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## INVERCARGILL CITY COUNCIL ELECTED MEMBERS
### INTEREST REGISTER

**Members Interest Register 12 February 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ENTITY</th>
<th>INTERESTS</th>
<th>PROPERTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RONALD LINDSAY ABBOTT</td>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiwi-Pie Radio 88FM Invercargill</td>
<td>Director / Broadcaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REBECCA RAE AMUNDSEN</td>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arch Draught Ltd</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BP Orr Ltd</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Ltd</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Murihiku</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Davin Literary Foundation</td>
<td>Trustee/Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage South</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glengarry Community Action</td>
<td>Events Co-ordinator (Volunteer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Council Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMAG Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ALLAN JAMES ARNOLD | Invercargill City Council  
Ziff's Café Bar Ltd  
Buster Crabb Ltd  
Ziff's HR Ltd  
Ziff's Trust  
Southland Aero Club  
Invercargill Club  
Invercargill East Rotary | Councillor  
Executive Director  
Executive Director  
Executive Director  
Trustee Administrator  
Member  
Member  
Member |
| TONI MARIE BIDDLE | Invercargill City Council  
Southland Museum and Art Gallery Trust Board  
McIntyre and Dick | Councillor  
Trustee  
Husband (Kris MacLellan) – Chief Executive Officer |
| WILLIAM STUART CLARK | Invercargill City Council  
Invercargill Ratepayers Advocacy Group | Councillor  
Member |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Invercargill City Council</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEX HOLLY CRACKETT</td>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ride Southland</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Invercargill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southland Youth Futures</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport Southland</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McIntyre Dick</td>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER WARREN KETT</td>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age Concern Southland</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kite Investments Limited</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invercargill Harness</td>
<td>Vice President and Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racing Club</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Member Ascot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM DAVID LEWIS</td>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bluff 2024 Rejuvenation</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospice Southland</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Centre Heritage</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARREN JAMES LUDLOW</td>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>770 Queens Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio Southland</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Invercargill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy Families</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invercargill</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murihiku Maori Wardens</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southland Community Law</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Lyndal Ludlow (wife) –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thrive Community Trust</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Southland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
<td>Contact Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAN REAY POTTINGER</td>
<td>Councillor, Director, Alice Pottinger (Wife)</td>
<td>171 Terrace Street Invercargill 9810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMOTHY RICHARD SHADBOLT</td>
<td>Mayor, Director, Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGEL DEAN SKELT</td>
<td>Councillor, Board Member, Vice President, Council Member (Chair of Communications and Media), General Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLEY FRANCES SOPER</td>
<td>Councillor, Chair, Director, Secretary / Treasurer, Member, Employee, Member, Member</td>
<td>137 Morton Street Strathern Invercargill 24 Margaret Street Glengarry Invercargill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXECUTIVE STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ENTITY</th>
<th>INTERESTS</th>
<th>PROPERTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLARE HADLEY</td>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hadley Family Trust</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMERON MCINTOSH</td>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>Group Manager - Works and Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID FOSTER</td>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>Acting Group Manager - Finance and Corporate Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director Foster and Associates Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARREN EDWARDS</td>
<td>Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>Group Manager - Environmental and Planning Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: INFRASCTURE AND SERVICES COMMITTEE
FROM: RUSSELL PEARSON – ROADING MANAGER
MEETING DATE: MONDAY 17 FEBRUARY 2020

SPEED LIMIT REVIEW PROCESS

SUMMARY

The speed limits in Invercargill are managed through the Roading and Traffic Bylaw. The review process of the speed limits has started and a draft Speed Management Map is being developed. Any changes to speed limits must be consulted on before they are considered by Council. The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) has published the Speed Management Guide which outlines the process to follow to ensure limits are appropriately set.

RECOMMENDATION

That the report “Speed Limit Review Process” be received.

IMPLICATIONS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Has this been provided for in the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is a budget amendment required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is this matter significant in terms of Council’s Policy on Significance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implications in terms of other Council Strategic Documents or Council Policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Has the Child, Youth and Family Friendly Policy been considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None at this time.
BACKGROUND

Speed limits within the Invercargill area are managed through the Roading and Traffic Bylaw. To adjust a speed limit, Council must amend its Bylaw changes which will require consultation to occur. This report signals that the prescribed process to review the bylaw has commenced and the statement of proposal is planned to be reported for consideration to the June meetings. The New Zealand Transport Agency has published the Speed Management Guide to outline the process to follow.

This guide sets out a series of requirements that Council must do including:

- Consider the safe and appropriate speed limit for a road with regard to the function, nature and use of the road;
- Consider its environment, land use patterns and whether the road is in an urban traffic area or a rural area;
- Review speed limits in accordance with the Speed Limits rule;
- Review a speed limit when:
  - there is a significant change in the nature, scale or intensity of land use adjacent to a road; or
  - there is a significant change in a road, its environment or its use; or
  - the RCA receives a written request to do so from the Transport Agency.

Council may also:

- Set speed limits in designated areas such as car parks, airports.
- Carry out the consultation required (as part of clause 7.2(1) of the Rule) at the same time they are making a bylaw in accordance with any enactment and its associated consultation procedures.

It is important (in the longer term) to look to have alignment between both the actual travel speeds and the speed limits with the road function, design, safety and use. On some roads, people may tend to go faster or slower than the speed limit due to the way the road appears and what is happening adjacent to the road. Speed management needs to take into account the community priorities and concerns, and have good public understanding, engagement and support.

Speed management can greatly impact results of crashes on the roads and this is one tool the community can utilise to reduce deaths and serious injuries. Public acceptance of speed reduction is key to effective speed management.

Staff are currently working through the required process to develop a draft Speed Management Map such that the consultation and Bylaw process can commence. It is anticipated this Map and Statement of Proposal will be available for the April meeting.

Staff are aware of a number of reasonably isolated areas where some concerns have been raised and these areas will be tested against the Risk Rating model information developed by NZTA. It is not anticipated that large scale changes will be promoted. Some changes may need challenging conversations to occur with that community.

Speed around schools has been a high community concern and in late December 2019 the Ministry of Transport issued some guidance on the direction to be taken. This guidance suggests, in general terms, that speed limits around the primary entrance should be managed at 40 km per hour. Some work will be needed to work through this detail.
Council is also able to set speed limits on Oreti Beach and this is enabled as the Resource Management Act establishes the beach as “road” and consequently Council can set a limit. Speed enforcement is undertaken only by the NZ Police. The current speed limit on Oreti Beach is 30 km per hour.

**CONCLUSION**

The setting of speed limits requires analysis of the road risks and development of a draft Speed Management Map. This work is underway.

Consultation with the public is required to ensure that good understanding of the issues and solutions is proposed.
SOUTHLAND REGIONAL SPACES AND PLACES PLAN UPDATE (RUGBY PARK STADIUM AND SURREY PARK GRANDSTAND)

SUMMARY

In 2019 Council committed funds (alongside other partners) towards the development of a Southland Regional Spaces and Places Plan. This plan will establish a regional approach to the provision of spaces and places. Rugby Park Stadium and Surrey Park Grandstand are being considered as part of this plan.

Otium Planning Group (Otium), the consultants working on this plan, were asked to undertake a preliminary assessment of the future of Rugby Park Stadium and Surrey Park Grandstand, noting the urgency and significance of decisions required about the future of these areas.

Two preliminary advice memos have been prepared about Rugby Park Stadium and Surrey Park Grandstand respectively with both recommending detailed business cases before committing to any significant redevelopment.

Subsequent to this, Sport Southland have approached Council with an offer to support the detailed business case process.

