

HUTT CITY COUNCILKOMITI RATONGA O TE AWA KAIRANGI
HUTT VALLEY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held in the Hutt City Council Chambers,
2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt on
Friday 8 March 2024 commencing at 9:30 am

PRESENT: Cr T Stallinger, HCC (Chair) Cr B Griffiths, UHCC (Deputy Chair)
Cr B Dyer, HCC Mayor W Guppy, UHCC
Cr C Parkin, HCC Cr C Carson, UHCC
Cr H Newell, UHCC

APOLOGIES: Cr N Shaw, HCC

IN ATTENDANCE: B Hodgins, Strategic Advisor, HCC (part meeting)
A Geddes, Director Environment and Sustainability
J Scherzer, Head of Climate and Solid Waste (part meeting)
B Latimer, Parks and Reserves Manager, UHCC
G Wild, Acting Director Asset Management and Operations,
UHCC
K Stannard, Head of Democratic Services

PUBLIC BUSINESS**1. OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA TIMATANGA**

Whakataka te hau ki te uru	<i>Cease the winds from the west</i>
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga	<i>Cease the winds from the south</i>
Kia mākinakina ki uta	<i>Let the breeze blow over the land</i>
Kia mātaratara ki tai	<i>Let the breeze blow over the ocean</i>
E hī ake ana te atakura	<i>Let the red-tipped dawn come with a sharpened air.</i>
He tio, he huka, he hau hū	<i>A touch of frost, a promise of a glorious day.</i>
Tihei mauri ora.	

2. APOLOGIES

RESOLVED: (Cr Stallinger/Cr Parkin)

Minute No. HVSC 24101

“That the apology received from Cr Shaw, Hutt City Council be accepted and leave of absence be granted.”

3. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND DEPUTY CHAIR

The Director Environment and Sustainability, Hutt City Council (HCC), acting under delegated authority from the Chief Executive, HCC, called for nominations for the position of Chair. Cr Griffiths nominated Cr Stallinger for the position and Cr Newell seconded the motion. The Director Environment and Sustainability, HCC, then asked if there were any other nominations, and as there were none, she put the motion to a vote.

RESOLVED: (Cr Griffiths/Cr Newell)

Minute No. HVSC 24102

"That Cr Stallinger be declared Chair of the Hutt Valley Services Committee until the end of 2024."

Cr Stallinger assumed the Chair.

The Chair called for nominations for the position of Deputy Chair. The Chair nominated Cr Griffiths and Cr Dyer seconded the motion. The Chair then asked if there were any other nominations and, as there were none, he put the motion to a vote.

RESOLVED: (Cr Stallinger/Cr Dyer)

Minute No. HVSC 24103

"That Cr Griffiths be declared Deputy Chair of the Hutt Valley Services Committee until the end of 2024."

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Comments are recorded under the item to which they relate.

5. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

There were no conflict of interest declarations.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED: (Cr Stallinger/Cr Griffiths)

Minute No. HVSC 24104

"That the minutes of the meeting of the Hutt Valley Services Committee held on Friday, 24 November 2023, be confirmed as a true and correct record."

7. WASTEWATER JOINT VENTURE UPDATE - 1 NOVEMBER 2023 TO 31 JANUARY 2024

Report No. HVSC2024/1/57 by the Strategic Advisor, Hutt City Council

Speaking under public comment, **Danielle Wills** talked about the issue of the odour coming from the Seaview Wastewater Treatment Plant (the plant) and how it was affecting the community. She expressed her disappointment with Wellington Water Limited (WWL) for not addressing the issue and ignoring her complaints. She said the lack of response from WWL had made her feel forgotten and ignored.

In response to a question from a member, Danielle Wills elaborated on the number of times she had reported issues regarding the odour. She explained that she had already brought it up with WWL but had not been added to the mailing list.

Blair Johnson, Head of Waste Water Contract, Gary Cullen, Head of Major Projects and Tim Blackman, Senior Advisor Resource Management and Environment from (WWL) were in attendance for the item.

The Strategic Advisor, HCC elaborated on the report. He addressed the concerns of Seaview residents and workers regarding the odour issue in the area, noting that they were taken seriously. He said he would follow up with WWL about adding the public speaker to the mailing list.

The Head of Waste Water Contract, WWL, emphasised that HCC had directed WWL to start the work on the plant immediately instead of waiting until July 2024. He also provided information about the public meeting on 21 March 2024.

In response to questions from members, the Strategic Advisor, HCC, promised to follow up with WWL regarding the delay in responses and upcoming events and would report back to the next meeting.

