



# EXTRAORDINARY SUSTAINABLE NAPIER COMMITTEE

## Open Minutes

Meeting Date:	Thursday 17 February 2022
Time:	3.00pm – 4.57pm
Venue	Via Zoom (audio visual link) and livestreamed via Council's Facebook page
<hr/>	
Present	Councillor Price (In the Chair), Mayor Wise, Deputy Mayor Brosnan, Councillors Boag, Browne, Crown, Mawson, McGrath, Simpson, Tapine, Taylor and Wright
In Attendance	Chief Executive (Steph Rotarangi) Director City Services (Lance Titter) Director City Strategy (Richard Munneke) Director Community Services (Antoinette Campbell) Director Corporate Services (Adele Henderson) Director Programme Delivery (Jon Kingsford) Acting Director Infrastructure Services (Debra Stewart) Pou Whakarae (Mōrehu Te Tomo) Chief Financial Officer (Caroline Thomson) Manager Sport & Recreation (Glenn Lucas) Manager Community Strategies (Natasha Mackie) Communications Manager (Jess Soutar Barron) Senior Project Manager (Drew Brown) Team Leader Building Asset Management (Andrew Clibborn) Team Leader Governance (Helen Barbier) Senior Advisor Policy (Matt Adamson)
Also Present	Tonkin & Taylor (Jamie Yule) Deane & Quane (Ben Quane)
Administration	Governance Team (Anna Eady & Carolyn Hunt)

## **Karakia**

The Chief Executive opened the meeting with a karakia.

## **Apologies**

---

Councillors Mawson / Taylor

---

That the apology from Councillor Chrystal be accepted.

---

Carried

---

## **Conflicts of interest**

Nil

## **Public forum**

Nil

## **Announcements by the Mayor**

Nil

## **Announcements by the Chairperson**

Nil

## **Announcements by the management**

Nil

# AGENDA ITEMS

## 1. NAPIER AQUATIC CENTRE CAPITAL REVIEW PROGRAMME

---

Type of Report:	Operational and Procedural
Legal Reference:	N/A
Document ID:	1431044
Reporting Officer/s & Unit:	Glenn Lucas, Manager Sport & Recreation

### 1.1 Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to recommend the approach to address the capital and operating investment required for the Napier Aquatic Centre.

---

#### At the Meeting

The Council Officer spoke to the report. In response to questions from the Committee it was clarified that:

- If the recommended work goes ahead across the next two years some of the planned future works on the Aquatic Centre in the Long Term Plan (LTP) could be brought forward. It is likely that budgeted future renewal funding is no longer required, however this is dependent on whether further issues are uncovered at the facility once the project begins.
- The Jackson's Engineering report, which was part of the mechanical review, identified the Building Management System, which controls all the information around the Aquatic Centre, is at end of life and is no longer supported. The system has been identified as likely to fail in just over five years, and if that happened it would be a significant closure of the complex whilst an alternative was sourced and installed. The Heat pump for the Ivan Wilson complex was also identified as likely to fail within the next five years, and this would cause a closer of that pool for a significant period whilst a replacement was sourced and installed.
- This report is a high level overview of what is required to keep the Aquatic Centre functioning. Since writing the report other options for operating the facility have come to light. One of these is a run-to-failure model. Council has a legislative obligation to meet the levels of service outlined in its LTP and must have a sustainable plan to achieve that. If the run-to-failure model was preferred Community Consultation would be required, otherwise as parts of the facility failed and needed to be closed the Council would not be meeting the levels of service required.
- Within the Health & Safety/legislative compliance area suitable hoists are required for access to the pools. There is a hoist for one of the spa pools, but this has had long-standing operational issues and needs replacing; there is also a mobile hoist which can be moved to different areas in the facility and provides

---

accessibility. A Barrier Free assessment was done and recommended more hoists, and other ways to provide more dignity for people getting in and out of the pool than what is currently provided. The improvements being discussed today include budget to implement such elements.