RECOMMENDATION

That the report “Southland Regional Spaces and Places Plan Update (Rugby Park Stadium and Surrey Park Grandstand)” be received.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

That Council commits to the next stage of investigation to develop a detailed business case for each facility before committing to any significant redevelopment

AND THAT

Further discussion be held with Sport Southland regarding their offer to support the detailed business case process.

IMPLICATIONS

1. Has this been provided for in the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan?
   No.

A2913482
2. Is a budget amendment required?  
Yes.

3. Is this matter significant in terms of Council’s Policy on Significance?  
No.

4. Implications in terms of other Council Strategic Documents or Council Policy?  
N/A.

5. Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?  
No. Further consultation will be required. This is already anticipated and planned for as part of the Regional Spaces and Places development process.

6. Has the Child, Youth and Family Friendly Policy been considered?  
No.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

A detailed business case for Rugby Park Stadium and the Surrey Park Grandstand will incur additional consultant’s fees, however as noted in Appendix 1, Council could consider Sport Southland’s offer to assist with the next stages of a detailed business case development.

**BACKGROUND**

The Southland Regional Spaces and Places Plan was commissioned in late 2019, with Otium awarded the contract to develop the Plan. The project is a joint initiative between Sport NZ, Sport Southland, Invercargill City Council, Gore District Council, Southland District Council, Invercargill Licensing Trust, ILT Foundation and Mataura Licensing Trust. Invercargill City Council have an active involvement in the project, providing relevant data and supporting the consultants via a role on the project’s Steering Group. Council’s Parks Manager is on this Project Steering Group.

Otium were commissioned to undertake this work. They have since commenced the information gathering phase of the project and are on track for a completion date of June 2020.

During the project establishment stages of this work, Invercargill City Council highlighted the urgency and significance of decisions on the future of Rugby Park Stadium and Surrey Park Grandstand due to their deteriorating state, type of use, and high profile and strategic locations.

Otium have subsequently undertaken a preliminary piece of research and offered preliminary advice on the future of both facilities. The two reports outlining Otium’s consultants advice are attached (refer to Appendix 2 for Rugby Park Stadium and Appendix 3 for Surrey Park Grandstand).
Regarding Surrey Park Grandstand, Otium outlines Preliminary Advice on page 5. Their ‘preliminary analysis suggests that replacement of the grandstand with a 200 to 300 permanent grandstand (or covered seating area) is warranted and a full business case would be needed to determine the most appropriate design solution including estimated capital and operational costs of improvements and a proposed funding mix’.

Regarding the Rugby Park Stadium, Otium also outlines Preliminary Advice on page 3 of Appendix 1. Their recommendation is to ‘prepare a Business Case’ (with the scope of the business case also provided on page 3 of Appendix 1).

In relation to these recommendations, Sport Southland recently submitted a letter to Invercargill City Council, welcoming an opportunity to support Council to progress the investigations into the two assets above, particularly given their relationship to the future of sport and recreation for this region.

The recommendations above respect that short term solutions for the ongoing use of each location may incur some minor developments and associated costs while the long term strategic future is determined. This includes possible demolition and temporary building placement for Surrey Park users and temporary Rugby Park Stadium repairs respectively. Separate reports will be presented outlining these options.

With this in mind and of note, a concurrent report is being presented to the Finance and Policy Committee regarding a request from Southland Indoor Leisure Centre Charitable Trust for further funding to support the operation of the Rugby Park Stadium.

**CONCLUSION**

Early research undertaken into the strategic future for Rugby Park Stadium and Surrey Park Grandstand via the Southland Regional Spaces and Places Plan development, suggests that full business cases are required for each facility before significant redevelopment investment is made into either facility. Council officers recommend that these next steps be fully scoped and undertaken prior to further significant investment into the future of either facility. Council officers also propose that further discussion be held with Sport Southland regarding their offer to support the detailed business case process.
Dear Michele

Re: Rugby Park and Surrey Park Grandstand

As you are aware we are currently in the middle of preparing the Regional Spaces and Places Strategy where both Rugby Park and Surrey Park Athletics Grandstand (as part of the Surrey Park precinct) were identified as key facilities by Council in the early planning phase with our external consultants Otium.

Recently we have asked Otium to do some additional work on these two assets to provide further strategic information to support future decisions that need to be considered. Whilst the Spaces and Places Strategy is not scheduled to be finished until 30 June 2020, preliminary advice from Otium recommended that a full business case would be needed in both cases.

We are aware of the strong desire from the Invercargill City Council and community to reach decisions about the best way forward for their key assets; in particular the Rugby Park Stadium and Surrey Park Grandstand.

With this in mind, Sport Southland would welcome an opportunity to support ICC to progress investigations into the future of the two assets above, particularly given their relationship to the future of sport and recreation for this region.

We welcome a discussion about further assistance Sport Southland could provide, including potentially helping with investment into the business cases and/or support to accelerate the business cases being completed.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Ngā mihi

Brendon McDermott
Sport Southland chief executive
MEMO

To: Michelle Frey, Interim Parks Manager - Invercargill City Council
Cc: Brendon McDermott, Chief Executive - Sport Southland
From: Ben Bainbridge, Associate - Otium Planning Group
Date: 7 February 2020
Subject: Rugby Park Grandstand

Overview
Rugby Park is a regional sports facility that has a main grandstand (3,400 seat capacity) that was fully rebuilt in 2002 with improved player facilities and corporate boxes.

Floodlighting is provided to allow for television night game viewing, together with a media tower. These facilities are understood to be in good condition. The sports field has been upgraded and appears to be in excellent condition.

The Invercargill City Council through the Invercargill Venue and Events Management Ltd has recently taken over the management of Rugby Park. Rugby Park is owned by the Invercargill Charitable Trust.

A structural engineering assessment on the Rugby Park concrete bleachers has found structural issues that is of a high safety risk to patrons. This has led to part of the seating being unusable and a reduction in use and loss of major sports events.

Invercargill City Council is now considering its future.

OPG is currently in the process of initial research and engaging stages of the Southland Regional Spaces and Places Strategy. To assist Invercargill City Council in its review of future options, the Consultant Team provides the following advice to inform the discussions.

The Issues
Structural engineering assessments have been undertaken on the grandstand. The assessment has found structural issues with the concrete bleachers that should they fail, would most likely lead to a ‘sudden and catastrophic’ event. This assessment has led to the closure of nearly half of the stadium (1567 seats now cannot be used) and to remedy will cost in order of $387,000. This assessment follows the presence of toxic mould and water leaks found in the old part of the grandstand. It is now understood that Council has undertaken further analysis into the cost to ‘fix’ the issues at Rugby Park. This is understood to be in order of $1.9M.

Due to these safety issues, the use of the facility has and will continue to be limited until the facility can be made safe and be optimised for use.

Further, Rugby Park is under-utilised, the maintenance is becoming unaffordable, investment has been adhoc and the design is not contemporary and would not meet spectator’s expectations of match day experience today.
Benchmarking Analysis

A benchmarking and research analysis into regional stadiums and stadium design trends have been undertaken. Appendix 1 shows the outcomes of the benchmarking analysis.

The benchmarking and research analysis show the stadium provision in similarly sized regional cities. These are:

- **Yarrow Stadium, New Plymouth (Taranaki)** is a 22,000 seat stadium. New Plymouth District Council operates the stadium and recently approved the Taranaki Regional Council’s (TRC) $50 million plan to repair and upgrade the Yarrow Stadium. The stadium is owned by the Taranaki Stadium Trust that is controlled by TRC. The Stadium has an anchor tenant, the Mitre 10 Taranaki Rugby Football Club and will also host the Chiefs Super Rugby Club. The Stadium hosts 15 to 20 major events each year.

