

Description of Options

Section	Who	Options		
		Option A (consulted as Do minimum) Moderate streetscape upgrade	Option B (consulted as Do more) Comprehensive streetscape upgrade (with future staging options)	Option C (not consulted) Minor safety and amenity improvements
Elizabeth Street	TCC	<p>BAU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council undertake stormwater quality improvements to address non-compliance issues • Council renew and upgrade wastewater and water pipes <p>Safety and amenity improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of pedestrian crossings at the Grey Street roundabout • Widening of footpath on south side of Elizabeth Street to a width of approximately 10m. • Construction of a mid-block pedestrian crossing and associated kerb build out with amenity enhancements • Generous low level planting and a number of trees • Street furniture such as seating, rubbish bins, bike parking etc 	<p>BAU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council undertake stormwater quality improvements to address non-compliance issues • Council renew and upgrade wastewater and water pipes <p>Safety and amenity improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade to Grey Street roundabout in order to slow speeds (raised table, kerb buildouts, pedestrian crossings etc) • Widening of footpath on south side of Elizabeth Street to a width of approximately 14m. • Construction of a mid-block pedestrian crossing and associated kerb build out with amenity enhancements • Generous low level planting and a number of trees • Street furniture such as seating, rubbish bins, bike parking etc • Lawn area • Play elements such as stepping stones and in ground trampolines 	<p>BAU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council undertake stormwater quality improvements to address non-compliance issues • Council renew and upgrade wastewater and water pipes <p>Safety and amenity improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of pedestrian crossings at the Grey Street roundabout • Construction of a mid-block pedestrian crossing and associated kerb build out with minor amenity enhancements
Laneway	TCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New paving, landscaping and lighting. 		
First Ave	TCC	<p>BAU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council undertake stormwater quality improvements to address non-compliance issues • Council renew and upgrade wastewater and water pipes <p>Safety and amenity improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of pedestrian crossings at First Ave/Devonport Road intersection • Construction of a mid-block pedestrian crossing and associated kerb build out with minor amenity enhancements • Installation of a raised median to prevent right turns at the Farmers carpark/Council carpark entrances/exits 		
	EPL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers reinstate footpath at their cost • Farmers create four new landscaped kerb build outs on north side of First Ave 		
Devonport Road	TCC	<p>BAU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council renew and upgrade wastewater pipes <p>Safety and amenity improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of raised pedestrian crossings at First Ave/Devonport Road intersection 		
	EPL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers reinstate footpath at their cost 		

	Options		
	Option A (consulted as Do minimum) Moderate streetscape upgrade	Option B (consulted as Do more) Comprehensive streetscape upgrade (with future staging options)	Option C (not consulted) Minor safety and amenity improvements
Consultation feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consulted on 217 people (31%) prefer Option A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consulted on 378 people (53%) prefer Option B Preferred option from public consultation, city centre residents and stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not consulted on 65 people (9%) reject Options A and B due to cost or would prefer no upgrade takes place
Construction cost estimate (QS) Includes rain gardens Includes 24% for traffic management and preliminaries and general Includes 20% construction contingency Does not include wastewater/water	\$5,420,000	\$6,550,000	\$4,570,000
Additional value including professional fees, design costs, MSQA, land purchase and 10% risk funding Does not include design costs spent to date	Total \$7,246,000	Total \$8,715,000	Total \$6,141,000
Underground services construction cost estimates	\$2,390,000 <i>*Note this value is based on preliminary information and is a high level estimate</i>		
Assessment against project objectives	Mostly meets project objectives Score 35/48	Achieves project objectives to a high standard Score 42/48	Partly meets project objectives Score 15/48
Can be built by Farmers opening?	Probably	Probably	Yes

Assessment against project objectives

Rating Does not achieve	0
Partly achieves	1
Mostly achieves	2
Achieves to a high standard	3

Key Objectives	What does this mean for the Elizabeth Street Upgrade?	Option A	Option B	Option C	Comments
Create vibrant streets and public places where people want to live, work and play, and businesses want to invest	Streets and public spaces provide high levels of amenity for city residents, and for people resting, shopping, dining, socialising and relaxing	2	3	1	With greater numbers of pedestrians in the area, it becomes more important to widen the footpath, and to provide shade and seating etc. Option B provides the highest level of amenity. Option C is only a slight improvement to what is existing.
	The quality of the streets and public spaces provides comparable quality to new development (i.e. the Farmers development)	3	3	1	Option A and B both provide comparable quality to new development. While Option B is wider and has more green space, it also has lower quality paving (asphalt).
	The Elizabeth Street Upgrade contributes to the 'green necklace' of connected high amenity walkways around the city centre	2	3	0	Option B can be considered as stage one towards the Linear Park. While Option A still provides elements of the linear park concept (trees and planting, wide walkways etc) the dimensions are inconsistent with the rest of the linear park concept.
	Design interventions respond to areas of active frontages, and pedestrian desire lines	3	3	1	Design interventions respond to respond to pedestrian desire lines for all options. There is insufficient room in Option C for areas of active frontages. For all options more could be done to respond to areas of pedestrian activity in front of the two Devonport entrances - such as the 'roundabouts' option
	Design supports current business types while also facilitating changing use over time towards more city living and office space	2	3	0	Option C supports current business types but does little to facilitate changing use over time. Options A and B support current business types and can facilitate changing use over time. Changes to parking in all options to provide more short term parking to encourage turn over would support businesses parking needs better.
	Design process future-proofs further development (further streetscape upgrades e.g. linear park and/or private commercial and residential development)	2	2	2	All options provide some future proofing for further development. Option A would have a high cost to change to linear park in the future.
	People feel safe to walk on the streets at night	3	3	2	Options A and B are likely to promote extra activity at night. Feature lighting is also a possibility in Options A and B. The laneway will be well lit.
Provide a safe and accessible slow speed environment that prioritises pedestrian access and connection.	Streets provide a high standard of pedestrian access and connection	2	3	1	All options provide for better access and connection than existing situation due to additional pedestrian crossings. Option C provides much less pedestrian space than the other two options. Option B is better at slowing vehicle speeds providing an improved environment for pedestrians.
	Design streets for 30km speeds to allow for a safe and pleasant pedestrian environment, and safer for people on bikes to share the road with cars	2	2	1	The carriageway in Options A and C is too wide to effectively keep speeds below 30kph. Option B is expected to slow traffic sufficiently but would require additional speed deterrents on Devonport Road to be effective.
	Transport system provides safe and effective access for development	1	2	1	Option B is slightly safer than Options A and C due to the proposed changes to the Grey Street roundabout and the alignment of the Farmers residential entrance to the roundabout. The 'roundabouts' option best meets this objective as it provides the safest access for the Farmers retail parking entrance.
	Street design caters for all ages and all levels of mobility and disability	2	3	1	Option C is an improvement to the existing environment, however footpaths are too narrow for mobility scooters to share with other users. Option A provides significant places for rest and more route options to allow for mobility scooters and the like. Option B is similar to Option A but includes play elements providing for children and their families
	Maintain effective public transport access	3	2	3	Option A and C are similar to existing. Option B scores slightly lower due to Grey Street roundabout being narrowed
	Reduce through traffic through the city centre	1	2	1	Elizabeth Street on its own cannot fully meet this objective. Additional upgrades to Devonport Road would be more effective.
Public spaces reflect local identity and values	Enhance mana whenua cultural landscapes within the design of streets and public spaces	2	3	0	This score represents potential for cultural expression. This objective will be addressed in more detail once an option has been decided
	Place making and design approaches reflect place and the people of Tauranga	2	3	0	As above. This score reflects potential for reflecting local identity and values
	The design approach, materials, and finishes are comfortable, welcoming, and enhance community connection	3	2	0	Option B has a lower score due to the use of asphalt
Total score		35	42	15	