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Memo

16 September 2019

To: Helgard Wagener – Relationship Manager Aotea / Great Barrier and Waiheke

cc: Izzy Fordham – Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board
Luke Coles – Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board

From: Jacqui Fyers – Senior Local Board Advisor, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board

Subject: Urgent decision request of the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board

Purpose
The purpose of this memo is to initially seek the local board relationship manager’s authorisation to commence the urgent decision-making process and if granted, seek formal approval from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) to use the process to make an urgent decision.

The urgent decision being sought needs to be authorised by the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) by signing this memo. The decision required, and the supporting memo, are attached to this memo (Attachment A).

Both memos will be reported as an information item at the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board’s final business meeting on Tuesday 17 September, if the urgent decision-making process proceeds.

Reason for the urgency
The Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board had requested an update on the costs of the cemetery project

The information was provided at the board workshop on Tuesday 10 September. Now the board need to resolve the decisions from that workshop noting that this is the final business meeting for the 2016/2019 term.

The reason for the urgency is that the board are required to allocate funding to cover the current overspend in budget and to provide direction as to whether to proceed with the shoring trial option.

The next ordinary business meeting is in the new electoral term in November 2019.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)
That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) approve an amendment to the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board 2019 – 2022 Community Facilities Work Programme to allocate Local Improvement Project budget of $37,698 in FY2019 / 2020 for capital expenditure for the Claris Cemetery project to cover the overspend and to carry out a trial of shoring equipment.
Background

1. In July 2015 the local board obtained authority for cemetery development on the island and in December that year approved the investigation of sites in the Okiwi and Claris areas that might be suitable for cemeteries.

2. In February 2017 the local board selected Crossroads Reserve on Whangaparapara Road opposite the sports club for further detailed investigation.

3. A resource consent to develop a cemetery was applied for in January 2019 and is now nearing completion, with some questions from the Duty Commissioner still to be resolved.

4. A proposed change to the reserve classification of Crossroads Reserve was publicly notified in March 2019 to reclassify the land under the Reserves Act and subsequently approved.

5. The total budget allocated to date is $100,000. The total spend has been $127,698. The current overspend of $27,698 is related to necessary investigation, resource consent and change of land designation costs.

6. The recommended option for the construction of the cemetery is a modified earthworks design with temporary shoring, which balances cost and functionality. This should be contingent on a trial of the proposed shoring methodology. This trial is estimated at $10,000.

7. A total of $37,698 of Local Improvement Project funding is recommended to cover the overspend and to carry out a trial of shoring equipment in the current financial year.
Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process

Signed by Helgard Wagener
Relationship Manager, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board 16/09/2019 Date

Approval to use the urgent decision-making process

Izzy Fordham
Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board 17/09/2019 Date

Luke Coles
Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board 17/09/2019 Date

Aotea / Great Local board Resolution/s

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) approve an amendment to the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board 2019 – 2022 Community Facilities Work Programme to allocate Local Improvement Project budget of $37,698 in FY2019 / 2020 for capital expenditure for the Claris Cemetery project to cover the overspend and to carry out a trial of shoring equipment.

Izzy Fordham
Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board 17/09/2019 Date

Luke Coles
Deputy Chairperson, Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board 17/09/2019 Date
Memorandum

12 September 2019

To: Aotea Great Barrier Local Board
CC: Jody Morley, Manager Project Delivery
     Katrina Morgan, Work Programme Lead
     Rodney Klaassen, Stakeholder Advisor
     Jestine Joseph, Finance Advisor

Subject: Breakdown of costs for Claris Cemetery project

From: Michael Cairns, Senior Project Manager

Purpose

1. To provide an explanation of the costs related to the Claris Cemetery project, as requested by the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board at the workshop on 13 August 2019. In particular:
   a. A breakdown of all past and forecast costs.
   b. What are the options for the construction of the cemetery?

