

F22/55/06 – D24/50822

Date: Tuesday 22 October 2024 at 3.00pm
Venue: Council Chambers, 63 Miranda Street, Stratford

Present

The Deputy Mayor – M McKay (the Chairperson), the District Mayor N C Volzke, Councillors: S J Beck, A K Harris, E E Hall, A M C Dudley, J M S Erwood, W J Sandford, V R Jones, G W Boyde and M J Watt.

In attendance

The Chief Executive – Mr S Hanne, the Director – Assets – Mrs V Araba, the Acting Director - Corporate Services – Mrs C Craig, the Acting Director – Community Services – Mrs E Bishop, the Director – Environmental Services – Mr B Sutherland, the Committee Secretary – Ms E Coulton, the Roding Asset Manager – Mr S Bowden, the Special Projects Manager – Mr N Cooper, the Services Asset Manager – Mr J Cooper (*part meeting*), the Communications Manager – Ms G Gibson (*part meeting*), the Parks and Reserves Officer – Mrs M McBain, the Community and Economic Development Manager – Ms S Azal (*part meeting*), the Graduate Roding Engineer – Mr F Hick (*part meeting*), the Environmental Health Manager – Mrs R Otter (*part meeting*), the Planner – Ms C Marner (*part meeting*), two members of the public and one member of the media (Stratford Press).

1. Welcome

The opening karakia was read.

The Deputy Mayor welcomed the Chief Executive, Councillors, staff, and the media.

The Deputy Mayor reiterated the health and safety message and emergency procedures.

2. Apologies

An apology was received from Councillor C W Tongaawhikau.

Recommendation

THAT the apologies be received.

HALL/BOYDE
Carried
P&S/24/230

3. Announcements

There were no announcements.

4. Declarations of members interest

Elected members were asked to declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to items on this agenda. There were no conflicts of interest declared.

5. Attendance Schedule

The Attendance schedule for Policy and Services Committee meetings, including Hearings, was attached.

6. Confirmation of Minutes

6.1 Policy and Services Committee –24 September 2024

Recommendation

THAT the minutes of the Policy and Services Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 24 September 2024 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

VOLZKE/HARRIS
Carried
P&S/24/231

7. Matters Outstanding

Recommendation

THAT the Matters Outstanding be received.

McKAY/VOLZKE
Carried
P&S/24/232

8. Quarterly Report – Economic Development Quarterly Report – Quarter Four 2023/24

Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/BOYDE
Carried
P&S/24/233

The Acting Director – Community Services noted the following:

- The quarterly report has been consistently being submitted further away from the end of the reporting quarter due to the requirements under the Local Government Act to be reported to New Plymouth District Council as its council controlled organisation first. Officers are working with Venture Taranaki to find a solution for this reporting time frame which is likely to be a snapshot presentation to Stratford at the end of the quarter with the final regional report being circulated once approved by NPDC.
- Mrs Bishop noted an apology was received from Venture Taranaki for the meeting today.
- A workshop is being scheduled with Venture Taranaki to discuss the refresh of Tapuae Roa with council. This will include a high level review of how this strategy relates to the Stratford Economic Development Strategy and will feed into the next part of the development of this.

9. Decision Report – Taranaki Water Service Delivery Options Analysis and Direction

Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/HARRIS
Carried
P&S/24/234

2. THAT the committee notes that Central Government has legislated that Local Authorities are to develop, and publicly consult on a Water Services Delivery Plan (WSDP) by 3 September 2025.
3. THAT the committee notes that these Plans can either be developed on an individual Council basis or jointly, depending on the preferred model chosen.
4. THAT the committee notes that analysis to date has been in conjunction with New Plymouth and South Taranaki District Councils and focused on a long list of options from enhanced status quo through to a regional Water Services Council Controlled Organisation (WSCCO).
5. THAT the committee notes that high-level financial modelling has been completed on a cost per connection basis only. Further detailed financial modelling will consider revenue tariff/sources in the next stage (if applicable).
6. THAT the committee notes that while the work to date has been funded from residual Three Waters Reforms budget, this has now been exhausted and as no budget allocation was made in the LTP, any expenditure on this matter going forwarded will be unbudgeted. As per the options analysis this could be in the order of \$250-300k.
7. THAT the committee recommends to develop both joint and independent Water Services Delivery Plans as per Option 3 to:
 - i) Enable undertaking of more detailed analysis on both scenarios to support future decision-making.
 - ii) Maintain 'off ramp' opportunities without risking central government interference or extending into the pre-election period.

