

**I give notice that
an Extraordinary Meeting of Council will be held on:**

Date:	Tuesday, 14 April 2020
Time:	1.00pm
Location:	www.taupo.govt.nz

AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson Mayor David Trewavas

Deputy Chairperson Cr Christine Rankin

Members

- Cr John Boddy
- Cr Kathy Guy
- Cr Tangonui Kingi
- Cr Kylie Leonard
- Cr John Mack
- Cr Anna Park
- Cr Kevin Taylor
- Cr Kirsty Trueman
- Cr Yvonne Westerman
- Cr John Williamson

Quorum 6

Gareth Green
Chief Executive Officer

Order Of Business

1	Apologies	
2	Conflicts of Interest	
3	Confirmation of Minutes	
3.1	Ordinary Council Meeting - 25 February 2020.....	3
4	Policy and Decision Making	
4.1	Adoption of the Fees and Charges 2020/21	4
4.2	Receipt of the LTPPJJC 21 February 2020 meeting minutes and options for future governance and management of the Lake Taupo Protection Project	7
4.3	Request for extension for the Operation of the Broadlands Road Resource Recovery Centre & Landfill and Kinloch Refuse Transfer Station Contract TDC/1213/088	12
4.4	Tender for Chemicals for Water and Wastewater Treatment Plants	15
4.5	Delegation of Authority to Chief Executive for award of Equipment Supply Contracts for the Kinloch Wastewater Treatment Plan MBR Upgrade Project	18
4.6	New Erosion Works on Lake Terrace Foreshore as an addition to the Great Lake Pathway Upgrade Project	21
4.7	Easement Request on Chad Street Gully Reserve	27
4.8	Delegation of Whareroa Private Plan Change to Commissioners.....	29
5	Confidential Business	
	Nil	

3.1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING - 25 FEBRUARY 2020

Author: Shainey James, Democratic Services Officer

Authorised by: Tina Jakes, Head of Democracy, Governance and Venues

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the minutes of the Council meeting held on Tuesday 25 February 2020 (both public and confidential portions) be confirmed as true and correct records.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Council Meeting Minutes - 25 February 2020
2. Council Meeting Minutes - 25 February 2020 - confidential portion

4.1 ADOPTION OF THE FEES AND CHARGES 2020/21

Author: Tanya Wood, Policy Advisor

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Head of Finance and Strategy

PURPOSE

To adopt the Fees and Charges 2020/21.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council sets fees and charges for a number of services that it delivers. The fees and charges are set annually.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council adopts the Fees and Charges 2020/21.

BACKGROUND

The proposal has been presented to Council at a workshop on: 3 March 2020. At the workshop, a number of potential increases from the 2019/20 fees were discussed. It was originally planned that Council would adopt a draft fees and charges schedule for consultation over the month of April 2020.

Since the time of the workshop, the Covid-19 pandemic has had far-reaching impact across New Zealand, including the Taupō district. On 23 March, the government provided the directive that, from 26 March 2020, New Zealand would be in lockdown for at least a four week period.

Because of the far-reaching impacts of Covid-19, Council indicated that it would not be acceptable for our community to experience an increase in fees and charges from what was charged in 2019/20. Council therefore intends on adopting a fees and charges schedule for 2020/21, which is almost the same as the schedule for the 2019/20 year. There are two exceptions: the Building Levy and the solid waste charges associated with the per tonne disposal of refuse.

The building levy will decrease from \$2.05 to \$1.75. The Building Levy is a charge that we collect on behalf of the MBIE and a change to the Building Act requires that the levy decrease.

The per tonne disposal of refuse will increase from \$120/tonne to \$130/tonne. Because of this, the minimum charge for a small load (<100kg) will also increase from \$12 to \$13. This increase is a result of legislative change relating to the Emission Trading Scheme.

As a result of there not being any increases to the fees and charges (with the exception of the Building Levy decrease and change to the solid waste disposal of refuse), and impacts of Covid-19, Council has decided not to consult on the 2020/21 Fees and Charges.

DISCUSSION

Council sets fees and charges for a number of services that it delivers. The fees and charges are set annually because Council is required to confirm the fees and charges for some activities annually.

OPTIONSAnalysis of Options

There are two options available to Council: either adopt the Fees and Charges 2020/21, or not.

Option 1 – adopt the Fees and Charges 2020/21.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that Council is meeting its legal requirement to adopt some fees and charges annually. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None

Option 2 – do not adopt the Fees and Charges 2020/21.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council will not be meeting its legal requirements to adopt some fees and charges annually.

Analysis Conclusion:

Option 1 is the preferred option as it ensures that Council is meeting its legal responsibilities.

CONSIDERATIONS

Alignment with Council's Vision

Council's vision is 'to be the most prosperous and liveable district in the North Island by 2022'. This is accompanied by a core set of values to underpin decision-making, the following of which are relevant to this particular proposal: World Class; Authentic; Charming; Vibrant; Quality; Resilient and Value.

Financial Considerations

The revenue to be collected from fees and charges has been included in Council's financial modelling for the Annual Plan 2020/21.

Legal Considerations

Local Government Act 2002

This proposal has been assessed against the consultation requirements in the LGA and also the legislation applicable to the different activity of charges for which Council is setting fees i.e. the planning fees have been assessed against the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the building services fees have been assessed against the requirements of the Building Act 2004.

Policy Implications

There are no known policy implications.

Māori Engagement

Council is bound by various Acts to consult and/or engage with Māori, including a duty to act reasonably and in good faith as a Te Tiriti ō Waitangi partner. Equally, Council has a responsibility to develop and proactively foster positive relationships with Māori as key stakeholders in our district, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti ō Waitangi including (but not limited to) the protection of Māori rights and their rangatiratanga over tāonga. While we recognise Māori in general, we also need to work side by side with the three ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district.

