

MINUTES

TITLE: Engineering Services Committee
DATE: Thursday 12 October 2006
TIME: 9.30 am
VENUE: Council Chambers, 189 Queen Street, Richmond
PRESENT: Crs T E Norriss (Chair), M J Higgins, S G Bryant, R G Currie, J L Inglis, E M O'Regan, S J Borlase, E E Henry, N Riley, R G Kempthorne, T B King
IN ATTENDANCE: Motueka Community Board Member, A C Fry, Chief Executive (R G Dickinson), Engineering Manager (P W Thomson), Transportation Manager (R Ashworth), Utilities Asset Manager (J Cuthbertson), Minute Secretary (V M Gribble)

APOLOGIES

Moved Crs Bryant/Higgins
WK06/10/01

THAT apologies from Crs Riley, King and Kempthorne for lateness and Crs Wilkins and O'Shea for absence be sustained.
CARRIED

1 PUBLIC FORUM

1.1 D Gallagher

Mr Gallagher spoke about the preservation of the Old Mill Walkway which is a very valuable coastal esplanade reserve and worthy of protection.

1.2 B Lemke

Mr Lemke spoke about the preservation of the Old Mill Walkway and asked Council to continue consultation with the community. He noted that the ten year plan includes the seawall which would protect the walkway.

1.3 Robin Goette

Ms Goette tabled a petition of 200 signatures seeking preservation of the Old Mill Walkway. She said it is not only the direct neighbours that are using the walkway.

1.4 H Gordon

Mr Gordon was disappointed to see the eastern end of the Old Mill walkway fall away. He supports something being done to preserve the walkway.

1.5 Lynley Worsley

Mrs Worsley spoke on behalf of the Mapua Women's Recreation Group who use the walkway regularly and endorsed all the comments made by previous speakers. She said it is devastating to see how fast the walkway is eroding.

1.6 J Stringer

Mr Stringer spoke about the confusion caused by changing the name of Pig Valley Road to Church Valley Road. He requested that Church Valley Road name be dropped in favour of Pig Valley Road.

1.7 Claire Parkes

Ms Parkes lives in Church Valley and is most affected by any name change. She disagrees with the proposal of Mr Stringer and supports the staff recommendation contained in the agenda.

1.8 B Stringer

Mr Stringer said there should be a sign indicating where Pig Valley is. The logical thing to do would be to replace the sign indicating Pig Valley Road.

1.9 J McDonald

Mr McDonald lives in Pig Valley. He said there should be a sign where the paper road is, saying Pig Valley.

1.10 H Bjorklund

Ms Bjorklund spoke about the coastal protection work for the Old Mill Walkway. She was disappointed in the way the Council has handled the issue.

1.11 C Robinson

Mr Robinson spoke about increasing water charges, abandoned vehicles, street marking for car parking in Talbot Street and consultation over the proposed central business district landscaping.

2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

2.1 Engineering Services Committee – 31 August 2006

**Moved Crs Henry/Borlase
WK06/10/02**

**THAT the minutes of the Engineering Services Committee meeting held on 31 August 2006, containing resolutions numbered WK06/08/01 to WK06/08/17 be confirmed as a true and complete record of the proceedings of that meeting.
CARRIED**

3 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

**Moved Crs O'Regan/Inglis
WK06/10/03**

**THAT the Chairman's Report for October 2006 be received.
CARRIED**

Cr Riley arrived at 10.25 am.

4 ASSET MANAGEMENT REPORT – TRANSPORT

Mr Ashworth was in attendance for discussion on this item.

4.1 Richmond Town Centre Upgrade

Mr Ashworth said the sun dial will be relocated and all present brick work will be removed. He said an extensive consultation process has been undertaken with businesses and interested people and there has been no negative feedback.

4.2 Croucher Square DILs Funding

Cr Henry advised that the matter of DILs funding will be discussed by the Richmond Ward Councillors in March 2007. This item confirmed the allocation of \$100,000 has been set aside through the LTCCP.

4.3 Anatoki Track Road – Private Bridge

Cr Borlase advised that at the Golden Bay Community Board meeting it was decided to seek another meeting with residents and try to progress the issue.

**Moved Crs Borlase/O'Regan
WK06/10/04**

**THAT the Asset Management Report – Transport be received.
CARRIED**

5 REQUEST TO RENAME CHURCH VALLEY ROAD AS PIG VALLEY ROAD

The agenda contained a report on a request to have Church Valley Road name dropped and the road section included as part of Pig Valley Road.

**Moved Crs Higgins/Inglis
WK06/10/05**

**THAT the Engineering Services Committee support the change point for Church Valley Road and Pig Valley Road remaining at the common boundary of Lots 5 and 6 DP 12533.
CARRIED**

6 ROADING HIERARCHY REVIEW

Mr Elkington spoke to the report in the agenda that recommended the proposed changes to Council's roading hierarchy be put out for public consultation.

