

Resource Consent Application to establish the Longford Bridge across the Maitland River.

Comment on new evidence dated 29 January 2021 as submitted by Mr Bayliss, Mr Standing, and Mr Crocker.

Mr Bayless states that a bridge built at Option c – Maitland street ‘provides the most direct route for connection of the water supply line’ and provides a costing for this bridge of \$5million and a pipeline cost of \$1,332,630 being a total cost of \$6,332,630. He also provides bridge costing for the preferred site as being \$3.7 million, even though the bridge at this point is 10m shorter I find it hard to accept that this 10metres would cost \$1.3 million to build. Has a subsidy from New Zealand transport Authority (NZTA) been factored into this pricing? That is not comparing apples with apples.

As the prime purpose of the bridge is to convey water surely the most direct and cost-effective route should be adopted. This would be a fiscally prudent decision.

In Mr Standings new evidence, he also provides a table of bridge costings with a difference in estimated pricing between Maitland Street, the direct route and Surrey Street, the preferred location for a bridge, of \$1.3 million dollars for a difference in length of 10 m. He does provide detailed discount pricing in Section 18 of his evidence of the total estimated cost to Gore Rate Payers with NZTA funding. This funding has not been applied to option d, Maitland street. Why not? It is my understanding that NZTA had not been asked if Option d would meet the requirements of NZTA funding. Again, not comparing apples with apples or providing all information for all options.

Mr Crocker has provided in-depth information detailing all sites for the construction of a bridge and the reasons why the preferred option is at the Surrey Street site. His evidence is supportive of a GDC perceived need to establish ‘connectivity’ between East and West Gore, or primarily Eastern Residents to Central Business District CBD). The real and identified need, created by Central Government legislation for the upgrading of Community Water standards, is to construct a means to convey water to and from a new water treatment plant the GDC wishes to construct at the Maitland street site. Logic says this is the primary objective of the bridge and the bridge should be in as direct a line as possible between the two water sources to be used in the Water Supply Re-development, to be seen to be contributing to keeping this project’s costs as low as possible.

The proposed bridge needs to be seen, as part of a larger picture, not as a project on its own. Fiscal prudence says to examine the prime purpose of the bridge, convey water, and the most economic way to do this as part of the whole. To this end I don’t believe GDC has examined all avenues of pipeline conveyance as the Environment Southland web site provides under Regional Water Plan Rule 27 for the placement of cables, wires, and pipes as a permitted activity, under certain conditions, which a trenched pipe line would be able to meet, nor have they kept the prime purpose of the bridge to the front of their decision making.

R.B. Bell
Property Owner/Residence Constructor
15 River Terrace
Gore
Resident
17 Denton Street
Gore