Although good faith does not necessarily require consultation, it is a mechanism for Council to demonstrate its existence and commitment to working together as district partners. Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

Risks

There is a risk associated with the proposal, because the community have not had an opportunity to have their say on the fees and charges for the 2020/21 year. However, this risk is considered minimal because the fees and charges are not changing from the 2019/02. It is noted that a special consultative procedure was run before the fees and charges were adopted for the 2019/20 year.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;

- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

ENGAGEMENT

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

The adoption of the Fees and Charges 2020/21 will be communicated via the usual communication methods, including a public notice in local newspapers and promotion through social media.

CONCLUSION

Council should adopt the Fees and Charges 2020/21, in order to ensure that Council is meeting its legal obligations.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Fees and Charges 2020/21

4.2	RECEIPT OF THE LTPPJC 21 FEBRUARY 2020 MEETING MINUTES AND OPTIONS FOR FUTURE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF THE LAKE TAUPŌ PROTECTION PROJECT
------------	---

Author: Tanya Wood, Policy Advisor

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Head of Finance and Strategy

PURPOSE

To receive the minutes of the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee (LTPPJC) meeting held on 21 February 2020.

To make a decision on whether Council should accept the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee's (LTPPJC) recommendations relating to the preferred options for the future governance and management of the Lake Taupō Protection Project (LTPP).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The current governance and management arrangement for the LTPP are in place until 30 June 2021. A decision must be made on these arrangements for post June 2021.

At the LTPPJC meeting on 21 February 2020, the LTPPJC recommended their preferred option for the future governance and management of the Lake Taupō Protection Project.

The LTPPJC's preferred option is Scenario 1b. Under this option, governance would be undertaken by a joint committee (the status quo) and the management of the project would be undertaken by a council-controlled organisation housed by a partner organisation.

Council now needs to decide whether to accept the LTPPJC's recommendation, or whether to send the recommendation back to the LTPPJC for reconsideration.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. That Council receives the minutes of the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee meeting held on 21 February 2020.
2. That Council receives and notes the findings of the Service Delivery Review of the Lake Taupō Protection Project.
3. That Council adopts in principle, and subject to consultation in the Long-term Plan 2021-31:
 - a) Retention of a joint committee with two representatives each from the Crown, Taupō District Council, Tūwharetoa Maori Trust Board and Waikato Regional Council as the preferred governance structure for the Lake Taupō Protection Project (LTPP) post June 2021 and with ongoing administration and management of the joint committee undertaken by Taupō District Council or Waikato Regional Council.
 - b) Retention of the Lake Taupō Protection Trust (LTPT) – an existing council-controlled organisation (CCO) with charitable status - as the preferred management structure for the LTPP.
 - c) Provision of accommodation and administrative services for the LTPT via a service level agreement with a project partner (partner to be determined at a later date).
4. That Council adopts in principle the following options for consultation purposes (in order of preference) as the principal alternatives to the preferred option (ie. joint committee with the LTPT – a CCO - housed by a partner organisation):
 - a) Joint committee (status quo) as the governance structure with management undertaken by the LTPT with independent administration (status quo)
 - b) Joint committee (status quo) as the governance structure with management of the nitrogen discharge reduction agreements undertaken by a project partner (agency to be determined at a later date).
5. That Council agrees to the recommendations from the LTPPJC on the basis that performance measures and a budget for the LTPT that includes reduced funding over time are agreed between

the TDC, WRC and the LTPPJJC.

BACKGROUND

The proposal has been presented to Council at a workshop on 3 March 2020.

In February 2007 the Crown, WRC and TDC signed an agreement (the Project Agreement) to contribute to a joint public fund to be used to undertake strategies and actions to reduce the amount of nitrogen from entering Lake Taupō.

The agreement covered, amongst other matters, governance of the project through a joint committee and the establishment of a council-controlled-organisation (the LTPT) to apply the public fund.

The LTPT has expended the public fund by entering into Nitrogen Discharge Reduction Agreements (NDRAs) with land owners. These NDRAs have a term of 999 years and require ongoing monitoring and contractual oversight to ensure that the terms and conditions of the contracts are adhered to and the investment made by the funding partners in the project is protected.

The original Project Agreement had a sunset clause terminating the project on 30 June 2019. A recent variation extended the term of the project to 30 June 2021 as there was a need to determine the future governance, management and ongoing funding arrangements for the project. The LTPT is operating on residual funds for the term of the extension.

DISCUSSION

The minutes from the 21 February 2020 meeting are attached to this report. At the LTPPJJC meeting on 21 February 2020, the following recommendations were made:

LTJC20/5

Moved By M Workman

Seconded By M Nepia

That the LTPPJJC makes the following recommendations to the project partners:

- a. That the Crown, Taupō District Council (TDC), Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board (TMTB) and Waikato Regional Council (WRC) receive and note the findings of the Service Delivery Review of the Lake Taupō Protection Project (WRC Doc # 15696400).*

LTJC20/6

Moved By Cr K Leonard

Seconded By M Nepia

That TDC and WRC adopt in principle, and subject to consultation in their respective long term plans:

- i. Retention of a joint committee with two representatives each from the Crown, TDC, TMTB and WRC as the preferred governance structure for the Lake Taupō Protection Project (LTPP) post June 2021 and with ongoing administration and management of the joint committee undertaken by TDC or WRC*

- ii. Retention of the Lake Taupō Protection Trust (LTPT) – an existing council controlled organisation (CCO) with charitable status - as the preferred management structure for the LTPP*

- i. Provision of accommodation and administrative services for the LTPT via a service level agreement with a project partner (partner to be determined at a later date).*

- b. That TDC and WRC adopt in principle the following options for consultation purposes (in order of preference) as the principal alternatives to the preferred option (ie. joint committee with the LTPT – a CCO - housed by a partner organisation):*

- i. Joint committee (status quo) as the governance structure with management undertaken by the LTPT with independent administration (status quo)*

- ii. Joint committee (status quo) as the governance structure with management of the nitrogen discharge reduction agreements undertaken by a project partner (agency to be determined at a later date).*

Council must now decide whether to accept the LTPPJC's recommendations, or whether to send the recommendation back to the LTPPJC for reconsideration.