- **Central Energy Trust Arena 1, Palmerston North (Manawatu)** is a 18,000 seat stadium. The venue features a multisport sports field surrounded by a speedway track. The stadium has an anchor tenant that play in the Mitre 10 Cup the Manawatu Turbos that play up to 7 matches during the winter season before the Robertson Holden International Speedway takes over in the summer season with up to 23 meetings a year.

These examples show that investment in stadiums is generally underpinned by having an anchor tenant or an event generation focus, to provide regular patronage and improve viability. That said, despite the lack of an anchor tenant, infrequent events, and/or high maintenance costs, a Council may regard a stadium as a community good which contributes to a City’s civic pride and a place that brings community together.

The benchmarking and research analysis identified the following design principles for major sports facilities. These design considerations are scalable to the role and scope of the major sports facility or stadium.

Stadium design trends are useful once its purpose, needs being addressed, and financial expectations are understood. When these are understood, stadium design should take into account trends and best practice in player/ user/ spectator elements.

Generic design considerations include:

- If a Stadium is identified as a home for training and competition for a sport, a level of high-performance training facilities and the sports administration areas form part of the facility design components schedule for new stadium designs. These could include change rooms with large indoor warm up areas, gym facilities, cold (recovery) and warm water pools (hydrotherapy and spas), medical area, briefing rooms, staff offices and coaching areas, property area and laundry, player development and recreation areas.

- A place making approach can be adopted for Stadiums that creates a place for people (see Creating Places for People Urban Design Protocol) and promotes universal design and female friendly design principles. Stadiums respond to the community and seek out ways to interact with and support community activity. The major sports facilities would not be just a standalone project, they would explore community and commercial uses.

- Stadiums are being designed as hubs for sport, entertainment, community and tourism activities. They complement the City’s other precincts for retail, food, arts and culture, etc; and connect via pedestrian and public transport links.

- A fundamental design principle is meeting contemporary standards for building and sports including for national and international competition where required. These Stadiums would be high quality offering a high level of service for players and spectators.

- Stadiums can be multi-purpose, promote shared-use and offer mixed-use programming. This will create facilities that are active and will engage the venue seven days a week. The space synergies can include sports, recreation, entertainment, transportation, food, healthcare, retail, hospitality, conferencing, housing and education.
• Stadium design now deliver multiple solutions. For example, a canopy that provides shade for daily activities would also be designed to capture rain water; the roof structure with solar panels can generate energy for the building; the materials can maximise use of natural light and double glazing for climate control; flexible lighting systems can offer security and safe passage for pedestrians and also add aesthetic and entertainment.

• New stadiums are adopting sustainable design features. Strategies include harvesting water and creating energy and adding value for the surrounding community.

• Biomimicry is a design consideration. New stadiums respond to the local climate, allowing the building to breathe, provide comfort for every human sense and adapt to year-round requirements.

• New stadiums embrace technology. The scope of Stadium design should consider new technology in terms of entertaining, operations and monitoring facility performance.

• An important design consideration is the maintenance and operational requirements of facilities with a view of making efficient and easy to maintain.

• Budget needs to be kept in mind! Governments are operating in tight fiscal environments and therefore the design must balance the above principles with delivering the service objectives of a Stadium within a reasonable budget.

OPG Preliminary Advice

The extent to which the above design considerations are adopted will be influenced by:
1. The need for a stadium in Invercargill - Is a stadium the right facility for the City?
2. The scope of use, scale of facility and viability?

While benchmarking of similar facilities will help to inform the need for future upgrading, our preliminary advice is to prepare a Business Case.

The Business Case should start from first principles by determining whether a stadium of the scale of Rugby Park is required; if not what sort of infrastructure is required to meet demonstrated needs; where should it be located and at what cost; what are the alternative uses for Rugby Park and implications of demolition.

The Business Case may determine that there are opportunities for better utilising the existing stadium and improving viability and identify what essential improvements are required for addressing these opportunities and at what cost.

The scope of the Business Case would include:

• Identifying current usage and operating position, and constraints to securing greater usage.

• Identifying potential usage of the stadium including new trends in sports events e.g. growth of women sport.

• Defining the regional role, scope of events and activities and the facilities required to support these. This includes the seating and other facility components necessary to address future demands. The use of the venue could include high level competition for rugby (or other rectangular field sports), community events, school competitions, or entertainment events such as music concerts.

• The regional role of the facility. If a stadium is assessed as the right facility to provide for the scope of events and activities identified, the role of the stadium would take into account stadiums in neighbouring regions including Forsyth Barr Stadium in Dunedin which we understand is the premier national level stadium servicing Southland and Otago regions.

• Recognise that the grandstand condition issue is a high safety risk to patrons and the recent reduction in the number of seats that can now be used means the function of the venue is significantly compromised.

• Assess whether Rugby Park is the best location for the scope of events and activities identified.
MEMO

- Explore contemporary stadium design considerations (as per above) whether the stadium is refurbished or redeveloped to optimise the potential social and economic benefits to Invercargill and the Southland Region.
- Include concept plans to reflect the identified facility mix components an estimated capital cost of improvements and future operational costs, together with a proposed funding mix.
### Major Multi-Use Stadiums in New Zealand

**Forsyth Barr Stadium, Dunedin**
- Capacity: 30,748
- Major Events Per Year: 22

The Stadium is considered the most contemporary stadium in New Zealand and is the only fully roofed indoor, multipurpose stadium and the capacity can be increased for rugby internationals.

It is understood to be the premier national major sports stadium in the Otago and Southland Region. This is evident through its usage.

Since opening in 2011, over 1.35M people have attended events at the stadium including the Rugby World Cup features and major music concerts, Sir Elton Job concert.

**Yarrow Stadium, New Plymouth**
- Capacity: 22,000
- Major Events Per Year: 15

The New Plymouth District Council operates the stadium and recently approved the Taranaki Regional Council's (TRC) $50 million plan to repair and upgrade the Yarrow Stadium. The stadium is owned by the Taranaki Stadium Trust that is controlled by TRC.

The repair and upgrade of the stadium is required following structural engineering assessments found that the East Stand and West Stand were earthquake prone and closed to the public.

**Central Energy Trust Arena 1, Palmerston North**
- Capacity: 18,000
- Major Events Per Year: 30

The Stadium features a multisport sports field surrounded by a speedway track. The stadium has an anchor tenant that play in the Mitre 10 Cup the Manawatu Turbos that play up to 7 matches during the winter season before the Robertson Holden International Speedway takes over in the summer season with up to 23 meetings a year. The main field has a grandstand providing undercover seating, embankment seating and standing areas.

**FMG Stadium, Hamilton**
- Capacity: 25,000
- Major Events Per Year: 12

**AMI Stadium, Christchurch**
- Capacity: 25,800
- Major Events Per Year: 19

**Westpac Stadium, Wellington**
- Capacity: 34,500
- Major Events Per Year: 39
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Eden Park, Auckland
Capacity - 50,000
Major Events Per Year - 21

Mt Smart, Auckland
Capacity - 30,000
Major Events Per Year - 13

North Harbour Stadium, Auckland (Formerly known as QBE Stadium)
Capacity - 25,000
Major Events Per Year - 18

New Major Multi-Use Stadium Design Example

Bank West Stadium, Paramatta (Aus)
The new $300M Bank West Stadium in Parramatta, a western suburb of Sydney (Aus) opened in 2019. The stadium is home to the Paramatta Eels Rugby League Club and the Western Sydney Wanderers Football Club that play in the national competitions.