- Of the critical plant needing to be replaced the heat pump can be designed to be installed externally so when a future development is built it could be transferred. Not much else would be salvageable.
- The internal wall design for the Ivan Wilson complex is based on a best practice concept design which is a different specification than what is currently there. It lifts the timber up and sits it on a concrete nib. This design will give longevity and assurance that the walls will not fail, as the timber will not be in contact with water, through cleaning and continued use. This will use the majority of the 3,417,742 needed for the internal wall remediation. There are other options which will cost less, but will not have the same longevity of use.
- The wall remediation would address the badly deteriorated timber framing under the cladding. As this deteriorates further the walls would move, but there would be no outward signs of degradation. Council does not have a timeframe of when this situation would become critical under Health & Safety, or other, legislation.
- In regards to the mould identified in the walls, the sampling is a point in time. Further sampling is problematic as it can release spores into the atmosphere. Ongoing on-site monitoring would be required however to make sure there is no dangerous mould present.
- The walls which are the worst affected by mould are not structural walls and are co-supported by the cladding. There are no immediate risks flagged or these would have been remediated straight away. There are structural wall brackets around the facility which have a recommendation for further investigation. If there was a seismic event it is anticipated the non-structural walls could move more than intended.
- Most of the walls in question are internal walls around offices and changing rooms. Some internal elements of the exterior walls are less-so affected. Modifications to the concrete in the courtyard outside of the complex has created new risks to the external walls of water ingress.
- To remove the building and operate the pools complex as an outdoor facility is a possibility, but the heat exchanges would need a redesign. It would change the amenity value of the complex, and could have an impact on swimming lessons in winter.
- Officers will need to do some further work on prioritising the different elements of the project, this will be dependent on market availability of materials and contractors, and also the decision on the future direction of the Aquatic Centre.
- The term of the Loan proposed for this project would be over ten years. This would be a 1.4% rates increase to complete the work required.
- Currently Council is projected to have paid off all loans over the next ten years, this borrowing may have an impact on that outcome, but there is time to work towards a balanced budget.
- Under the LGA if Council receives new information about an asset it can notify this, and the resulting consequence, in its next Annual Plan. If the information Council receives was known prior to the Annual Plan being set, and this could

- 
- affect delivery of service, it would need to put the proposed change to the community for consultation.
- A run-to-failure model would mean the facility could close at short notice without a backup plan, which users could find unsettling.
  - If the facility closed this would affect 30-35 Council positions. Council is obligated to take all practicable steps to retain the staff affected.
  - The improvements required for Allan's pool are largely cosmetic. The funding requested for this pool, and for accessibility to it via Flanders Avenue, should ensure it remains functional for approximately ten years, as long as the plant and tank do not require major work. As a stand-alone pool, Allan's pool could continue to return positive outcomes for Council and the community, however a business case would be needed to confirm that.
  - Demand on Napier aquatic facilities has not been met for a number of years. Currently there are approximately 500 to 600 learn to swim users at the facility, which without Covid setting disruptions can be as high as 900, along with additional aqua aerobic users, competitive swim training users and recreational users.

**ACTION:** Officers to seek advice on whether the more detailed information presented in this report is new information in terms of the 2021/22 Annual Plan. Also to clarify Council's obligations to the community if a run-to-failure model or closure of the facility is the preferred option.

#### **Officer's Recommendation**

The Sustainable Napier Committee:

- a. Note the risks to ongoing service delivery at the Napier Aquatic Centre;
- b. Note the interdependent relationship with the new aquatic development and the Napier Aquatic Centre capital expenditure requirements;
- c. Endorse an additional \$8,626,435 of capital funding over 2022/23 and 2023/24 to perform the recommended health and safety and service continuity capital improvements; and
- d. Endorse an additional \$80,000 of operational expenditure per year of the remaining life of the asset to enable repair and maintenance of end of life components.

#### **Committee's Amended Recommendation**

Mayor Wise / Councillor Mawson

---

The Sustainable Napier Committee:

- a. Note the risks to ongoing service delivery at the Napier Aquatic Centre;
- b. Note the interdependent relationship with the new aquatic development and the Napier Aquatic Centre capital expenditure requirements;
- c. Endorse an additional \$8,626,435 of capital funding (loan funded) be included in the Annual Plan 2022/23 over 2022/23 and 2023/24 to perform the recommended health and safety and service continuity capital improvements; and

- d. Endorse an additional \$80,000 of operational expenditure per year of the remaining life of the asset to enable repair and maintenance of end of life components (funded from existing budgets).
- e. Direct officers to prepare a phased plan of the proposed detailed expenditure to bring back to Council for endorsement.

