



AGENDA

Extraordinary meeting of the

Nelson City Council

**Thursday 14 April 2016
Commencing at 9.00am
Council Chamber
Civic House
110 Trafalgar Street, Nelson**

Membership: Her Worship the Mayor Rachel Reese (Chairperson), Councillors Luke Acland, Ian Barker, Ruth Copeland, Eric Davy, Kate Fulton, Matt Lawrey, Paul Matheson (Deputy Mayor), Brian McGurk, Gaile Noonan, Pete Rainey, Tim Skinner and Mike Ward

Opening Prayer

1. Apologies

Nil

2. Confirmation of Order of Business

3. Interests

3.1 Updates to the Interests Register

3.2 Identify any conflicts of interest in the agenda

4. Public Forum

5. Trafalgar Centre - Update on Request for Additional Items

4 - 15

Document number R5761

Recommendation

THAT the report Trafalgar Centre - Update on Request for Additional Items (R5761) be received;

AND THAT funding be approved to complete the western corridor to the main building (\$140,000), lining and insulating the northern wall (\$80,000) and administration offices in the north east corner of the main building (\$130,000);

AND THAT funding of \$320,000 be approved to install a new roof over the current roof on the main building;

AND THAT business cases be developed to consider the value of a lift to access the eastern mezzanine floor, and High Definition television lighting in the main stadium and authority be delegated to the Mayor, Chair of Works & Infrastructure and Chair of Community Services Committees (or their deputies) and the Chief Executive to act on the outcomes of the business cases.

6. Nelson Southern Link Investigation - Feedback Submission

16 - 20

Document number R5731

Recommendation

THAT the report Nelson Southern Link Investigation - Feedback Submission (R5731) be received;

AND THAT no feedback on the Nelson Southern Link Investigation - Programme Business Case approaches be provided to the New Zealand Transport Agency.

7. Mayor's Report

21 - 23

Document number R5758

Recommendation

THAT the Mayor's Report (R5758) be received.

REPORT R5761

Trafalgar Centre - Update on Request for Additional Items

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To outline progress on the Trafalgar Centre Reopening and Rutherford Park Upgrade project and to consider additional items to enhance the functionality of the Trafalgar Centre.

2. Delegations

- 2.1 Council resolved in June 2014 for updates to be reported to full Council.

3. Recommendation

THAT the report Trafalgar Centre - Update on Request for Additional Items (R5761) be received;

AND THAT funding be approved to complete the western corridor to the main building (\$140,000), lining and insulating the northern wall (\$80,000) and administration offices in the north east corner of the main building (\$130,000);

AND THAT funding of \$320,000 be approved to install a new roof over the current roof on the main building;

AND THAT business cases be developed to consider the value of a lift to access the eastern mezzanine floor, and High Definition television lighting in the main stadium and authority be delegated to the Mayor, Chair of Works & Infrastructure and Chair of Community Services Committees (or their deputies) and the Chief Executive to act on the outcomes of the business cases.

4. Background

Trafalgar Centre

4.1 At its meeting on 23 July 2015, Council was presented with the following estimates for this project;

• Main Building	\$ 4,112,000
• Southern Extension	\$ 1,491,000
• Northern Building	\$ 4,155,000
• Ground Improvement	\$ 1,789,000
• Infrastructure/External Works	\$ 831,000
• Maintenance	\$ 483,000
• DIL and Consent Fees	\$ 95,000
Total	\$12,956,000

4.2 The project estimate of \$12,956,000 did not include the Rutherford Park work package.

4.3 On 3 September 2015, Council considered a report on procurement of a contractor for the Trafalgar Centre Reopening project. It outlined the progress and outcomes of the Early Contractor Involvement process and proposed engaging a contractor to undertake the physical works.