Summary

2. The capital budget allocated from financial year 2016 / 2017 to financial year 2019 / 2020 totals $100,000.

3. Discretionary capital costs incurred from 1 July 2016 to 2 September 2019 total $127,698.

4. There are additional provisional costs of about $20,000 in the current financial year.

5. The recommended option for the construction of the cemetery is a modified earthworks design with temporary shoring, which balances cost and functionality. This should be contingent on a trial of the proposed shoring methodology. The shelter feature should be excluded at this stage to offset the additional provisional costs. Additional budget of $330,000 will be sought from the board’s Local Improvement Project funding to undertake the next stage including physical works.

6. Other design options for the cemetery are estimated to cost from $260,000 to $550,000.

7. The current overspend of $27,698 is related to necessary investigation, resource consent and change of land designation costs. Expenses will reduce when a refund is received for the unused portion of the ‘notified deposit’ for the resource consent application. A total of $37,698 of Local Improvement Project funding is recommended to cover the overspend and to carry out a trial of shoring equipment in the current financial year.

8. Importing fill from the isthmus is unlikely, but if necessary, it would add an estimated $85,000 to the recommended option.

9. The main political risks and mitigations for this project are:
   a. There is a risk of not meeting the expectations of the public to create a centrally located cemetery on Great Barrier. Public consultation has indicated support for a new cemetery at this location.
   b. There is risk of cost over runs prior to making the cemetery operational. For instance, although unlikely, if a suitable source of fill was not available from the island this would add...
considerable expense. The current cost estimate was prepared by a well-respected cost management firm and reviewed by the Community Facilities quantity surveyor team.

- Once the cemetery has been opened to the public, there is risk of operating problems, particularly problems that impact on people mourning the loss of a loved one. The current operating practices for cemeteries on Great Barrier are intended to continue, except for the proposed use of temporary shoring for the excavation of graves. An onsite trial of the temporary shoring methodology is proposed.

Context

10. For many years now Great Barrier Island residents have asked for cemeteries to be developed in the north and centre of the island so people can be remembered in their own communities.

11. In July 2015 the local board obtained authority for cemetery development on the island and in December that year approved the investigation of sites in the Okiwi and Claris areas that might be suitable for cemeteries. In February 2017 the local board selected Crossroads Reserve on Whangaparapara Road opposite the sports club for further detailed investigation.

12. A resource consent to develop a cemetery was applied for in January 2019 and is now nearing completion, with some questions from the Duty Commissioner still to be resolved.

13. A proposed change to the reserve classification of Crossroads Reserve was publicly notified in March 2019 to reclassify the land under the Reserves Act and subsequently approved.

Discussion

14. The following table shows a breakdown of the budget allocated to the project and the actual expenditure since 1 July 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Allocated Dept Budget</th>
<th>Year to Date Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$7,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$38,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$92,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-$10,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$127,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. The following table shows a breakdown of actual costs to date, additional provisional costs and an estimate for essentially construction costs for the recommended option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approx. date of purchase</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ACTUAL COSTS TO DATE</strong> (about 1 Jul 2016 to 12 Aug 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site investigation and assessment of site options, cemetery investigation, including specialist reports for geotechnical, stormwater, traffic, flooding, survey and planning assessments. Developed design of the cemetery including documentation for resource consent application. Provision of a cost estimate for the proposed works by a quantity surveyor. Resource consent fees and professional fees.</td>
<td>$127,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL PROVISIONAL COSTS</strong> (for the 2019 / 2020 financial year)</td>
<td>Rough Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial of shoring</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duty Commissioner requests (disposal location, truck movements, stockpiles, source of fill)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design changes</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testing of fill</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possible legal fees for change of designation</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE</strong></td>
<td>Quantity Surveyor Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the recommended option i.e. minimum cut/fill, shoring shield, basic shelter, provisional sums for stabilised construction entrance and kerbing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Plant Requirements - assumes plant on GBI</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civils - cut, fill, sediment control</td>
<td>$92,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access road - including drainage</td>
<td>$38,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelter - basic structure</td>
<td>$16,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burial area - octagonal ash plots, basic fencing, trench shield</td>
<td>$25,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaping - mulch, native vegetation, planting</td>
<td>$19,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety notices</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor Costs - site costs, material deliveries, safety, margin</td>
<td>$52,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous - professional fees, consenting, stakeholder engagement, contingency, rounding</td>
<td>$76,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$477,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Most expenses to date have been spent on consultant fees to undertake design and specialist investigations to satisfy the regulatory requirements for the resource consent application. This includes specialist disciplines for archaeological, land surveying, planning, CAD draughting, geotechnical, stormwater, traffic, flooding, environmental, quantity surveying and project management. To obtain a resource consent and to a lesser extent a simultaneous change of land designation, it has meant committing to these specialist disciplines that are determined by the Resource Management Act process and are unavoidable.

