

24 May 2017

File: (17/832)

Report no: CPC2017/3/138

Future of HCC Wharves

Purpose of Report

1. This report provides further information on the options for the Council owned wharves.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Council:

- (i) notes the summary of responses to the consultation on the future of the wharves;
- (ii) notes that officers are seeking further specialist advice regarding the possible effect of piling works, including the removal of piles, on the Waiwhetu aquifer;
- (iii) agrees in principle to implement the following options, subject to the specialist advice on the aquifer;
 - (a) Days Bay Wharf – fully refurbish
 - (b) Rona Bay Wharf – fully refurbish
 - (c) Petone Wharf – partially remove approximately 50 metres of the 393 metre wharf and fully refurbish the rest
 - (d) Point Howard Wharf – demolish and don't replace
- (iv) agrees that the funding in the draft budget be amended to reflect the recommended options and likely timing of works as follows:

| | | |
|-----|---------|--------|
| (a) | 2017/18 | \$1.4M |
| (b) | 2018/19 | \$2.5M |
| (c) | 2019/20 | \$3.4M |

Background

2. As part of this year's annual plan consultation, Council agreed to seek feedback on options for the future of the City's four wharves. Three of the four wharves are more than 100 years old and nearing the end of their economic lives. Following the most recent condition assessments, undertaken in 2015, and again after the November 2016 earthquake, Council's engineering consultants recommended that Council consider the wharves long term future and implement, as appropriate, a comprehensive renewal programme.
3. Council agreed that the options outlined in the following table, (taken directly from the proposed Annual Plan consultation document), would be the subject of community engagement.

| WHARF | FULLY REFURBISH | REMOVE, DON'T REPLACE | PARTIALLY REMOVE AND REFURBISH | REMOVE AND REPLACE |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Rona Bay | \$1,370,000 | \$200,000 | \$580,000 | \$1,500,000 |
| Days Bay | \$2,076,000 | Not applicable | Not applicable | \$2,000,000 |
| Pt Howard | \$2,306,000 | \$400,000 | Not applicable | \$3,000,000 |
| Petone | \$4,758,000 | Not applicable | \$3,415,000 | \$8,200,000 |

Removing and not replacing the wharves is not deemed an option for Petone or Days Bay and is only provided as an option for Rona Bay and Pt Howard.

4. In addition to undertaking general consultation within the wider annual plan engagement, two public meetings were held in Petone and Eastbourne respectively, both of which were well attended, large signboards were erected at the entry to each of the wharves and letters were sent to organisations identified as likely to having an interest in the wharves future. Officers also met with individuals or groups who requested to do so.
5. A summary of the responses on the options is shown in the table below. The first line for each row is from the general consultation and the second from the citizen's panel. Note that even though the questionnaire specifically excluded some options for some wharves, respondents still indicated those options as a preference.

| Wharf | Fully refurbish | Partially remove and refurbish | Remove and replace | Remove, don't replace |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Rona Bay | | | | |
| General | 21% | 24% | 7% | 48% |
| Citizen's Panel | 18% | 28% | 7% | 47% |
| Days Bay | | | | |
| General | 54% | 2% | 43% | 1% |
| Citizen's Panel | 55% | 10% | 29% | 6% |
| Pt Howard | | | | |
| General | 31% | 3% | 8% | 58% |
| Citizen's Panel | 25% | 19% | 8% | 48% |
| Petone | | | | |
| General | 54% | 30% | 14% | 2% |
| Citizen's Panel | 53% | 23% | 15% | 9% |

6. One concern that has been raised by a number of submitters is the effect of piling work, or removal of piles, on the Waiwhetu aquifer. Officers have commissioned a specialist engineer from Tonkin & Taylor to provide advice in respect of the aquifer at each of the wharf locations. This information will be used to determine the likely risk and review the methodology proposed with the proposed works. It is proposed that this information be reported back to the City Development Committee prior to any works being undertaken.

Discussion

7. Officers contend that a decision on the future of the wharves should be made on a collective basis, given that the four wharves provide similar recreational opportunities. The options recommended in this report have been submitted on this basis.

Petone Wharf

8. Petone Wharf is by far the largest of the Council owned wharves and therefore the most expensive to maintain. At 110 metres long (the length of a rugby field) the outer head of the wharf provides an area and perimeter (230 linear metres), that is far greater than what is required for its current recreational use. Officers propose that the option to remove approximately 50 metres of the wharf's outer head (which represents about 1/8th of the total length of the wharf), and fully refurbish the rest is the best long term option, balancing costs, current use and heritage matters. At the public hearing the Heritage NZ representative stated that this option was a good compromise, retaining the heritage value of the wharf and would enable funds to be available for retaining the Rona Bay Wharf.
9. Refurbishment of the shortened outer head could include upgraded facilities to ensure this area is more user friendly.
10. This option also significantly reduces the amount of hardwood that will need to be sourced to undertake the renovations. This is not an insubstantial issue, given that there is a large question over sourcing hardwoods sustainably. Council's wharf contractor has advised officers that the main source of hardwood is from the rain forests of South America.
11. Another advantage is that there is likely to be salvageable timbers from both the outer head of Petone Wharf and from the Pt Howard Wharf which could be re-used in the renovations of the remainder of the wharf, further reducing the quantity of timber required to be imported and reducing costs.

Point Howard Wharf

12. Taking a strategic view of the wharves, officers are recommending that the Point Howard Wharf be demolished and not replaced. This will have a negative impact on the two main users, being recreational fishers and the Lowry Bay Yachting Club. Recreational fishers can be accommodated at other wharves and the starting box for the Lowry Bay Yacht Club

would be relocated to Whiorau Reserve. The Seaview oil terminal wharf is not available for recreational use as this is a high security facility. Council could consider improving public access to part of the Seaview Marina breakwater to accommodate fishers in this particular part of the harbour, subject to such activity not adversely impacting on Marina access.

13. This option is supported by more than half of all respondents. The usage information showed that this was the least visited wharf with over 80% of respondents having never visited the wharf. This wharf is not listed as a heritage structure, as are the other three wharves. Salvageable timbers would be used for work on other wharves.

Days Bay Wharf

14. The Days Bay Wharf is the most used of all of the Council wharves. Officers consider that with the costs (both capital and ongoing maintenance), of the two options under consideration being similar, the option to fully refurbish the existing wharf should be adopted. This is the preference of the majority of respondents and will preserve the character of Council's oldest wharf (1895).

Rona Bay Wharf

15. Officers are proposing that the Rona Bay Wharf be fully refurbished for a number of reasons. Again this is taking all wharves into consideration and is in despite of the 48% of respondents who had ticked as their preferred option, remove and don't replace.
16. The factors considered relevant in proposing that Rona Bay Wharf be fully refurbished include its high heritage value; strong local support; former decisions and works to integrate the wharf with the main Eastbourne shopping area; the positive impact of the wharf on the neighbouring Yacht Club facilities; the wharf's recreational value and the relative cost of works when compared to other wharves.

Options

17. Council has consulted on a range of options to address the long term future of the wharves. In addition to these options Council could take a do nothing approach, but this merely postpones a decision that needs to be made, particularly given the Petone Wharf closure, could have longer term cost implications and pose health and safety issues, which would be a risk for Council to manage.

Consultation

18. A summary of the consultation is provided in the background.

Legal Considerations

19. Demolition and remedial works will require resource consents, before being able to proceed.

Financial Considerations

20. The total estimated cost of the options that were the subject of consultation ranges between \$6.0M and \$14.7M. The draft budget currently has a sum of \$9.0M proposed for renewal works, spread over the next three years, and a further sum of \$2.3M for wharf inspections and ongoing maintenance spread over the out years.
21. The estimated cost of the options recommended in this report total \$7.3M for renewal works and it could be expected that ongoing survey and maintenance costs would reduce to \$1M for the out years.
22. If approved, the timing of the renewal and demolition works is likely to differ from what is currently shown in the draft plan. With consent and logistical processes it is unlikely that physical works would be able to commence on Petone Wharf (the top priority given its closure), for as much as 12 months. It is therefore proposed that the funding be split over a three year period as shown in the following table:

| Year | Budget | Description of works |
|---------|--------|---|
| 2017/18 | \$1.4M | Obtain consents for Petone Wharf and Pt Howard Wharves. Undertake demolition and acquire wharf timbers. Relocate Lowry Bay Yacht Club starting box. |
| 2018/19 | \$2.5M | Petone Wharf renewal works undertaken and obtain consents for Rona Bay and Days Bay Wharves |
| 2019/20 | \$3.4M | Rona Bay and Days Bay Wharves works undertaken. |

Other Considerations

23. In making this recommendation, officers have given careful consideration to the purpose of local government in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. Officers believe that this recommendation falls within the purpose of the local government in that it considers the future of community assets. It does this in a way that is cost-effective because it considers a variety of options that consider the long term future of these assets.

Appendices

There are no appendices for this report.

Author: Bruce Hodgins
Divisional Manager, Parks and Gardens

Author: Craig Cottrill
Reserves Assets Manager, Parks and Gardens

Approved By: Bruce Sherlock
General Manager, City Infrastructure