The Officials Working Party prepared a comprehensive service delivery review which identified the three reasonably practical options for the future governance and management of the project. The report is attached to this report. The service delivery identified that the preferred option was for the governance to be undertaken by the joint committee, and for the management to be undertaken by the Lake Taupō Protection Trust (a council-controlled organisation).

OPTIONS

Analysis of Options

A service delivery review of the LTPP was undertaken by the Officials Working Party. The review involved:

- An overview of the ongoing services to be delivered including a long-term work programme (2020 – 2031)
- Identification of the service delivery options and the development of six governance and management scenarios
- An assessment and ranking of the six scenarios in accordance with a set of principles agreed by the partners for the transition of the project as well as analysis by efficiency (cost) and risk
- Closer examination of the three highest ranking scenarios and selection of a preferred option.

Based on the assessment undertaken in this review, the three highest-ranking scenarios were:

- Scenario 1a: Governance - Joint committee (status quo), Management - CCO with independent administration (status quo)
- Scenario 1b: Governance - Joint committee (status quo), Management - CCO (status quo) housed by partner organisation (new)
- Scenario 2a: Governance - Joint committee (status quo), Management - Single partner responsible for management of the NDRAs (new).

Analysis Conclusion:

At this stage in transitioning the project from a development to a maintenance phase, the conclusion of this review is that Scenario 1b (Joint Committee with CCO housed by partner organisation) is the preferred option. Briefly, the reasons for this are as follows.

- a) The structural arrangements for the project have proved to have been successful. Specifically, this option:
 - Reinforces the collaborative aspects of the project and maintains the sense of shared responsibility
 - Reduces the likelihood of project intellectual property being lost
 - Allows for the independent, commercial management of the NDRAs.
- b) This option maintains flexibility for the future by:
 - Retaining the constitutional and structural arrangements for the project which would be difficult to reinstate if deconstructed
 - Keeps options open should changes need to be made to address new circumstances.
- c) Housing the LTPT as a stand-alone operation with a service level agreement within a partner organisation, reduces the annual operating costs by approximately \$50k and aligns expenditure with the scope of the activities to be performed.

For further analysis on each of the options, please review the service delivery report attached to this report.

CONSIDERATIONS

Alignment with Council's Vision

Council's vision is 'to be the most prosperous and liveable district in the North Island by 2022'. This is accompanied by a core set of values to underpin decision-making, the following of which are relevant to this particular proposal: World Class; Authentic; Charming; Vibrant; Quality; Resilient and Value.

Financial Considerations

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The next phase of the project will make decisions on the funding arrangements for the project post 2021. These options will be included in the Consultation Documents for the Long-term Plan 2021-31.

Legal Considerations

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of [Section 10](#) of the Local Government Act 2002. That section of the Act states that 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. It is considered that the social / economic / environmental and cultural well-beings are of relevance to this particular matter.

The proposal has been evaluated with regards to a range of legislation, including the Local Government Act 1991.

Policy Implications

There are no known policy implications.

Māori Engagement

Council is bound by various Acts to consult and/or engage with Māori, including a duty to act reasonably and in good faith as a Te Tiriti ō Waitangi partner. Equally, Council has a responsibility to develop and proactively foster positive relationships with Māori as key stakeholders in our district, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti ō Waitangi including (but not limited to) the protection of Māori rights and their rangatiratanga over tāonga. While we recognise Māori in general, we also need to work side by side with the three ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district.

Although good faith does not necessarily require consultation, it is a mechanism for Council to demonstrate its existence and commitment to working together as district partners. Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

Risks

The risks associated with each option are outlined in the service delivery report attached to this report.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is significant.

ENGAGEMENT

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is significant. This issue will be included in the Consultation Document for the Long-term Plan 2021-31, which will be consulted on in early 2021.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

This issue will be communicated through the wider communications for the Long-term Plan 2021-31.

CONCLUSION

The LTPPJC have recommended their preferred option for the future governance of the LTPP. Council must now decide whether to accept the recommendation, or whether to send the recommendation back to the LTPPJC back for reconsideration.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Minutes of the LTPPJC Meeting - 21 February 2020
2. Service Delivery Review for the Lake Taupo Protection Project - 2020

4.3 REQUEST FOR EXTENSION FOR THE OPERATION OF THE BROADLANDS ROAD RESOURCE RECOVERY CENTRE & LANDFILL AND KINLOCH REFUSE TRANSFER STATION CONTRACT TDC/1213/088

Author: Brent Aitken, Asset Manager - Storm Water and Solid Waste

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

PURPOSE

This report is to seek approval to award a contract extension of 2 years for contract TDC/1213/088.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Operation of the Broadlands Rd Resource Recovery Centre, Landfill & Kinloch Refuse Transfer Station Contract expires in at the end of June 2020.

The contract was awarded to Envirowaste Services back in June 2013 for the sum of \$6,629,750.00 for a 7-year term.

The contract incorporates a 2+1-year extension clause if subject to satisfactory performance.

The preferred option is to award the 2-year contract extension to Envirowaste Services as they have successfully operated the contract and met the contract KPIs.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council approves the 2-year extension of Contract TDC/1213/088 Operation of Broadlands Road Resource Recovery Centre, Landfill & Kinloch Refuse Transfer Station from 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2022 and that the contract sum be increased by \$1,920,000.00 to a total value of \$8,549,750.00.

BACKGROUND

The operation of the Broadlands Road Resource Recovery Centre, Landfill & Kinloch Refuse Transfer Station is currently undertaken by Envirowaste Services Limited under Contract No. 088 which expires at the end of June 2020.

Envirowaste have successfully operated the contract for the past 7 years since its commencement in 2013.

The contract has an option for a 2-year contract extension and Envirowaste have indicated their desire to continue.

DISCUSSION

Envirowaste services were awarded Contract No. 088 in 2013 for the value of \$6,629,750.00 with a contract term of 7 years and possible contract extensions of 2 + 1 years.