4.4 At that meeting Council resolved (CL/2015/001);

THAT the report Trafalgar Centre Reopening (R4749) be received;

AND THAT Gibbons Construction Ltd be contracted to undertake the physical works associated with the reopening of the Trafalgar Centre and the development of Rutherford Park;

AND THAT the scope of work contained within the Trafalgar Centre Reopening Project and the Rutherford Park Development be grouped into five packages:

*Compliance works and ground improvement;
Southern extension;
Main building, infrastructure/external works and maintenance items;
Northern building;
Rutherford Park;*

AND THAT each package be subject to detailed design, scheduling and pricing with due diligence to determine a total out-turn cost for that package;

AND THAT the total budget for the refurbishment of the Trafalgar Centre (noting this does not include capital expenditure for Rutherford Park) be approved at \$12.289M in the 2015/16 year;

AND THAT the Chief Executive, Her Worship the Mayor, Chair of Community Services and Chair of Works and Infrastructure (or their Deputies) be given delegated authority to approve the total out-turn cost for each package provided it is equal to or below the relevant July 2015 estimate for that package.

4.5 The detailed design phase for the first three works packages (TOCs 1, 2 & 3) progressed through the ECI phase and the detailed design schedules priced and the Total Outturn Costs (TOCs) finalised. These were presented to those with delegated authority for approval on 4 November 2015.

4.6 The Total Out-turn Costs for the three work packages totalling \$6,445,608 excl GST and the Guaranteed Maximum Price of \$7,570,920 excl GST were approved as follows;

• TOC 1 - Compliance & Ground Improvements	\$2,351,648
• TOC 2 - Southern Extension Strengthening	\$ 900,744
• TOC 3 - Main Building/Maintenance	<u>\$3,193,216</u>
Total	\$6,445,608
• Guaranteed Maximum Price (TOCs 1,2 & 3)	\$7,570,920

Rutherford Park Upgrade

4.7 During the latter part of 2015, Council deliberated on the options for upgrading Rutherford Park.

4.8 At its meeting on 19 November 2015, Council considered a report on the two concept design options for Rutherford Park and the associated estimates. From that report and subsequent discussion, Council resolved:

THAT the report Rutherford Park - Roading and Parking Concept Plan (R5079) and its attachments (A1457554, A1457555 and A1451682) be received;

AND THAT the Rutherford Park – Option 1 Roading and Parking Concept Plan (A1451682) at an estimated cost of \$2,905,000 (and noting the enhancements proposed by the Urban Design Panel reflected in document A1462199) be approved, noting this will take the total budget to \$3,005,000;

AND THAT funding to come from the \$2 million for roading, carparking and landscaping and \$300,000 for walk/cycle connections budgeted in the Long Term Plan 2015/25;

AND THAT up to \$700,000 unbudgeted capital expenditure be approved to give effect to enhanced option 1 based on A1462199;

AND THAT authority be delegated to the Mayor, Chair of Works and Infrastructure, Chair of Community Services or their Deputies and the Chief Executive (in alignment with the delegated authorities for the Trafalgar Centre project) to effect this.

- 4.9 The detailed design was completed and the schedule priced. Physical work started on the southern part in December 2015 to coincide with the partial opening of the main building and southern extension for the National Basketball League on 2 April 2016.
- 4.10 The TOC and Guaranteed Maximum Price for Rutherford Park (Work Package 5) was approved by those with delegated authority on 7 April 2016 as follows;
- TOC 5 – Rutherford Park Upgrade \$2,580,000
 - Guaranteed Maximum Price (TOCs 5) \$3,005,000
- 4.11 The TOC includes a scope risk of \$240,000 to cover any scope variations that may be necessary.
- 4.12 The work is being undertaken by Downer as a subcontractor to Gibbons Construction Ltd.

5. Progress with Project

Compliance Works and Ground Improvement (TOC 1)

- 5.1 This package of work has largely been completed. The surface reinstatement will be undertaken as part of Rutherford Park Upgrade (works package 5). The scope of work in this work package was significantly less than originally planned. The savings on the approved TOC amount to around \$900,000. These savings comprise the following;
- Reduced amount of ground improvement work (\$345,000);
 - Net savings of increased costs related to service relocations and reduced amount of external reinstatement works, some of which is being undertaken in work package 5 (\$240,000);
 - Not needing to utilise the scope risk (\$315,000).