More than 550,000 spectators have attended events in 6 months since opening. Thirty-six sport and entertainment events are scheduled for 2020. 27,000 visitors have attended functions, business conferences, community or cultural events. Major events have included international rugby and soccer matches.

The stadium features:
- 30,000 seat capacity, 3,000 premium seats and 54 corporate suites
- Four change and warm up rooms
- Two large video screens
- Led floodlighting
- Wi-Fi coverage
- Spectator amenities
- Grass field with water recycling system, ventilation and vacuum system
- Green spaces step down from the stadium to the river. There is an urban playground developed along one side of the stadium that is serviced by a cafe
- Design offers 360c views around the facility. The only area boxed in is the corporate areas
- Located a 10-minute walk from public transport, Paramatta Interchange
- Design responds to surround World Heritage river flats and coastal flood lands and site lines from Government House to Church Spire.

Mars Stadium, Ballarat (Aus)
Mars Stadium in Ballarat is located in a regional city with a similar population size and mix of sport and cultural facilities to that of Invercargill. The Stadium has a capacity of 11,000 where 5,000 is accommodated in grandstands. The Stadium was built in 2016 for $9 million and included installation of lighting, electronic video scoreboard, expanded food and beverage services, improved playing surfaces and a grandstand. The Stadium includes a corporate venue with bistro, function and gaming facilities.

The Stadium hosts 2 AFL games each year together with 2 one-off major events like WBBL Cricket. The facility today is home to the North Ballarat Sports Club including the Greater Western Victoria Rebels of the NAB League, and the North Ballarat City of the Ballarat Football and Netball League. It is also used as a venue for Central Highlands Football League and Ballarat Football League finals.
Overview

The Surrey Park Sports Precinct is a regional sports precinct drawing people from across the Southland region including Gore DC and Southland DC. The venue has a multicourt sport and entertainment centre, squash courts, velodrome, commercial conference spaces, climbing wall, a badminton centre, athletics centre a new baseball facility and future football fields in place of the relocated baseball facility.

A structural engineering assessment on the Surrey Park Athletics Centre grandstand has found structural issues that are of a high safety risk to patrons.

Invercargill City Council is now considering future options in respect of repairs to the stadium.

OPG is currently in the process of initial research and engagement stages of the Southland Regional Spaces and Places Strategy. To assist Invercargill City Council in its review of future options, the Consultant Team provides the following advice to inform the discussions.

The Issue

The Surrey Park Athletics Centre includes a synthetic track. The track is owned and maintained by Athletics Southland. There are separate club rooms for two athletics clubs and a grandstand that includes a basic club room and storage areas under the seating.

Funding ($784,000) has been secured to replace the 16-year old synthetic track in early 2020 (works are now underway). Additional works include a new inside running rail, alterations to the steeplechase jump, extending the track’s back straight, a new javelin run up area, new lighting around the track and a public address system. Athletics Southland and community trust funding organisations are funding these works.

A structural engineering assessment has been completed on the 1964 grandstand (refurbished in 1992). The assessment has found structural issues that present a high safety risk to patrons. The grandstand does not meet the current required earthquake ratings (as of 1 July 2017) to ensure the building meets the seismic performance requirements of the Building Code and will now require significant funds to strengthen.

This has led Council to erect condition warning signage on use and to consider its future.

Strategic Context

A draft Surrey Park Development Plan was prepared by Xyst in 2015 but was not adopted.

The Plan supports the retention of the athletics centre. Key issues identified by stakeholders for the master plan were:

- Parking / transportation.
- Traffic circulation.
- Lack of storage facilities.
- Duplication of facilities.
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- Retention of club identity.
- Asset renewal.
- Coordination of events.
- General amenity and design issues.

The master plan observations and recommendations relevant to the athletics centre were:

- Support the development of a single purpose-built combined club facility to eventually replace all individual clubrooms on the park including softball, football, athletics and potentially rugby in the long term. Development of such a facility should occur under a model of an incorporated society with individual clubs being founding members of the society. The location of the new facility should be based around providing a direct relationship to the athletics track, premier football field and premier softball diamonds.

- Consider the redevelopment of the grandstand within the broader context of the need to renew the athletics track and improve the quality of the football field within the athletics track. Critically review the demand for grandstand use against the cost of redevelopment or replacement of the existing grandstand and compare this with the cost and practicality of temporary or portable grandstand facilities.

- The renewal of the athletics track is a significant capital project and needs to be carefully planned. The individual clubs are unlikely to be able to fund such developments and leadership will be required from Council and other community funding partners who will need to consider and plan for this expenditure.

Figure 1: Recommended Option, Draft Surrey Park Development Plan 2015
The Athletics NZ Strategic Plan 2017-22 vision is for all New Zealanders to be engaged in athletics. To achieve this vision, two key areas are identified with outcomes and initiatives: To enable (participation) and to inspire (winning). These outcomes will be supported by lead strategies that ensure Athletics NZ and its delivery partners have the capability to deliver.

The Surrey Park Athletics Centre supports the “enable” outcomes such that through the delivery of athletics events, programmes and partnerships, club membership will reach 30,000, branded programme participation will reach 175,000 and entrants in events and championships will grow by 5% pa. Creating strong clubs and providing quality events is a key initiative, where Athletics NZ will provide services to support the development of clubs.

A further lead initiative is to develop contemporary environments that encourage and attract people to athletics. This initiative relates to facilities that welcome and facilitate participation in athletics across all ages, genders, abilities and cultures.

Over the course of 2018-19, Cooperation Agreements were put in place with Athletics NZ Regional Athletics Centres including Surrey Park Athletics Centre. Also, The NZ Children’s Athletics Association was transitioned to Athletics NZ with Athletics Southland likely to receive funding for a program leader to expand this program across the school. These are key steps to Athletics NZ delivering on a ‘whole of sport’ approach.

Local Participation Analysis

There are eight clubs that provide for senior athletics, harriers, children’s athletics and masters compete in the Southland Region. These are:

- Athletics Gore (Venue: Newman Park, Gore)
- Athletics Invercargill (Venue: Surrey Park Athletics Centre, Invercargill)
- Fiordland Athletics Club (Venue: Fiordland College)
- Otautau Athletics (Venue: Otautau School)
- Riverton Athletics (Riverton Rugby Grounds)
- St Pauls Harrier and Athletic Club (Venue: Surrey Park Athletics Centre, Invercargill)
- Winton Athletics and Harriers Club (Central Southland College, Winton)
- Wyndham Amateur Athletic Club (Menzies College, Wyndham)

The Surrey Park Athletics Centre is well used. Athletics Southland, Athletics Invercargill and St Pauls Harrier and Athletics Clubs operate from the Surrey Park Athletics Centre. The clubs train once a week and there is competition on the weekends. Athletics operates from the facility all year round.

Outside athletics, the Waihopai Amateur Football Club uses the grass infield for soccer as a Winter Tenant for training and competition.

The Athletics NZ Annual Report 2018/19 records 399 registered athletes in Southland Region plus a further 607 athletes in secondary school sports programmes. Of these participants, 60 athletes are U7, 248 athletes are between 7 and 14 years, 44 athletes are between 15 and 19 years and 57 are aged 20 years and over. 52% are male and 48% female. In addition to club membership, there are children aged 3 to 8 years participating in the Get Set Go programme and children aged 6 to 11 years participating in the Run Jump Throw programme. This is provided by Athletics Southland through schools.