This contract is responsible for the operation of the Broadlands road and Kinloch waste and recycling facilities in accordance with the relevant management plans and resource consents. It also incorporates green waste shredding at all the waste and recycling facilities in the district.

The Broadlands Rd landfill is the disposal site for most of the districts waste and requires an experienced contractor to provide the desired outcomes incorporated in the contract documents.

Envirowaste services has a long history of successful landfill management and employ local people to operate this contract. To date they have met all the contract KPIs and Council staff are satisfied that this high level of performance will continue if the contract was extended.

OPTIONS

There are two options to be considered, which are:

1. Extend the current contract as allowed for in the contract documentation.
2. Decline the extension and go back to the market.

Option 1 – Extend the current contract as allowed for in the contract documentation.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current contractor has proven performance and has met all KPIs • Employs local people to run and administer the contract • Avoids the cost of retendering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not test the market

Option 2 – Decline the extension and go back to the market

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will allow Council to retest the market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could possibly increase the contract cost • Would have the cost of retendering

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$1,920,000.00.

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently budgeted for under the Solid Waste cost centre.

Legal Considerations

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of [Section 10](#) of the Local Government Act 2002. That section of the Act states that 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.

Policy Implications

There are no known policy implications.

Risks

There are no known risks

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016) and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

ENGAGEMENT

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

No communication/media required.

CONCLUSION

Envirowaste Services are an experienced contractor who have successfully operated this contract over the last 7 years and have met all the contract KPIs. The contract has an option for a 2-year extension subject to satisfactory performance. Council staff are satisfied that this high level of performance will continue if the contract was extended.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

4.4 TENDER FOR CHEMICALS FOR WATER AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANTS

Author: Daniel McKay, Contracts and Procurement Specialist

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

PURPOSE

Hauraki District Council (HDC) invited Matamata Piako District Council (MPDC) and Taupō District Council (TDC) to participate in a procurement exercise to leverage spend and achieve efficiencies through bulk buying our operational chemicals for our water and wastewater treatment plants.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A procurement exercise was undertaken with HDC, MPDC and TDC to try and rationalise our operational chemical spend for our water and wastewater treatment plants. It was decided that a panel of 4 suppliers would provide the optimal spread of product mix and savings. These 4 suppliers are:

- Chemiplas (N.Z.) Limited
- Chemtrex Limited
- Ixom Operations Pty Limited
- STM (New Zealand) Limited

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council accepts the Tender for Contract HDC375 for panel suppliers for chemicals for our water and wastewater treatment plants submitted by Chemiplas (N.Z.) Limited, Chemtrex Limited, Ixom Operations Pty Limited, STM (New Zealand) Limited for the estimated sum of \$511,251.96 (excl. GST) and authorises His Worship the Mayor and the Chief Executive to sign the Contract Document(s) and attach the Council's Common Seal to them.

BACKGROUND

The proposal has not been presented previously.

DISCUSSION

Hauraki District Council (HDC) initiated a procurement process to look at their operational chemical spend for their water and wastewater plants. Matamata Piako District Council (MPDC) and Taupō District Council (TDC) took the opportunity to leverage this spend to try and make both bulk buying savings and operational efficiencies across the region.

HDC Project Managed this work and approved the Contract in Committee. It is HDC Council Resolution C20/74/1.

TDC managed the procurement process on behalf of HDC, MPDC and TDC.

The scope of works is for all treatment chemicals used within the water and wastewater treatment plants.

These are panel contracts with no guaranteed minimum spend.

TENDERS RECEIVED

Tender documents were issued for a proposed contract on 16 September 2019. Tenders closed on 14 October 2019. Seven conforming tenders were received from the following organisations:

- Chemiplas (N.Z.) Limited - Auckland
- Ixom Operations Pty Limited – Mount Maunganui
- Hardman Chemicals Limited – NSW, Australia

- Activated Carbon Technologies NZ - Auckland
- STM (New Zealand) Limited - Auckland
- Chemtrex Limited - Tauranga
- Redox Limited - Auckland

Tender prices were provided as a schedule of prices. The Councils are free to choose whichever panel contract for whichever chemical required.

TENDER EVALUATION

Tenders were evaluated on a weighted attributes basis.

Following evaluation, the below organisations were chosen, as they offered the complete product mix required, and demonstrated sufficient health and safety performance, product support, and supply chain efficiencies:

- Chemiplas (N.Z.) Limited
- Chemtrex Limited
- Ixom Operations Pty Limited
- STM (New Zealand) Limited

RECOMMENDED CONTRACT PRICE

TDC will spend approximately \$511,251.96 (excluding GST) over the initial 3-year Contract period.

This equates to savings of \$22,057.98 (excluding GST) over this period when compared to current spend.

The regional savings (ie: for HDC, MPDC & TDC combined) of this procurement are \$428,882.76 (excluding GST) over the initial 3-year Contract period.

OPTIONS

Council may choose to accept the preferred tender or not. If the tender is not accepted then TDC will not realise the benefits of joining the panel. These include better pricing, better contract management (HDC will manage the contracts), and robust key performance indicators to ensure health and safety performance, product support and supply chain robustness.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be savings of \$22,057.98 (excluding GST) over 3-years. There are no transitional cost impacts.

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently budgeted for \$533,309.94 over this 3-year period within the operational renewals budget

Legal Considerations

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of [Section 10](#) of the Local Government Act 2002. That section of the Act states that 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. It is considered that social / economic / environmental and cultural are of relevance to this particular matter.

Policy Implications

There are no known policy implications.

Risks

There are no known risks.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

ENGAGEMENT

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

No communication/media required.