17. Current expenses include a ‘notified deposit’ of $17,392 to cover the internal processing fees for the resource consent. As public hearings were not required, a refund will be received from this deposit when the application is finalised shortly. This refund will reduce the current overspend, however the amount cannot be determined at this stage.

18. As shown in the above table, there are several unexpected provisional costs that could potentially occur in the current financial year. These need to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, if they occur.

19. It is expected that suitable hardfill will be available free of charge from an existing stockpile, such as Claris Airfield, Claris Landfill, Okiwi Airfield, Blackwell Quarry (surplus over burden material is expected to be available shortly), or possibly from local farmland. Transport costs are included in the estimates for the supply of fill.

20. Importing fill from the isthmus is undesirable due to the risk of ecological contamination and high cost. This is estimated to add $65,000 to the recommended option shown above or an additional $170,000 to the cost of the initial design option i.e. option 1, shown below.

21. The various options investigated for the design and construction of the cemetery include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Initial design – to remove existing fill and replace with suitable fill (2.0 to 2.5m of cut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Modified design with concrete vaults (permanent blockwork retaining)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Modified initial design (raised ground level, reduced cut depths generally 1.8m and exclusions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Modified minimal earthworks design and temporary shoring - recommended (minimum cut/fill, shoring shield, optional basic shelter, includes provisional sums for stabilised construction entrance and kerbing etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Modified design with no shelter (no provisional items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Modified design with temporary shoring (no provisional sums)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Modified design with no shelter and only ecoburials (use Gooseberry Flat Cemetery for grave burials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Modified design for half site and no shelter (staged site development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Modified design with temporary shoring, no shelter or provisional stabilised construction entrance and kerbing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. The recommended design option, that includes temporary shoring, has evolved from the previous designs primarily to reduce the cost of the earthworks. Costs have been reduced by minimising the cut and fill on site, which is achieved by raising the final ground level and reducing the depth of imported fill. This option includes an allowance to purchase custom made shoring equipment and would be a fully functional cemetery when complete.
23. It is difficult to estimate a time frame to deliver this project due to many external factors, including:
   • formal budget approval to continue this project
   • resolving the outstanding resource consent issues (expected shortly)
   • the outcome of the proposed testing for shoring
   • securing suitable fill material
   • redesign unknowns
   • building consent unknowns
   • construction contractor availability.

24. With timely resolution of the above, the design and specification could be completed by the end of 2019 and the building consent submitted. The next step would be the procurement of a contractor in the new year, then construction starting shortly after. Construction is estimated to take about three months to complete, depending on the resources that the contractor has available.

25. However, delays with any of the mentioned issues could cause significant delays to the project.

Next steps

26. The local board to give direction on:
   • whether to proceed with this project, considering the current cost estimates and benefits
   • the preferred construction option for the cemetery.

27. A report will then be submitted at the next available business meeting seeking formal approval of the required budget to complete the project.

28. Completion of the design stage, including:
   • resolve outstanding resource consent issues
   • confirm an appropriate source of fill
   • complete the detailed design and specifications
   • lodge a building consent for the earthworks and potentially the shelter
   • prepare tender documentation
   • call for tenders.