**Moved Crs O'Regan/Bryant
WK06/10/6**

**THAT the Engineering Services Committee supports the proposed changes to Council's roading hierarchy being circulated for public consultation.
CARRIED**

7 SPEED LIMIT REVIEW RICHMOND WARD AND MURCHISON LAKES WARD AREAS

Mr Elkington spoke to the report that recommended changes to a number of speed limits on various roads in the Richmond Ward and Murchison/Lakes Ward.

Cr Henry considered the road going to the Aquatic Centre is capable of having a 50 kph speed limit and didn't think it would be necessary to put it at 30 kph.

Mr Elkington said 30 kph was proposed because of the amount of traffic turning into Raewards and Craft Habitat, and parking along both sides of the road.

Cr Henry said if we change this road to 30 kph it won't be long before there are other requests made.

Cr Currie asked if the round-a-bout at Champion Road was going to be redesigned to take in extra traffic that will be generated by subdivisions in Champion Road. He supported a 30 kph speed limit.

Mr Ashworth said the Champion Road round-a-bout is a Transit NZ responsibility.

**Moved Crs Borlase/Riley
WK06/10/7**

THAT the Engineering Services Committee support the following recommended changes to Council's Speed Limit Bylaw for Speed Limits in the following areas, subject to these changes going to public consultation.

Location or Road Name	Existing Speed Limit kph	Proposed Speed Limit kph	Recommendation
Richmond/Hope Salisbury Road	80	50	Extend in a northerly direction the Urban Traffic Area for Richmond to within approximately 65metres of the Champion Road intersection.

Champion Road (Western Extension) and ASB Aquatic Centre Access Road	80	30	Put in place a 30kph Permanent Speed Limit extending in a westerly direction from Salisbury Road to The ASB Aquatic Centre main carpark.
Queen St (Existing 70kph Speed Limit to West of Sandeman Road)	100	70	Put in place a 70kph Permanent Speed Limit extending in a north westerly direction from the existing 70kph Speed Limit for a distance of 500metres, to a point west of Sandeman Road Intersection.
McShanes Road	100	70	Put in place a 70kph Permanent Speed Limit extending in a southerly direction from Queen Street to the intersection of SH 60.
Sandeman Road & Artillery Place	100	50	Extend the Richmond Urban Traffic Area in a north westerly direction to encompass all of Sandeman Road and Artillery Place.
Hill Street South (North of White Road) & Sunview Heights	80	50	Extend in a south easterly direction the Richmond Urban Traffic Area along Hill Street South to White Road intersection and encompassing Sunview Heights.
Brightwater			
Factory Road & River Terrace Road (Between SH6 and Factory Road)	100	50	Create an Urban Traffic Area to encompass all of Factory Road between SH6 and River Terrace Road and, River Terrace Road extending from SH6 for a distance of approximately 320metres to a point south east of Factory Road intersection.
River Terrace Road (Factory Road to Mt Heslington Road)	100	80	Put in place a Permanent 80kph Speed Limit extending from near Factory Road intersection for a distance of approximately 1150metres to a point just east of Mt Heslington Road intersection.
Wakefield			
Eighty Eight Valley Road	100	50	Extend the Urban Traffic Area for Wakefield in a southerly direction for a distance of approximately 160metres, to the southern side of Genia Drive Intersection.

Eighty Eight Valley Road	100	80	Put in place a Permanent 80kph Speed Limit extending from the southern side of Genia Drive and extending to a point on the south side of Totara View Road intersection.
Genia Drive & O'Shea Place	100	50	Extend the Urban Traffic Area for Wakefield in a south easterly direction to encompass all off Genia Drive and O'Shea Place.
Totara View Road & Kilkenny Place	100	50	Extend the Urban Traffic Area for Wakefield in a south easterly direction to encompass all off Totara View Road and Kilkenny Place.
Treeton Place and Matariki Place	100	50	Extend the Urban Traffic Area for Wakefield in a southerly direction to encompass all off Treeton Place and Matariki Place.
Bird Lane	100	50	Extend the Urban Traffic Area for Wakefield in a north easterly direction to encompass all off Bird Lane between SH6 and the Road end.
Mayer Crescent & Whiting Drive	100	50	Extend the Urban Traffic Area for Wakefield in a northerly direction to encompass all off Mayer Crescent and Whiting Drive.
Rotoroa			
Gowan Valley Road, Braeburn Track and Porika Road	100	50	Create an Urban Traffic Area to encompass all of Porika Road and, approximately 440metres of Gowan Valley Road, extending in a north westerly direction from the intersection of the Braeburn Track and, the Braeburn Track, extending in a westerly direction for approximately 400metres from the intersection of Gowan Valley Road.

CARRIED

8 2007/2008 LAND TRANSPORT PROGRAMME

Mr Ashworth spoke to the report that included the draft subsidised maintenance, improvement and community road safety programmes for 2007/2008.

