
Minutes for a meeting of the Infrastructure Committee of Waikato District Council held via Audio Visual Conference on **MONDAY, 28 MARCH 2022** commencing at **9.31am**.

Present:

Cr EM Patterson (Chairperson)
Cr CA Eyre (Deputy Chairperson)
His Worship the Mayor, Mr AM Sanson
Cr AD Bech
Cr JA Church
Cr JM Gibb
Mr B Green (Maangai Maaori)
Cr SL Henderson
Cr SD Lynch
Cr RC McGuire
Cr FM McNally
Cr JD Sedgwick
Cr NMD Smith
Cr LR Thomson
Cr CT Woolerton

Attending:

Mr R MacCulloch (General Manager Service Delivery)
Mr C Morgan (General Manager Community Growth)
Mrs S O’Gorman (General Manager Customer Support)
Mr P McPherson (Community Projects Manager)
Ms M May (Community Connections Manager)
Ms J Bishop (Contracts and Partnering Manager)
Ms C Nutt (Waters Contract Relationship Manager)
Mr B Cathro (Customer Support Project Manager)
Ms C Cullen (Project Manager)
Mr T Ranga (Project Manager)
Mr N McGrath (Contract Engineer)
Mr R Bayer (Roading Team Leader)
Mr P Ellis (Solid Waste Team Leader)
Mr R Rink (Contracts Team Leader)
Ms J Calambuhay (Project Development Team Leader)
Mr M Horsfield (Democracy Advisor)
Ms G Shaw (Democracy Advisor)

APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

All members were present.

CONFIRMATION OF STATUS OF AGENDA ITEMS

Resolved: (Crs Sedgwick/Smith)

THAT:

- a) **the agenda for a meeting of the Infrastructure Committee held on Monday, 28 March 2022 be confirmed; and**
- b) **all reports be received.**

CARRIED

INF2203/01

DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolved: (Crs Patterson/Thomson)

THAT the minutes for a meeting of the Infrastructure Committee held on Monday, 14 February 2022 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

INF2203/02

REPORTS

Actions Register
Agenda Item 5

The report was received [*INF2203/02 refers*] and there was no discussion.

Service Delivery Project Status Report – March 2022
Agenda Item 6.1

The report was received [*INF2203/02 refers*] and the following items were discussed:

- A presentation was provided highlighting the work the Service Delivery team were undertaking. Staff spoke to the presentation and highlighted the projects below:

- Pokeno Road Urban upgrade – Part one of a broader reset for Pokeno. There had been a high level of engagement with the community, local Iwi, schools and developers.
- Te Awa Cycleway – Project started in 2018 and runs through the Waipa and Waikato Districts and Hamilton City. There had been a number of bridges built through gullies, with a portion of land needing to be vested with the relevant Council for the project.
- Mangawara Bridge – The bridge won a national award at IPEWA asset management excellence awards. The bridge was developed in cooperation with Waikato-Tainui, KiwRail and Waka Kotahi.
- Papahua Walkway – 700m of concrete path was delivered with the design worked in with existing natural features. Iwi, Holiday Camp and Community Board fed into the design and path for the walkway. Staff also engaged with the Raglan Football Club as the path impacted the football fields. The design took into account the feedback from all stakeholders.
- Tamahere Pavilion – The pavilion could allow concerts and performances. Staff engaged with schools and parents for the pavilion. COVID created delays for the construction of pavilion. Works commenced in February 2022, but COVID continued to impact the project with contractors falling ill.
- Meremere Playground – The playground was a destination playground with a scooter track. Engagement was held in November 2021, but COVID impacted the engagement plan and staff had to think of new ways to engage with the community as face-to-face engagement could not be undertaken.
- Tuakau Skatepark – The skatepark was a joint project between Council and the Tuakau Youth Sports Trust. The project started in February 2022 and due for completion in June 2022.
- Elbow Boat Ramp – The reserve was a place of significance for the local Iwi and the community. The reserve was used year round for a variety of activities such as whitebaiting, duck shooting and waterskiing.

The Boat ramp was failing, with the retaining walls collapsing. Council was looking to replace the boat ramp walls which would involve dismantling the ramp and building the ramp on a steeper angle.

The ramp currently was not functional for boat users during low tide. The resource consent process was difficult due to the interaction with the river. There was a protected Pohutukawa tree that sits on the retaining wall and needed to be taken into account.

The project was currently mid-way through completion.

- There was an ambitious target of \$152 million of capital expenditure (CAPEX) to deliver for the 2021/22 financial year. So far only \$35 million had been delivered, a long way from target set in the Long Term Plan (LTP).
- Staff had analysed what could be realistically achieved before the end of the financial, and staff had forecast that Council could deliver \$100 million of capital expenditure. In 2021, Council delivered \$57 million of capital expenditure and the average for the last five years was \$46 million.

The current trend forecasts that the delivery of capital expenditure looks better than previous years. This is despite the impacts of COVID and supply chain issues.

