

CONFIRMED MINUTES
OF THE WAITAKI DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING
HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, THIRD FLOOR,
OFFICE OF THE WAITAKI DISTRICT COUNCIL,
20 THAMES STREET, OAMARU
AND VIA ZOOM VIDEO-CONFERENCE
ON TUESDAY, 30 MAY 2023 AT 9.00AM

PRESENT: Mayor Gary Kircher (Chair), Deputy Mayor Hana Halalele (Deputy Chair), Cr Tim Blackler, Cr Brent Cowles, Cr Jeremy Holding, Cr Jim Hopkins, Cr Courtney Linwood, Cr Guy Percival, Cr John McCone, Cr Rebecca Ryan, and Cr Jim Thomson (via Zoom)

IN ATTENDANCE: Alex Parmley (Chief Executive)
Paul Hope (Finance and Corporate Development Group Manager and Acting Assets Group Manager)
Lisa Baillie (People and Transformation Group Manager / Deputy Chief Executive)
Roger Cook (Heritage, Environment and Regulatory Group Manager)
Ainslee Hooper (Governance and Policy Advisor)

IN ATTENDANCE FOR SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEMS:

Marty Pacey (Water Services Manager)
Michael Goldingham (Senior Assets Planning Engineer)
Joshua Rendell (Assets Operations Manager)
Rodger McGaw (Network Infrastructure Engineer)
Lori Butterworth (Co-Property Manager)
Mathew Scott (Property Assets Officer)
Lindsay Hyde (Recreation Manager)

The Chair declared the meeting open at 9.00am and welcomed everyone present.

1 APOLOGIES

RESOLVED WDC 2023/072

Moved: Cr John McCone
Seconded: Cr Jeremy Holding

That the apology received from Deputy Mayor Hana Halalele be accepted.

CARRIED

The Chair advised that the Deputy Mayor was absent from this meeting because she was in Wellington for the Investiture Ceremony tomorrow morning where she would receive her Queen's Service Medal (QSM) for services to Pacific Health from the Governor-General, The Right Honourable Dame Cindy Kiro GNZM QSO.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3 PUBLIC FORUM

The Chair welcomed members of the Maheno Water Committee to the meeting. They included Mrs Barbara Small, Ken Keen (Past Chair), and Alan McKenzie.

Mrs Barbara Small thanked Council for the opportunity to address the meeting. She noted that there was a draft agreement between Council and the MWC currently on the table but that it was not complete at this time because there were still things to be ironed out and a few mistakes in the draft that needed correcting.

Mrs Small briefed the meeting on the history of MWC. Key points included that the Maheno water supply had served the Maheno community for 85 years, and the members had paid for the water supply assets during that time; there had been no requirement for Oamaru ratepayers to subsidise the Maheno scheme with rates. There are currently 127 users of the scheme, which is not enough to fund and keep funding depreciation and the scheme has 'just scraped by'. The change in water regulations means that an upgrade to the Maheno water scheme is required, and the Maheno community cannot afford it. The Scheme supervisor needs to retire, which would leave the scheme without a qualified operator. If a contractor was to be engaged to look after the scheme it would cost up to \$90k a year. There are no salaries currently involved and there is no succession plan in place. Members of the community are not interested in running the scheme if any one of the MWC steps down. There are pressures on everyone today – both financial and social.

Mrs Small spoke about the Committee's understanding that development contributions would not need to be paid if members of the Maheno water scheme joined up and gave their allocation to Council by 30 April. That had been done. However, now Council was saying that Maheno ratepayers would have to be charged DCs after 1 July 2024, and that had not been communicated to its members and it was now a 'sticking point' for the MWC in the agreement discussions.

If the DCs were enforced next year, she believed that would be another 100% increase in water costs. There was also now an additional cost of \$50k for adding a running pump. "We discussed this with officers and said our members would be happy to run the pump house for another year to allow time for members to be connected to the Hamnak line." However, that was 'arbitrarily charged' and no members had agreed to it, Mrs Small said. She added that they were told that would be covered by rate funding.

Mrs Small referenced the United Nations' General Assembly's recognition of safe drinking water being available to everyone without discrimination to have access to safe and physically acceptable and affordable drinking water for personal use. She asked Council to apply this standard and to recognise that Maheno ratepayers had limited means. There were still costings in the draft agreement that the MWC did not agree to. Mrs Small asked for a commitment from Council to work through the issues fairly.

The Chair thanked Mrs Small for her comments. He acknowledged the approach by the MWC and the work of officers to try and deal with Maheno water consumers as equitably and transparently as possible. Council was trying to work with the Committee the way it worked with everyone else. It was not appropriate to compare Maheno with other communities that have been ratepayers, because there were new development aspects involved for Maheno. Members of the Governance Team had not agreed to any waiving of DCs but were looking at ways to minimise the impact of DCs on consumers. Extra capacity had been built into the Hamnak line over time, and someone had to pay for it. If the people joining are not going to pay for it, then everyone else would need to.

Invited by the Chair to comment, Group Manager Paul Hope advised that the commitment to the MWC was based on the expectation at the time that Council would only be operating the scheme for 12 months and then it would be transferred to the new water entity. A commitment was given that DCs would not be charged in that 12 months; importantly, it was only ever a 12-month commitment on the understanding that the Scheme would be transferred to a new water entity and Council could not make a commitment on that entity's behalf. Understandably, the DC issue has become far more important now that there had been a decision to delay the creation of the water services entities by central government. Every piece of correspondence he had seen always limited the non-charge of

DCs to 12 months. If Council was going to be taking responsibility for it longer than that, then the matter would have to go into the LTP next year.

The Chair noted that the UNGA provided rights to water, but that was not a right to free water.

Mrs Small responded that MWC was not asking for free water; just affordable water.

The Chair acknowledged that that came at a cost, and cost is apportioned as fairly as possible. Council would look at that and into some of the other details she had raised. There may be a decision to subsidise the water charges, but that decision could not be made now without further information and analysis by officers. He sought to be very clear that Council could take over the Maheno water scheme on day 1. However, Council was not aware of the state of the scheme's assets and there were challenges in that, but it was willing to take it on because Maheno was part of our wider Waitaki community. The people that Council would engage to look after the scheme would come with a cost.