29. A memo will be provided to the local board outlining the preferred tenderer and price for construction, seeking local board feedback and direction.

30. Following tender negotiations and a contractual agreement, construction of the cemetery can commence.

Recommendation

That the local board approve an amendment to the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board 2019 – 2022 Community Facilities Work Programme to allocate Local Improvement Project budget of $37,698 in FY2019 / 2020 for capital expenditure for the Claris Cemetery project to cover the overspend and to carry out a trial of shoring equipment.

Attachments

Nil
To: Aotea Great Barrier Local Board

Funding Agreement 5 April 2019 – Glenfern Sanctuary – Education and Research Business Case – Interim Report

The Glenfern Trust (the Trust) was highly appreciative of the Local Board grant of $80,000 for the business case for an education and research centre (the Centre) at Glenfern Sanctuary. The Trust provides this interim report on the initial work on the business case for the proposed Centre.

Envirostrat Report

The Glenfern Trust used as its start point for the business case work the executive summary of the Envirostrat Education/Research Centre Feasibility Report. That report defined the Centre as comprising “a number of buildings including residential facilities, a separate accommodation block for Glenfern volunteers and a visitor centre/research centre available to the local community”.

Key sponsors

The Envirostrat report identified the following organisations as those most likely to have a lead role in the Centre:

- Glenfern Trust as manager of Glenfern Sanctuary and primary sponsor of the visitor/research centre and volunteer accommodation;
- Auckland Council as owner of Glenfern Sanctuary;
- Hillary Outdoors as primary sponsor of the student residential facility;
- An anchor tenant for the residential facility (yet to be identified).

The Trust has closely involved Council and Hillary Outdoors in the work to date and will continue to do so going forward.

Desired outcome of current business case phase

A business case for the Centre which is ready for submission to potential funders requires:

- design of the buildings sufficient for an application for planning consent;
- costings sufficiently detailed for the financial base for a business case;
- a fully developed and detailed business case;
- (ideally) a successful planning consent.

Progress to date

The first step for the Trust was to identify the preferred location for each of the buildings. That took time. While a site has been confirmed for the student residential facility, the sites of the other components of the Centre have yet to be finalized.
At the same time as site identification, the Trust has taken steps to engage Strachan Group (recently designed and project managed the lodge on Motu Kaikoura Island) to provide concept designs of the buildings. Other consultants have been engaged for design of services, survey, geo-tech and planning. A pre-app planning meeting has been held with Council. That meeting indicated that consenting of the Centre at Glenfern is achievable. An archeological/historical survey of Glenfern has been commissioned by the Trust.

Next steps

Concept design and services design will commence in October along with the preparation of business cases for the buildings.

The Trust intends to engage Envirostrat to assist with preparation of the business case for the visitor centre/research centre.

Budget

A budget has been prepared for the current phase of work streams required to prepare a business case. That budget shows a likely total of $120k - $140k to achieve a consented project with business case ready for submission to funders. The Trust is taking steps to seek the additional funding required to supplement the Local Board grant.

To date, $20,000 (approx) of the grant has been spent on fees paid to the planner, Strachan Group and Council for the pre-app meeting and report.

Timetable

By December concept plans should be finalized and outline business plans prepared. However the project will stretch into 2020 given the goal of achieving consents for the buildings.

Reporting to the Local Board.

The Funding Agreement required an interim report to the Local Board by 30 July. This report is late due to the late documentation of the Funding Agreement and the time taken by the Trust to finalise sites for the proposed buildings. The Funding Agreement provides for a final report to the Local Board by Dec 2019. The Trust seeks an extension of that date to 30 June 2020 to allow for the time required for the consenting process. In the meantime, the Trust proposes to provide a further interim report to the Local Board in Dec 2019.

Please advise if the Local Board would like more detail on any of the above.

Thank you again on behalf of the Glenfern Trust for the grant.

Sincerely

Rupert Wilson
Trustee