Southern Extension (TOC 2)

- 5.2 This package of work is largely finished. All of the structural work has been completed and some of the cladding reinstatement still needs to be done. The overall savings on this work package are around \$55,000.

Main Building, Infrastructure and External Works (TOC 3)

- 5.3 The structural aspects of this package of work are substantially complete. The only remaining work for completion are the public toilet facilities, reinstatement of ceilings, reinstatement of cladding and the

sanding and varnishing of the main floor. These will be completed over the next two-three months. Some of the work will be coordinated with the construction of the northern building.

- 5.4 The scope within this work package was significantly different to what was originally envisaged and scoped. This resulted in around \$560,000 additional expenditure for this work package, the primary causes being:
- Adjusting the reinforcing steel to avoid services that were not clearly identified on the 'as built' plans;
 - The increased scale of work involved breaking out and drilling through the pile caps whilst avoiding the existing reinforcing and installing reinforcement to tie them into the new foundation beams;
 - The changes required to accommodate the pile cap connection with the foundation beams required the foundation beams to be enlarged. This resulted in the reinforcing having to be redone;
 - Encountering concrete slabs on the western side not shown on the as-built drawings, which had to be cut and jack hammered out manually;
 - In several locations the structure did not reflect what was in the original 'as built' drawings. Structural steel was not as shown and the design and location of the new steelwork had to be altered;
 - There was significant increased cost in fitting the steel plates and cleats for the BRB bracing. The design had no tolerance and most of the bracing locations clashed with other steelwork or concrete work, and solutions had to be found and verified with the structural engineers;
 - When the cladding was removed on the western wall under the roof eaves, it revealed the top of the concrete columns supporting the roof had significant cracking and spalling. A couple of the columns had sufficient spalling that the reinforcing steel was exposed and not providing any strength. All the cracked and broken concrete had to be removed and the columns repaired;
 - The various services within the main building such as cables, sprinkler pipes and conduits proved a problem. Most were installed since the original construction and it wasn't until the cladding was removed that they were identified. In many cases they had to be relocated to allow the structural strengthening to occur. Others had to be identified, tagged and subsequently re-connected. In addition, sprinkler pipes in the roof cavity had to be realigned to enable the new structure to be installed.
- 5.5 Although a significant scope risk on this work package had been included it still was not sufficient. This reflects the challenges of the project.

Fortunately savings on the other two work packages have largely compensated for this increased expenditure.

Northern Building (TOC 4)

- 5.6 The detailed design has nearly been completed. It will then be priced and subjected to a value engineering process before the final TOC is derived. The foundations and floor slab consent application has been submitted and work should start on this phase later in April. The scope of work is being scaled to match the available budget of \$3,580,000.

Rutherford Park Upgrade (TOC 5)

- 5.7 The Rutherford Park upgrade has commenced with the southern part of the Park constructed ready for the temporary opening of the main stadium. The remainder of the work will progress alongside the construction of the northern building and be completed around the same time.
- 5.8 The approved TOC for this work package is \$2,580,000 with a Guaranteed Maximum Price of \$3,005,000.

Professional Fees

- 5.9 The structural, architectural and project management input associated with these scope variations has impacted the professional fees to some additional \$420,000. This is primarily related to work package three. As the enabling works (removing cladding and linings) progressed it became apparent that the building structure was different to that envisaged. This required design modifications and development of specific solutions. This increased involvement from the structural engineers and architects was significant, and certainly not expected to the extent that occurred.

Additional Items

- 5.10 The original estimates presented to Council in July 2015 were largely focused around strengthening the building to reopen it. There were very few additional functional improvements included. During the development of the concept plans for the northern building and the scoping of the Rutherford Park upgrade, three functional improvements were requested by Council. Council asked they be included within the allocated budget with the intention that some of the scope risk could be utilised to fund them. The three improvements were:
- Western Corridor – extending the original corridor on the western side of the main stadium to link the new northern building with the southern extension without having to go through the main stadium. This is estimated at \$140,000.
 - Thermal insulation and lining the northern wall of main stadium – the existing northern wall is only zinc cladding. This is estimated at \$80,000.