During further interactions, Mrs Small noted that MWC had only received the draft agreement from Council's lawyers on Thursday and had not yet had time to meet with the Maheno community. She believed they would be very disappointed to learn that the non-charging of DCs was just for 12 months. She mentioned that Reidston scheme consumers had not paid DCs. On that point, the Chair advised that DIA had paid the DCs for Reidston consumers, so Council did recover that cost. If MWC could find someone to do that for them, that would be appropriate too, but the important point to realise was that Reidston consumers had initiated that, not Council. Mrs Small said she understood that, and noted that as a community, Maheno knew that water needed to be paid for; that the supply would not be free; or that they should not expect to have to pay for it. They just did not want to pay more than any other ratepayer on the Hamnak line.

The Chair reiterated that, if the DCs were not paid, then someone else had to pay them.

Mrs Small advised that Maheno ratepayers felt they were being treated in a biased way, as they had paid for the Maheno scheme in the same ways as others had. The Chair noted that Council had maintained the assets for other schemes, and depreciation had been accounted for alongside that. That said, he saw a need for Council to put together the relevant information to ensure there is clarity around what people have been paying. He acknowledged the work the MWC had done and the financial benefit the Maheno community had derived from that. However, the district's other ratepayers had not had that benefit and Council had to be mindful of that, too.

The Chair then asked Mrs Small if the MWC was prepared to carry on if the connection of the scheme could not take place in six months. Mrs Small answered "yes". They had a timeline and expected that to be considered. If Council was determined that DCs must be paid by scheme users, the MWC wanted to see that the new changes were able to be affected even if they did not agree with them. She sought a commitment from Council that it would act in the in the best financial interests of the Maheno community. The Chair said Council would do its best to act in the best interests of all its consumers – and that was the difference. Council was not in a position to be able to subsidise everyone. That is one of the concerns around all of the water reforms occurring at this time.

Asked by a Member whether the delay in handover of assets to the new ten water entities would mean that any DCs left payable would be taken over by the new entities as a debt, Mr Hope advised that there had been no change indicated to the approach on that matter – if there was a debt in place, it would pass across. There were also other options arising from the Revenue and Financing policy that could be introduced to assist with this matter through the LTP. Council has an RFP that it needs to comply with. The offer arrangement that has been offered to MWC is the most appropriate in those circumstances.

The Chair acknowledged the advice that any debt made by water consumers would be assumed by the relevant water entity. That is why Council could hold things for 12 months. He advised Mrs Small that Council could not confirm what would happen after that time, but that it would try to be as reasonable as it could. He assured Mrs Small that Council understood the MWC's concerns, and it would try to do its best for Maheno but would also need to be mindful of affordability for all.

Speaker 2: Mr Ray Henderson said he was “very worried” about Three Waters (now Affordable Water), especially given the General Election in October. Through the Annual Plan submission hearings, there had been discussions about putting off activities because the world could change. And yet, some projects had been brought forward. He suggested to Council that the optimum thing to do would be to delay any project that has not yet been started and any that are way beyond budget.

Regarding workshops, the Ratepayers Association still wanted these to be open and had asked for them to be, as was happening elsewhere in the country. The Association had submitted a LGOIMA request for a list of Council workshops for the last year and the items listed totalled 68. He said that the Mayor had indicated on at least two occasions that he (the Mayor) also wanted that to happen, but it has not happened yet. Mr Henderson felt that Council used to be open, and there was a need for it to be so again so that ratepayers had information to be able to sensibly submit to hearings and any consultation. He noted that, “if it does not happen very, very soon, the Ratepayers Association will raise it with the Ombudsman”.

Regarding the list of 68 workshops, the Chair noted that about half of them were not workshops at all, they were information sessions, one of them was a site visit, but they had been included because of the broader definition that the Ratepayers Association had used in its request. The Chair acknowledged that Council did not blame the Ratepayers Association for saying there were 68 as Council had been using the term “workshop” for anything other than a formal, decision-making meeting, and that was probably not the best approach which was now being remedied. Regarding open workshops, the Chair said he did support some of them being open to the public, but he also had some concerns that some elected members may be more reticent about speaking at them, which may be one of the compromises to occur going forward. Mr Henderson referred to the consultation on the harbour plan, where a public workshop had been held in the Inkbox at the Oamaru Opera House. It had been an open environment and interactive. The culture at Council now had changed, he felt, and that sort of discussion would be held behind closed doors. The Chair advised that he had made the decision to hold that workshop in public and would make the same decision again today. The consultant had brought back something that Council did not agree with.

The Chair closed the Public Forum and directed the meeting to Agenda Item 4.1.

4 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

4.1 PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 9 MAY 2023

RESOLVED WDC 2023/073

Moved: Cr Jim Hopkins
Seconded: Cr Brent Cowles

That Council confirms the Public Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 9 May 2023, as circulated, as a true and correct record of that meeting.

CARRIED

5 DECISION REPORTS

5.1 MAHENO WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT WITH MAHENO WATER COMMITTEE

The report, as circulated, sought Council’s approval of the draft legal agreement with the Maheno Water Committee to record the terms and conditions of the transfer of the Maheno Water Supply over to Council. The Chair highlighted that the legal agreement, in its current but unfinished state, had been circulated separately in the Agenda Addendum for this meeting.

Group Manager Paul Hope advised that a decision on this matter was 'reasonably time critical', so that a rate could then be included in the Annual Plan. If no rate was able to be included, then there would be no funding available for the Maheno Water Committee. While it could be delayed for 12 months and fully resolved through the Long Term Plan (LTP) process, the Committee had advised that it was not prepared to operate for another 12 months, and therefore a decision is required at this meeting. Mr Hope added that the circumstances had changed quite significantly with the delay of the creation of the Water Services entity by central government. However, all material that he had seen had referred to a 12-month period for those reasons. There had never been a cancellation of development contributions (DC). Rather, there had simply been a 'no requirement to pay them for the first 12 months'. To try and include that in a legal agreement would be very difficult as it would place a limitation on Council for future funding of water. Regarding the request for fair treatment, what has been done has been treated consistent with the supply of water rates elsewhere. Council needs to take a position at this meeting and then that needs to be inserted into the agreement, for it then to be signed off in the next period. Officers have taken it as far as they can under RFP and consistent with what Council had previously agreed and with the consultation document for the Annual Plan. Members of the community outside of Maheno may be impacted and Council needs to take a position at this meeting with regard to what areas can still be negotiated as terms in the agreement and what parts are our 'bottom line'.