HALL/VOLZKE
8 for 1 against
Carried
P&S/24/235

Recommended Reason

While this option incurs additional cost, it ensures elected members have sufficient information available to engage with the community and make an informed decision regarding the future ownership and or management of council's three waters assets and associated services.

The Chief Executive noted the following:

- He summarised that this report and its recommendations are seeking input from elected members on their preferences for actions to take between now and the public consultation period.
- Today elected members are required to discuss options they would like to enquire further on or discard completely.
- Neighbouring councils have made their decision, which is the recommended outcome listed in the report).

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Boyde noted his frustration with the obligations set by central government to consult with the public on a large scale matter after the LTP has been completed.
- Councillor Boyde inquired whether examining the two options would incur operational costs and how these would be recorded—would they fall under operating reserves or be categorized as an overspend with an explanation? The Chief Executive clarified that if the proposal is adopted as it stands, it would grant authority to spend the money without needing to bring it back to another Policy and Services meeting in the future.
- Councillor Boyde asked whether exploring an independent venture would involve a CCO or a business unit. The Chief Executive responded that the purpose of today's discussion is to provide guidance to management on the direction to pursue, this can be at a high level of local vs regional or include and exclude individual models.
- Councillor Harris noted that option 3 allows council to have the best of both worlds with a broader outline, however it is costly and not budgeted for. She questioned as to where the money to fund this would come from. The Chief Executive noted that the recommendation from council would be to take the funds out the operational reserve, however elected members have the final say and multiple options to choose from. The Corporate Accountant noted that the reserve currently contains \$640,000.
- Councillor Harris sought clarification on the partnerships and cost savings available with the neighbouring councils if we go for option 3 as they did. The Chief Executive noted that this will only be available if all 3 councils select the same option and decide to work together.
- The District Mayor questioned if option 3 excludes stormwater. The Chief Executive clarified that this is to be decided as part of the design process.
- Councillor Beck noted that he would like to see SDC back themselves and see us do a standalone business unit as we have decent infrastructure available.
- Councillor Watt inquired if anyone has any information on whether the central government intends for the Taranaki councils to merge into a single entity for this issue. He pointed out that it might be possible that, regardless of our decision, they could mandate a merger. The Chief Executive noted that currently we are meeting all legal requirements. The District mayor noted that Councillor Watts question is a perfectly relevant question to be asked at the next step.
- The Deputy Mayor inquired about the implications of expressing interest in a joint venture with the other Taranaki Councils, should they decide to withdraw at the next decision-making checkpoint. The Chief Executive responded that if one council opts out, we would need to consider the feasibility of continuing the joint venture, as having only two councils involved would significantly alter its dynamics.
- The Deputy Mayor noted that page 70 indicates that SDC proceeding on their own is a viable option, she asked if the Chief Executive can speak to that. The Chief Executive clarified that there are a number of criteria to meet if council wants to do a standalone venture.
- Councillor Beck asked the Chief Executive if he is confident that SDC can successfully pursue a standalone venture. The Chief Executive affirmed his belief in the council's capabilities. Councillor Beck also sought clarification on whether a CCO or a business unit would be more cost-effective. The Chief Executive indicated that the business unit is the cheaper option.
- Councillor Hall noted her support to investigate both options as knowledge is power. She emphasised that whilst she does not like making decisions based on others decision outcomes, we need to take into consideration our neighbouring councils indicative decisions and that looking at both options is pragmatic.
- The District Mayor expressed his support for Councillor Hall's comments, emphasizing the importance of exploring both options for comparison. He stressed that elected members need to expand their thinking, noting that this decision should focus on sustainability rather than just the cheapest option. He reiterated that today's task for elected members is simply to indicate which options they wish to explore, rather than making a final choice.

10. Decision Report – Low-Cost Low Risk Improvement Funding

Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

DUDDLEY/HARRIS
Carried
P&S/24/236

2. THAT the Committee gives consideration to the **four** options proposed in the report, for the implementation of the low cost low risk improvement projects for the next 3 financial years - 2024/25 to 2026/27- being:
 - a. **Option 1** – Proposed Low Cost Low Risk (LCLR) Programme based on NZTA's approved budget of **\$1.5M** at a Funding Assistance Rate (FAR) of **82%**;
 - b. **Option 2** – Proposed Low Cost Low Risk (LCLR) Programme based on **half** of Stratford District Council's LTP approved contribution being **\$1.56M**, at an *equivalent* FAR of **44%**;
 - c. **Option 3** – Proposed Low Cost Low Risk (LCLR) Programme based on Stratford District Council's LTP approved contribution of **\$3.12M**, at an *equivalent* FAR of **28%**;
 - d. **Option 4** – Proposed Low Cost Low Risk (LCLR) Programme based on Stratford District Council's **Normal** FAR of **63%**, equating to a contribution of approximately **\$750k**.
2. THAT the Committee approves **Option 2**, being the implementation of 'Proposed Low Cost Low Risk (LCLR) Programme based on **half** of Stratford District Council's LTP approved contribution of **\$1.56M**, at an *equivalent* FAR of **44%**.
3. THAT the Committee approves the bringing forward of funds from 2026/27 to 2024/25, to match NZTA's re-allocated *Maintenance, Operations and Renewals (MOR)* budgets. This will require an additional operating expenditure of **\$59.6k**, being Council's contribution, to enable Council Officers uplift the *advanced* funding allocation of **\$161.1k** approved by NZTA for (*MOR*) for the 2024/25 financial year.

ERWOOD/BOYDE
9 for 2 against
Carried
P&S/24/237

Recommended Reason

To allow Council Officers to reprogramme Council's Low Cost Low Risk (LCLR) projects for the next 3 years and *Maintenance, Operations and Renewals (MOR)* projects for the 2024/25 financial year.

For the LCLR projects, of the **\$8.34M** budget requested at a FAR of **63%**, only **\$1.5M** was approved for the LCLR resilience projects at a FAR of approximately **82%**. For the MOR projects, a re-allocation of budgets by NZTA from 2026/27 financial year to the 2024/25 financial year has resulted in an increase of **\$161,081** for the 2024/25 financial year. This requires an increase in council share of **\$59.6k**.

There is no change to the total funding sought/approved for the MOR projects.

The Roothing Asset Manager noted the following:

- This report was prepared in response to the update given to elected members at the last Policy and Services meeting regarding the lack of approval for funding related to low-cost, low-risk projects.
- It outlines options for our next steps.
- Since that meeting, we have received a letter confirming that the Crown has allocated \$1.5 million to us for necessary repairs.
- We are proposing to spend half of our budget for low – cost, low – risk.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Boyde asked for clarification on what constitutes an unacceptable risk and who would be liable if we do not receive the expected funding, leading to issues with a proposed project that does not proceed. The Roothing Asset Manager responded that SDC's primary goal is to reduce the road toll, but he acknowledged that liability is a complex issue.
- The District Mayor emphasised that he too shares the frustration expressed throughout the room. He noted that we are not alone as only 14 councils received funding in this category, majority of those being put towards projects already in motion. The option 2 presented to us within the report, attempts to strike a balance and allows us to get some projects done.
- Councillor Dudley asked if, by choosing Option 2 and proceeding with the 44%, would NZTA would recognize this and decide to in future, only provide 44% of funding. The Roothing Asset Manager noted that he does not have a definitive answer on this, however 63 other councils are in the same situation as us.
- Councillor Hall observed that it seems to be a common trend that we are having to be reactive and reassess decisions that have already been made. She commended SDC staff on pivoting when these challenges arise. Councillor Hall noted that she agrees it will be good to strike a balance, but will be disappointed that we won't be able to accomplish all.
- Councillor Beck noted that he would prefer to go through with option 1 or 4. He noted that we typically do 63% and would like to see it stay.
- Councillor Watt noted that he is in agreeance with Councillor Beck, he noted that our message through the LTP has been that we are going back to basics, therefore he believes we should spend what we have. Councillor Watt expressed that he is concerned that NZTA have done this to test us, he noted that if we spend out of our own pocket, they may expect us to do it again.
- Councillor Erwood noted that he supports option 2. Councillor Boyde noted that he too supports option 2 and notes that it allows us to have balance.

A division was called:

Those voting for the motion: Councillors: Boyde, Dudley, Erwood, Hall, Harris, Jones, Sandford, Volzke and Mckay

Those voting against the motion: Councillors: Beck and Watt.

11. Decision Report – Rates Remission Application – Excessive Water Use Due to a Leak

Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/VOLZKE
Carried
P&S/24/238

The Services Asset Manager noted:

- An application seeking a rate remission has come in and due to the volume of water, it requires to be discussed by the elected members.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Harris questioned if council officers are aware of any change in circumstances in terms of water consumption. The Services Asset Manager noted that the business had a change of scope in 2021 which increased their average water consumption.
- It was clarified that the business had known about the leak and fault for over a month and have not sought to repair it within the timeframe allocated within the policy.
- Councillor Jones inquired whether there is an option to remit half of the rates or defer the decision, allowing the individual to resubmit their case after receiving the updated water bill and gathering more data. He pointed out that, on average, it takes three months to receive the water bill, and given that the leak could of occurred within the first few days, the individual would have been unaware of the issue. It was clarified that the leak in question had persisted for two quarters.

Recommendation

THAT a 50% rate remission due to a leak be approved.

JONES/DUDLEY
Division
For: 2
Against: 9
Lost

A division was called:

Those voting for the motion: Councillors: Jones and Dudley.

Those voting against the motion: Councillors: Boyde, Beck, Erwood, Hall, Harris, Sandford, Watt, Volzke and Mckay.

- Councillor Boyde noted that this is not consistent with our policy and personally doesn't see that we have any choice but to decline it.
- Councillor Hall noted that the information within the report clearly shows a timeline that exceeds the timeframe, therefore no remission should be given.
- Councillor Harris noted that she too does not support the motion on the table as it has been outlined in the report that it does not meet the policies requirements.

Recommendations

2. THAT Council gives consideration under Clause 9 of the Rates Remission Policy to remit water use lost due to a leak.
3. THAT Council declines the application for a rate remission due to a leak.

HALL/BOYDE
9 for 2 against
Carried
P&S/24/239

Recommended Reason

Council Policy allows for rate remission due to a leak to be considered, if the water loss was out of their control. As detailed below, the business informed of a leak and were not proactive in identifying or addressing the leak, and once the leak was identified it was allowed to continue while an application for a rate remission was lodged before the leak was fixed.

Councillor Beck voted against the motion.

12. Decision Report – Draft Vehicle Crossing Policy and Bylaw – Adoption and Release for Public Consultation

Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/SANDFORD
Carried
P&S/24/240

2. THAT the *draft* Vehicle Crossing Policy be adopted with the noted changes.

3. THAT the *draft* Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2025 be approved and released for public consultation.

ERWOOD/SANDFORD
Carried
P&S/24/241

Recommended Reason

The recommendation from the Committee is required to maintain a current *Vehicle Crossing Policy* and initiate the consultation process for the *draft Vehicle Crossing Bylaw 2025*. Public consultation is required to seek comments from the public on the draft bylaw, and will be undertaken in accordance with the special consultative procedure (SCP) requirements, pursuant to Sections 82 and 83 of the Local Government Act (2002).

The Services Asset Manager left the meeting at 4.19 pm.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Jones questioned as to how many applications for crossings does council receive each year. The Roading Asset Manager noted that we do not receive many.
- Councillor Jones noted that the fees proposed are expensive and not encouraging for members of the community to partake in updating vehicle crossings in accordance with council standards.

One member of the public left the meeting at 4.23 pm.

- Councillor Watt agreed with Councillor Jones regarding the costs. He suggested that provisions could be made to reduce expenses by ensuring that when a council-approved contractor completes the work, it would keep costs down by eliminating the need for multiple inspections.
- Councillor Beck questioned if the delegations within this policy apply to rural areas as well as urban areas. The Roading Asset Manager clarified that yes it does, including traffic management.
- The District Mayor noted that it has long been a practice in the urban area that if an existing vehicle access crossing on a footpath needs to be removed or repaired, the council will cover 50% of the crossing costs.

The Communications Manager left the meeting at 4.28 pm.

- The Deputy Mayor questioned as to who decides and requests the need for a new vehicle crossing as it is not entirely clear. The Roading Asset Manager noted that it is the property owner. The Director – Assets noted that this will be amended to be more clear.
- Councillor Jones noted that he is happy with the policy but wants to see some leniency in the fees and charges to cut costs down if they do it correctly. The District Mayor countered by noting that the multiple inspections are in place so property owners and staff can be certain that the work is being completed properly at various stages throughout the process.

13. Decision Report – Draft Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw 2025 – Adoption and Release for Public Consultation

Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

SANDFORD/ERWOOD
Carried
P&S/24/242

2. THAT the *draft* Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw 2025 is released for public consultation using Special Consultative Procedures as required by Section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

HARRIS/BOYDE
Carried
P&S/24/243

Recommended Reason

Committee's approval is required to begin the public consultation process, as required by Section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002, allowing the public an opportunity to make submissions on the proposed *draft* Restricted Access of Roads Bylaw 2025.

The Roding Asset Manager noted the following:

- This bylaw gives council the power to place restrictions on any road that is deemed appropriate, the first road this bylaw will be applied to will be Whangamomona Road.
- This bylaw can help protect roads that are assets to the community by enforcing a seasonal closure or restricting the vehicles types eligible for access.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- The Director – Assets reiterated that whilst this bylaw will first be used on the Whangamomona road, it is a broad bylaw for any road.
- Councillor Boyde noted that he is in support of this bylaw and is looking forward to it going out for consultation.
- The District Mayor noted that he shares Councillor Boydes thoughts and thinks that it is great that it can apply to any road. He questioned that in the case of Whangamomona Road, is it possible to change dates as needed. The Roding Asset Manager noted that it is possible via council resolution at the time.
- Councillor Harris questioned if this bylaw has a section that simply states that roads should be utilised as a destination connector and not a playground, particularly for 4WDs. The Director – Assets noted that there is a definition of what a road is within the bylaw but it does not go into specifics however, she noted that she would believe that this is common sense. It was clarified that this bylaw will help council recover costs associated with wilful damage.
- Councillor Beck questioned if this bylaw has provisions for limiting logging truck access on specific roads throughout winter due to the damage being caused. The Chief Executive noted that we would get significant push back on this matter if followed through. The Roding Asset Manager noted that it could be possible under a different act, however it is important to bare in mind the response received from the targeted forestry roading rate implementation.

14. Decision Report – Draft Parking Control Bylaw 2025 – Adoption and Release for Public Consultation

Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.

SANDFORD/DUDLEY
Carried
P&S/24/244

2. THAT *Draft* Parking Control Bylaw 2025 is approved and released for public consultation using Special Consultative Procedures as required by Section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

HALL/DUDLEY
Carried
P&S/24/245

Recommended Reason

The approval of the Committee is required to initiate the consultation process required by Section 83 of the Local Government Act (2002) to give the public an opportunity to make submissions on the proposed *Draft* Parking Control Bylaw 2025.

The Director – Assets noted:

- Pages 267 through to 277 require deletion.
- Page 246 through to 266 should be listed as appendix 2, not 1.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- The Roading Asset Manager noted that this bylaw is a revised bylaw from the previous version that was introduced to elected members. He noted that the bylaw formalises a large number of actions already in place and captures what is already in place. It was noted that this bylaw allows for changes to be made via Council resolution rather than a bylaw change.
- The District Mayor noted that he likes the flexibility allowed through the bylaw. He further noted that he has one area that he disagrees on, but is happy to see what the community feedback has to say.

The meeting adjourned at 4.57 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 5.05 pm.

15. Monthly Reports

15.1 Assets Report

Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/McKAY
Carried
P&S/24/246

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Boyde noted that the report highlights a few issues discovered within the transfer station and concerns raised by members of the community. He questioned if an update on these concerns can be given. The Services Asset Manager noted that all complaints and concerns have been passed onto Waste Management, he emphasised that due to these complaints they have reinstated the bins that have been taken away.
- Councillor Boyde questioned if the tenders for demolition of the TSB Pool Complex has gone out yet. The Director – Assets noted that tenders have not gone out as of yet as they are awaiting on final checks and reports.
- Councillor Boyde shared that the farm is up 9% and 14% for the year.
- The District Mayor noted that the housing for older persons programme has a new tenant in one of the units and has been a successful addition thus far. He noted that this is the first new tenant since the new fees have been introduced and has not had any declined tenant applications based on fees or finances.
- Councillor Dudley sought clarification on the decline of bookings at our facilities, she questioned if this is due to us now taking deposits. The Director – Assets noted that there are various reasons for the decline in bookings and rise in cancelations.