- Council had historically struggled to deliver capital expenditure. During the last LTP process, there was an aim to remove carry forwards and reset the budget. Additionally there were challenging questions at the time whether LTP could be achievable due to COVID.
- Is it a good thing to carry forward the \$50 million CAPEX budget from this financial year or reset the LTP budget? Within the \$50 million that was unlikely to be delivered, \$24 million was allocated to Waters projects. Waters Projects could be delayed due to consents and upgrades and improvements should be undertaken.
- The work programme had not changed and still needed to be delivered. There was a \$6 million carry forward which were developer led projects and would be vested assets in Council. Council does not control the delivery of developer led projects.
- The Projects team were confident that over the next three years that the workplan could be delivered.
- Cyclone Dovi – What was the extent of the number of dangerous trees on roads and reserve? Work had started to identify the location of dangerous trees but had dropped off. The Waikato District Alliance had said if Council transfers budget funds to the Alliance that work could be undertaken this financial year.
- Council had budgeted approximately \$100,000 on dangerous trees before the end of the financial year. Liquidambar trees were significantly affected during the cyclone. There had also been issues with trees falling on neighbouring fences. Cr Patterson had been involved with residents for responsibility for damages. Part of the contract with Council's arborist included an assessment of all the trees on Council reserves.

Was Council was aware of a blight affecting trees throughout the district? The General Manager Service Delivery was not aware of the blight. There was Dutch Elm disease in the Pokeno. WDC was working with Auckland Council to keep an eye on the issue.

ACTION: Staff to investigate whether there was blight affecting evergreen trees in the district.

- The major delivery mechanisms were the relationships Council had with Watercare and the Alliance. It was critical to have a good relationship.

There had been a fundamental shift within the culture of the Service Delivery team to work early in the project state with the community and identify keyholders. This engagement could take a considerable amount of time, while previously Council did things a little too quickly.

- The presentation provided by the Service Delivery only covered the community connections projects, with no mention of water project and only a few slides regarding roading. It was important that elected members and the community were kept informed with projects other than community connection projects.
- A web page on Council's website was being created to highlight the works being undertaken by Council, but there can be more proactive communications sent out to the Community for what projects were in progress.
- Mr Green noted that the optimistic budget approach and thorough consultation was the right approach. It important that solid engagement was undertaken with the community and with Iwi, and create a solid foundation to deliver projects.
- Council needed to think about how the three waters reform would impact the contract renewal with Watercare.
- What percentage of the \$150 million capital expenditure budget was allocated to three waters? The Waters team was looking at delivering \$50 million this financial year, with a carry forward of \$24 million to the 2022/23 financial year.
- Huntly Resource Recovery Centre – There was concern about the long-term costs of the leasing, and that it may be more expensive than purchasing the site. Funding was transferred from the CAPEX budget to the Operating Expenditure (OPEX) budget Moved from CAPEX option to an OPEX option.

The \$200,000 allocated was to improve the McVey site for public recycling disposal and for roading upgrades. The sorting plant will move to Rotowaro Rd. There was a time limit to the solid waste contract due to the Solid Waste Review. Future tenders may possibly encompass the entire district. Leasing makes sense for the McVey site as there was contamination at the site that would need addressing.

- Hooning damage – Were there any plans to help reduce the problem? There was meeting last week regarding hooning behaviour but Police could not attend. It was a challenge and was difficult to mitigate the issue. Council was working with Police to see what can be done. A new camera had been installed on Onion Rd that appeared to reduce activity, however the cameras were costly. Staff had considered changes to the Open Spaces Bylaw to stop people congregating.

What the costs of the roading damage cause by hoons? Most of the costs had been for investing in infrastructure and cameras but damage to the roads had been negligible. Police were short of resources to adequately deal with the hoons.

- Pokeno – The road improvements in Pokeno were well done. The Pokeno Community Committee had commented that there was often too much talk, too little delivery.

There was an expectation from the Pokeno community that works get completed and that the community had been over consulted.

- Were the Waikato Alliance vehicles monitored like Council's vehicles? Yes, they were monitored by E-Roads. A Councillor witnessed reckless driving in an Alliance vehicle, which would be followed up by staff.

ACTION: Staff to investigate the reckless driving incident witnessed by Cr Gibb.

- His Worship the Mayor noted that COVID has had a significant impact and Councillors needed to be tolerant of the stresses staff and contractors were under.
- Huntly State Highway Revocation – The roading renewals were fully funded by Waka Kotahi but due to issues that had been unable to be resolved it will be delayed to the 2022/23 financial year.
- State Highway 1B revocation - Council was still working through the funding agreement with Waka Kotahi for \$10 million. The agreement was on track but unsigned. Consultation for the revocation of SH1B was important and consultation was still sitting with Waka Kotahi. It was planned that revocation will happen in the 2022/23 financial year.

Minutes of the Waikato Regional Transport Committee of 21 February 2022 Agenda Item 5.3

The report was received [*INF2203/02 refers*] and the following items were discussed:

- Did the meeting occur before the Waka Kotahi 'Road to Zero' advertising campaign started? Yes, the committee met before the campaign commenced.