Cr Jim Hopkins raised a Point of Order relating to the receipt of the draft legal document in the Agenda Addendum and whether there was a need to receive that first. With the leave of the Chair, the Governance Advisor explained that the draft legal document was referenced in the report in the main agenda, and it was noted there that it would be following separately. Therefore, the legal agreement had been signalled as a part of the agenda and therefore it did not need to be formally received separately. The Chair agreed with that advice, and ruled, in response to the Point of Order, that Council could proceed to discuss it at this meeting.

There was brief discussion on the highlighted red text in the draft legal agreement and the fact that it stated various elements "will not be imposed before 1 July 2024" but it did not state that they will be imposed after 1 July 2024. When asked if there would be an automatic application from 1 July 2024, Mr Hope advised that it was "not an absolute, because Council would need to review the Development Contributions (DC) policy as part of the LTP first.

It was suggested that the Governance Team needed to know more about the whole context of the decision around water. With a loan sitting there for the extra capacity on the line, if everything went to the new entity, then that debt would go with it, and it would be up to the entity to decide how to deal with the debt. It was further clarified that Council did not know at this time what a minimum threshold would be. Mr Hope advised that Council could give an indication relating to Oamaru water and of what DCs would need to be paid under the current policy. However, that would not be helpful under the agreement, and Council could not give any level of certainty other than this is what we are going to charge in 12 months' time.

Regarding the current position, Chief Executive Alex Parmley advised that the Policy stipulates that the community receiving the service has to pay for it and Council had already signalled that, because of the water reforms, it would need to have an open discussion with the community about that. If there is to be a move to a different model – where other communities subsidise the water cost for the one benefitting from it, that would be a breach of current Policy. Whilst Council wanted to help with the scheme and recognised the potential burden on the Maheno community as part of the transfer, Council needed to be mindful that moving away from the policy would pose a risk without first going out for consultation.

MOTION

Based on that discussion, Cr Jim Hopkins said he would move the report's recommendation, and Mayor Gary Kircher seconded it from the chair.

Discussion on the motion:

The Chair noted that Council was trying to help a community through a difficult position, and he acknowledged the Committee's good work to date. He also highlighted that Council was finding

out, for all its water schemes, that they could not be run in the future as they had been run in the past; there were increased compliance standards, challenges around testing water much more frequently, and the like, and they were difficult for volunteers to continue to manage. It was necessary to run the schemes as best and affordably as possible, but there were costs involved and if one party did not pay for them, then another party had to.

RESOLVED WDC 2023/074

Moved: Cr Jim Hopkins

Seconded: Mayor Gary Kircher

That Council:

1. Approves the draft legal agreement with the Maheno Water Committee to transfer the Maheno Water Supply over to Council, subject to any minor amendments agreed by Council; and
2. Instructs officers to inform the Maheno Water Committee that the legal agreement has been approved; and
3. Delegates to the Chief Executive the power to sign the agreement on Council's behalf.

CARRIED

The Chair thanked members of the Maheno Water Committee for sharing their concerns with Council. He acknowledged that those concerns were understood, but also that Council had a responsibility to look at the district as a whole as it was working through this matter. He thanked staff for the time and effort they had expended to reach the current point and he hoped that discussions would continue to proceed well from here.

5.2 KEY DIRECTIONS FOR THE 2023-24 ANNUAL PLAN

The report, as circulated, sought Council's consideration of the additional information requested by the Governance Team arising from the 2023/24 Annual Plan hearing of submissions and deliberations held on Tuesday 16 May 2023, and to provide final direction to officers on changes to the draft 2023/24 Annual Plan.

Group Manager Paul Hope highlighted the decisions that needed to be made (in the report recommendations) and the process for achieving that (outlined on page 22 of the agenda papers).

Prior to discussions, the following summary of rates elements was acknowledged for the record:

- Rates as proposed for community engagement – **8.06%**
- Total proposed rates requirement prior to this Key Directions Council Meeting – **7.95%**

Discussion on the report and attachments followed, and a summary of the outcomes is provided below.

Economic study of OWCT – There was some support for proceeding with this. Officers suggested it would be better to discuss that once the Economic Development Agency had been established because such a study would fall to that entity to conduct it and investigate funding opportunities. One Member expressed concern that that would essentially postpone the economic study for around 12 months, to allow sufficient time for the EDA to be established and settle in.

Decision – return to this topic

Shuttle Service to Dunedin: The St John solution could be at least a year away, and none of the longer-term solutions would happen immediately, either.

Decision: Leave in for now. Officers to find out from St John what their intended timeframe is and whether any delay was the result of a need to seek volunteers or fundraising, or whether a

Council donation would help speed things up. In addition, Governance Team members to liaise with operators and consider options and potential funding (including a subsidy) for a service at some later stage. That would need to include the Otago Regional Council which rated for such services, and it was noted that would be more of a longer-term option.

Awamoa Park Toilet: It was clarified that the Memorial Oaks had been considered as part of discussions on this facility, but it was not known whether the Heritage Advisor had been involved. Concern was raised about why any of the road reserve might be required because that had not been part of the discussions to date.

Decision: More information is required.

Waitaki Sports and Events Centre – Elected Members wanted more information about the operating cost and loan and how it would be shared across the district, as well as about the status of funding from the Trust. At this point, detail around how the money would come into Council and how it would be expended would be helpful. Mr Hope advised that there needed to be a realistic amount in the Annual Plan about what would be treated as revenue and what would be expended. This was more of a technical process. Because it is embedded in the Annual Plan, it has a number of accounting impacts even though that would not affect rates. Accordingly, there needed to be an amount that has a project along with it in order for work to be able to continue. Importantly, it did not commit Council at this time to any particular contribution.

Decision: More information is required.