There are a number of events hosted each year. These include the Otago - Southland Athletics Championships, South Island Secondary School Championships, South Island Colgate Games, school carnival events and local events. Athletics Southland considers the grandstand fundamental to hosting these athletics events.
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Trends Analysis

Active NZ Surveys show the trends of participation for athletics and track and field in Southland. Athletics participation levels for young people is one of the top 15 sports, recording 13.98%. Only 0.38% of adults participate in athletics.

Athletics NZ has 170 affiliated clubs recorded 19,126 registered athletes in 2018/2019. In the past year, 30 meets of national significance were held plus 100+ regional meets and 1,000 weekly club nights. Participation in most events increased by 8% from the previous year. 34,538 children participated in the Get Set Go programme and 14,826 participated in the Run Jump Throw programme. The sport has a significantly higher proportion of children actively involved compared to adults.

The largest growth in athletics is through emerging informal social and recreation running groups and events. Parkrun offers free weekly timed 5km runs for people of all ages and abilities using parks and trails. In the last five years, Parkrun has become established in 29 locations across New Zealand. Invercargill’s Parkrun launched at Queens Park in 2018 and attracts on average a weekly attendance of around 106 runners. The largest attended event was 200 runners. Since being launched, 103 events have been held, hosting 1,765 runners.

Benchmarking Analysis

A benchmarking analysis of regional athletics centres in New Zealand and Australia was undertaken to help inform the facility requirements of the Surrey Park Athletics Centre. The outcome of this benchmarking analysis is shown at Appendix 1.

Surrey Park Athletics Centre is classified as a regional athletics facility under the IAAF Technical Track and Field Facilities Manual (1 November 2019) and when analysing the scope, location and catchment of regional athletics centres across New Zealand and Australia. According to the guidelines and outcomes of the benchmarking analysis, the key facility requirements should include: a synthetic track with 8 lanes on the bend and straight, jumping pits for long jump, triple jump and high jump, throwing areas for shot put, discus and javelin and spectator facilities including toilets and covered seating for 200 people.

Athletics NZ Response

OPG interviewed Athletics NZ about the role the Surrey Park Athletics Centre plays in the network of athletics facilities across the country and the facility requirements of a regional athletic centre.

Athletics NZ considers Surrey Park Athletics Centre to be a regional athletics centre. They confirmed the benchmarking analysis findings noting that every ‘main’ athletics centre (National / Regional) has a synthetic track and has a requirement for covered seating if hosting major athletics meets.

Athletics NZ guarantees major athletics meet(s) at the main athletics centres. For Surrey Park Athletics Centre, the Colgate Games is allocated on rotation. This event is one of the major athletics meets in New Zealand and attracts 1000 children plus 1500 family members. It is considered a State Championship level event. The event has a significant social and economic impact wherever it is held. A ‘covered’ seating area for 200-300 seats is considered a mandatory requirement for Athletics NZ to allocate this event.

In addition, the Surrey Park Athletics Centre will host the Secondary School Championships on rotation. This event attracts 2000 competitors. Covered seating to the same capacity is required.

From a regional level, athletics meets and school carnivals (primary and secondary schools) are held each year. The school events attract high numbers and require a level of seating.

Athletics NZ notes the history of taking events to Surrey Park Athletics Centre and the success of Athletics Southland regionally in terms of participation and success.
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If the grandstand is renewed, a covered seating area for 200-300 seats that is fully accessible is important to service the major athletics meets and school championships currently held on a rotation base. It is also considered important to hosting regional school carnivals.

OPG Preliminary Advice

Our initial advice for Surrey Park Athletics Centre grandstand, based on what we have found to date is:

1. Athletics is a stable mature sport. Participation numbers have remained consistent over a long period of time and as a result the sport is serviced and organised on a regional basis.
2. Athletics NZ is now responsible for all athletics development and programs in partnership with regional athletics organisations and facilities e.g. Athletics Southland. A whole of sport approach is being adopted and cooperation agreements between Athletics NZ and regional athletics organisations and facilities will ensure resources capability to roll this out. This means future Athletics NZ programs and events will continue to be associated with regional athletics centres like Surrey Park Athletics Centre.
3. There are eight clubs that provide for senior athletics, harriers, children’s athletics and masters compete in the Southland Region. Two of these clubs are based at the Surrey Park Athletics Centre and most schools are located in Invercargill within 10km of the facility. Based on the current athletics club participation rates, there is sufficient supply of a number of athletics venues within the Southland Region to provide for both the training and competition requirements.
4. The scope and quality of these athletics facilities across school sites and sports reserves vary. Most operate training from grass fields outside the Surrey Park Athletics Centre that has a synthetic track and caters for all field sports with a grandstand for shelter / shade and spectator viewing.
5. The Surrey Park Athletics Centre is well located with other major (regionally significant) sports facilities within the Surrey Park Sports Precinct. It operates as Southland Region’s regional athletics facility and therefore the infrastructure to support events is required.
6. Benchmarking of regional standard facilities shows that an appropriate level of covered seating for major events such as regional athletics championships and school athletics carnivals is required.
7. Athletics NZ classifies the Surrey Park Athletics Centre as one of the main athletics centres in New Zealand. All main athletics centres now have a synthetic track and to support this level of investment, Athletics NZ guarantees major athletics meets at these centres. For Surrey Park Athletics Centre, the Colgate Games is allocated on rotation. This event is one of the major athletics meets in New Zealand and attracts 1000 children plus 1500 family members. It is considered a State Championship level event and has a significant social and economic impact wherever it is held. A ‘covered’ seating area for 200-300 seats is considered a mandatory requirement by Athletics NZ to allocate this event.
8. The emerging growth and participation in social and recreational running, which primarily utilises trails and parklands is an opportunity for athletics to attract future participants across senior athletics, harriers, children’s athletics and masters.
9. The funding and delivery of required resurfacing of track works at Surrey Park Athletics Centre will address asset renewal issues at the facility and lift the quality of the facilities to be able to host national standard events. The most significant asset renewal issue remaining is now the grandstand. A redevelopment is required due to the age and condition of the asset and the current design does not meet current sports facility design standards that promotes universal access and female friendly design principles.
10. Our preliminary analysis suggests that replacement of the grandstand with a 200 to 300 permanent grandstand (or covered seating area) is warranted and a full business case would be needed to determine the most appropriate design solution including estimated capital and operational costs of improvements and a proposed funding mix.
11. Development options could include:
   - Providing a basic covered seating area for 200 to 300 people.
   - The proximity of the current grandstand to the ILT Stadium Southland (Entertainment Venue) is an opportunity to explore commercial opportunities to support stadium activities and events as part of any redevelopment.
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- The proximity of the athletics track to the football fields and new softball diamonds is an opportunity to explore a central pavilion that caters for all community sports including toilet, change, first aid, office and social / function room. This would mean a relocation of the grandstand.
## APPENDIX 1: REGIONAL ATHLETICS CENTRES - BENCHMARKING ANALYSIS TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Surrey Park Athletics Centre (Invercargill)</th>
<th>Saxton Field (Nelson)</th>
<th>Inga Puna Wai (Christchurch)</th>
<th>Aorangi Stadium (Timaru)</th>
<th>Celtician Athletics Complex (Gisborne)</th>
<th>Morrison Reserve Athletics Centre (Dunedin)</th>
<th>Le Trobe University Athletics Centre (Bendigo)</th>
<th>John Landy Athletics Field (Geelong)</th>
<th>Mangere Regional Athletics Centre (Central Coast)</th>
<th>Barwon Park Athletics Centre (Ballarat)</th>
<th>Liamberg Reserve Athletics Centre (Ballarat)</th>
<th>Hunter Sports Centre Athletics Track (Hunter Valley)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>Surrey Park Road, Invercargill (NZ)</td>
<td>Saxton Road, Stoko, Nelson 7011 (NZ)</td>
<td>Augustine Drive, Wigram, Christchurch (NZ)</td>
<td>Morgans Road, Timaru (NZ)</td>
<td>Logan Park, Butts Road, Darfield (NZ)</td>
<td>Old Harford Road, Mount Maunganui (Vic / Aus)</td>
<td>40 Retreat Street, Flora Hill (Vic / Aus)</td>
<td>300 Swindale Street, South Geelong (Vic / Aus)</td>
<td>Mangere Drive, Turakirerata Park (NSW / Aus)</td>
<td>Scott Street, Cairns (QLD / Aus)</td>
<td>York St, Ballarat (Vic / Aus)</td>
<td>43 Stockland Dr, Glendale (NSW / Aus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Track Surface</strong></td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
<td>Synthetic (Polyurethane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Cylindrical Track Lanes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front Straight Lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steeplechase Water Jump</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pole Vault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Jump</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T&amp;F Pits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discus / Hammer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shot Put</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Javelin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Address System</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic Timing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clubroom Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>Granstand for 200+</td>
<td>Granstand for 300</td>
<td>Granstand for 500</td>
<td>Granstand for 1000</td>
<td>Covered Seating for 100-200</td>
<td>Covered Seating for 200-400</td>
<td>Covered Seating for 400-800</td>
<td>Covered Seating for 800-1000</td>
<td>Covered Seating for 1000-2000</td>
<td>Covered Seating for 2000-3000</td>
<td>Covered Seating for 3000-4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Rooms</td>
<td>Yes - Two club Rooms</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiosk</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Aid Room</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration / Officials Room</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Space</strong></td>
<td>Yes - Function Room</td>
<td>Yes - Bar and Function Room, Shared with cricket and soccer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Storage</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car Parking</strong></td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
<td>Marking for 200+ cars, however part of overall sports precinct parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lighting</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX 1: REGIONAL ATHLETICS CENTRES - BENCHMARKING ANALYSIS TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Ownership/Management</th>
<th>Highest Level of Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Park Athletics Centre</td>
<td>Owned by Invercargill City Council and leased to Athletics Southland / Licensee to Football Club (Winter)</td>
<td>National Athletics Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Invercargill)</td>
<td>Managed by Sport Tasman</td>
<td>National Athletics Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saigon Field (Nelson)</td>
<td>Managed by Sport Tasman</td>
<td>National Athletics Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga Puna Wai (Christchurch)</td>
<td>Owned by South Canterbury All-Weather Track Trust who leases to athletics and football</td>
<td>National Athletics Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorangi Stadium (Timaru)</td>
<td>Dunedin City Council</td>
<td>National Athletics Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Athletics Complex (Blenheim)</td>
<td>Owned by Yarra Ranges Council / Leased to Yarra Ranges Athletics / Licensee to Soccer Club (Winter)</td>
<td>National Athletics Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison Reserve Athletics Centre (Yarra Ranges)</td>
<td>Owned and managed by La Trobe University</td>
<td>State Athletics Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Trobe University Athletics Centre (Westleigh)</td>
<td>Owned by City of Greater Geelong and managed by the La Trobe Field Management Committee</td>
<td>State Athletics Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Landy Athletics Field</td>
<td>Owned by Central Coast Council and managed by Mingara Recreation Club</td>
<td>State Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong Cross Country Club</td>
<td>Owned by City of Geelong Managed by Ballarat Regional Athletics Centre</td>
<td>State Athletics Championships, Q Cup, NRL pre-season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxton Field (Nelson)</td>
<td>Managed by Sport Tasman</td>
<td>State Athletics Championships, NRL pre-season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga Puna Wai (Christchurch)</td>
<td>Owned by South Canterbury All-Weather Track Trust who leases to athletics and football</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorangi Stadium (Timaru)</td>
<td>Dunedin City Council</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonian Athletics Complex (Blenheim)</td>
<td>Owned by Yarra Ranges Council / Leased to Yarra Ranges Athletics / Licensee to Soccer Club (Winter)</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison Reserve Athletics Centre (Yarra Ranges)</td>
<td>Owned and managed by La Trobe University</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Trobe University Athletics Centre (Westleigh)</td>
<td>Owned by City of Greater Geelong and managed by the La Trobe Field Management Committee</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Landy Athletics Field</td>
<td>Owned by Central Coast Council and managed by Mingara Recreation Club</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong Cross Country Club</td>
<td>Owned by City of Geelong Managed by Ballarat Regional Athletics Centre</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxton Field (Nelson)</td>
<td>Managed by Sport Tasman</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga Puna Wai (Christchurch)</td>
<td>Owned by South Canterbury All-Weather Track Trust who leases to athletics and football</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorangi Stadium (Timaru)</td>
<td>Dunedin City Council</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonian Athletics Complex (Blenheim)</td>
<td>Owned by Yarra Ranges Council / Leased to Yarra Ranges Athletics / Licensee to Soccer Club (Winter)</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison Reserve Athletics Centre (Yarra Ranges)</td>
<td>Owned and managed by La Trobe University</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Trobe University Athletics Centre (Westleigh)</td>
<td>Owned by City of Greater Geelong and managed by the La Trobe Field Management Committee</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Landy Athletics Field</td>
<td>Owned by Central Coast Council and managed by Mingara Recreation Club</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong Cross Country Club</td>
<td>Owned by City of Geelong Managed by Ballarat Regional Athletics Centre</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxton Field (Nelson)</td>
<td>Managed by Sport Tasman</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga Puna Wai (Christchurch)</td>
<td>Owned by South Canterbury All-Weather Track Trust who leases to athletics and football</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorangi Stadium (Timaru)</td>
<td>Dunedin City Council</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonian Athletics Complex (Blenheim)</td>
<td>Owned by Yarra Ranges Council / Leased to Yarra Ranges Athletics / Licensee to Soccer Club (Winter)</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison Reserve Athletics Centre (Yarra Ranges)</td>
<td>Owned and managed by La Trobe University</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Trobe University Athletics Centre (Westleigh)</td>
<td>Owned by City of Greater Geelong and managed by the La Trobe Field Management Committee</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Landy Athletics Field</td>
<td>Owned by Central Coast Council and managed by Mingara Recreation Club</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong Cross Country Club</td>
<td>Owned by City of Geelong Managed by Ballarat Regional Athletics Centre</td>
<td>National Tour Competitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES COMMITTEE
FROM: CAMERON MCINTOSH, GROUP MANAGER – WORKS AND SERVICES
MEETING DATE: MONDAY 17 FEBRUARY 2020

RECYCLING SERVICES

SUMMARY

Invercargill City Council (ICC) in collaboration with the partner WasteNet Councils has a recycling processing contract that is due to expire on 30 June 2020. WasteNet is working through a process of finding a way forward for a regional approach to recycling. The situation is complex and considerable uncertainty exists in determining the best course of action, particularly the difficulty in finding markets for recycled materials.

ICC should be aware of its options, including the possibility of continuing a service only for ICC residents, continuing to work as part of WasteNet, and in either case possibly diverting recyclables directly to landfill.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report “Recycling Services” be received

AND THAT

Invercargill City Council work through the process proposed by WasteNet before making decisions about future recycling services.