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that TDC signs up to the Chemical panel to supply water and wastewater treatment chemicals across the region.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

4.5 DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO CHIEF EXECUTIVE FOR AWARD OF EQUIPMENT SUPPLY CONTRACTS FOR THE KINLOCH WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLAN MBR UPGRADE PROJECT

Author: Michael Cordell, Asset Manager Water and Waste

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

PURPOSE

To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to award the Contracts for the supply of inlet works equipment and membrane filtration equipment for the Kinloch Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) MBR Upgrade project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requests for quotations (RFQ's) have recently been issued for the supply of long lead time process equipment for the Kinloch WWTP MBR Upgrade project. This equipment must be selected as early as possible and without delay in order to complete the design for the Kinloch WWTP MBR Upgrade project and is on the critical path for completion of the project prior to the peak summer holiday period of 2021/2022.

It is considered necessary to complete the upgrade project by this time to avoid overloading of the existing WWTP plant which is operating the upper limit of its design capacity. In order for the equipment to be selected (and the information required to integrate the equipment into the design to be obtained from the selected suppliers), it is recommended that Council approve delegated authority to the Chief Executive to award the contracts for the procurement of the long lead time equipment to avoid unnecessary delay in the project.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council delegates authority to the Chief Executive to award the contracts for the supply of inlet works and membrane filtration equipment once the evaluation of equipment supply quotations are completed by Council staff and their technical advisors up to the value of \$2,000,000 [excl. GST] and authorises the Chief Executive to sign the Contract Document(s) and attach the Council's Common Seal to them.

BACKGROUND

The detailed background to the project has been previously presented to Council at the 27 August 2019 meeting. In short, upgrade to the wastewater treatment plant is required to cater for the growth in Kinloch.

The design services contract for the upgrade was awarded at the 26 November 2019 meeting.

DISCUSSION

The Kinloch WWTP upgrade project is due to be completed by the end of November 2021 in readiness for the onset of 2021/2022 peak summer influent flows and loads. The project cannot be completed any faster, partly due to the long lead time of the key process equipment items required to be incorporated in the works.

Any delays to the project completion date will increase the risk of WWTP overloading (summer months), exacerbated by the rapid growth in new connections associated with ongoing and new developments in Kinloch.

There are several key equipment packages that need to be procured in this upgrade project. Two of the key critical equipment items for the upgrade are the membrane system and the inlet-works (screens). Much of the detailed design (e.g. hydraulics, layout, electrical, control etc) is contingent on the inlet works and membrane equipment selected. The inlet works and membrane equipment also have a long lead time, being specialist equipment sourced and manufactured to order from overseas. Therefore, the best option is for Council to procure this equipment through a competitive request for quotation (RFQ) process to invited specialist equipment suppliers with a presence in New Zealand.

Given the complexity of the equipment it is likely that the process of evaluating quotations and seeking clarifications from prospective suppliers will take several weeks to conclude. The process of selecting and awarding the contracts for the supply of the critical equipment items is on the critical path of the project.

Delaying award of these two supply contracts will result in a delay to the completion date of the project. If at any stage it appears that the physical installation works for the upgrade project cannot be completed by November 2021, then it will be necessary to delay the commencement of the physical installation works until after the 2021/2022 summer holiday period. The existing WWTP does not have capacity to handle peak summer holiday flows at the same time as trying to undertake physical installation works; as the work will require process units to be taken offline for tie-ins, conversions and retrofits. Hence the physical installation works must be completed during an off-peak period i.e. over the winter months.

Given this tight timetable we would like to eliminate any possible risk of delay and the Council contract approval process can cause delay of several weeks. Council providing authority to the Chief Executive to award the contracts for the procurement of the long lead time equipment will remove any unnecessary delay.

TENDERS RECEIVED

The RFQ documents were issued to invited tenderers on 11 March 2020. Quotations are due to be submitted to Council via Tenderlink on 22 April 2020. Contracts for the supply of the equipment are due to be awarded in May 2020.

The number of quotations that will be received, or prices is unknown at the time of preparing this report.

The value of the inlet works equipment supply package is estimated at \$ 500,000.

The value of the membrane equipment supply package is estimated at \$ 1,200,000.

TENDER EVALUATION

The quotations received will be evaluated by Council staff and Councils design consultant to recommend equipment based on the best technical solution and minimum whole of life cost to Council. It is likely that the process of evaluating quotations and seeking clarifications from prospective suppliers will take several weeks to conclude.

OPTIONS

Council may choose to delegate authority to the Chief Executive to award the contracts to the recommended tenderers or not.

If the Council does delegate such authority, the Chief Executive may choose to accept the offers recommended by Council staff and the project consultant or not.

If the recommended offers are not accepted and awarded in May 2020, then the Kinloch WWTP MBR Upgrade project maybe subject to unnecessary delay and risk non-completed prior to the summer of 2021/2022.

Such a delay will increase the risk that the existing Kinloch WWTP SBR process will be unable to cope with the 2021/2022 summer peak flows and loads. The existing Kinloch WWTP process was showing signs of significant stress during the 2019/2020 summer peak period and there is significant growth occurring in the Kinloch area which will add to the peak flows and loads in subsequent summer seasons.

Overloading of the Kinloch WWTP SBR process will result in non-compliant final effluent and failure to meet resource consent conditions, along with increased operational challenges at the site.

CONSIDERATIONS

Financial Considerations

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be in the order of \$1.7 million.

Detailed project cost estimates are being prepared as the project progresses.

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure is covered in the programme presented in the 27 August 2019 meeting.

Legal Considerations

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of [Section 10](#) of the Local Government Act 2002. That section of the Act states that 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. It is considered that economic wellbeing (ability for the community to grow) and environmental wellbeing (ability to comply with discharge resource consent conditions) are of relevance to this particular matter.

Policy Implications

There are no known policy implications.

Risks

The greatest risk is failing to complete the upgrade project (and provide additional plant capacity) before the peak influent wastewater flows and loads exceed the capacity of the existing Kinloch WWTP SBR process. This is considered to be a medium risk at present (based on the plant performance over the 2019/2020 summer) and this risk will increase as further developments are completed and new wastewater connections are made. The project cannot be completed before the onset of summer 2020/2021, however it is possible to complete the project before the onset of summer 2021/2022, provided there are no delays (including no delays in awarding the contracts for the supply of the critical process equipment).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;
- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

ENGAGEMENT

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

No communication/media required.