- Constructing offices in the north-east corner of the main stadium where the original kitchen was located. This was intended to become storage space, however it has been proposed that it be utilised as office space for event organisers and/or a Trafalgar Centre custodian. This is estimated at \$130,000.

5.11 These three additional items are considered important in the delivery of the project. They have been recommended because they add value to the ongoing functionality of the Trafalgar Centre.

Summary

5.12 There have been savings made on the first two work packages and extra costs incurred on work package three. The scope risk included in the July 2015 estimates for these three work packages was deemed to be sufficient at the time; however the extent of additional work required to strengthen the main building was more than expected (as set out in 5.4).

5.13 The additional requested items cannot be included within budget, but remain desirable. At this stage of completion of TOCs 1,2 and 3, the financial position is on track.

6. Main Stadium Roof

6.1 Part of the structural work on the main stadium required the removal of sections of the roof to lift structural members internally into the roof space. When the roof cladding was removed it revealed severe corrosion under the roofing overlaps. Although the roof appears to still be water tight, this suggests that perhaps it will not be long before problems emerge.

6.2 The project scope included \$70,000 to repaint the roof. However given this revelation it is recommended that Council reconsider its options for the roof. There are three preferred options which are:

- **Roof Option 1** – Lift the roofing and treat the corrosion under the overlaps and repaint the roof. This has an estimated cost of \$210,000. This option is viable though it is considered that it may only extend its life by 10-20 years.
- **Roof Option 2** - Remove the old cladding and replace with new cladding. This has been estimated at \$310,000. This is also viable however removing the old roof could increase the risk of inclement weather affecting the interior of the main stadium. There are also additional health and safety risks with removing the old roof compared to the other two options.
- **Roof Option 3** - Treat the corrosion under the laps on the old roof, then put new batons across the old roof and install a new roof over the top. This is estimated at \$320,000. This can be undertaken with minimal effect on the rest of the building. This option has the advantage of potentially providing additional insulation and sound

proofing from external weather events. It is a similar estimate to option 2 and will give a 40-50 year life to the roof aligning with the life of the strengthened building.

- 6.3 During the Long-Term Plan considerations Council did consider funding a roof replacement on the Trafalgar Centre. This was included in budget considerations on the basis of the condition assessment undertaken as part of the preparation of the Long Term Plan. However, this assessment was not a destructive one, ie it did not involve removing any part of the roof. It was not until the sections were lifted (see para 6.1) that the true condition was identified.
- 6.4 Once the scale of work on the Trafalgar Centre was clarified, the budget for the roof was removed from the Long Term Plan, and added to this project as a painting task only.
- 6.5 This work could easily be undertaken as part of the project without affecting timelines should Council decided to progress with funding a replacement now.
- 6.6 It is recommended that Roof Option 3 be adopted and implemented.

7. Lift

- 7.1 During the concept planning for the northern building there was discussion about a provision to install a lift to access the mezzanine seating on the eastern side of the main stadium. Providing disabled access to the mezzanine seating is not mandatory.
- 7.2 One reason for considering this is to provide disability access to the mezzanine floor. A second reason could be to improve functionality to the eastern rooms on level 1 in the southern extension. This room is on the same level as the walkway at the back of the mezzanine seating. This room has not been utilised effectively to date. A lift would allow equipment, refreshments and seating to be easily relocated to this room for either corporate or private functions for small groups (15-20 people).
- 7.3 The intention was to form the well and shaft in readiness for the installation of a lift at a later date. However with the changes in technology potentially it may not be suitable as and when a lift is purchased. Any shaft and sump built now is likely to need modification later to install a lift.
- 7.4 The estimate to build the sump, shaft and install a lift is \$170,000.
- 7.5 The option of installing a lift needs some justification for the investment. It is recommended that a business case be developed over the next month to justify the need. This would allow sufficient time to add this to the current scope of work and have it installed as part of this project.

