

Infrastructure Committee

23 November 2023

Report for Agenda Item | Rīpoata moto e Rāraki take [2]

Department: Property & Infrastructure

Title | Taitara: Butlers Green Retaining Wall

Purpose of the Report | Te Take mō te Pūroko

The purpose of this report is to present the options for future maintenance of the historic stone wall between Butlers Green and Buckingham Street in Arrowtown.

Recommendation | Kā Tūtohuka

That Infrastructure Committee:

1. **Note** the contents of this report; and
2. **Note** that existing budgets are insufficient to reconstruct the wall, which would require a new budget and prioritisation under the Long Term Plan process; and
3. **Agree** on the option of maintaining the wall in the interim.

Prepared by:



Name: Ben Greenwood

Title: Roading Operations and Contracts
Manager

18 October 2023

Reviewed and Authorised by:



Name: Tony Avery

Title: General Manager of Property &
Infrastructure

26 October 2023

Context | Horopaki

1. Butlers Green wall is a historic stacked stone feature constructed in the 1880s, located between Buckingham Street and the Butlers Green reserve in Arrowtown. The wall is listed as a Category 2 Historic Place with Heritage New Zealand (HNZ) under “Stone Wall” List number 2120, as of 24 November 1983, and Category 3 under Council’s District Plan reference number 311.
2. Movement of the wall has been an ongoing concern, and various options to maintain, remediate or reconstruct the wall have been put forward following an options study by Stantec in 2018.
3. For further background information, including context and progression of options, refer to previous report to Infrastructure Committee, 23 February 2023.
4. The resolution of the 23 February 2023 meeting was as follows:
 1. **Note the contents of this report.**
 2. **Direct staff to undertake a heritage assessment of the wall including its heritage values, what can be properly restored, and the heritage implications of options 1-3 in the report.**
 3. **Direct staff to consider the heritage strategy and consult with all the partners within the strategy including the Whakatipu Heritage Trust.**
 4. **Direct staff to consider all reasonable, practicable options within existing budgets for preventing the further deterioration of the wall including reducing the road to Dudley’s Cottage to one lane.**
5. The heritage assessment (Attachment A) is now complete. It indicates that options to remediate the existing wall, such as tying it back with anchors and mesh or stabilising with bracing, will obscure the wall and impact on the heritage values. The report states that the preferred option from a heritage conservation perspective is to dismantle and reconstruct the wall.
6. As a Category 3 heritage feature, preservation of the heritage resource is encouraged under Council’s District Plan; however the District Plan also states Council will be more flexible regarding significant alterations.
7. Design work has not been completed on the reconstruction option, however a scoping level estimate indicates cost would be in the order of \$1.5 million, which is above the \$600k budget.
8. Progress is continuing on the design of a one-way system for the section of Buckingham Street between Villiers Street and Dudleys Cottage, to reduce traffic loading on the wall with traffic travelling down to the reserve area and through a yet to be constructed path between the overflow parking area and the Ramshaw Lane carpark. It is expected this could be implemented by 30 June 2024. It is not clear whether this change will materially increase the remaining life of the wall.

9. The budget was previously aligned to a remediation option, which was not favoured due to dissatisfaction with the appearance of the proposed mesh and anchor approach. After considering cost escalations, and time remaining to complete design, consenting, tender and construction, this option is not viable to complete within the available time and budget.
10. The remaining budget after implementing the one-way system will be deferred initially, most likely to Year 3 of the 2024-27 Long Term Plan due to the forecasted funding constraints over the next two years. A decision on this agenda item would then see the budget either retained in 2026/27 or declared as surplus. Future reconstruction of the wall, if desired, would require a new budget to be considered under the Long Term Plan process.
11. It is noted if the wall was to require replacement, either planned or under emergency works, it would likely attract Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency funding for a standard retaining wall only. If aesthetic components are desired, allocation of a local share budget or community funding initiative would be required in future.

Analysis and Advice | Tatāritaka me kā Tohutohu

12. This report identifies and assesses the following reasonably practicable options for assessing the matter as required by section 77 of the Local Government Act 2002.
13. Option 1 Monitor and maintain the wall under the roading maintenance contract and existing budgets for structures maintenance, to a do-minimum standard. Declare the remaining project budget as surplus or reallocate to another project.