CONCLUSION

Delegation of authority to the Chief Executive for the award of contracts for the procurement of long lead time process equipment for the Kinloch WWTP MBR Upgrade will minimise the risk of delays to the project completion date beyond the 2021/2022 summer and minimise the risk that the existing Kinloch WWTP SBR process will not cope with the increasing peak summer influent wastewater flows and loads. The Chief Executives delegation should be increased to \$2,000,000 [excl. GST].

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

4.6 NEW EROSION WORKS ON LAKE TERRACE FORESHORE AS AN ADDITION TO THE GREAT LAKE PATHWAY UPGRADE PROJECT

Author: Fraser Scott, Landscape Architect

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

PURPOSE

This report seeks Council approval for:

1. The concept plans to address the erosion risk for the section of Lake Terrace opposite Tremaine Ave (attachment 1); and
2. To go to detailed design and pricing and construction.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed works include 110 lineal metres of rock revetment to address the erosion risk along this length of the Taupō Bay shoreline. The rock revetment would be of the same style and installation process as has been used at Rainbow Point and is planned for in front of Manuels hotel. This revetment will form a bench for installation of a new concrete path as well as two timber lookout points. The lookout points are located to make the most of the opportunity to tell the unique stories of the area and its cultural history.

The recommended approach seeks to strike the right balance between addressing the erosion risk in this area while still providing a visitor experience that is in keeping with the high scenic value of this foreshore landscape. As with the wider Great Lake Pathway Project the goal is to enhance the recreational, environmental and cultural values of this iconic lakefront reserve and future proof it to cope with the ever-increasing number of visitors.

Option 1 is the preferred option for addressing this issue, as it fully addresses the erosion issue in the most robust way while also addressing the amenity experience. It also ensures we get the best construction efficiencies by combining erosion and pathway at the same time.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. That Council approves the concept plan and scope for this section of the Great Lake Pathway Project to go to detailed design and pricing to address the urgent erosion issue.
2. That Council approves the use of \$150,000 (plus GST) from the 2019-20 Taupo Erosion Control Budget.
3. That council approves the use of \$ 20,000 (plus GST) from the 2021 Annual Plan for Erosion Control.

BACKGROUND

The proposal has not been presented previously.

In December 2019 Taupō District Council (TDC) engaged Camex Civil to deliver the Great Lake Pathway Upgrade Project. This work commenced in January 2020. The project consists of a significant enhancement of the lakefront reserves; and the components of the project are the installation of a 2.8m wide concrete path, several boardwalks, various reserve improvements and erosion mitigation work made up of both rock revetments and a series living walls. Tonkin and Taylor (T+T) from Tauranga were commissioned to provide the erosion construction plans. Only areas of lake shore that were showing obvious signs of erosion or have a history of erosion were included in this contract.

There was a storm event in early January 2020 that coincided with a very high operating lake level. This event impacted the Taupō lakefront project in two ways. Firstly the lake edge in front of Manuels hotel sustained significant erosion damage and had to be temporarily repaired under emergency works. These

repairs were completed in mid-January 2020. The level of damage sustained in front of Manuels was anticipated, as this area had been previously identified by T+T as requiring erosion mitigation in the form of rock revetment. This planned work makes up part of the erosion works that are included in the existing contract with Camex to complete the Great Lake Pathway Upgrade Project. The second area of lake shoreline to sustain damage in this storm event was opposite the Tremaine Ave and Lake Tce intersection. This area had not been identified in early survey works as there has never been any erosion issues along this stretch of lake shore and there are no documents which record how poorly constructed this stretch of subgrade is. This area is made up of fill that is not suitable for the purposes of building on. There is also weed mat along this stretch that was possibly used as a very basic solution to stabilising this bank in the past. Now that it is apparent how poor the ground conditions are through this stretch of the lakeshore and the risk they pose to existing infrastructure. It is apparent that revetment work would be required completely independent of the enabling works required for the Great Lake Pathway Upgrade Project.

The damage sustained to the Taupō Bay shoreline in the January 2020 storm event opposite Tremaine Ave has highlighted a number of issues:

1. The poor quality of the existing ground in this area; and
2. The urgency of addressing erosion in this area as any future storm events and high lake levels will undermine the existing infrastructure, including the Lake Tce carriageway and underground stormwater services;
3. Ongoing slumping of this area is expected now that the toe of this slope has been compromised. The project team plans to work on a solution to these new issues – the proposed solution will be a combination of T+T drawings to address the erosion issue, and TDC drawings to ensuring these works address the goals of the current Great Lake Pathway Upgrade Project.

DISCUSSION

Based on this information it is considered that there are four options

The estimated costs were provided with the assistance of WSP who have been working alongside the facilities team to address this issue.

Option	Description	Ongoing erosion risk	Estimated cost
One	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install full height rock revetment the full 110lm • Install concrete path adjacent to the kerb • Install x2 timber viewing platforms as per existing construction drawings and construction contract 	Very low	170 k
Two	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install full height rock revetment the full 110lm • Install concrete path adjacent to the kerb 	Very low	170 k
Three	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install full height rock revetment the full 110lm • Install concrete path adjacent to the kerb • Install 45lm of boardwalk with no balustrade and include x2 timber viewing platforms as per the construction drawings 	Very low	210 k
Four	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No erosion treatment • Installation of a concrete path would require a handrail due to increased fall hazard risk 	Very High	18 k

Note: due to contractual obligations materials for this section have already been purchased and paid for. This has an impact on the final cost of each option, for example while option four is the least construction it still requires the cost of the boardwalk materials apportioned to it.