8. SKY TV Lighting

- 8.1 During the scoping for the new lighting in the main stadium it was raised that SKY TV needs much higher lighting standards than normal when it broadcasts from the main stadium.
- 8.2 The new lights have been designed to provide around 900 lumens. SKY TV need around 1500-1600 lumens for normal TV broadcast and 1800 lumens for high definition (HD) television. The lighting needs to shine from different angles around the building to mitigate shadows on the floor. Most of the lights would be located close to the ceilings around the sides of the main stadium above the mezzanine floor, along the back wall and on a stage bar across the front edge of the southern extension.
- 8.3 When SKY TV has broadcast from Trafalgar Centre in the past, additional temporary lighting was hired and installed for the specific event. Anecdotal evidence suggests this has only occurred on isolated occasions. Whether the frequency will increase or not probably needs to be assessed.
- 8.4 The estimate to purchase the high definition lights, install fixings and cabling is around \$100,000.
- 8.5 It is recommended that before making a decision to invest in permanent extra lighting that it be justified with business case assessment. The key risk with a one-off investment such as this, is that lighting technology is changing and potentially any investment could be obsolete within a few years. In addition the standards required for television could also change.
- 8.6 There is work that still has to be done on the ceilings above the mezzanine seating. It would be advantageous that if this was committed, that a decision be made by the end of April so the cabling, fittings and lights are installed whilst this other work is done. It is not critical but it would be more cost-effective.

9. Funding

9.1 The additional items outlined above are summarised in the following table;

Item	Estimate	Funded Already	Additional Funding Req'd
<i>Items requested by Council:</i>			
Western Corridor	\$140,000	\$0	\$140,000
Northern Wall	\$80,000	\$0	\$80,000
Administration Offices	\$130,000	\$0	\$130,000
Sub Total	\$350,000	\$0	\$350,000
<i>Recommended at this time:</i>			
Main Stadium Roof (recommended option 3)	\$320,000	\$70,000	\$250,000
Sub Total	\$670,000	\$70,000	\$600,000
<i>Discretionary, subject to business case:</i>			
Lift	\$170,000	\$0	\$170,000
SKY TV Lighting	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000
Sub Total	\$270,000	\$0	\$270,000
Total	\$940,000	\$70,000	\$870,000

9.2 The first three items (subtotal \$350,000) are considered to be important and funding is recommended. The option to reroof the main stadium (\$320,000) is discretionary, however it is recommended as it is a good investment and Council will be faced with this investment in the next 10-20 years. The remaining two items (\$270,000) are discretionary.

10. Timing

10.1 The northern building work package is now on a critical path. This project is being undertaken at the same time as many other projects across the country. Consultants advising to the project are in demand, as is the delivery of steel. The project team is reviewing construction timeframes to see if completion can be any earlier.

10.2 Currently the programme has an indicative completion date of mid-October 2016. The project team will make endeavours to bring this forward; further advice on the completion date will come back to Council.

11. Alignment with relevant Council policy

11.1 This report is in line with Council's position of re-opening the Trafalgar Centre as it is outlined in its Long-Term Plan 2015/25.

12. Assessment of Significance against the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy

12.1 This decision is not a significant decision in terms of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

13. Consultation

13.1 Council signalled its intention to re-open the Centre as part of its 2014/15 Annual Plan. Council has also included the project in its Long-Term Plan 2015-25. No consultation on the matters raised in this report has been undertaken.

14. Inclusion of Māori in the decision making process

14.1 Consultation with Maori occurred through the Annual and Long Term Plan processes.

15. Conclusion

15.1 There have been savings made on work packages one and two, and additional costs incurred on work package three. The scope risk included for these three work packages has been fully utilised.

15.2 Council requested the inclusion of three additional items (western corridor to the main stadium, lining and insulating the northern wall, and building offices in the north east corner of the main building) and gave a direction these be funded within the allocated budgets if at all possible. This report identifies that this is not possible, and seeks additional funding.

15.3 The roof of the main stadium is in worse condition than originally thought and needs more than just a repaint. Of the three options it is recommended that a new roof be installed over the top of the current roof.

15.4 Business cases need to be developed to justify the investment of installing a lift and high definition lighting. In order to maximise the cost-effectiveness of the installation of either of these options, the businesses cases would need to be completed by the end of April to incorporate them into the current project.

15.5 Most of the work packages that contain uncertainties have been completed. The remaining work comprising the new northern building and Rutherford Park has less risk associated and therefore less likely to have an adverse affect on the budgets.

15.6 The works programme indicates completion by mid-October 2016, though efforts are being made to have it completed by the end of September 2016.

Richard Kirby
Consulting Engineer

Attachments

Nil

Nelson Southern Link Investigation - Feedback Submission

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To consider if Council should provide feedback to the NZ Transport Agency on the Nelson Southern Link Investigation.

2. Delegations

- 2.1 This matter is a cross-committee item presented directly to Council, as it addresses areas of responsibility and functions of the Works and Infrastructure Committee, and the Regional Transport Committee.

3. Recommendation

THAT the report Nelson Southern Link Investigation - Feedback Submission (R5731) be received;

AND THAT no feedback on the Nelson Southern Link Investigation - Programme Business Case approaches be provided to the New Zealand Transport Agency.

4. Background

- 4.1 The Nelson Southern Link Investigation (NSLI) is part of the Government's Accelerated Regional Roading Package for State Highway projects. The investigation is looking at how to best address existing and future transport issues on the arterial networks between the Annesbrook Drive and Haven Road roundabouts.
- 4.2 The NZ Transport Agency is seeking feedback to finalise the programme business case and in particular identify a preferred approach to address Nelson's arterial transport problems. Feedback closes on 24 April 2016. Any submissions received by Council in the Annual Plan process will be forwarded on to the NZ Transport Agency.
- 4.3 NZ Transport Agency provided a briefing session to Council on the Strategic Case on 4 December 2016.

- 4.4 A second Council briefing session was held on 22 March 2016 just prior to the start of the NSLI feedback period to allow elected representatives from Nelson City Council to have the latest information available and ask questions of the NZ Transport Agency team leading the investigation.

5. Discussion

- 5.1 In 2010 and 2011 Council led an Arterial Traffic Study (ATS) with considerable input from the NZ Transport Agency to gain better understanding of short to medium term transport demand issues as they relate directly to Nelson. The Council discussed the recommendations of the Stage 4 report at its meeting on 11 August 2011. Councillors felt that leaving two options open (both the Rocks Road/Waimea Road clearways and the Southern Arterial transport corridor) left a huge amount of long term uncertainty for the community, and that based on the weighting and analysis of each option (as detailed in the Stage 1 – 4 reports), the Southern Arterial transport corridor was the better option for the City because:

- *The opportunity cost of preserving two options was too high.*
- *Preserving two options left unnecessary uncertainty that would discourage investment.*
- *Preserving the clearway option would limit the benefits to the city of enhancing the waterfront.*
- *Preserving the southern arterial corridor was necessary due to concerns over the future security of the current state highway from climate change and storm surge.*
- *The Benefit Cost Ratio (-0.5 versus +1.3) was more favourable for the Southern Arterial Corridor.*

- 5.2 The final resolution of Council was as follows:

THAT the recommendations of the Arterial Traffic Study be received (ref 2.7 of the Stage 4 report 1120417);

AND THAT Council confirms that the best configuration between Annesbrook Drive and QEII / Haven Road Roundabout that would improve the City as a whole is determined to be the Southern Arterial Corridor;

AND THAT the relevant elements of the recommendations and the implementation plan be given effect by their incorporation into:

- *The Transport Activity Management Plan 2011;*
- *The draft Long Term Plan 2012/22;*
- *The next review of the Regional Land Transport Strategy;*

- *A review of the modelling data following the 2013 census (in partnership with the New Zealand Transport Authority);*

AND THAT the Regional Transport Committee should note within the Regional Land Transport Programme 2012 - 2015:

- *The outcomes and recommendations of the Arterial Traffic Study;*
- *Council support for the allocation of funding towards implementing the recommendations from the Arterial Traffic Study;*
- *Council support for further investigation into a walkway/cycleway around the waterfront;*
- *Council support for the further investigation into a walkway / cycleway connecting the waterfront to commuter corridor linkages near Annesbrook Drive roundabout;*

AND THAT staff be directed to prepare an issues definition report to the Council assessing the options available for the Southern Arterial Transport Corridor.

