, using, disclosing or copying this message. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

From: Shannon.Watson@ghd.com <Shannon.Watson@ghd.com>

Sent: Tuesday, 8 October 2019 3:50 PM

To: Hamilton, Catherine <Catherine.Hamilton@wsp.com>; Head, Jeremy <Jeremy.Head@wsp.com>

Cc: Grinlinton-Hancock, Michelle <Michelle.Grinlinton-Hancock@wsp.com>; dan.kellow@huttcity.govt.nz; Jo Frances <Jo.Frances@gw.govt.nz>

Subject: Eastern Bays Shared Path LVA addendum to include assessment of project with safety barriers

Importance: High

Hi Catherine and Jeremy

I hope this email finds you both well – I have now left GWRC but have been seconded back to complete the Eastern Bays Shared Path project consenting.

Following concerns from HCC's consultant Transport Engineer David Wanty about the need for the project to include safety barriers and/or wheel guards at certain locations pursuant to Building Act requirements and safety concerns, the applicant has reassessed their preliminary design to determine whether it is necessary, and if so where it will be necessary, to incorporate some form of edge protection along the seaward side of the Shared Path. As a result, Julia Williams, the applicants Landscape and Visual Amenity expert has prepared an addendum to her original Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (LVA) to address any changes the incorporation of edge protection had on the conclusions that she reached in the original LVA.

Could you please review the attached addendum and visual simulations for the Shared Path project with the inclusion of edge protection features and let me know whether the addition of edge protection changes any of the conclusions you reached during your initial assessments in relation to significance or scale of effects. Additionally, I would be keen to understand whether either of you have any major concerns related to the addition of edge protection from an amenity (both visual and recreational) or safety perspective.

This information has come quite late in the process, with plans to notify the application immediately following Labour Weekend (29 October). It would be greatly appreciated if you could get any comments back to me by **18 October 2019**.

Please feel free to give me a call if you would like to discuss.

Kind regards

Shannon Watson
Environmental Planner

GHD

Proudly employee owned

T: +64 04 474 7330 | V: 517330 | | F: 04 472 0833 | E: shannon.watson@ghd.com
Level 2, Grant Thornton House, 215 Lambton Quay, Wellington 6011 | www.ghd.com

Connect



[WATER](#) | [ENERGY & RESOURCES](#) | [ENVIRONMENT](#) | [PROPERTY & BUILDINGS](#) | [TRANSPORTATION](#)

Please consider our environment before printing this email

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email, including any attachments, is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately, and please delete it; you should not copy it or use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. GHD and its affiliates reserve the right to monitor and modify all email communications through their networks.

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

..LAEHhHHzdJzBITWfa4Hgs7pbKl

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email, including any attachments, is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately, and please delete it; you should not copy it or use

it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. GHD and its affiliates reserve the right to monitor and modify all email communications through their networks.

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email, including any attachments, is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately, and please delete it; you should not copy it or use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. GHD and its affiliates reserve the right to monitor and modify all email communications through their networks.

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses