

Laura Bowman

From: official information
Sent: Monday, 15 November 2021 2:53 pm
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: official information
Subject: FINAL RESPONSE - LGOIMA 21282 - [REDACTED] - Information around potential reports made regarding FMG Stadium, Seddon Park and Claudelands Events Centre.
Attachments: FINAL RESPONSE: LGOIMA 21283 - [REDACTED] - Information regarding potential reports made regarding FMG stadium.; RESPONSE: LGOIMA 21193 - [REDACTED] - Maintenance, Engineers and General Reports regarding Seddon Park.

Kia Ora,

I refer to your **information request below**, Hamilton City Council is able to provide the following response.

Your Request – Part 1 of 2:

The Venues, Tourism and Major Events consisting of Claudelands Events Centre, FMG Stadium Waikato, and Seddon Park in the Long Term Plans of 2015/26, 2018/28 and 2021/31 detail the expenditure of replacing of assets or building renewals. There is considerable increase costs as follows:

[Page 65 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDING IMPACT STATEMENT](#)

Capital expenditure: to replace existing assets: total of \$35,918,000 over the 10 year period 2015/16 – 2025/26
(2,818 - 2,104 - 2,512 - 2,171 - 3,756 - 6,519 - 5,022 - 5,126 - 3,426 - 2,464)

Please provide detail and cost(s) of assets that are to be replaced.

[Page 23 PROSPECTIVE VENUES, TOURISM AND MAJOR EVENTS FUNDING IMPACT STATEMENT](#)

Capital expenditure: to replace existing assets: total of \$42,038,000 over the 10 year period 2018/19 – 2028/29
(5,117 - 4,760 - 3,180 - 3,864 - 4,126 - 2,847 - 2,655 - 5,183 - 5,646 - 4,660)

Please detail the assets/issues that caused the \$6,129,000 (14.56%) increase cost(s)

[Page 50 Venues, Tourism and Major Events](#)

Capital expenditure: CE21011 - VTME building renewals: total of \$48,497 over the 10 year period 2018/19 – 2028/29
(5,558 - 6,290 - 236 - 5,045 - 5,285 - 1,738 - 6,178 - 10,203 - 5,472 - 2,492)

Please detail the assets/issues that caused a further \$6,459,000 (13.32%) increase cost(s)

Why was there a \$12,579,000 (25.94%) increase over the three Long Term Plans?

Our Response – Part 1 of 2:

Venues, Tourism and Major Events Group is responsible for the operation of event facilities (Claudelands Events and Conference Centre, FMG Stadium Waikato and Seddon Park). A key consideration of delivering this activity is Council's desired commitment to asset maintenance. This involves ensuring our venues (and internal assets associated with their use) are fit for purpose, meet our contractual obligations, meet market expectations and manage risks (health & safety, security, financial and reputational).

In respect to your comparison across the three 10-Year Plans (2015-25, 2018-28 and 2021-31), we would like to clarify that comparing these plan values from different ten-year periods does not accurately compare like with like. Each Long-Term Plan is prepared on a rolling three-year basis, meaning that the first three years drop off in the next plan and the last three years are added on (e.g., 2015-25 and 2018-28). This results in timing differences between plans which is a key driver of the increases. In addition, the differences between the plans are unequivocally driven by the movement of projects both in the past and looking forward, based on criticality and reprioritisation. Projects are removed and added back to 10-Year Plans on the same basis. The value of replacement also changes when updated information becomes available across plans. Many other factors drive increased renewals budgets. These include:

- Significant replacement value of assets
- Aging assets
- Historical underinvestment
- Assets with high usage
- Better asset information
- Price increases

- Compliance requirements i.e. seismic strengthening.

Your Request – Part 2 of 2:

Further to LOGIMA Reference No HCC-QF-210922-9Q0BI-QEL – What reports have been produced to support the expenditure of replacing of assets or building renewals of the Venues, Tourism and Major Events consisting of Claudelands Events Centre, FMG Stadium Waikato, and Seddon Park in the Long Term Plans of 2015/26, 2018/28 and 2021/31? Please forward all Maintenance, Engineer, and General reports that have been produced. What was/is the cost(s) of the report(s)? What is the cost of any work in the reports? Date range 1 July 2015 – 30 June 2021.

Our Response – Part 2 of 2:

In regards to your request for relevant reports (“..to support the expenditure of replacing assets or building renewals..”), please find below a list of the our 2015/25 Key Projects:

LTP Year	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23
Projects	FMG Stadium PA System	FMG Stadium Kitchen Upgrade	FMG Stadium Light Fittings		FMG Stadium Turf Replacement	FMG Stadium Sports Seating	FMG Stadium Kitchen Fitout	FMG Stadium Boiler
	FMG Stadium Data Network		FMG Stadium Data Network		Seddon Park Light Fitting	Claudelands Kitchen fitout	Willoughby Park Light Towers	
			Seddon Park Sight Screens		Seddon Park Seating Structure	Beetham Park Turf + Irrigation	FMG Stadium Sports Lights Head Frames	
						Seddon Park Irrigation		
						Claudelands Oval Drainage		

In regards to copies of any associated reports, we note that we have previously provided you with some of this data by way of our response (see attached) to:

- LGOIMA 21283 - [REDACTED] – “Information regarding potential reports made regarding FMG stadium”
- LGOIMA 21193 - [REDACTED] – “Maintenance, Engineers and General Reports regarding Seddon Park”

In respect of “provide any further reports”, please can we ask that you refine your request to the list above and resubmit a request as this will assist in our understanding of what details you are seeking and staff time spent on reviewing files and seeing if there are any associated reports.

If you would like to discuss any of this further, please call:

Sean Murray

General Manager, Venues Tourism and Major Events
Hamilton City Council



You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this decision. Information about how to make a complaint is available at www.ombudsman.parliament.nz or freephone 0800 802 602.


Kind Regards,

Tatiyana | Official Information & Legal Support Advisor
Legal Services & Risk | People and Organisational Performance
Email: officialinformation@hcc.govt.nz



Hamilton City Council | Private Bag 3010 | Hamilton 3240 | www.hamilton.govt.nz

[Like us on Facebook](#) [Follow us on Twitter](#)



From: Hamilton City Council <do.not.reply@hcc.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 September 2021 4:33 pm
To: official information <officialinformation@hcc.govt.nz>
Subject: HCC Website - Official Information Request ref: HCC-QF-210922-9Q0BI-QEL

HCC Website - Official Information Request

Reference: HCC-QF-210922-9Q0BI-QEL
Attachment: attached

Name: [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED]

Phone number: [REDACTED]

Detailed Description of Request

Long Term Plan(s) Increase of Costs Venues, Tourism and Major Events

Organisation: not supplied

Laura Bowman

From: official information
Sent: Thursday, 4 November 2021 3:45 pm
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: official information
Subject: FINAL RESPONSE: LGOIMA 21283 - [REDACTED] - Information regarding potential reports made regarding FMG stadium.
Attachments: Facilities - H3 FMG Stadium sports Lighting Renewal 4- LDP - DESK TOP STUDY.PDF

Kia Ora,

I refer to your **information request below**, Hamilton City Council is able to provide the following response.

Please find below, links to the external reports which you have requested. Based on your further clarification, we have only provided reports obtained between 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021.

If you would like to discuss this venue in further detail, please do not hesitate to contact:

Ben Slatter
Director of Operations, H3
[REDACTED]

Report Title	Date	Provider	Link to report	Cost of Report	
CONCEPTUAL PEER REVIEW REPORT For LIGHTING POLES At FMG STADIUM, HAMILTON, NZ	Aug 2020	Miyamoto	here	\$17,860	The l inc co
FIRE EVACUATION REPORT	Aug 2020	NZ Fire Service	here	\$175	
ASBESTOS REPORT	Nov 2020	About Safety Ltd	here	\$4,500	
FMG STADIUM – MEANS OF ESCAPE ASSESSMENT	Feb 2021	BCD	here	\$11,970	
FIRE SAFETY SURVEY REPORT WEL NETWORKS GRANDSTAND	May 2021	BCD	here	\$23,940	
EMERGENCY LIGHTING DESIGN WEL NETWORKS GRANDSTAND	May 2021	BCD	here	Included In above invoice	
FMG LED LIGHTING UPGRADE – SUMMARY	June 2021	LDP Limited	Attached	\$72,767	

You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this decision. Information about how to make a complaint is available at www.ombudsman.parliament.nz or freephone 0800 802 602.

Kind Regards,

Tatiyana | Official Information & Legal Support Advisor
Legal Services & Risk | People and Organisational Performance
Email: officialinformation@hcc.govt.nz



Hamilton City Council | Private Bag 3010 | Hamilton 3240 | www.hamilton.govt.nz

[Like us on Facebook](#) [Follow us on Twitter](#)

From: Hamilton City Council <do.not.reply@hcc.govt.nz>

Sent: Wednesday, 22 September 2021 2:45 pm

To: official information <officialinformation@hcc.govt.nz>

Subject: HCC Website - Official Information Request ref: HCC-QF-210922-8LLK6-JGV

HCC Website - Official Information Request

Reference: HCC-QF-210922-8LLK6-JGV

Attachment: not attached

Name: [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED]

Phone number: [REDACTED]

Detailed Description of Request

FMG Stadium

What reports:

- Maintenance, Engineer, and General have been produced for FMG Stadium?

Please forward all reports.

What was/is the cost(s) of the report(s)?

What is the cost of any work in the reports?

Organisation: not supplied

FMG Stadium Lighting Upgrade – Progress Report

Prepared for

Hamilton City Council



INDEPENDENT ELECTRICAL & ILLUMINATION ENGINEERS

LDP Limited
L1 B:HIVE, Smales Farm T: +64 9 414 1004
74 Taharoto Rd E: info@ldp.nz
Auckland 0622 New Zealand W: www.ldp.nz



INDEPENDENT ELECTRICAL & ILLUMINATION ENGINEERS

LDP Limited
L1 B:HIVE, Smales Farm **T:** +64 9 414 1004
74 Taharoto Rd **E:** info@ldp.nz
Auckland 0622 New Zealand **W:** www.ldp.nz



DOCUMENT VERSION HISTORY

Revision	Prepared By	Description	Date
1	[REDACTED]	Issue for client review	16/04/2021

DOCUMENT QUALITY CONTROL

Action	Name	Signed	Date
Prepared by	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	16/04/2021
Reviewed by	[REDACTED]		
Approved by			
on behalf of	[REDACTED]		

INDEPENDENT ELECTRICAL & ILLUMINATION ENGINEERS

CONTENTS

Document Version History	2
Document Quality Control	2
CONTENTS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1 INTRODUCTION	6
2 METHODOLOGY	6
3 FLOODLIGHTS EVALUATED	6
4 LIGHTING DESIGN EVALUATION	8
5 ILLUMINANCE RESULTS	9
6 HEADFRAME DETAIL	10
7 ADDITIONAL POLES	11
8 CONCLUSIONS	12
9 RECOMMENDATIONS	12

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The FIFA illuminance requirements could in part be achieved by removing each of the 50m pole 'Eyebrows' and positioning floodlights so that all of the spare area of each headframe would be populated with floodlights.

To assist with the end camera illuminance requirements of FIFA and Sky/OSB 4 x new 25m poles each with 14 floodlights would also be required.

The 20 floodlight positions under the Brian Perry Stand roof would also be used, albeit repositioned into clusters.

Subject to confirmation by the lighting design, it currently appears likely that the combination of these elements will enable most of the FIFA requirement to be achieved. Fully meeting FIFA requirements would require a significant additional expenditure, so will need to be discussed to agree upon final target requirements.

1 INTRODUCTION

This progress report outlines the investigative process taken to establish the result at this point in time. It is envisaged that this report will provide a basis for discussion to progress the project.

2 METHODOLOGY

- Floodlights from a number of suppliers would be reviewed to establish the top two or three products that could be used for this desk top study.
- The initial stage would establish indicative illumination levels achieved with the one for one replacement of existing luminaires using LED floodlights located in existing locations.
- To achieve this a computer model was created in order to model the floodlighting. This has established the 'Base line' illumination levels on the field and back to camera locations. This was then compared with the ideal FIFA requirements.
- Illuminance performance comparisons were made between two appropriate manufacturers products with similar photometry and light outputs, as each of the manufacturers floodlight photometrics were inputted into the computer model.
- In the event that the illuminance levels for both the horizontal and the various 'Back to Camera' locations fall short of FIFA requirements from the initial study (above), it was proposed to 'fill as practical' the entire space of the headframe with new LED luminaires and again compare the illuminances achieved by this desktop study against the FIFA requirements.
- 4 x additional 25m poles were added to the design model, as the end camera locations would not benefit from projected light supplied by the existing floodlight locations.

3 FLOODLIGHTS EVALUATED

The Signify Arenavision provides the best quality of light performance with the highest Efficacy, lumen output, beam selection, efficient optical performance, longevity and electrical loading.

Both Signify (Philips), with their Arenavision and Musco, with their TLC 1400 were selected for the investigation as they each provided appropriate qualities for their floodlight offer when compared against the remaining competitors investigated.

The evaluation reviewed the following criteria



















- Lumen output (light output) at a colour rendering of CRI90
- Efficacy

INDEPENDENT ELECTRICAL & ILLUMINATION ENGINEERS

- Size, weight and windage, (sail area) of the floodlight
- Price, as a indicative project value

The results of the supplier product available, as indicated in Table 1: Floodlight Comparison.

Table 1: Floodlight Comparison

FLOODLIGHT COMPARISON										
SUPPLIERS	MODEL	MAX LUMEN OUTPUT @CRI90 Lumen	WATTAGE W	EFFICACY lm/W	WEIGHT Kgs	WINDAGE m2	PRICE INCLUDING DMX DRIVER \$	IMAGE	DIMENSIONS mm	COMMENTS
Signify	Arena Vision	158197	1500	105	26.5	0.48	3000			Up to 11 optics available, good pricing, high output, highest efficacy. Ctr to Ctr Spacing 1.2m Horizontal could go down to 0.9. Vertical 0.8m
Thorn	Altis	137346	1392	99	30.7	0.51	4493			Low output, more expensive
Schreder	Ecoblast	155516	1820	85	36	0.53	4750		 ECOBLAST 6 - 696x765x346	Low efficacy, Pricey, high windage
ADLT	Petrarca	132745	1346	99	33	0.46	3750		 6 MODULES	Low light output requiring additional luminaires, Low efficacy
CU Phosco	FL810			#DIV/0!	43	0.31	3100			Heavy 43KG Cannot supply CRI90+
Ewo	R System	198154	2417	82	37.5	0.47	6000			Lowest Efficacy, Most expensive
AEC	ALO	136250	1615	84	31	0.41				Photometrics Not Available No pricing, no ies
Musco	TLC1400	147748 x 0.82 = 121,153 Note 0.82 depreciation Factor as per Musco instructions	1615	95	48	0.43				Size will require new headframe Low Lumen output when compared to Philips Very heavy Musco recommend Ctr to Ctr 0.86m horizontal have been down to 0.76m Vertical 1.12m have been down to 1.06. Musco say 'Potential issues light blockage'
Musco	TLC1500	118072 x 0.82 = 96,819 Note 0.82 depreciation Factor as per Musco instructions	1097	88	30	?				Inappropriate optics and low light output

INDEPENDENT ELECTRICAL & ILLUMINATION ENGINEERS

4 LIGHTING DESIGN EVALUATION

For evaluation purposes, 4 fixed cameras and 6 secondary camera positions were investigated for both Rugby and Football along with horizontal light levels for the respective areas around the field.

For the purpose of clarity we have only reported fixed camera positions, the horizontal playing area and the U2 (Emin/Eave) uniformities.

The FIFA Handbook of Requirements Illuminance values were used as the target values for this investigative design. Ref table 2: FIFA Camera and Horizontal Illuminance Requirements.

Table 2: FIFA Camera and Horizontal Illuminance Requirements.

Illuminance Grid	Illuminance Eave (lux)	Illuminance Emin (lux)	Illuminance Emax (lux)	Uniformity Emin/Emax (U1)	Uniformity Emin/Eave (U2)
<i>Vertical @ 1.0m above ground</i>					
FIFA Requirement (Fixed camera/ field camera)	≥2,400/ 1,800	NA	NA	0.5/0.4	0.7/0.65
<i>Horizontal @ 1.0m above ground</i>					
FIFA Requirement	3,500	NA	NA	0.6	0.8

5 ILLUMINANCE RESULTS

At this stage of the evaluation, it is important to note that the comparison is conducted with equal quantities of luminaires between the manufacturers product.

Both products achieve good illuminance values with Signify's Arenavision having a good advantage with the broader beam selection, higher efficacy and higher lumen output, when compared against the Musco TLC1400.

With additional time spent improving the uniformity with the Musco design version it is expected that the illuminance values will decrease as the uniformity improves.

The illumination levels for both horizontal and back to camera illuminance were calculated. It is anticipated that the values will be improved at the 'Detail Design' phase of the project.

Ref: Table 3 Summary of illumination results (red figures are below FIFA targets)

Table 3. Calculated lighting Performance vs FIFA

Illuminance Grid	Floodlight Supplier	Illuminance Eave (lux)	Uniformity Emin/Eave (U2)
FIFA Requirement (Fixed cam/ field cam)		≥2,400/ 1,800	0.7/0.65
<i>Vertical @ 1.0m above ground</i>			
Calculated:	Signify	2460	0.81
Camera 1	Musco	2224	0.73
Calculated:	Signify	2454	0.73
Camera 2	Musco	2237	0.62
Calculated:	Signify	2203	0.81
Camera 3	Musco	2218	0.65
Calculated:	Signify	2047	0.73
Camera 6	Musco	1283	0.74
<i>Horizontal @ 1.0m above ground</i>			
FIFA Requirement		3,500	0.80
Calculated Performance	Signify	2281	0.79
	Musco	2631	0.65

6 HEADFRAME

The recommended manufacturer floodlight spacing will not allow either floodlight to utilise the existing locations. Image 1 shows a mark-up indicating the potential luminaire layout, with the poles 'eyebrow' removed.

Detail dimensions of the headframe construction and luminaire locations were not available at the time of this progress report. The dimensions and positions must be confirmed by HCC.

Mounting recommendation, Signify Arenavision:

Mounting in the horizontal – Centre to centre spacing 1200mm is the standard although we have been advised that they have previously used 960mm with the caveat that care is required as there may be potential issues with light blockage as this is dependent on azimuth aiming angle. In the past we have typically used 1000mm with little issues.

We do not recommend reducing the spacing to this minimum dimension as in past projects it has been tight when this dimension has been used.

Mounting in the vertical - 800mm is standard.

Mounting recommendation, Musco TLC 1400:


Mounting in the horizontal – Centre to centre spacing 860mm is the standard although we have been advised that they have used 760mm with the caveat that care is required as there may be potential issues with light blockage as this is dependent on azimuth aiming angle.

We do not recommend reducing the spacing to this minimum dimension.

Mounting in the vertical - 1120mm is standard. Again we have been advised that they have used as little as 1060mm with the caveat that care is required as there may be potential issues with light blockage.

We do not recommend reducing the spacing to this minimum dimension.

Image 1: Luminaire mounting potential with pole 'Eyebrow' removed.



7 ADDITIONAL POLES

Additional poles have been used to provide illuminance back to the fixed end cameras, Cam 3 and Cam 6.

The maximum pole height of each is 25M. Our current design model uses 14 floodlights for each of the poles.

Please see image 2 for a representation of a typical pole and Image 3 for the site pole location.

Image 3: Representation of Pole positions





Image 4: Site, Indicative additional pole positions



8 CONCLUSIONS

- FIFA Illuminance levels can not been fully achieved. Recommend stakeholder discussion with LDP designer as to the nuances and the potential effect to project costs going forward.
- The FIFA illuminance requirements could in part be achieved by removing each of the 50m pole 'Eyebrows' and positioning floodlights so that all of the spare area of each headframe would be populated with floodlights.
- To assist with the end camera illuminance requirements of FIFA and Sky/OSB 4 x new 25m poles each with 14 floodlights would also be required.
- The 20 floodlight positions under the Brian Perry Stand roof would also be used, albeit repositioned into clusters.
- Subject to confirmation by the lighting design, it currently appears likely that the combination of these elements will enable most of the FIFA requirement to be achieved. Fully meeting FIFA requirements would require a significant additional expenditure, so will need to be discussed to agree upon final target requirements.
- Signify have a clear edge over Musco with luminaire performance of light technical parameters and efficacy.

9 RECOMMENDATIONS

This progress report has highlighted a number issues:

- Engage Quantity Surveyor to obtain luminaire costs of the two floodlight providers. This may allow for a potential turn-key provider for the installation based on LDP detailed design to be selected. To be discussed with the stakeholder and lighting designer.
- Check existing headframe dimensions and potential locations of floodlights against the existing locations.

Laura Bowman

From: official information
Sent: Thursday, 22 July 2021 4:25 pm
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: official information
Subject: RESPONSE: LGOIMA 21193 - [REDACTED] - Maintenance, Engineers and General Reports regarding Seddon Park.

Kia Ora,

I refer to your **information request below**, Hamilton City Council is able to provide the following response.

Your Request

- Maintenance, Engineer, and General have been produced for Seddon Park?
- Please forward all reports.
- What was/is the cost(s) of the report(s)?
- What is the cost of any work in the reports?
- Date range 1 July 2018 – 31 May 2021.

Our Response

In regards to your request for Seddon Park reports (“maintenance, engineer and general”) from 1 July 2018 to 31 May 2021, please find below the list of external reports.

If you would like to discuss Seddon Park in further detail, please call:

[REDACTED]
H3's Director of Operations
[REDACTED]

All documentation referred to below can be accessed via this link – [LGOIMA 21193 - Maintenance, Engineers and General Reports regarding Seddon Park](#)

This link is best accessed via Google Chrome. This link will also expire on 21 AUGUST 2021. Please download the relevant documents for your personal use.

LGOIMA 21193 - Maintenance, Engineers and General Reports regarding Seddon Park from 1 July 2018 to 31 May 2021						
Report Name		Report Type	Date	Cost of Report	Cost of any work in the reports	Document
Fire Safety Reports	Seddon Park Fire Alarm Annual Report	General	March 2019	Part of a whole of Council contract	No significant resulting works	Appendix 1
	Seddon Park Fire Services Annual Report	Maintenance	Feb 2020			Appendix 2
	Trial Evacuation Report	General	October 2020			Appendix 3
Contract 17460	Seddon Park Light Replacement Moody Inspection Report	Engineering	April 2019	Cost of all reports in relation to Contract 17460 was part of		Appendix 4

	Seddon Park Light Replacement BECA	Engineering	July 2019	total project budget in 2019/20. Annual Report 2020 comment on VTME		Appendix 5 Appendix 6 Appendix 7 Appendix 8 Appendix 9
	Seddon Park Regulatory Review Light Towers Final Report	General	August 2020	Capital projects refer page 33		Appendix 10
	Seddon Park LED Lighting Arcadis report	Engineering	March 2020			Appendix 11
	Seddon Park LED Lighting Miyamoto Peer Review Report	Maintenance	April 2020			Appendix 12
Other	Contract 18340 – Seddon Park Staff Facilities retaining wall redesign	General	June 2020	\$3.5K	Cost of work was part of total project budget in 2019/20	Appendix 13
	Seddon Park Dumb Waiter & Staircase – Asbestos Report	Maintenance	July 2018	\$1.3K	\$5k	Appendix 14
	Seddon Park HV Asset Condition Assessment and Engineering Evaluation	Engineering	March 2019	\$15K	Nil	Appendix 15
	Seddon Park Replay Screen – Structural Condition Assessment (Draft)	Engineering	May 2021	\$3.4K	Cost of resulting work TBC	Appendix 16

You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this decision. Information about how to make a complaint is available at www.ombudsman.parliament.nz or freephone 0800 802 602.


Kind Regards,

Tatiyana | Official Information & Legal Support Advisor
Legal Services & Risk | People and Organisational Performance
Email: officialinformation@hcc.govt.nz



Hamilton City Council | Private Bag 3010 | Hamilton 3240 | www.hamilton.govt.nz

[Like us on Facebook](#) [Follow us on Twitter](#)



From: Hamilton City Council <do.not.reply@hcc.govt.nz>

Sent: Friday, 11 June 2021 1:49 pm

To: official information <officialinformation@hcc.govt.nz>

Subject: HCC Website - Official Information Request ref: HCC-QF-210611-810EG-12I8

HCC Website - Official Information Request

Reference: HCC-QF-210611-810EG-12I8

Attachment: not attached

Name: [REDACTED]

Email address: [REDACTED]

Phone number: [REDACTED]

Detailed Description of Request

Seddon Park

What reports:

- Maintenance, Engineer, and General have been produced for Seddon Park?

Please forward all reports.

What was/is the cost(s) of the report(s)?

What is the cost of any work in the reports?

Organisation: not supplied