- 5.3 The key differences between the Arterial Traffic Study outcome which was agreed by New Zealand Transport Agency and the Council resolution, which were not ratified by New Zealand Transport Agency at that time are:
- *The Arterial Traffic Study outcome retained the Peak Hour Clearways and Southern Arterial Corridor option but Council want to retain only the Southern Arterial Corridor.*
 - *The Arterial Traffic Study outcome issues definition report was to cover protecting both the existing arterial routes and the Southern Arterial Corridor, but Council has directed that the report should only cover the Southern Arterial Corridor.*
 - *Council added the investigation of a walk / cycleway connecting the waterfront to commuter corridor linkages near Annesbrook Drive roundabout.*
- 5.4 There has been no advice to Council to re-consider the position set out in paragraph 5.2 since that resolution. Discussions to date have continued to support the position of no clearways; protecting the Southern Arterial Corridor; and seeking to provide walk / cycle facilities along the waterfront. This is consistent with the Long Term Plan as discussed in section 7.1.
- 5.5 The NZ Transport Agency is currently undertaking engagement with the community directly on the NSLI – Programme Business Case.

6. Options

- 6.1 Provide feedback to the NZ Transport Agency.
- 6.2 Provide no feedback as there have been no Council decisions or information presented from officers since the Arterial Traffic Study to change the position or guide what to include in the feedback. This is the recommended option.

7. Alignment with relevant Council policy

- 7.1 The 2015-2025 Long Term Plan (page 45 and 46) and the associated consultation document (page 13) discusses the NSLI and states 'Current Council policy is to protect the potential corridor, and no change is proposed'.
- 7.2 The Draft Annual Plan consultation document stated 'The NZ Transport Agency Nelson Southern Link project is considering options for a route to connect the state highway from Whakatu Drive to QEII Drive as part of the Government's Accelerated Regional Roding Package for state highway projects and is currently at the Programme Business Case stage. Council, while an important stakeholder, is not driving either project. The Transport Agency will be collecting views from the community on the Nelson Southern Link project during March and April 2016. The Transport Agency will consider and provide advice to Government on next steps following the Programme Business Case after July 2016.' This highlighted to the community that the NSLI is a NZ Transport Agency project and that the Government will be making the next step.

8. Assessment of Significance against the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy

- 8.1 The decision to provide feedback or not to the NZ Transport Agency on the NSLI is not a significant decision under Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

9. Consultation

- 9.1 Council consulted on the position to protect the potential corridor during the LTP consultation.
- 9.2 Council has not consulted with its community on whether to provide feedback to the NZ Transport Agency.
- 9.3 The NZ Transport Agency is engaging with the community directly as stated in section 4.2.

10. Inclusion of Māori in the decision making process

- 10.1 No consultation with Māori has been undertaken on this issue.

11. Conclusion

- 11.1 The NZ Transport Agency is currently seeking feedback from the community on the Nelson Southern Link Investigation.
- 11.2 Council has not formally re-considered its position since 2011. It has not considered any officer advice to shape any feedback to the NZ Transport Agency.
- 11.3 It is recommended that no feedback be provided.

Rhys Palmer
Senior Asset Engineer - Transport and Roading

Attachments

Nil

Mayor's Report

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To update Council on a proposal to increase focus on community wellbeing.

2. Recommendation

THAT the Mayor's Report (R5758) be received.

3. Background

- 3.1 In my Mayor's Report of 3 March 2016 I advised you of my desire to provide greater governance oversight of community wellbeing by creating a Sports and Recreation Committee.
- 3.2 I have asked the Deputy Mayor to chair this committee.
- 3.3 A committee structure is a mechanism that Council uses to make decisions on resources, policies and strategies in an open and transparent way. It allows elected members to give direction to the Chief Executive and to set priorities for the organisation.

