

Memorial Park - 90% Developed Design Query Register

MPA and Wellington City Council



Query No.	From	Query Description	Response	Response by
1	Paul Glennie (803 8273)	<p>1. The "A" street light located in C/D 01/02 appears to be lighting Taranaki Street; this would seem to be an outlier of sorts as there are no lights of this orientation in any location south of this point.</p> <p>2. Additionally, there is some concern that when we go to LED's in the future, we may not be using the same supplier as the MPA and thus end up with design issues.</p> <p>3. Would it be possible to ask Brian Goldstein for their lighting design drawings, including intersections with Taranaki, Victoria, and Willis.</p>	<p>1. The comment is correct, however, this is replacing an existing HPS fitting (refer ICB- 10-03-101 on the tab "Supplement to Query 1 ").</p> <p>2. The pole selected only works well (visually) with LED fittings. The alternative is to keep that pole without the fitting pointing towards Taranaki and keeping the HPS pole. That would mean three SL poles in a 30m area. A light fitting is needed in that vicinity.</p> <p>3. A hard copy of these drawings is provided in the folder.</p>	Virgil Karan
2	Sheryl Barker (803 8125) and Capacity	<p>Drainage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear definition of WCC public drainage network and private (NZTA / Parks?) network • use of WCC public drainage manhole lids on non WCC public drainage network • designing for a 1 in 5 year event for the primary stormwater system - it doesn't seem they've adequately considered potential secondary flow paths • Capacity did / do not agree with the analysis and conclusions in terms of the "Pre and Post Development Flows" report (Appendix D).A meeting was held between MPA and Capacity on the 27th Nov to discuss this and they agreed to address our concerns however they have not amended the report for this submission. <p>Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o the existing catchment areas do not appear correct o Capacity did not advise that the capacity of the Kent / Cambridge system was 1% AEP. Their understanding is that the capacity of the combined system is in the region of 5-10 year ARI o There are significant issues with the assessment of existing network operation and capacity from the level logger analysis and Capacity do not agree with the conclusions • thought design was to include storage/retention of stormwater to be used for irrigation – which would result in lower stormwater discharge • design report details existing and post development capacities of section of WCC public stormwater including a short fall at the proposed Buckle Street East pipeline (10 litres / per second. For 10min event could result in 6,000 litres of excess stormwater) <p>Public Drainage and Capacity would like a meeting with the MPA team to discuss these issues before there is further progress on this project.</p>	<p>1) There are no NZTA networks shown on the Memorial Park Drainage. Demarcation between Park and Public needs to be confirmed and agreed internally within WCC. 2)</p> <p>Visually the public drainage lids offer a better alternative than a standard plain cover and as such have been adopted for the park drainage covers. Following confirmation by yourselves on the demarcation of public network / parks we can look to rationalise the covers.</p> <p>3) The park stormwater and local road drainage has been designed on the project is to a 1 in 20 year ARI. Overland flow has been considered for Buckle Street east. Flows in excess of 1 in 5 year ARI will run as overland flow along the street roadway and adjacent rain gardens until it reaches Sussex Street where it will be intercepted by catchpits and then piped under Sussex Street.</p> <p>4) The Pre and Post development flows will be reissued to accomodate the comments made at the meeting and issued towards the end of Jan 2014. In summary the outcomes were as follows:</p> <p>4a) The pre and post development catchment areas taken into account in our calculations are correct but arrows on the catchment drawings were misleading and will be corrected in the update of the report.</p> <p>4b) Capacity advised that the capacity of the 1800 dia pipe was somewhere between a 1 in 2 year and 1 in a 100 year event during the early stages of the undrpass design (Refer email from Tim Strang to Sam Reed on the 5th October 2012). Calculations and drawings were sent to WCC (John Boot) for approval who confirmed the underpass design was acceptable to discharge into the Cambridge Terrace network.</p> <p>4c) The level logger information frequency is inadequate and any further work will be done at a higher frequency of measurement. The report conclusions in respect to this will be updated to reflect this. In respect to the design this doesn't change and Richard Keightly confirmed he would double check if WCC / Capacity had any concerns on the currently approved undrpass design and Park design collectively.</p> <p>4d) A stormwater storage/reuse system was considered in the design of the stormwater drainage and irrigation system for the Memorial Park. It was ruled out by the stakeholders because the economics did not stack up (given the relatively low unit cost of town supply water)</p> <p>4e) The 100 l/s capacity given in our report referred to simply the pipe-full capacity. Allowing for water buildup within the manholes, the Buckle Street primary system has greater capacity than 100 l/s before secondary system overland flow is activated. Also, the post development design flow of 110 l/s has not taken any flood detention provision by the rain garden system to be provided as part of the park.</p> <p>4f) We would like to amend the report and then arrange a meeting following your review (mid Feb)</p>	Johnny Priestley
3	Nicci Wood (803 8081)	<p>Services:</p> <p>Drainage lid design -</p> <p>The manhole covers are correct but the sump grate covers aren't our new standard sump grate.</p>	<p>Please provide electronic drawings so we can update the new type lid. We have noted on the drawings the new cover will be provided.</p>	Johnny Priestley
4	Steve Spence (803 8099)	<p>Traffic -</p> <p>The sign and road marking plans are acceptable, however it is requested that a copy of the associated roading layout plans/details are provided to Council.</p>	<p>We have provided the relevant set of drawings</p>	

5	Vikki Muxlow (803 8343)	<p>Landscaping - Is there a maintenance period (and the timing of this) following practical completion before the ongoing maintenance comes over to WCC?</p> <p>Can the Parks Team be included in the various stages of inspections of the tree pits & rain gardens as they are built?</p>	<p>The contract between the Ministry for Culture and Heritage and NZTA is that maintenance is the responsibility of "others" once practical completion is issued. This condition excludes trees which have a 2 year maintenance period (MPA responsibility).</p> <p>Happy to discuss the level of inclusion Park Team have in various stages of inspection of tree pits & rain gardens</p>	Jason Harrison
6	Mike Cox (803 8766)	<p>I have also asked one of our building officers for his comments: With regards to schedule 6 part 1 conditions 3 and 4, I note that the draft plans are not complete and have not been certified, certification being required under subpart 5 section 19(2)(a)(b). Furthermore, as yet the authorising body appears not to have been consulted as required under subpart 5 20(2) as to the suitability of the certifier.</p>	<p>On the subject of certification referred to under subpart 5 section 19(2)(a)(b) this refers to the certification of the various management plans - the intention of special legislation was to remove the need for building consent certification.</p> <p>On the matter of the appointment of experts for certification, I've spoken to MPA staff here who have advised that Bill Stevens was sent through a list of the certifiers being used by MPA</p>	Jason Harrison
7	Neil Johnstone (803 8397)	<p>Infrastructure - comments:</p> <p>There is a lot of detail in these plans and they need careful consideration by those that are going to be responsible to maintain these assets and areas in the future.</p> <p>There needs to be a plan which identifies which organisation and who their respective representatives are for maintaining the facilities in the future.</p> <p>Asset facilities that need to be considered are at least: Street Cleaning Street Furniture Street Structures, e.g. walls, Drainage infrastructure e.g. in rain gardens and roads Pavements and kerb features Utility reticulation needs, e.g along Buckle Street and Tory/Tasman St Planting and growth management Irrigation Lighting</p> <p>Many of these will be maintained by different organisations depending on their location and purpose. e.g. Ministry for Culture and Heritage, NZTA, WCC, Massey University,</p> <p>In respect of Utility needs there needs to be future-proofing for utilities along the Tory to Tasman Street bridge route. Otherwise road pavements may be compromised.</p>	<p>Responsibility for the built assets is outside the scope of the engagement of MPA.</p> <p>The Ministry for Culture and Heritage and Council are in the process of agreeing a Service Level Agreement - suggest that this comment be addressed to Council's Geoff Swainson & Anna Harley for more details on this item.</p>	Jason Harrison
7	Neil Johnstone (803 8397)	<p>In respect of Pavements I did notice on Drawing MP-09-013 the Type 3 Pavement flagstones need to be on a concrete base for strength unless vehicles are physically excluded.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correct, if vehicles are not physically excluded from flagged surfaces, then the base needs to be concrete. 2. However, Type 3 Pavement is now on a 150mm AP40 Basecourse, comment 1 still correct (This has been revised since last issues.) 	Duncan Thomson
8		<p>A further request was received for the street lighting design details along the SH1 corridor which are being constructed under the ICB works.</p>	<p>Dwgs included - ICB-10-01-100, ICB-10-02-100 ICB-10-02-101, ICB-10-03-100 ICB-10-03-101, ICB-10-03-102, ICB-10-03-103, ICB-10-11-100, ICB-10-12-100</p>	Matthew Lesiak