

Response of Section 42A Officer to Applicant's Further Evidence

Land use resource consent

Resource Management Act 1991

Applicant:	Gore District Council
Reference:	LU 2020/012
Location:	Mataura River and River Street and River Terrace Road Reserves
Proposal:	Application under Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to construct a new bridge across the Mataura River to attach the new water pipelines linking East Gore with Jacobstown Wells and Hilbre Ave reservoir
Type of Consent:	Land Use Consent
Legal Description:	Mataura River river margins and riverbed; River Street and River Terrace Road Reserve; Section 80 Blk XVI Town of Gore (RT SL14/120); Pt Block XXVI Town of Gore (Recreational Reserve NZGZ 1983 p 2175)
Zoning:	Rural
Activity Status:	Discretionary Activity
Commissioners:	Dean Crystal (Chair), Reginald Proffit and Bonnie Mager
Date of Reply:	2 March 2021
Recommendation:	Decline

1. Introduction

My name is Nigel Bryce and I am the author of the section 42A report. My experience and qualifications are set out at Section 1 of this report and I do not repeat these here.

The following is a response to the Third Minute of Commissioners that sought comments on three pieces of new evidence from Mr Bayliss, Mr Standring and Mr Crocker, which addresses alternative locations for the proposed bridge. The Third Minute requests that any comments received are to be limited to the matters covered by the new evidence from these three witnesses and that these be submitted by 3rd March 2021.

2. Consideration of Reply Evidence

The evidence in reply of Mr Bayliss, Mr Standring and Mr Crocker has been helpful to shed more light on the consideration of the alternative bridge Options considered at the Council hearing (including Option A, Preferred Location, Option B and Option C).

Mr Standring's evidence discusses pedestrian and cycle connectivity and the merits of each option when considered against alignment with Government Policy Statement and project objectives. His evidence at paragraph 18 sets out the costs to the Gore District ratepayers with and without 55% NZTA funding of each bridge option. My reading of Mr Standring's evidence is that neither Option B and C would meet NZTA funding criteria because they offer less cycle and pedestrian engagement. Without NZTA funding, Options B and C both significantly increase costs to Gore District ratepayers.

Mr Bayliss's reply evidence addresses the costs associated with provision of water supply pipeline at Option A, Preferred Location, Option B and Option C, with the Preferred Option having the least overall costs.

Mr Crocker's reply evidence at paragraph 16 states in summary "that in reviewing the alternatives, that the proposed option represents the best value outcomes when trying to strike a good balance between span, cost, flood risk, and connectivity."

While the reply evidence submitted sets out that the Preferred Option is likely to be the most viable and effective in responding to the overall project objectives (as set out at paragraph 6 of Mr Standring's evidence), including in terms of securing NZTA funding, and is the least costly to construct (based on bridge cost and pipeline costs), the Preferred Option still generates significant adverse visual effects on nine residential properties within 250m radius of the bridge site. In my opinion, these adverse effects are not outweighed by the positive benefits of a dual purpose bridge in this location.

3. Recommendation

Having regard to the above reply evidence, I maintain my recommendation to the Commission that the application be declined.