IMPLICATIONS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Has this been provided for in the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is a budget amendment required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Is this matter significant in terms of Council’s Policy on Significance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Implications in terms of other Council Strategic Documents or Council Policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste Management and Minimisation Plan has expired and is in the process of being updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Have the views of affected or interested persons been obtained and is any further public consultation required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Has the Child, Youth and Family Friendly Policy been considered?

No

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

ICC charges participating residential ratepayers $171.85 excluding GST per annum for the kerbside recycling and rubbish collection service. Approximately $46.61 of this figure is budgeted for the recycling processing contract.

Increases in the cost of the recycling contract last year were not passed on to properties receiving the wheelie bin service and the Invercargill City Council (ICC) budget ended the year in deficit.

The current cost of the contracts will require a rate increase of $30.53 per property over the current charge. This increase is made up of $18.00 of New Zealand Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) charge and $12.53 of recycling contracting costs.

In the event that WasteNet is unable to continue a full Southland Service for recycling processing and if ICC was to seek to continue the current contract alone (but only for volumes of recyclables from Invercargill), the rate increase would be approximately $69.15 per property being $18.00 ETS charge and $51.15 recycling contract costs.

If ICC chose to send all recyclables direct to landfill (without processing) until confidence returns to the situation, the cost per property for the kerbside recycling and rubbish collection service would decrease to approximately $163.56 per annum.

Ministry for the Environment have signalled further increases in the Landfill Levy in the near future (1-2 years) this is currently under consultation with a decision expected in June 2020.

**BACKGROUND**

Council in collaboration with the shared service – WasteNet Southland – has a recycling processing contract. This contract was due to expire on 30 June 2019, however a 12-month contract extension was able to be negotiated. This contract now expires on 30 June 2020.

WasteNet Southland’s heads of agreement document does not oblige the partner WasteNet Councils to provide a recycling processing service beyond the current contract. WasteNet is currently working through a way forward, and intends to work collaboratively and seek guidance from the partnering councils this month. The WasteNet report from January 2020 is attached as *Appendix 1*.

The current recycling processing contract was originally established with the intent that WasteNet would cover the operating costs to process recyclables, and that the revenue generated from the sale of the processed recyclables would be shared between the two parties.

**Context**

The final decision arrived at in 2011 was to provide participating ratepayers with a two-bin kerbside collection service – a landfill-rubbish bin (red lid) and glass-in commingled recycling bin (yellow lid). The contracts struck a balance between:
- Cost of mobile bins
- Cost of collection and processing
- Quality of processed recyclables

It was recognised at the time, that having a glass-in service may in the long term impact the quality of the processed recyclables.

New Zealand is heavily dependent upon offshore markets for the sale of recycled commodities. In recent months the end markets for recyclables have become increasingly difficult, especially for fibre (mixed paper and cardboard) and plastic categories 3 to 7.

The effect of this is that some recycled commodities are being stockpiled or sent directly to landfill.

Some companies are investigating the cost benefits for improving the quality of recyclables, and/or additional sorting of mixed paper/plastic streams.

For the partner WasteNet Councils, in simple terms the cost of processing recyclables is approximately $1.9 million per annum under the current contract. In comparison, sending recyclables directly to landfill would be approximately $1.2 million per annum.

From a purely economic viewpoint it is undesirable to pay $1.9 million to process recycling which then goes to landfill at the additional cost of $1.2 million.

Central government is working towards improvements in the legislation and policy surrounding waste minimisation, and will continue to incentivise the minimisation of material going to landfill. The rapidly escalating waste levy will further complicate matters.

The whole situation is complex with considerable uncertainty in the short to medium term.

WasteNet's financial situation is impacted by the cost increase in the contract extension. Bin inspections were not prioritised over the last 18-months while WasteNet staff focussed on other issues. Bin Inspections would help to improve the quality of the recycling input stream but were unpopular with some residents. This made the roles somewhat difficult to fill and there were increased health and safety concerns for staff welfare.

Unfortunately the complexity of the situation has been reduced by some to a matter of social good versus cost. This Local Government Act (LGA) once again provides the four well-beings; social, cultural, environmental and economic. Council is currently developing the next iteration of its procurement policy. It would be good practice to separate the social good component of a decision from the costs of service involved in a contract.

Where Council elects to contribute to social good, this amount should be clearly separated from the service provision, funded separately and reported on separately.

From a contract management and operational viewpoint, the separation would greatly improve clarity and visibility for governance.

**Recovering Glass in Southland**

O-I NZ is New Zealand’s only glass bottle and jar manufacture, located in Penrose Auckland. Historically Invercargill had glass bottle banks, whereby residents placed empty bottles into a large container. The glass was loaded into railway containers and railed to Penrose. It is
unknown what year this service stopped. It is believed the reason why the service was
stopped was due to a load being rejected and cost of landfilling in Auckland.

Council recovers approximately 1,538 tonnes of glass bottles and jars annually through the
kerbside recycling collection service. This glass is processed by the contractor to remove
contaminants (e.g. small materials such as paper, plastic, metal) and transported to Southern
Aggregates Sandy Point facility where it is stockpiled awaiting use as a construction material.

The presence of glass in a commingled recycling bin, is a major contaminant for fibre. New
best practice recommends removing either fibre or glass from a commingled recycling bin to
overcome this issue.

Removing Glass

Glass is a heavy product and accounts for 44% of the weight in the kerbside recycling bin. There
are a number of options available for managing glass: (a) dispose of glass in the red
rubbish bin (b) separate kerbside glass collection service and (c) network or glass bottle
banks. Each of these options have their own pros and cons, and need to take into
consideration what would happen if a container return scheme was introduced.

Below is a table of approximate costs for the identified options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Rate increase per household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glass in red rubbish bin</td>
<td>$9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate glass collection service</td>
<td>$36.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass bottle bank</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more detailed investigation would be required to establish the true costs and actual
benefits before moving away from the current commingled glass service. This investigation
will be part of the review of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

Options

For future recycling services the options available for ICC are:

1. Continue to work through process commenced by WasteNet to seek a collaborative way
   forward, or
2. ICC make its own decision regarding recycling processing:
   a) Recycle or landfill
   b) Mix of recycling and landfilling
   c) Choice of service provider

CONCLUSION

WasteNet is working through a process of finding a way forward for a regional approach to
recycling. The situation is complex and considerable uncertainty exists in determining the
best course of action, particularly the difficulty in finding markets for recycled materials.

ICC should be aware of its options, including the possibility of continuing a service only for
ICC residents, continuing to work as part of WasteNet, and in either case possibly diverting
recyclables directly to landfill.
Decisions regarding future services should be made after WasteNet has had the opportunity to consult with its partner councils.

1 Excludes processing cost and capital investment for mobile bins.
TO: WASTE ADVISORY GROUP
FROM: CAMERON MCINTOSH, WASTENET SOUTHLAND REPRESENTATIVE
MEETING DATE: MONDAY 27 JANUARY 2020

RECYCLING ACCEPTANCE SERVICES

SUMMARY

The WasteNet Councils (Invercargill City Council, Southland District Council and Gore District Council) provide recycling and rubbish collection services to its communities. The collected recycling is processed under Contract 650 Recyclables Acceptance Service. This Contract expires on 30 June 2020. The purpose of this report is to request guidance from the Committee and member Councils on the principles which will determine future service provision.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the report “Recycling Acceptance Services” be received

AND THAT

The Waste Advisory Group confirm its position on the preferred principles guiding the future provision of recycling services with regard to:

- A regional approach to service provision
- Consistent with National initiatives
- Moving towards aligning contract renewal dates
- Consistent Levels of Service for all regional users
- Recognition that there is no economic value in the collection and processing of recyclables which are subsequently landfilled

AND THAT

The Waste Advisory Group seek guidance from Invercargill City Council, Southland District Council and Gore District Council on the preferred principles and options for the future procurement and service delivery for recycling processing.