OPTIONS

Analysis of Options

Option 1. Install full height rock revetment the full 110lm, install concrete path adjacent to the kerb, install two timber viewing platforms as per existing construction drawings and construction contract.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures protection of roading and underground assets • Provides a good balance between addressing the erosion issue and still providing amenity opportunities • Locate the lookout points to better relate to the stakeholders story boards • Utilises boardwalk materials already purchased for this project • Creates information sharing opportunities that help people connect with the sites cultural, ecological, geological and cultural aspects. • Still meets the course requirements of the 70.3 world triathlon champs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces the visitor experience by removing the boardwalk experience • Impacts on the beach along the lake edge

Option 2. Install high rock revetment the full 110lm and a concrete path adjacent to the kerb.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures protection of roading and underground assets • Utilises boardwalk materials already purchased for this project • Still meets the course requirements of the 70.3 world triathlon champs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces the visitor experience by removing the boardwalk and lookout experience • Impacts on the beach along the lake edge • Does not utilise the boardwalk materials already purchased for this project • Misses the opportunity to create information sharing opportunities that help people connect with the sites cultural, ecological, geological and cultural aspects

Option 3. Install full height rock revetment the full 110lm, install concrete path adjacent to the kerb, install 45lm of boardwalk with no balustrade and include two timber viewing platforms as per the construction drawings

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures protection of roading and underground assets • Provides the full boardwalk experience while also addressing the erosion issue • Locate the lookout points to better relate to the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More costs to the project • Impacts on the beach along the lake edge • The boardwalk was initially designed to ensure the impact on the beach area was kept to an absolute minimum – the boardwalk makes less

<p>stake holders story boards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilises boardwalk materials already purchased for this project Creates information sharing opportunities that help people connect with the sites cultural, ecological, geological and cultural aspects Still meets the course requirements of the 70.3 world triathlon champs 	<p>sense now that rock revetment and some beach encroachment is required</p>
--	--

Option 4. No erosion treatment. Toinstall concrete path would require handrail due to increased fall hazard risk.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faster to construct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a real risk that infrastructure will be damaged in the next storm event To address the erosion issue around a new path will be more complex and costly The cost to address the erosion will be higher in the future. Reduces the visitor experience by removing the boardwalk and lookout experience. Impacts on the beach along the lake edge Does not utilise the boardwalk materials already purchased for this project. Misses the opportunity to create information sharing opportunities that help people connect with the sites cultural, ecological, geological and cultural aspects

Analysis Conclusion:

Option 1 is the recommended approach. This option strikes the balance between addressing the erosion risk while ensuring the user experience is maintained at a standard in keeping with the rest of this iconic stretch of Taupo Lakefront.

CONSIDERATIONS

Alignment with Council’s Vision

Council’s vision is ‘to be the most prosperous and liveable district in the North Island by 2022’. This is accompanied by a core set of values to underpin decision-making, the following of which are relevant to this particular proposal: Charming; Vibrant; Quality and Resilient.

- This work is consistent with the 10 principles that underpin the Lake Taupo Erosion and Flood Strategy.

Financial Considerations

The financial impact of the proposal is estimated to be \$170,000.00

The \$170,000 to be funded as follows - \$150,000 to be covered within existing 1920 Taupo Erosion Control budgets, with the remaining \$20,000 to sit within the 2021 Annual Plan for Erosion Control.

Long-term Plan/Annual Plan

The expenditure outlined is currently budgeted for in the 2019/20 Annual Plan and draft 2020/21 Annual Plan.

Legal Considerations

Local Government Act 2002

The matter comes within scope of the Council's lawful powers, including satisfying the purpose statement of [Section 10](#) of the Local Government Act 2002. That section of the Act states that 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. It is considered that social, environmental and cultural well-beings are of relevance to this particular matter.

The proposal has been evaluated with regards to a range of legislation. The key legislation applicable to the proposal has been reviewed and the matter is not inconsistent with any key documents.

Authorisations as follows are required for the proposal:

- Resource Consent Building Consent Environmental Health
 Liquor Licencing Licence to occupy

Authorisations required from external parties.

Policy Implications

There are no known policy implications.

Māori Engagement

Council is bound by various Acts to consult and/or engage with Māori, including a duty to act reasonably and in good faith as a Te Tiriti o Waitangi partner. Equally, Council has a responsibility to develop and proactively foster positive relationships with Māori as key stakeholders in our district, and to give effect to the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi including (but not limited to) the protection of Māori rights and their rangatiratanga over tāonga. While we recognise Māori in general, we also need to work side by side with the three ahi kaa / resident iwi of our district.

Although good faith does not necessarily require consultation, it is a mechanism for Council to demonstrate its existence and commitment to working together as district partners. Appropriately, the report author acknowledges that they have considered the above obligations including the need to seek advice, guidance, feedback and/or involvement of Māori on the proposed recommendation/s, objective/s, project/s or service/s outlined within this report.

As with the establishment of the original plans for the Great Lake Pathway Upgrade Project, TDC has kept both C75 Maori Trust and the Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board (TMTB) up to date with this new development; and have explained the potential solutions to them as per the above options. Both Trusts are in agreement that the work is urgent.

Risks

There are always risks associated with work of this nature however we believe that if the work is carried out as per option 1 we believe that the risks present will be adequately mitigated.

If there are any changes to the scope design or timeframes there are significant associated risks, including:

- Ground conditions worse than expected – requires addition excavation and remedial works
- Rescinding of affected party and iwi approvals
- Reduced project quality

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION OR PROPOSAL

Council's Significance and Engagement policy identifies the following matters that are to be taken into account when assessing the degree of significance of proposals and decisions:

- a. The level of financial consequences of the proposal or decision;

- b. Whether the proposal or decision will affect a large portion of the community or community of interest;
- c. The likely impact on present and future interests of the community, recognising Maori cultural values and their relationship to land and water;
- d. Whether the proposal affects the level of service of an activity identified in the Long Term Plan;
- e. Whether community interest is high; and
- f. The capacity of Council to perform its role and the financial and other costs of doing so.

Officers have undertaken a rounded assessment of the matters in clause 11 of the Significance and Engagement Policy (2016), and are of the opinion that the proposal under consideration is of low importance.