Ahuriri Community Board submission – The issue of **dust on Settlement Road** was repeated year after year. Cr Cowles had circulated some information on a range of products that may be effective in suppressing dust, and it was proposed that Council commence an experimental trial with identified products on exemplar roads within the existing roading budget. Chief Executive Mr Parmley advised that Council did not have any spare funding to allocate to such a trial. If Council made a commitment to that proposal today, it would need to be on the basis that it would be uncosted and officers would need to bring back a proposal about what could be done and what would need to not be done in order to fund it. Two other Members spoke in support of the proposal. A user-pays option would also put forward as a potential solution.

Decision: Officers to prepare a proposal on dust suppression options for specific roads, including costs.

Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC) – Federated Farmers had requested an increase. Mr Hope believed it was currently around 18%. If that was increased to 30% as Federated Farmers had submitted, then the overall increase in individual properties' rates would be too high due to around 80% of the residential rates requirements in 2023-24 then being a fixed charge. Mr Hope said his team would be monitoring the UAGC closely over the next 12 months.

Decision: No change

Hampden wastewater treatment – It was noted that the officer report stated that for this work to be done, something else would have to be deferred. The Chair said he believed the work had to be done, which was supported by Councillors.

Decision: To be included

Tūhura Otago Museum contribution – It was noted that the Dunedin City Council had confirmed an increased contribution of 5%, and it was suggested that our Council should do the same (an increase of 5%) which would save \$1k.

Decision: Agree to increase contribution by 5%

Parking – Mr Hope explained that item 1 would be returning to the status quo that has been in place – two hours free parking, and then charging, with the discussion to also consider increasing the parking charge once resumed; item 3 would be to utilise the existing reserve to limit the impact on the Oamaru business rate. All would have a positive impact on the Oamaru business rate primarily. A Member raised the question that, given the rates examples used in the consultation document, should not there have been an automatic decrease? However, that was shown in the

report. Mr Hope advised that the first five items had been included because they had been given general support during the deliberations. They need a specific decision first, however, and then that would go into the equation before they could be included in the final budget. Mr Parmley added that the other options had been included because there was no emergent direction from discussions at the deliberations and officers could not proceed to include or exclude them until a Council decision was made at this meeting.

Other key comments made during discussions included that (i) the proposed increase in item 2 would be \$1 per hour; and (ii) that there was a need to keep working on the long-term solution for parking in Oamaru. Regarding (ii), a Member noted that there was strong support for continuing the two hours free parking, but equally there was support for increasing the charge after that which would provide additional revenue. Reserves could be used to assist with the transition, and it was noted that staff had done some work on options and technology had been considered as well. The Member thought it was time for Council to 'stop kicking the can down the road on parking and deal with it'. The intention should be to get through winter and allow people to appreciate the couple of hours free parking before increasing the charge after that free period.

Cr Holding left the meeting at 10.51am and returned at 10.54am.

Group Manager Roger Cook sought clarification on whether the free parking was to start from 10.00am onwards and to go through to midday. The Chair believed that would be problematic, and stated his preference for two hours in total and suggested a timeframe from 9.00am to 11.00am would make more sense.

Mr Cook asked if officer calculations on what that would mean for permit holders would help inform Council's discussions, one Member shared their surprise that off-street parking could be at a premium and noted that if the proposal was to apply to permit holders, there would be a cost. It was suggested that that detail be dealt with separately. Officers would bring back recommendations to the 27 June 2023 Council Meeting accordingly.

Palmerston Tracks and North Otago Mountain Biking Club – One Member noted that this was a good case where austerity was needed, because it involved \$7.5k increase in funding. They noted that there were many opportunities like this one, where items could be classified as 'nice to have', rather than 'need to have'. They supported maintaining the \$17k budget but noted that the extra \$7.5k was symbolic of spending where Council could not afford to spend at these difficult economic times. Another Member sought to argue differently and suggested an increase of \$3k instead due to the increased area looked after by the Club, to the benefit of the wider public.

Another Member asked if that would place pressure on maintenance requirements. In response, it was suggested that it was a 'chicken and egg' situation. There was some support to increase funding for tracks where viable but 'not with an open chequebook'. There was a need to identify what was affordable to do with the money in place, but also to find the right balance. It was clarified that the increase in tracks funding was possibly in response to inflation, and it was noted that an initial grant had come from the North Otago Mountain Biking Club with the rest from the Waihemo Community Board (it was acknowledged that the Board's funding was from ratepayers as well).

Another Member felt that the request for additional funding was unreasonable and if Council was trying to be constrained, then the increase should be pulled back to \$3k.

Decision: An increase of \$3k only

OWCT – The increase in visitor centre funding of \$50,000 was supported.

Decision: Increase as proposed

Geopark – One Member suggested to their colleagues around the table that there had to be more hard-nosed decisions between what is needed and what is wanted. They felt there had to be some input from those who were requesting income, because Council is not a bank and it had to supply funds to the whole district. The Geopark was now in place and internationally recognised so funding could not be denied, but there was a need to look at the whole operation, it was suggested.

Otago Museum – it was acknowledged that this had been agreed earlier in the conversation.

Community Board requests for budgets for members to attend conferences – one of the community board councillors spoke in support of this request because it would be beneficial to provide some formal training to community board members and to have the opportunity to discuss with other communities what they were doing and to bring other ideas and thinking back to their own board table discussions. This was acknowledged.

Decision: Yes, increase as proposed.

Parks for small dogs – There was support for adding this item for LTP discussions but not to be added to rates.

Decision: Agreed as above (not rates-funded).

OWCT – Regarding the request for a Council grant to offset the loan, it was suggested that a grant of \$21k be offered that is funded from ground rents (ie a non-rates grant to offset loan interest. This was supported by one Member. Another Member acknowledged that the Trust was doing a great job, but noted it was ironic that Council was giving the Trust money to cover interest on a loan that had been there for a while. They felt there was a serious need for Council to revisit how the Trust worked with Council. The Chair agreed with that point but noted that it would not happen before the end of June when the Annual Plan needed to be adopted.

A different Member felt that Council still needed to have an honest and provocative conversation with the Trust. The Trust had spent a lot of money on refurbishing the Criterion's kitchen, and in theory, the Trust should be generating income from those expenses, they believed. They also felt that the Trust should be able to cover mortgage and interest charges.

The Chair noted that the Trust would have had a discount on their land rent from Council if they had applied for it, but they had not due to changes in personnel and a loss of institutional knowledge. Council wanted them to invest in the buildings and wanted to see the buildings used. It is expensive to operate historic buildings. He then asked for a show of hands in favour of allocating \$21k from ground rents to the Trust and declared the count to be 6 – 3 in favour.

Decision: Include a grant of \$21k

Sealing of eastern and western ends of District Road – One Member queried the proposed allocation of \$250k to do all or one end of District Road. They noted that the sealing policy required residents to contribute before Council would commit to some sealing, and suggested Council should commit only to engage with them about it. The Chair acknowledged that and also that it would be loan-funded, and he was happy to support that view and for it to be reflected in the officer report.

Puketapu Track – It was noted that the Waihemo Community Board wanted to switch Better Off Funding to this from the Palmerston CBD project. Mr Hope sought an indication from Council that they would support officers talking to DIA to negotiate that switch. The Chair acknowledged that it is an economic development project for Palmerston either way, and it was the Board's preference to make the switch. Mr Parmley suggested the matter be discussed in the context of the Better Off Funding, to which the Chair agreed.

Ahuriri Community Board items – Ahuriri Ward Councillor Brent Cowles spoke to these. Regarding the footpath to the Kurow bridge, it was noted that there was funding in the amenity rate which could be used for that, so there would be no rating impact on that. With regard to the building resilience items, they too could be included because the funding was already there and there would be no rating impact for them, either.

Waihemo Community Board creating a new footpath on a feeder street to the school (ie Copinsha Street) – It was noted that three had previously been approved to be done, but there was only enough funding for two. It was suggested that the Palmerston amenity rate could be used to fund a substantive part of this work, and loan-fund the rest.

Decision: Amenity rate to be used, and loan-funding as required.

Hampden Sewerage Scheme – It was noted that the Hampden community was waiting on this, so it had to be done. Officers had suggested that, if Hampden proceeded, then another scheme would have to wait. The project for Duntroon's wastewater treatment was selected for delay because it had a similar allocation of staff time and resource. Asked if Ohau was another option

instead of Duntroun, Mr Hope advised that Ohau would require vastly more staff resources, so it was already being delayed.

Decision: Add in Hampden sewerage scheme; delay Duntroun.

Waitaki Sports and Events Centre – The money expected from grants had not been received this year. The decision on whether to contribute \$10M or \$15M was conditional and dependent on figures yet to be received, so it would be delayed until 13 June, or perhaps even the 27 June Council Meeting.

Decision: Delayed pending receipt of more financial information

Shuttle Service –

Decision: To be left in for now.

As a consequence of decisions taken thus far in the meeting, the revised rates requirement was now sitting at **7.95%**.

Mr Hope advised that there were no other items that would have a rates impact, so 7.95% was now proposed to be the rates increase that Council would put into the Annual Plan. That was an overall increase only; every individual ratepayer would see a movement quite different to that.

The meeting moved on to the project schedules.

Three Waters – this was confirmed.

Duntroun wastewater – to be removed.

Asked whether the FTE figures stated for project delivery were based on what was achievable, inclusive of carry forward projects, Mr Hope advised that it had been prepared on that basis. However, 12 months would be a long time in the Waters space and retaining staff, and recruiting and retaining contractors, would be critical factors so they were the best understanding on current availability in the market and internally. Things that would be carried forward in the Waters space were already underway – eg Kakanui, which had an 8-12 month delivery programme. The concerns raised in the Public Forum were mostly around cost increase, and in response Mr Hope advised that any project that went outside of budget limits would come back to Council to defer the decision. The reticulation work was a 'best estimate' only at the moment, and regular updates would be provided to the Governance Team as work progressed.

Regarding emergency management works, the proposed project allocation was at \$100k. One Member suggested that that should be directed to building resilience in communities, given the need to make sure that halls were ready to be communication centres and had star lamps and satellite phones, and allowed for power to continue. The Chair suggested that up to \$250k be allocated from the Disaster Fund to invest in building that resilience. Another Member supported that suggestion.

Decision: the Chair ruled that it be included.

It was clarified that the \$1M on backflow prevention would be for on-demand supplies and not on restricted ones.

The details of how the \$1M would be spent on Asset Group roading matters would be provided in due course.

The Chair directed the meeting back to the report recommendations and sought a mover and seconder for them noting that agreed changes had been made during discussions on this item and that that would be reflected in a slightly reworded recommendation 2.

The Chair also noted that he had intended to move an additional motion to acknowledge that decisions on Council's proposed contribution to the Sports and Events Centre would be made later, but he believed that that comment had already been captured and acknowledged in the preceding discussion.

RESOLVED WDC 2023/075

Moved: Cr Brent Cowles
Seconded: Cr Courtney Linwood

That Council:

1. Receives further information as requested at the hearings and deliberations held on Tuesday 16 May 2023; and
2. Agrees the final changes to the draft 2023/24 Annual Plan as discussed at this meeting in advance of its adoption on 27 June 2023 as recorded in the Summary of Movement in Projected rates (Attachment 2), and noting the proposed revision of the 3 Waters project delivery programme (Attachment 3); and
3. Pursuant to section 95 (2A) of the Local Government Act 2002, agrees that the proposed 2023/24 Annual Plan does include significant or material differences to Year 3 of the 2021/2031 Long Term Plan; and
4. Instructs officers to make final changes to the draft 2023/24 Annual Plan based on the resolution of recommendations 1 and 2 above; and
5. Notes that the draft 2023/24 Annual Plan will be presented to Council for adoption at the Council Meeting scheduled for 27 June 2023.

CARRIED

5.3 WATER ENTITY MEMBERSHIP

The report, as circulated, sought a decision of Council about whether it has a preference to be in the Canterbury/Westland Water Entity (Entity I) or the Otago/Southland Entity (Entity J).

Group Manager Paul Hope noted that this was a 'relatively brief report on an important item'. He acknowledged that Waitaki's membership choice came down to the potentially different impact of each on the financial line. The 'absolute numbers' were certainly debatable, but the quantum between the two was very clear. Waitaki would be better off financially if it joined the Canterbury / Westland Water Entity (Entity I).

It was clarified that:

- The figures stated were an estimate of where average residential water accounts would get to after 20 years, as a per annum number. While they would not show in accounts in the first 12 months, they would rapidly get to that level.
- Officers have communicated with the Runaka but had not had a formal response back yet, so it was not possible to state one way or the other at this time.

One Member suggested that, on that basis, and "sadly", Canterbury was looking like the better option for Waitaki. Most of the district's water source is coming from the top, and without the source, there could be no reticulation, so Council did not have too many options.

MOTION

Cr Jim Hopkins then moved the report's recommendations, and Cr Courtney Linwood seconded the motion.

Discussion on the motion:

One Member's view was that joining Entity I "made sense". The big fundamental difference is the cost. Some are concerned that Christchurch would have a lot of sway in that entity. Equally, Dunedin could have similar sway in the Otago/Southland entity. However, the way the representative groups are being set up, every Council would now have a voice, and only one voice each. That was more than what was offered under Central Government's previous model.

However, the voice was not weighted by population, so Waitaki would have as much say as Christchurch if it joined the northern entity, and as much say as Dunedin if it went south.

One Member suggested to the meeting that, given the considerable comments from the ratepayers including the new group about the 'unpalatable option' in relation to its imposition from central government, the key issue was that, in terms of finances, Entity I is half the cost. They hoped that, for those members of the public who wanted Waitaki District Council to be mindful of costs, that they would understand why Waitaki would choose Canterbury/Westland over Otago/Southland for that reason.

Asked about the level of confidence in the figures in the report, Mr Hope advised that he was "very confident" about the relative difference stated, as the figures were largely driven by population.

RESOLVED WDC 2023/076

Moved: Cr Jim Hopkins

Seconded: Cr Courtney Linwood

That Council:

1. Communicates to the Minister of Local Government that the Waitaki District Council has a preference to join the Canterbury/Westland Water Entity (Entity I) and thanks the Minister for the opportunity to have input into this decision; and
2. Instructs the Mayor and Chief Executive to communicate this decision as soon as practicable to the Minister and the Department of Internal Affairs.

CARRIED

5.4 ADOPTION OF THE PROPERTY STRATEGY

The report, as circulated, sought Council's adoption of a new strategic direction for the delivery of improved outcomes and services for Council property management. Mr Duncan Mitchell, a representative of consultant entity TwentyTwo, participated in the discussion on this agenda item via Zoom.

Chief Executive Alex Parmley introduced the report and highlighted that no property would be considered surplus until Council resolved to make it surplus. There would be a process to achieve that result.

The Chair left the meeting at 11.49am, and Cr Jim Hopkins assumed the role of Chair.

Mr Parmley also advised that the Property Strategy did not include parks and reserves because that was another whole task in itself and was made difficult by numerous different types of reserves.

A Member shared their concern that Forrester Heights had been listed as "surplus" in the strategy document and, noting that it was a decision of the previous Council, asked if the decision could be revisited. Mr Parmley advised that it was listed as 'surplus' because of that previous Council decision and revisiting it would require another decision paper to be brought to Council. Two other Members agreed that it may be premature to identify Forrester Heights as surplus given that no final decision to sell it had been reached.

Another Member was concerned about Council being asked to make a decision on a property strategy that excluded parks and reserves, which meant that the full portfolio of Council properties was not available for consideration.

Mayor Gary Kircher returned to the meeting at 11.53am and resumed the role of Chair.

Property Co-Manager Lori Butterworth advised that Forrester Heights being listed as 'surplus' was a holding pattern only, and the Governance Team would be kept up to date about possible solutions for it through the investigations. It was there because there had been a resolution to

investigate options for selling it. The Chair acknowledged this as a “legitimate approach”, given that no other uses for the land had been agreed.

Another Member highlighted that property activity was costing ratepayers a lot of money. There was probably a lot of property that was not needed and to which ratepayers had to contribute through their rates. Those issues of affordability could be slightly elevated now that Council had a UNESCO Geopark within its property portfolio which would also have costs.

It was noted that Holmes Wharf was listed as ‘strategic’, but it was suggested it could also be ‘commercial’. Officers noted that that property would be unlikely to ever pay for its own costs.

A correction to the previous named “Steam Café” was requested.

ACTION: Property team

When asked, Property Assets Officer Mathew Scott clarified that the “Portfolio Snapshot in Scope” had been created by the consultant at the outset of the property strategy development before moving into the current classification. A number of the 410 sites were from the fixed value register. 159 sites had since been classified as part of the strategy.

Asked if that was the whole portfolio of property owned by Council, Mr Parmley reiterated that it did not include parks and reserves at this stage, which included a lot of property, was a complex area, and would constitute a massive piece of substantive work.

It was acknowledged that parks and reserves did include leases that were out for grazing, some of which provided revenue to Council. A concern raised was that the property strategy before Council should cover everything, not just the pieces that the Property Department looked after. They were keen to see Council progress all of its properties through the classification process, and once the template had been set by Council, then staff would be able to proceed with the work involved. Other Members supported that view, noting their understanding of the need to make a start with something first.

It was suggested that a GIS overlay showing all Council properties would be beneficial, and the identification of which ones were in scope of the strategy and which ones were currently outside of scope.

The reference on page 189 of the agenda papers to “In future, Council may consider opportunities to sell or repurpose” was highlighted as something not to lose sight of, because further enhancements could be made.

The practicalities of the implementation road map were raised. When asked about the process that would be involved if the Governance Team did decide to move something to ‘surplus’, Assets Operations Manager Joshua Rendell advised that a report would need to come to a Council Meeting with a case for that move, and it would require a decision of Council before action could be taken. Another Member asked if that decision would be approved in principle that something would be ‘surplus’ because, if Council had not yet gone out to the market to achieve something, it would not know what might be yielded from the process. In that case, would there be a feedback loop available? Mr Parmley said the simple answer would be ‘probably’. If it was a small piece of property, Council could state that, if it delivered “x”, then it could be done via him and his team (by delegation). But for a bigger property, it would come back to Council for a decision. Ms Butterworth noted that a list of properties that might be considered for sale would be provided to Council in such circumstances. The Chair acknowledged that the ‘devil would be in the detail’ and it would be important for Council to see that list.

Ms Butterworth further explained that, through the strategy implementation process, officers would also be creating draft policies, and through reporting, Council would be able to determine how best they are achieved (eg GIS maps). It would be a collaborative process.

Another Member suggested that some of the building categorisations were based on current use, so storage would be ‘operational’ whereas a building like Community House that is delivering on many of Council’s wellbeing outcomes for the community would be ‘strategic’. That would not change until Community House gets a new home (something bigger would be needed). That would be a detail, but a concerning detail if that is not sorted. The Drill Hall also provided

community outcomes and would need a specific process that would consider what would happen to the 100-200 people who are using that currently? The RSA building could potentially have strategic or commercial opportunities but was currently sitting in “Other Assets”. Areas around the harbour that are nominally at least identified as opportunities for commercial development would require getting the balance right between public and commercial areas but there was no mention of that. Is that something that the Harbour Area Sub-Committee could develop to better seek out where those people could be? The Member felt that there was a need to look at how those sorts of issues were approached, and this document is not what they were expecting in that regard. “Parks and reserves” should be in there because they are strategic, but they would always be wanted to be there for public recreation. Other assets Council was managing were leased out which meant a commercial aspect. With that in mind, if something was adopted by Council today it would be as a stage one strategy; with a stage two expectation that there are other aspects still to be covered.

Mr Parmley noted that a lot of issues had been raised during that commentary. He advised that this was a strategy, not a plan, and there was a whole programme of work yet to be developed which would take years to be completed. It would not be this Council that would agree to that; it would be a future one. Part of that process is working through whether something in one category can be moved to another. Taking the RSA building as an example, it was classified as operational now, but the notes say that it has potential to be more strategic. Therefore, if the strategy is approved today, then that would be the direction of work to be explored. Officers would come back with a plan about how to move items forward and how engagement with the Governance Team would occur. Council would still need to agree any changes.

Another Member welcomed the strategy as the start of the process and noted that there was a lot more work to be done. Further along, they acknowledged that there would be opportunities for the Governance Team to make political decisions on the future of particular buildings and that was what they had been elected to do. This is the starting point, not the finishing point. There would be many opportunities for Council to consider and realise going forward.

MOTION

Cr Jim Hopkins moved the report’s recommendations and Cr Jeremy Holding seconded the motion.

Discussion on the motion:

The question was raised about whether comments and questions could be incorporated into the strategy now. Mr Parmley sought clarification on which ones specifically. He felt they would be better resolved through the ongoing discussions that would inform another report to a future meeting. The commitment to quality design was put forward as an example. Ms Butterworth advised that it would be difficult to commit to that today without exploring further the implications of the suggestion. Instead, it could be proposed during the investigations and addressed as matters progressed.

The need for some recategorisation was highlighted. 29 Aln Street had originally been bought as a site for community housing but was now residential accommodation; the Drill Hall, Community House, and the RSA needed to be listed as strategic rather than sitting in Other Property because they were too important to be in the “other” category. Ms Butterworth advised that the RSA was in the “other” group to recognise its complexity.

The Chair asked the meeting if there was support for the Drill Hall, Community Hall, and the RSA buildings to be reclassified as strategic. One Member agreed; another suggested that Council could simply commit today to saying it was not on the market and reserving the categorisation for a later discussion. They felt the logic of the current classification was valid and should stay.

Views for the reclassification included that Council was trying to transform and stop working in silos, prepare itself to be a “Future for Local Government” leading council, and having other organisations helping to deliver on community wellbeings. The Drill Hall was delivering on physical

wellbeing and so it had a strategic purpose. There was a need to get away from silo thinking and to link strategies together.

Mr Parmley advised that, if there was a desire of Council to use some buildings more strategically, then engagement with the Governance Team would facilitate that. Nothing would be changed without their involvement.

One Member used the Harbour Endowment land's current classification as commercial for illustrative purposes. Noting the discussion earlier in the meeting regarding the repurposing of the ground rental, they asked whether it would sit under a commercial classification, or should it be classified as strategic based on the service it is providing? A Member responded that they felt it should still be commercial. Another felt that Council did not need to be as concerned about such subtleties at this stage, and in response the Member who had raised this topic shared their concern that, if Council did not deal with the subtleties, then the strategy may not work. There was a need to link to other strategies for the purposes Council had within the local government framework. A third Member acknowledged what was being said but believed that the task for Council today was to accept the document as a 'beginning document'. There was no support from other Members for the reclassification of buildings at this time.

RESOLVED WDC 2023/077

Moved: Cr Jim Hopkins

Seconded: Cr Jeremy Holding

That Council:

1. Adopts the Property Strategy presented at Attachment 1; and
2. Notes the High-level Implementation Plan included as Attachment 2.

CARRIED

5.5 INTERIM SPEED MANAGEMENT PLAN

The report, as circulated, sought Council approval for Waitaki District Council's Draft Interim Speed Management Plan (ISMP) (Attachment 3) so that it can be submitted to Waka Kotahi for certification.

Network Infrastructure Engineer Rodger McGaw advised that officers had completed the action points from the ISMP Hearings held on 2 May 2023. They had met with Weston School and the Principal was happy to have the variable speed limit. They had also met with Five Forks School who were also happy with the proposed 60 km speed limit. Council's feedback had also been provided to Waka Kotahi.

Other matters clarified during brief discussion on the report are summarised below.

State Highway matters would be noted in Council's submission to Waka Kotahi's own interim speed management plan later in the year.

Regarding early childhood centres falling outside of the scope of Council's ISMP, Mr McGaw confirmed that officers had sought agreement from Weston School to extend the speed limit to the Weston early childhood centre, and that had been agreed. In Council's full speed management plan later in the year, Council would be creating zones, and it could look at including kindergartens in the outlying areas of those.

A new or revised National Policy Statement was expected to be released in June, which would take account of some of the changes Government will make. Officers had sought advice from Waka Kotahi on the possible impacts of that.

One Member acknowledged the time, patience and effort of officers that had gone into this process and the ISMP which had been produced.