In response to questions from members, the Head of the Waste Water Contract, WWL stated that he could not provide the costs associated with the infringement notices. He said he would follow up and ensure that the plant information was updated on WWL's website. He advised that the odour problem had been a long-term issue and WWL was working to improve its communication with the community. He highlighted they had a draft communications plan expected to be finalised shortly. He advised that WWL recognised from the last public meeting that there was a gap in their communications and the communication plan was created to address it. He noted that the communications plan would be implemented immediately and available to the community this month.

In response to questions from members, the Strategic Advisor, HCC, advised that the plant equipment had reached its end-of-life stage and that investment would be required in the next few years. He highlighted that members considered a report at its meeting outlining the plant's plan for the next 10 years.

In response to a question from a member, the Head of Major Projects, WWL, stated that the project plan would be fast tracked if necessary.

In response to a member's question, the Senior Advisor for Resource Management and

Environment provided the timeframe for the resource consent.

Mayor Guppy expressed concern regarding the role of Veolia in this matter.

Cr Carson proposed that officers report back on the plant's history and plans, communication relating to odour complaints and and capital investment plans.

RESOLVED: (Cr Carson/Cr Stallinger)

Minute No. HVSC 24105

"That the Committee:

- (1) receives and notes the information in the report; and*
- (2) asks officers to report to the next meeting on:*
 - (a) the history and plans relating to odour complaints at the Seaview Treatment Plant;*
 - (b) an update on the communication relating to odour complaints and*
 - (c) details of capital investment plans for the following 10 years."*

8. UPDATE ON SILVERSTREAM LANDFILL AND RESOURCE RECOVERY

Report No. HVSC2024/1/20 by the Manager Waste Minimisation, Hutt City Council

The Head of Climate and Solid Waste, HCC elaborated on the report.

In response to questions from members, the Head of Climate and Solid Waste, HCC, explained that the identification of lizards on the site had led to additional requirements in the process. However, he assured members that officers were still on track with the construction phase. He advised that officers were monitoring and managing the applications for special waste.

In response to questions from a member, the Head of Climate and Solid Waste at HCC clarified that they could stop accepting PFAS contaminated soil, but if they did, they would need to find an alternative solution for disposing of the soil. He explained that leaving it untreated could contaminate groundwater and that disposing it in the Silverstream landfill would be the safer option. He stated that officers were exploring emerging technologies to deal with PFAS contamination and collaborating with a private company to trial these new technologies potentially.

In response to a question from a member, the Director Environment and Sustainability, HCC stated that the officers were working with the residents of Manor Park. She pointed out that there was a misunderstanding regarding the resource consents. She mentioned that a public meeting was held to discuss the matter, and the residents were provided with communication updates.

RESOLVED: (Cr Stallinger/Cr Griffiths)

Minute No. HVSC 24106

"That the Committee receives and notes the report."

9. AKATĀRAWA CEMETERY UPDATE

Report No. HVSC2024/1/21 by the Parks and Reserves Manager, Upper Hutt City Council

Under public comment members read a statement from **Daniel Chrisp** attached as pages 7-8 to the minutes.

The Parks and Reserves Manager, UHCC, introduced Gunther Wild, Acting Director Asset Management and Operations, UHCC.

The Acting Director Asset Management and Operations, UHCC, said he met with the Head of Parks and Reserves, HCC. He said they discussed the timeline for reviewing the Akatārawa Cemetery agreement and the need for more detailed work on the cemetery development. He would report back in the next few months.

The Parks and Reserves Manager, UHCC, elaborated on the report. He advised that he was uncertain about Daniel Chrisp's concerns and that their figures differed.

The Chair informed members that the officers would address the concerns and questions raised by Daniel Chrisp.

In response to questions from members, the Parks and Reserves Manager, UHCC, stated that he was unaware of the timeline for the Akatārawa Cemetery agreement review and was awaiting a response from the Head of Parks and Reserves, HCC. He advised that he would provide a breakdown of the number of plots, but that depended on the availability of land and what was suitable for double interments.

Cr Carson proposed that members receive a report outlining the terms of reference and timeframe for completing the Akatārawa Cemetery agreement review.

RESOLVED: (Cr Stallinger/Mayor Guppy)

Minute No. HVSC 24107

"That the Committee receives the report."

RESOLVED: (Cr Carson/Cr Dyer)

Minute No. HVSC 24108

"That the Committee asks officers to report back to the next meeting on the Terms of Reference, including reviewing the structure and timeline for the completion of the Akatārawa Cemetery agreement review."

10. **HUTT VALLEY SERVICES COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME 2024**

Report No. HVSC2024/1/22 by the Senior Democracy Advisor

RESOLVED: (Cr Stallinger/Cr Newell)

Minute No. HVSC 24109

"That the Committee receives and notes the Forward Programme for 2024 attached as Appendix 1 to the memorandum."

11. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

12. **CLOSING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA**

Unuhia!	<i>Release us from the supreme sacredness of our tasks</i>
Unuhia!	<i>To be clear and free</i>
Unuhia i te uru-tapu-nui	<i>in heart, body and soul in our continuing journey</i>
Kia wātea, kia māmā	<i>Oh Rongo, raise these words up high</i>
Te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua i te ara	<i>so that we be cleansed and be free,</i>
takatū	<i>Yes indeed, we are free!</i>
Koia rā e Rongo whakairihia ake ki	<i>Good and peaceful</i>
runga	
Kia wātea, kia wātea!	
Ae rā, kua wātea!	
Hau, pai mārire.	

There being no further business the Chair declared the meeting closed at 10.48pm.

Cr T Stallinger
CHAIR

CONFIRMED as a true and correct record
Dated this 3rd day of May 2024

Firstly thank you to the officers who have worked hard on this project and from the report I can see they are keeping within budget also. Cemetery planning projects are far more complex than people realize.

I do have further concerns after looking at today's report and update.

Point 8 on the report states that they expect 1.5 ha per decade for burial space for all 5 stages.

It is important to note that neither council has approved stage 3 - 5 construction. So based on previous presentations and figures provided to the Services Committee - stages 1 and 2 only provide 2.2 ha of burial space, so the forecasted capacity for this report would be 14 years for stages 1 and 2? this number is different from previous reports stating at least 25 years for stage 1 and 2? why is there such a large gap and discrepancy in these reports and calculations? Even if we add the stage 3 area that would only add less than 10 years based on today's report (1.3ha in stage 3)

These kinds of discrepancies make me doubt that the reports are being peer-reviewed by industry experts. but I may be missing key details, I genuinely hope I am wrong!

Point 9 covers plot sizes, it's good to see this information as it is vital to all burial capacity forecasting.

Industry best practice is for plots to be 4.5-5m². how have the plot sizes provided been calculated? For example, do they include the space taken up by concrete headbeams? If the head beams have not been included in the calculations - below is an example of how much that can throw out calculations for capacity reporting

Headbeam average size 0.7-0.9m².

using the larger plot size given - 4.0m² + 0.9m² is 4.9m².

1 hectare of land with 4.0m² plots would equal 2500 plots

1 hectare of land with 4.9m² plots would equal 2040 plots - a 20% difference.

The Key question then is why are the plot sizes given in this report smaller than the cemetery industry's best practice?

Furthermore, previous Lower Hutt council minutes concur that the industry's best practice is to invest in cemetery land development that provides for 50 years of capacity.

“This site (reynolds bach drive) would have a life expectancy of 34 to 39 years. An ideal site would provide for at least 50 years.” (2003) minutes

Even 30 years is a good minimum. with today's update, we are being informed that we are only getting 25 years of capacity for stages 1-3. At a cost of 11 million. Have officers provided reports to both Councils about best and worst-case scenarios for the projected capacity of the Akatarawa Cemetery Expansion? I understand with land development projects that there are always contingencies and no guarantees of numbers can be given until the project is finished, however, project managers should have accurate data to provide a range of best and worst-case scenarios for the development. The reports to date that have been brought to the committee have appeared too high level and don't provide enough detail to give the certainty required for such a sensitive project.

The larger issue for HCC still exists that the residents were never consulted on the future of their cemetery services, the minutes from a 2004 meeting confirm this

"No public consultation has been carried out as part of the investigations for a potential cemetery site"--

Tom Putawai has started a petition for the Council to take this issue more seriously and to exhaust all options before banking everything on Akatarawa Cemetery. The council needs to seriously consider the resident's well-being of forcing those who want burial to travel out of their hometown to do this. They also need to consider the risks they are accepting given the discrepancies evident in the Akatarara Cemetery Expansion project updates.

I would suggest that banking everything on Akatarawa Cemetery Development is simply kicking the can down the road and in 10 years all of these discussions will come back up. suitable land is only getting rarer and more expensive and I fear for the wellbeing of all Lower Hutt residents who will forever be forced to travel long distances to visit their loved ones who have passed. traveling out of the district should be an absolute last resort option for Council, I do not see enough evidence that HCC has exhausted all options. I would be happy if someone could provide me with this evidence.

I would like to know if Hutt City Council has ever done spatial mapping of land within the city to inform cemetery land options. Spatial mapping is typically the very first step in any new Cemetery land project plans. if they have, where are those documents?

Daniel Chrisp