ENGAGEMENT

Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of a low degree of significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

COMMUNICATION/MEDIA

A communications plan has been prepared in consultation with the communications team.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the storm event in January 2020 we now have a far greater knowledge of our poor the subgrade is along this section of Lake Tce. Due to this new knowledge we now know that rock revetment is required to address this urgent erosion risk to council infrastructure. The opportunity to combine this work along with the Great Lake Pathway Upgrade Project offers council the potential to achieve maximum construction efficiencies. Due to contractual obligations council is committed to purchasing materials for this section of the pathway and as such it makes sense to include these in the redesign of this area.

We have reviewed the options and recommend option one as it addresses the erosion issue. In addition to this it addresses the goals of the Great Lake Pathway Project by providing two lookout points that greatly enhance the visitor experience.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Erosion mitigation concept plan opposite Tremaine Ave and Lake Tce intersection

4.7 EASEMENT REQUEST ON CHAD STREET GULLY RESERVE

Author: Nathan Mourie, Senior Reserves Planner

Authorised by: Kevin Strongman, Head of Operations

PURPOSE

To decide on approving an easement to Unison on Chad Street Gully Reserve, Taupō for the purposes of power supply.

DISCUSSION

Unison own and operate the local electricity distribution network. They have approached Council requesting an easement to convey electricity, telecommunications and electronic data over Council administered land on Chad St Gully Reserve.

Council's legal officers have advised that staff do not have the appropriate delegations to approve any such request. The ability to make such changes under section 48 of the Reserves Act 1977 has been delegated by Council to the Taupō Reserves and Roding Committee. Due to this committee's infrequent meeting schedule this decision is being brought before Council in order to get a timely decision.

In addition, section 48 requires the Minister of Conservation to consent to the granting of the easement. The Taupō Reserves and Roding Committee does not have the delegated authority to make decisions on behalf of the Minister either; therefore this report recommends Council consent under delegated authority of the Minister in addition to approval as the administering body.

Section 48 deals with grants of rights of way and other easements. This section allows the administering body to grant an easement over any part of the reserve for the establishment and lawful exercise of a right of way or other easement without public consultation provided:

- The reserve is vested in an administering body and is not likely to be materially altered or permanently damaged; and
- The rights of the public in respect of the reserve are not likely to be permanently affected.

Information on the works have been provided by Unison and are included below. Preparation of the easement documentation and all associated costs would be met by Unison.

The purpose of the new transmission cable is to secure the power supply to the new Chad St apartments development. The number of apartments, and the specifications of the infrastructure and services they contain, means that the existing power supply at the end of the street does not have the capacity to meet the likely electricity demands that this development will make on the network at this location.

Having looked at alternative options for supply to this address, the most straightforward and low impact option is to thrust a large 150mm duct a minimum of 900mm underground from the main supply location on Pukenuamu Rd on the other side of the gully at the end of Chad St. Having the cable installed in this manner will mean minimal disturbance to the reserve grounds and the planting on the north facing bank of the gully. Having ducting installed will also enable any future maintenance or cable upgrades to be done without any ground disturbance.

In addition to supplying electricity to the new development, this cable also gives Unison the ability to back feed electricity supply between two sub-groups, further reinforcing supply security and minimising customer outages.

It is not unusual for utility infrastructure to be located on Council reserves; and it is considered that in this instance the effects on reserve users is negligible. There are few other realistic alternative locations for the installation of this utility infrastructure.



Figure 1 - Location of new ducted cable (red)

CONCLUSION

The installation of the new cable is important to facilitate the residential development currently taking place at the end of Chad St, and adds another layer of resilience to the electricity network in this location.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. That Council, acting as administering body of Chad Street Gully Reserve, agrees to grant an easement to Unison over part of Chad Street Gully Reserve for the right to convey electricity, telecommunications and electronic data.
2. That Council pursuant to section 48(1) of the Reserves Act 1977 and to a delegation from the Minister of Conservation, consent to the granting of an easement over part of Chad Street Gully Reserve to Unison for the right to convey electricity, telecommunications and electronic data.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

4.8 DELEGATION OF WHAREROA PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE TO COMMISSIONERS

Author: Hilary Samuel, Senior Policy Advisor

Authorised by: Alan Menhennet, Head of Finance and Strategy

PURPOSE

To seek approval for a panel of independent Commissioners to hear, consider and make a decision on the Whareroa North Plan Change request.

DISCUSSION

The Whareroa North Plan Change request is a private plan change (where an applicant applies to change the District Plan). It is the first private plan change we have received under the Operative District Plan.

The Plan Change request seeks to rezone a 14.63ha area north of Whareroa Stream adjoining the existing Whareroa settlement. The area is zoned under the Operative Taupō District Plan as Rural Environment. The applicant is seeking a Residential Environment zone to enable a maximum of 160 dwellings with densities ranging between 500m² to 1,100m².

In the case of this Request, because the land is owned by a Māori Trust, the application is subject to the Joint Management Agreement (JMA) between the Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board and Taupō District Council. The JMA sets out that two Commissioners will be recommended by the Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board and two will be selected by Taupō District Council. The initial 4 Commissioners have selected a 5th member in accordance with the process set out in the JMA.

Under the RMA, Plan Change Requests must be heard by either Councillors or Independent Commissioners with accreditation in the *Making Good Decisions (RMA)* programme. As currently no Councillors are accredited this report seeks approval to delegate the hearing, consideration and decision-making powers to Independent Commissioners, as per the JMA agreement.

In order to confirm availability, the four original Commissioners have been pencilled in since the end of 2019.

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that delegation be granted to independent Commissioners (as per the JMA) to hear, consider and make a decision on the Whareroa North Plan Change request.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Council, as per section 34A of the Resource Management Act, delegates the hearing, consideration and decision making powers for Plan Change 36 – Whareroa North Plan Change Request to a panel of Independent Commissioners as per the Joint Management Agreement between Taupō District Council and the Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board. The Commissioners are:

- Rob van Vorthuysen
- Rosanne Jollands
- Poto Davies
- Steven Wilson
- Doug Fairgray

ATTACHMENTS

Nil