Proposed Road Names for Lakeside Developments Ltd Te Kauwhata, Subdivision 0340/18, Stages 2 to 6

Agenda Item 6.3

The report was received [*INF2203/02 refers*] and the following items were discussed:

- Why do some of the street names relate to breeds of cows, which was out of context with the other proposed street names?
- There was concern that a number of the proposed street names were the same as towns, such as Matamata, Karaka and Reporoa.
- The Te Kauwhata Community Committee (TKCC) had similar concerns, however the emergency services were comfortable with the names. The list came from the local Iwi in conjunction with the Lakeside developers.

- The proposed street names were approved by Council staff. There was pressure from the developers for approval for the proposed street names. TKCC undertook their own due diligence for the proposed street names.
- TKCC had their own list of street names for developers. Developers were supposed to contact the Community Communities/Boards for suggested names. The Lakeside developers and Iwi determined they did not want to access the names on TKCC's list.
- If Council did not see an issue with proposed names, there should not be a problem. A number of times, the process for proposed street naming had been different. Is there a need to align the proposed street naming process? The issue was that the process and the policy needed to be adhered to.
- The street naming policy was coming up to review. There would be consultation coming up in the near future.
- The current policy does not state that Community Committee/Board lists had to be used and developers could submit their own names. If a Community Board/Committee rejects the proposed street name list, the list would still require approval from the Infrastructure Committee.

Resolved: (His Worship the Mayor/Cr Sedgwick)

That the Infrastructure Committee approves the following thirty-four proposed road names submitted by the developer Lakeside Developments Ltd for Stages 2 to 6 of Lakeside Development, Te Kauwhata:

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| • Ayrshire | ▪ Oreti |
| • De Joux | ▪ Pat Kingi |
| • De Thierry | ▪ Pickering |
| • Hauhunga | ▪ Piharau |
| • Hind | ▪ Puketutu |
| • Hingaia | ▪ Rangeview |
| • Huntaway | ▪ Reporoa |
| • Karaka | ▪ Romney |
| • Kotuku | ▪ Steer |
| • Lakeview | ▪ Tauanui |
| • Leonard | ▪ Te Mamae |
| • Matamata | ▪ Te Waiata |
| • Merehira | ▪ Te Whaiti |
| • Miriama | ▪ Turau |
| • Montgomery | - Waikaukau |
| • Muruhana | ▪ Whakamau |
| • Whatahuhu | |
| • Yearling | |

CARRIED

INF2203/04

Proposed Easement on Utility Reserve - Earles Place, Raglan
Agenda Item 6.4

The report was received [INF2203/02 refers] and the Strategic Property Manager spoke on his report. The following items were discussed:

- The applicant had engaged with two hapu, with response of one hapu who was supportive. Regarding maintenance, the applicant will be required to undertake the maintenance and there be a six-monthly inspection.

Resolved: (Crs Thomson/Lynch)

THAT the Infrastructure Committee recommends to Council:

- a. **That subject to satisfactory Iwi and Hapū consultation, Council exercises its delegated authority under s.48 Reserves Act 1977 to complete a grant of drainage easement in gross of parcel of land being Lot 17 DPS 11336 held in RT 174539.**
- b. **That the applicants being the owners of 5 and 7 Earles Place Raglan:**
 - i. **are to note that any approval as to the easement cannot be used to bind any Agency or any Council (in its regulatory capacity) to consent;**
 - ii. **Easement Agreement provides for maintenance specifying Applicant (owners of 5 and 7 Earles Place, Raglan), are responsible for costs associated with the future maintenance of the Level Spreader/s.**
 - iii. **are to meet all Council costs incurred throughout the process**
- c. **That the Chief Executive be delegated authority to execute all relevant documentation to give effect to the resolution.**

CARRIED

INF2203/05

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

Agenda Item 7

Resolved: (Crs Gibb/Eyre)

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
Item number PEX 1 Confirmation of Minutes	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 6 or Section 7 Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987	Section 48(1)(a)
PEX 2.1 Ngaruawahia Development		
PEX 2.2 Te Kauwhata Watermain Renewals		

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

Item No.	Section	Interest
Item PEX 1 Confirmation of Minutes		Refer to the previous Public Excluded reason in the agenda for this meeting.
Item PEX 2.1 Ngaruawahia Development	7 (2) (h)	To enable commercial activities to be carried out without prejudice or disadvantage
Item PEX 2.2 Te Kauwhata Watermain Renewals	7(2)(b)(ii)	To protect information that would otherwise unreasonably prejudice a person’s commercial position
	7(2)(h)	To enable commercial activities to be carried out without prejudice or disadvantage.
	7(2)(j)	To prevent use of the information for improper gain or advantage.

CARRIED

INF2203/06

Resolutions INF2203/07 – INF2203/10 are contained in the public excluded section of these minutes.

There being no further business the meeting was declared closed at 11:15am.

Minutes approved and confirmed this day of 2022.

EM Patterson
CHAIRPERSON