From: Jenny Lapham
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 Request re sealing of Portobello Road
Date: Monday, 24 May 2021 02:45:00 p.m.
Attachments: image001.png

Dear [redacted]

I refer to your e-mail of 20 March 2021 to Mayor Hawkins (see below), requesting information regarding the resealing of Portobello Road. Your request was forwarded to the Council team, who responds to requests for Official Information and I advise that your request has been considered under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987. Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to your request.

The information you have requested is inserted below in red to assist with the clarity of our response.

Regards

Jennifer Lapham
Governance Support Officer
Civic

P 03 4774000 | **E** **Jenny.Lapham@dcc.govt.nz**
Dunedin City Council, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin
PO Box 5045, Dunedin 9054
New Zealand
www.dunedin.govt.nz

From: [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, 20 March 2021 6:35 p.m.
To: Mayor
Subject: FW: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 Request

Dear Sir

I sent you an email requesting information on 12 February. I have not had the courtesy of a reply from you but did receive a response from one of your staff (who is not an elected official). Her response concerning the re sealing of Portobello Road did not really answer my question. I have sought clarification but have received no reply. I shall therefore again ask my question pursuant to the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act and would be obliged if you would answer.

While Jennifer Lapham has stated the technical reason for applying the resealing I have the following questions:

1 Why was the resealing not completed before the walk/cycle way was officially opened by you?

The second coat reseal was not required to open the project for public use, therefore an official opening was able to take place.

2 Was the resealing planned as part of the original contract? Could you provide evidence that this was the case?

The second coat seal was not part of the Peninsula Widening Project. It was part of the Council's capital renewals programme for second coat seals. These are applied to first coat seals within approximately a year, the purpose of which is to enhance the waterproofness of the first seal and to ensure the durability of the seal (which should last up to 15 years depending on traffic volumes etc). You may reference the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) Chipseal Selection Chapter Six 6.2 and Chapter 3 3.7.4

3 Was the failure not to complete the resealing an oversight by DCC or their contractor?

There was no oversight or project failure. The second coat seal needs to be applied approximately one year after the first seal, this is industry best practice.

4 Was the cycle/walk way completed within budget?

Yes, the project was completed within budget.

5 Did the "final" resealing add additional costs to the budget?

As advised in question 2, the second coat seal is part of the capital renewals programme for second coat seals, not part of the project budget.

6 Who undertook project management of the construction of the cycle/walkway?

Fulton Hogan was the Contractor, GHD was the Design Engineer and Bonisch Consultants was the Project Manager.

7 Is the cycle/walkway fully compliant with the conditions of the resource consent issued for its construction?

Yes, the cycle/walkway is compliant with the conditions of the resource consent issued for its construction.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 16 March 2021 13:38
To: 'Jenny Lapham' <Jenny.Lapham@dcc.govt.nz>
Cc: 'mayor@dcc.govt.nz' <mayor@dcc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 Request

Dear Jennifer Lapham

Thank you for your email which I discovered today in my "Junk Mail folder"?? Because I did not appear to have received a reply on time I have made a complaint to the Ombudsman which I have now withdrawn.

In regard to the resealing of Portobello Road - Was this included in the original project plan and was it included in the original budget? Or, was it an oversight that is now being corrected?

In regard to my other questions I am puzzled by your belief that a search through a large quantity of information is required? Questions 1-4 of my request can be answered very simply by your testing laboratory, the answers are informative requiring no research. Question 5 is simply about Council process requiring Yes/No answer and whether procedures were followed? No searching through large quantities of information is required? It is concerning that you believe I am seeking a large quantity of official information. The information I am seeking should be at Council's finger tips and require no research. It suggests that DCC does not really understand what it is doing? Your website information does not provide any information relevant to my questions? I shall look forward to a better response from you in due course; please advise me of the date when that response can be expected?

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Jenny Lapham [mailto:Jenny.Lapham@dcc.govt.nz]
Sent: 12 March 2021 13:07
To: [redacted]
Subject: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 Request

Dear [redacted]

I refer to your e-mail of 12 February seeking information relating to sealing of Portobello Road and the water issues in Karitane, Waikouaiti and Hawksbury.

In regards to Portobello Road you asked why the section of Portobello Road between Anderson Bay Road and Challis was resealed again.

The Transport team advise that a second coat seal is applied to the road to enhance the waterproofness of the first seal. This surface will typically be durable and last for 8 to 15 years. Leaving just the first coast would lead to early potholing and further problems with the road pavement.

In response to your request relating to the elevated lead levels in the Waikouaiti/Karitane and Hawksbury water supply for information relating to testing of the water supply you are advised that your request involves a search through a large quantity of information and currently the staff required to undertake this search are involved in the response and investigation to identify the cause of lead levels in the water. The same staff are likely to also be required to respond to the Rapid Review by the Minister of Health over the next few weeks. Therefore, pursuant to section 14 (1)(a) of LGOIMA, because your request is for a large quantity of official information, or necessitates a search through a large quantify of information, meeting the usual time limit for a decision on this request would unreasonably interfere with the operations of the local authority, we have extended the time to respond to your request until the conclusion of the Rapid Review, estimated to be late March.

However, the Council has already put a substantial amount of information on the Council

website, including the test results and you may find this of interest. It can be viewed via the following link:

https://www.dunedin.govt.nz/news-and-events/public-notices/alerts/water-notice

As we have extended the time to respond to your request you are advised that you have a right to seek a review of this decision by the Office of the Ombudsman.

Jennifer Lapham
Governance Support Officer
Civic

P 03 4774000 | **E** **Jenny.Lapham@dcc.govt.nz**
Dunedin City Council, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin
PO Box 5045, Dunedin 9054
New Zealand
www.dunedin.govt.nz

DCC Main Page