4. Discussion

- 4.1 Over this term of Council we have made significant strides forward in a number of areas. We have changed the way we have operated in the past and we are seeing the benefits of those changes.
- 4.2 As examples, the Works and Infrastructure Committee has completed a major overhaul of finances and asset management for all Council's core infrastructure. The Planning and Regulatory Committee has been tasked with working through a full Resource Management Plan review and is also well engaged in Nelson Nature and Project Maitai/Mahitahi. The Governance Committee has established Audit, Risk and Finance and Commercial sub-committees. We now have an internal audit system, health and safety system, and an organisational risk management system.

- 4.3 As a result of changes in the Long Term Plan, the Community Services Committee has seen a new system for Community assistance funding progress and be implemented.
- 4.4 However, Community Services Committee still has a significant amount of work to progress.
- 4.5 My concern is that in areas of community wellbeing, areas principally covered by the breadth of issues in the Community Services Committee, we are too often reactive rather than being proactive, and sometimes we are not sufficiently engaged or resourced. I want a greater governance input and a stronger organisational focus in these areas.
- 4.6 In expanding this focus I'm asking you to consider what makes Nelson a great place to live. I want to redirect the Council by doubling our focus in the area of wellbeing.
- 4.7 This is not an either - or discussion – arts and culture pitched against sports and recreation. It is recognition that all play an important part in making Nelson a great place to live and visit. It is also recognition that before we can achieve the goal of partnership that is set out in both our Long Term Plan and Nelson 2060 we as local government leaders need to have sound and informed relationships and with others in the community.
- 4.8 So I have sent the Deputy Mayor on a mission to meet with as many sporting and recreational organisations as he could over the last few weeks. One important group, the Nelson Mountain Bike Club, I have met with personally.
- 4.9 I asked the Deputy Mayor to find out whom at Council groups engage with and whether they believed engagement with committee members would deliver better outcomes. I asked him to request groups strategic plans – their Long Term Plan – and if they didn't have one, to find out if they wanted help creating one. I asked him to find out if they wanted a closer partnership with Nelson City Council or whether we had things about right.
- 4.10 The feedback gathered so far says there is a need and desire for change.
- 4.11 That feedback is supported by data and research undertaken by Lincoln University, Sport New Zealand, Rata Foundation and Not for Profit Organisations like No Child Left Inside and Project Wild Thing.
- 4.12 A scan of current research tells us that sports and recreation is changing fast. There are some alarming trends. Obesity, diabetes, and depression rates are rising. Adult participation rates are falling as are hours spent volunteering. But then there are some extraordinary successes like the growth and development of mountain biking in our region – a success that we need to better understand and support.

- 4.13 The benefits of sport and recreation are well-recognised, and contribute to social, environmental, health and wellbeing outcomes for individuals and communities
- 4.14 Our Long Term Plan needs to understand the changes that are occurring if we are to achieve the wellbeing outcomes that our residents and visitors deserve.
- 4.15 As a key funder and provider of facilities and open space we need to take a strategic and informed approach to sports and recreation.
- 4.16 I want you as elected members to have a real time finger on the pulse, to know how our sports and recreation organisations are functioning now; where they are going in the next 1 -3 years and 5 – 10 years and how Council can help get them there.
- 4.17 I will be offering you an opportunity to make a difference over the next six months to both progress some achievable outcomes now and to start the strategic preparation for the next Long Term Plan.
- 4.18 During this time the Community Services Committee will have a greater focus on youth and libraries. I am aware that Councillor Rainey, staff and consultants have done some work on library re-development options. I am keen to see that work. As Mayor and a member of the committee I would like library redevelopment put in front of the committee for broader input and progress.
- 4.19 As you know, in this year’s Annual Plan, I included a new section on Youth Services that signals the need for a collaborative process with youth and those that provide youth services. I would also like the Community Services Committee to make progress in this area with some urgency.
- 4.20 I know youth issues and the libraries are areas of keen interest for some of you who are currently not members of the Community Services Committee. Therefore I intend to open the membership.
- 4.21 Similarly the membership of the Sports and Recreation Committee will be open for any of you to join.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 If you would like to join either committee please come and see me before the agenda is prepared for the 5 May meeting.

Rachel Reese
Mayor of Nelson

Attachments

Nil