BACKGROUND

Under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008, territorial authorities are responsible for promoting effective and efficient waste management and minimisation practices. The three territorial authorities in the Southland region (being Invercargill City Council, Southland District Council and Gore District Council) operating under the joint venture – WasteNet Southland – are collaboratively working together to achieve this outcome. There are a number of activities undertaken by WasteNet that contribute to the promotion of effective and efficient waste management and minimisation, including the provision of recycling services to the community.
Contract 550 Collection and Transfer Station Services

In 2010, the WasteNet Councils awarded Contract 550 Collection and Transfer Station Services to Bond Contracts Limited. The Contract commenced services on 1 May 2011 for Southland District Council, 1 July 2011 for Invercargill City Council and 1 July 2012 for Gore District Council.

The Contract term was 8-years and included a right of extension for a further 8-year term (or a maximum 16-year contract term). In 2018 WasteNet undertook negotiations with Bond Contracts Limited to extend the Contract under the renewal provision. The negotiations were successful and the right of renewal was granted. This Contract ends on 30 June 2027.

This contract includes the delivery, maintenance and emptying of the kerbside recycling mobile bins, and emptying of the WasteNet Councils recycling drop-off centres. The contents of the recycling bins are delivered to the nominated recycling process facility being Southland disAbility Enterprises Limited for processing under Contract 650.

Contract 650 Recyclables Acceptance Services


The Contract term of 8-years included a right of extension for a further 8-year term (or a maximum 16-year contract term). In 2018 WasteNet undertook negotiations with SDE to extend the Contract under the renewal provision, however these negotiations were unsuccessful. The Contract was to conclude on 30 June 2019, however by the mutual agreement of all parties, the contract was extended for a further 12-month period. The Contract now ends on 30 June 2020.

Request for Proposals Contract 850 Recyclables Acceptance Services

The Waste Advisory Group resolved at its 15 November 2018 Committee Meeting that WasteNet would commence a procurement process for recyclable acceptance services, following the unsuccessful contract extension negotiations with the incumbent service provider.

From November 2018 to December 2019, WasteNet and its partnering Councils undertook a request for proposals procurement process for recycling processing services. The procurement process ultimately concluded with no contract being awarded.

Recycling Commodity Market Situation

In September / October 2018, the Ministry for the Environment engaged consultants to provide reports on (a) Situational analysis of the New Zealand recycling market and (b) short and medium term response to China’s national sword. This section of the report provides a briefing from those reports and the Ministry’s waste work programme.

China had been the world’s largest importer of recyclable products, especially fibre (cardboard and paper) and plastics. In July 2017 China announced its intention to progressively withdraw trading in the global recyclable fibre and plastic markets in favour of their domestic sources. The result of China’s new policy has significantly decreased demand for recyclable commodities and lowered prices.
The International response has been to transfer trading to new markets; increase domestic capacity; and improve quality to meet China’s high quality standards. Finding new markets has been challenging, as the significant tonnage increase to non-China countries has not only created backlogs at seaports, in many cases the country’s reprocessing capacity did not match new demand. This has resulted in a number of countries following China’s lead and placing their own import restrictions on recyclables.

In New Zealand approximately half of all reclaimed fibre is sold offshore, as well as the majority of plastics and all metals. The New Zealand Government’s response is to:

- Identify the gaps in materials recovery and waste infrastructure where investment is needed.
- Review kerbside collection and processing systems to identify how to increase the quality of recyclables and to ensure more materials can be recovered and recycled instead of going to landfill.
- Undertake feasibility studies around how to increase New Zealand’s fibre (paper and cardboard) processing and plastic reprocessing capacity.
- Examine how product stewardship for packaging can be used to ensure manufacturers consider what happens to packaging once a product is used by a consumer.
- Assess the options for shifting away from low value and difficult to recycle plastics, such as single-use plastic bags and other low volume and/or mixed materials. This could include regulations around ensuring plastic packaging is able to be recycled and/or require a portion of recycled content in packaging.
- Run an education campaign to help New Zealanders ‘recycle right’, and reduce the amount of recyclable materials going to landfill because of contamination.
- Develop model contracts for the sector to reduce contamination, increase transparency and to better accommodate fluctuations in market prices for recyclable materials.
- Develop a sustainable procurement plan and guidelines to encourage purchase of products made of recovered and recycled materials.

A number of New Zealand councils have amended their long-term recycling collection and processing contract to exclude plastics grades 3, 4, 6 and 7 as they are challenging to recycle anywhere in the world and often end up as waste.

**OPTIONS**

The current recycling processing services are being operated by way of contract extension which ends on 30 June 2020, after which no service arrangements exist for the WasteNet Councils. The recycling collection service delivery arrangements for the WasteNet Councils do not expire until 30 June 2027.

There is no clear direction on how WasteNet is to proceed with investigating the short-term and long-term options available to recycling processing service delivery for the WasteNet Councils.


WasteNet requires clarity from the WasteNet Councils on whether they want to continue working together on recycling processing service delivery.

The following identifies potential principles for consideration:
Regional Solid Waste Services

In principle, the WasteNet Councils agree that together they are able to provide cost effective and high quality waste management and minimisation services to the Southland region. Individually the WasteNet Councils are challenged by economies of scale, distance from markets and attracting high quality tenderers. Collectively they are able to overcome these challenges for the betterment of their communities.

Example: Section 17A 2016.

In principle, the WasteNet Councils agree that together they are well-resourced to jointly procure services to achieve waste management and minimisation objectives.

Example: Southland Regional Landfill; Contract 550 Collection and Transfer Station Services; Contract 650 Recyclables Acceptance Services.

In principle, the WasteNet Councils agree to work towards alignment of solid waste contracts by 2027, to permit a regional procurement process for a combined package of solid waste services. It will provide high quality, cost effective and consistent approach to solid waste levels of service in the region.

Example: Queenstown Lakes District Council has one contractor provide their solid waste services which includes – kerbside landfill-rubbish collection and disposal; separate commingled and glass recycling collections and processing; public place waste management; facility upgrades; management and operations; data management; remote collections and waste education.

National Initiatives

In principle, the WasteNet Councils support national initiatives that are mutually beneficial for all parties.

Example: The Ministry for the Environment is developing model contracts for the sector to reduce contamination, increase transparency and to better accommodate fluctuations in market prices for recyclable materials.

Level of Service

In principle, the WasteNet Councils agree there is value in providing the same solid waste levels of service to the community. Short term options which divert some recyclables directly to landfill should be “easy to understand”, consistent and reversible.

In principle, the WasteNet Councils agree there is no economic value in the collection and sorting of recyclables which are subsequently landfilled.

Example: In 2018/2019 contamination in the kerbside recycling mobile bin service weighed 1,150 tonnes and cost the WasteNet Councils collectively $276,000. The direct cost to landfill for this weight is $120,750.

CONCLUSION

The WasteNet Councils (Invercargill City Council, Southland District Council and Gore District Council) provide recycling and rubbish collection services to its communities. The collected recycling is processed under Contract 650 Recyclables Acceptance Service. This Contract expires on 30 June 2020.
There are no recycling processing service delivery arrangements for the WasteNet Councils after 30 June 2020. However the recycling collection service delivery arrangements for the WasteNet Councils do not expire until 30 June 2027.


WasteNet requires clarity from the WasteNet Councils on whether they want to continue working together on recycling processing service delivery.