---

Carried

*Councillors Browne, Simpson, and Wright voted against the motion*

---

*The meeting adjourned at 4.17pm and reconvened at 4.19pm*

## **2. AQUATIC REDEVELOPMENT: OPTIONS FOR CONSULTATION**

---

*Type of Report:* Operational and Procedural

---

*Legal Reference:* N/A

---

*Document ID:* 1429954

---

*Reporting Officer/s & Unit:* Glenn Lucas, Manager Sport & Recreation

### **2.1 Purpose of Report**

The purpose of this report is to recommend to Council the next steps for the new aquatic facility development process.

---

#### **At the Meeting**

Council Officers spoke to the report and showed a PowerPoint presentation (Doc ID: 1436205). It was noted by the Chief Executive that this report was not able to be presented at the Sustainable Napier Committee meeting held on the 10<sup>th</sup> of February due to the late arrival of important consultant reports.

In response to questions from the Committee it was clarified:

- The purpose of this report is to provide further information to inform a provisional decision on a way forward. This additional information is a geotech analysis of the Onekawa site, a possible site analysis, and a cost analysis. It is acknowledged this is a high interest item and that construction costs continue to rise, so officers will be proceeding with urgency.
- The cost of additional investigations, since the development of a new aquatic facility project was halted, has been \$223,000.
- The Geoff Canham Consulting (GCC) analysis of a preferred aquatic site sought to weight the analysis equally; it is up to the Council to decide if that was the correct way to do the analysis and community feedback can inform that decision.
- Financial questions in regards to the two sites can be worked through in more detail at the 10 March 2022 Ordinary Council meeting, along with who is best to

---

answer the questions Elected Members may have, whether that is council officers, consultants or the community.

- The Mitre 10 Sports Park 50 metre pool is due to be completed mid-2022, but this aims to cater for high performance sports and swim sports. It will not be a venue for recreational swimmers.
- The options for community consultation will not be decided on at this meeting; it will need to go through its own approvals process, and there are ways to structure consultation questions to incorporate more than one option at the Onekawa site.
- Three metres is not very deep for a landfill. Onekawa was not a landfill under the current landfill code and practices, it was more of an unregulated tip site.
- The Hornby pool and library in Christchurch project is on an old landfill. That project is more advanced, with an architectural masterplan and a large project team. Some key assumptions have had to be made for Onekawa's risk register, particularly around the level the pool lies. Hornby does not have the shallow ground water issue which Onekawa has, also Onekawa's soil profile has very low strength materials, which means there is very little strength in the soil. In Hornby steel piles were driven through into gravel, and this mitigates geotechnical risk. Onekawa does not have a solid gravel layer and therefore would require significant ground work to achieve the same ends so piling has not been considered at this point. Also the cost of steel is subject to significant price fluctuations.

**ACTION** – Elected Members to collate questions and send through to council officers to address.

#### **Officer's Recommendation**

The Sustainable Napier Committee:

- a. Note the geotechnical and contamination reports and implications for potential aquatic redevelopment.
- b. Note the independent multi-criteria site analysis results for the Onekawa and Prebensen sites.
- c. Note the interdependent relationship with the new aquatic development and the work required to extend the life of the existing facility.
- d. Note the impact of increasing construction costs.
- e. Direct Council Officers to prepare further information for community consultation.

#### **Committee's Amended Recommendation**

Councillors Brosnan / Crown

The Sustainable Napier Committee:

- a. Note the geotechnical and contamination reports and implications for potential aquatic redevelopment.
- b. Note the independent multi-criteria site analysis results for the Onekawa and Prebensen sites.

- c. Note the interdependent relationship with the new aquatic development and the work required to extend the life of the existing facility.
- d. Note the impact of increasing construction costs.
- e. Councillors are to forward all questions to Council Officers to investigate and bring responses back before the Council meeting on 10 March 2022.

---

Carried

**Attachments**

- 1 [Aquatic Development presentation.pdf](#)
- 

*The meeting closed with a karakia at 4.57pm*

---

Approved and adopted as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

Chairperson .....

Date of approval .....