15.2 Community Services Report

Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

HARRIS/BOYDE
Carried
P&S/24/247

The Acting – Director Community Services noted the following:

- The Library staff scored highly in our Key Research survey, amassing a satisfaction score of 97%. Due to this high score they are being used as an example across Key Research presentations.
- The Stratford District Youth Council are preparing a report recapping their trip to Wellington and is set to be presented at the next meeting.
- Wai o Rua – Stratford Aquatic Centre is currently at capacity with Swim School enrolments having at 510 fir Term 4 enrolments, with a waiting list as well.
- Stratford Primary School and Avon Primary School are undertaking their TOI funded learn to swim classes in Term 4 at Wai o Rua.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Hall questioned if the Swim School will receive a separate review now that it has completed one year of operation. The Acting Director – Community Services noted this data would form part of the overall business plan for the facility to be able to paint a full picture of the impact this activity has.
- Councillor Sandford questioned if it would be possible for the SBA to provide us with a number of attendees that attended each event in their reporting. The Acting Director – Community Services noted that she will pass that on.
- Councillor Beck requested clarification on whether the school that utilised a different local pool for their swim sports event had returned to the facility The Acting Director of Community Services confirmed that, although the school held their swim sports events elsewhere, they still attend Wai o Rua for their swimming lessons.
- Councillor Hall noted that the Creative Communities Committee have seen and considered an exciting array of projects. She noted that it is positive to see so much happening around the community.
- The Percy Thomson Trust met for their AGM last week, Councillor Hall was excited to announce her appointment of the Chair of the trust.

- The District Mayor noted that the MTFJ has had an outstanding few months with 8 placements being made in the past month. He noted that none of these jobs were advertised positions and that they were all 'word of mouth' opportunities.

15.3 Corporate Services Report

Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

WATT/HALL
Carried
P&S/24/248

The Corporate Accountant noted the following:

- As far as rate rebates go, last year we assisted 338 members of the community.
- Rate rebates for this year are currently sitting at 224 rate payers receiving the full subsidy.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Boyde noted questioned if the revenue management figure listed on page 312, is seeing a steady growth. The Corporate Accountant noted that over time this figure will go down, however they are aware the current figure is rather high.
- Councillor Harris questioned if when undergoing the LTP process, do we take into account and consideration unpaid rates that do not get successfully recovered and do we make any allowances. The Corporate Accountant noted that there is an account for penalty income.
- Councillor Boyde questioned as to where the penalty rates income is situated. The Corporate Accountant noted that penalty rates are situated under democracy and corporate support revenue.

15.4 Environmental Services Report

Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

ERWOOD/McKAY
Carried
P&S/24/249

The Director - Environmental Services noted:

- In regards to the local alcohol policy, STDC have made a formal decision that they would like a policy, however they have not decided if they would like to join our policy shared with NPDC.

16. Resolution to Exclude the Public

Recommendation

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

Agenda Item No: 17

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution to each matter	Grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
Purchase of Land	The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information <i>and</i> to enable any local authority holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist, under section 6 and section 7 of the Act - specifically Section 7(2)(b)(ii) and Section 7(2)(h). (Section 48(1)(a) Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

BOYDE/DUDLEY
Carried
P&S/24/250

The media left the meeting at 5.28pm.

17. Public Excluded Item

Recommendation

THAT the open meeting resume.

BOYDE/JONES
Carried
P&S/24/253

18. Questions

- Councillor Harris questioned if the insurance company has paid for the work to be completed on the Puniwhakau Bridge. The Roading Asset Manager noted that this is still in the works.

19. Closing Karakia

The closing Karakia was read.

The meeting closed at 5.43 pm.

M McKay
Chairperson

Confirmed this 26th day of November 2024.

N C Volzke
District Mayor