RESOLVED WDC 2023/078

Moved: Cr John McCone

Seconded: Cr Brent Cowles

That Council:

1. Approves the attached Waitaki District Council Draft Interim Speed Management Plan (ISMP) 2023 to be submitted to Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency for certification; and
2. Acknowledges that Waka Kotahi certification is required before any speed changes can be made. Once certification is achieved, officers can initiate the speed reductions outside Phase One schools, as per the consultation document.

CARRIED

The meeting was reconvened at 1.36pm and the Chair directed discussion to Agenda Item 5.6.

5.6 COUNCIL LETTERS OF SHAREHOLDER EXPECTATION TO COUNCIL CONTROLLED ORGANISATIONS FOR FY 2023-2024

The report, as circulated, sought approval of the Letters of Shareholder Expectation for each of Council's four Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs).

Group Manager Paul Hope advised that three of the letters were reasonably consistent with those sent the previous year because Council had set out some longer term objectives in those letters and achieving the outcomes was not realistic in one year.

Mr Hope acknowledged and welcomed the input of Chief Financial Officer Amanda Nicholls this year, and in particular the important changes to the letter of shareholder expectations to Tourism Waitaki Limited this year, because of the potential impact on that agency of proposals in the Economic Development Strategy.

Mr Hope advised that drafts of the letters had been sent prior to this meeting to each of the four CCOs, with the intention that they would draw on their content and incorporate it into their Final Statements of Intent for FY 2023/2024 which were scheduled to be formally received at the Council Meeting scheduled for 27 June 2023.

RESOLVED WDC 2023/079

Moved: Cr Jim Hopkins

Seconded: Cr Jeremy Holding

That Council:

1. Approves the attached Letters of Shareholder Expectation for FY 2023-2024 for Council Controlled Organisations, with any agreed minor amendments, for:
 - a) Whitestone Contracting Limited; and
 - b) Tourism Waitaki Limited; and
 - c) Omarama Airfield Limited; and
 - d) Waitaki District Health Services Limited.

CARRIED

5.7 2022/2023 CAMP SEASON

The report, as circulated, updated Council on the 2022/2023 Camping season.

Questions and requests for more information were raised by Members, as summarised below.

- a) What is the capacity of Waitaki's campsites in terms of total site nights and the current utilisation, as well as the infrastructure capacity limits?
- b) How many consultants and contractors were employed and for how long for the \$25k allocated to this work?
- c) Is there any analysis available at the end of the season regarding income loss from having fewer locals or fewer visitors compared with previous years and what was the impact of COVID?
- d) How many Waitakians camped on the other side of the lake that promotional initiatives could be directed to in order to encourage them back to the Waitaki side?

Recreation Manager Lindsay Hyde undertook to provide that information.

ACTION: Recreation Manager Lindsay Hyde

Regarding costs, it was noted that Waimate had lower camping fees than Waitaki, and that season ticket sales were flat. Two of the sites were popular and four were not. Asked whether specific marketing strategies or discounts might help increase the other less popular campsites, Mr Hyde acknowledged that the two most popular ones were the largest by far. Popularity came down to consumer choice. When the marketing programme was reviewed for next year, initiatives could be altered to target particular market sectors.

On whether enhanced services (eg provision of shower blocks) would attract more campsite users, Mr Hyde advised that a survey two years ago had included questions on additional facilities but it was focused on current usage so that could be worth reviewing when facilities were renewed. Some sites were also coming to the end of their use-by life, so that would also be a factor in future reviews.

It was acknowledged that New Zealanders "take everything except the kitchen sink" (and sometimes including it!) on a camping trip because it was part of the overall 'Kiwi camping experience'.

Group Manager Paul Hope suggested that, looking ahead, the ability to generate remote power (eg via solar) may open up more possibilities to cater for slightly different target markets. Putting in power infrastructure would be cost-prohibitive, but there would be a need to keep evolving what was being offered to campers to keep pace with what urban visitors required.

RESOLVED WDC 2023/080

Moved: Cr Jim Hopkins

Seconded: Cr John McCone

That Council:

1. Receives the Waitaki Lakes Camping Report and Freedom Camping update for the 2022 /2023 season; and
2. Notes the information contained within.

CARRIED

6 RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED WDC 2023/081

Moved: Cr Jim Hopkins

Seconded: Cr Tim Blackler

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter 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 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 in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
7.1 - Public Excluded Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 9 May 2023 PE	<p>s7(2)(a) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)</p>	<p>s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of 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 or section 7</p>
7.2 - Camps Management Contract PE	<p>s7(2)(b)(ii) - 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</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)</p> <p>s7(2)(j) - the withholding of the information is necessary to prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage</p>	<p>s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of 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 or section 7</p>
7.3 - Contract 734 - Parks Maintenance Contract PE	<p>s7(2)(b)(ii) - 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</p>	<p>s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of 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 or section 7</p>

	<p>who supplied or who is the subject of the information</p> <p>s7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)</p>	
--	---	--

CARRIED

7 PUBLIC EXCLUDED SECTION

The Public Excluded Minutes apply to this section of the meeting.

8 RESOLUTION TO RETURN TO THE PUBLIC MEETING

RESOLVED WDC 2023/085

Moved: Cr Courtney Linwood
Seconded: Cr Rebecca Ryan

That Council resumes in open meeting and decisions made in the public excluded session are confirmed and made public as and when required and considered.

CARRIED

9 RELEASE OF PUBLIC EXCLUDED INFORMATION

In accordance with Waitaki District Council Standing Orders, and pursuant to resolutions in the public excluded session of the meeting, Council agreed to release the following previously public excluded information under this agenda item in the Public Minutes of this meeting.

7.3 CONTRACT 734 - PARKS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT PE

RESOLVED WDC 2023/084

Moved: Cr Jim Hopkins
Seconded: Mayor Gary Kircher

That Council:

1. Approves a one-year extension for Contract 734 to Downer (NZ) Limited from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024.

CARRIED

10 MEETING CLOSE

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting closed, at 2.19pm.

CONFIRMED at the Additional Council Meeting held on Tuesday, 4 July 2023.

.....
CHAIRPERSON