Advantages:

- No further Capex cost is incurred on an option that is not supported
- Allows existing heritage feature to be retained initially without adverse visual impact, although maintenance work over time may impact on this

Disadvantages:

- Impact on operational budgets to complete minor maintenance of the wall ad-hoc over time
- Unclear when a longer-term option will be prioritised under the Long Term Plan process
- Sudden failure of the wall could occur, resulting in the need to consider reconstruction. It is noted that mitigation is in place by way of safety fencing to keep people away from the base of the wall

14. Option 2 Complete remediation of the wall by tying back with mesh and anchors. Retain the project budget, deferred to 2026/27. It is likely that additional funding will be required, and it is

anticipated this could be planned for and topped up utilising operational roading maintenance or renewal budgets.

Advantages:

- Likely to be the lowest cost option over time
- Considered the minimum level of engineering intervention that allows retention of the existing heritage wall, and as such is a compromise between these conflicting priorities
- Accelerates a reasonable standard of repair to the whole wall in what may inevitably end up happening ad-hoc over time under Option 1

Disadvantages:

- Some community opposition to this approach as it will significantly change the look of the wall
- Does not align to the preferred option from a heritage impact perspective
- Sudden failure of the wall could occur, resulting in the need to consider reconstruction. Implementing this option (over Option 1) will significantly reduce the risk of damage to the wall in a light to moderate earthquake. It is noted that mitigation is in place by way of fencing to keep people away from the base of the wall.

15. Advice The recommended option is Option 1. This will allow the wall to be monitored under Council's routine structures inspections and maintenance contracts, and targeted maintenance completed as required. It will increase the length of time the wall remains in its natural state, but there will be additional cost associated with an ad-hoc repair approach. Should the wall collapse or deteriorate such that reconstruction becomes a priority the budget and design details would be considered at that time. This approach carries increased risk of failure of the wall, particularly in an earthquake.

Consultation Process | Hātepe Matapaki

Significance and Engagement | Te Whakamahi I kā Whakaaro Hiraka

16. This matter is of medium significance, as determined by reference to the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy because it involves a high level of community interest.
17. The persons who are affected by or interested in this matter are the residents and ratepayers of the Queenstown Lakes District, Heritage New Zealand, along with people who have an interest in historic infrastructure.
18. The Council has undertaken the following consultation with stakeholder groups:

- Site meeting in February 2022 to discuss a Stantec options report and establish the community's preferred option, prior to requesting the funding via internal submission to the annual plan.
- Community engagement session at the Museum in November 2022 to explain the key features, constraints and compromises of Stantec's options report and seek community input on the design details.

Māori Consultation | Iwi Rūnaka

19. The Council has not undertaken any consultation with iwi on this matter.

Risk and Mitigations | Kā Raru Tūpono me kā Whakamaurutaka

20. This matter relates to the Community & Wellbeing risk category. It is associated with RISK10021 Ineffective operations and maintenance of property or infrastructure assets within the QLDC Risk Register. This risk has been assessed as having a moderate residual risk rating.
21. The approval of the recommended option will support the Council by allowing us to retain the risk at its current level. This shall be achieved by monitoring the wall and completing maintenance as required.

Financial Implications | Kā Riteka ā-Pūtea

22. Both options are able to be implemented within current Long Term Plan budgets.
23. Reconstruction of the wall would require a new budget to be established under the Long Term Plan prioritisation process.

Council Effects and Views | Kā Whakaaweawe me kā Tirohaka a te Kaunihera

24. The following Council policies, strategies and bylaws were considered:
- QLDC Heritage Strategy March 2010
- The recommended option is consistent with the principles set out in the named strategy.
25. As a Category 3 heritage feature, preservation of the heritage resource is encouraged under Council's District Plan which states Council will be more flexible regarding significant alterations.
26. This matter is included in the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan

**Legal Considerations and Statutory Responsibilities | Ka Ture Whaiwhakaaro me kā Takohaka
Waeture**

27. At this stage legal advice has not been sought, but will be if required as part of working through the following consent processes for Option 2:

- A building consent will be required under the Building Act 2004.
- A resource consent will be required under the Resource Management Act 1991.
- An archaeological authority will be required under the Historic Places Act 1993.

Local Government Act 2002 Purpose Provisions | Te Whakatureture 2002 o te Kāwanataka ā-Kīaka

28. The recommended option:

- Section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002 states the purpose of local government is (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and (b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future. As such, the recommendation in this report is appropriate and within the ambit of Section 10 of the Act.
- Can be implemented through current funding under the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan;
- Is consistent with the Council's plans and policies; and
- Would not significantly alter the intended level of service provision for any significant activity undertaken by or on behalf of the Council or transfer the ownership or control of a strategic asset to or from the Council.

Attachments | Kā Tāpirihaka

A	Heritage Assessment: Butlers Green Retaining Wall
---	---