Cr Norriss talked about the problems with driver licensing restrictions and noted that in rural areas, restrictions on carrying passengers are not realistic.

Cr Higgins suggested taking the matter up with Area Commander McGurk.

**Moved Crs Borlase/Henry
WK06/10/8**

**THAT the programmes as appended be approved in principle and forwarded to Land Transport New Zealand.
CARRIED**

**9 PRIORITY CHANGE – UNDERGROUND CONVERSION
PROGRAMME**

Mr Ashworth presented the report contained in the agenda which sought the Engineering Services Committee's acceptance of substituting the undergrounding of power for McGlashen Avenue in Richmond for Clifford/Whitby Road, Wakefield.

Cr Higgins was disappointed that undergrounding of services in Whitby Road was not proceeding, but supported the recommendation. He asked that Whitby Road be added in the 2016 year.

Mr Ashworth said the costs for Whitby Road were being transferred to McGlashen Avenue. Council's contribution would be approximately \$110,000.

**Moved Crs Borlase/Inglis
WK06/10/9**

**THAT the Engineering Services Committee approve the substitution of McGlashen Avenue for Whitby Road as part of the 2005/2006 underground conversion programme, and that Whitby Road priority be revised to the end of the ten year programme.
CARRIED**

10 TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL RIVERS RATING REVIEW

Mr Drummond was in attendance to present the report which informed the Committee of the results of the low detail study into the effectiveness of the current river rating system.

Cr Kempthorne arrived at the meeting at 11.45 am.

Cr O'Regan expressed concern that there is difficulty in working out accounts for the rivers rating areas.

Mr Drummond said apart from Marlborough District Council that has a similar system to us, every other regional authority has a complicated system.

Mr Thomson said if a different level of service is required then it will probably come at an increased cost.

Cr Henry asked that staff give consideration to reviewing all three rates. The philosophy behind Z rate was that from time to time smaller streams would need

some work on them and also people in the rest of the district appreciate values of the river, eg for recreation and amenity values. To assess that at 50% is far too high.

Cr Norriss said there are Council assets, ie roads, that are used by recreational river users that need to be protected.

Cr Kempthorne concurred with Cr Henry but could also see the reasoning for the river rates that are struck.

Cr O'Regan said there are more Z ratepayers than others. He was concerned about the extension of another 58 kilometres and whether it was wise for Council to include more rivers and streams. He considers the best way of managing streams is to put the onus on the adjoining property owners to maintain them.

Mr Thomson said we need to go through an assessment of whether X, Y and Z river rating differentials are going to remain the same or change for next year. There is an issue with river X income being spent in other areas, so we can address that with other options. The issue about whether Z river rate area should be paying 50% of the total was raised and that creates a whole lot of different rate differential options to come back with.

Cr Riley supports the system as it stands now.

**Moved Crs O'Regan/Bryant
WK06/10/10**

**THAT the Tasman District Council Rivers Rating Review report be accepted by the Engineering Services Committee as a preliminary analysis of the recent performance of the river rating system.
CARRIED**

**11 DEVELOPMENT/CUSTOMER SERVICES – CUSTOMER SERVICES
THREE MONTHLY UPDATE – JULY – SEPTEMBER 2006**

Mr Thomson spoke to Mr Ley's report contained in the agenda which reviewed and highlighted development and service levels to customers throughout the Tasman District.

Cr O'Regan said the areas with biggest flooding problems are in Mapua and Motueka, not Takaka as noted in Mr Ley's report and said there are areas with land slipping problems. He said the Takaka River has degraded, the entrance to the sea has been modified and the river is now relatively safe.

Cr King arrived at the meeting at 12.25 pm.

Cr Kempthorne said we shouldn't think there is no risk at Takaka, the question is how high is that risk. One of the reasons Council is doing the urban study for Golden Bay is to try and find another location for the township to be developed.

Cr Riley said Takaka Township is not the only place in Tasman District that has dangers.

**Moved Crs Higgins/Kempthorne
WK06/10/11**

THAT:

- a) the Development/Customer Services – Customer Services Three Monthly Update – July - September 2006 report be received;
- b) the Engineering Services Committee recommends to the Environment and Planning Committee that options including those noted in this report be investigated and reported back to the Engineering Services Committee (or appropriate committee) with a view to addressing developments in high risk areas (in regard to inundation/flooding hazards) in the Tasman region.
- c) That Environment and Planning Committee be encouraged to hasten the options for alternative urban growth in Golden Bay outside of the high risk areas, in regard to inundation and flooding hazards.

CARRIED

12 MOTUEKA RIVER – STOP BANK REVIEW

Mr Drummond spoke to his report contained in the agenda which presented the Motueka Stopbank Pre-feasibility Study for acceptance by the Engineering Services Committee.

Cr Norriss said we will probably be asked to concentrate on the weak areas of the stopbank and he asked can that be done in stages and will the resource consent have to be for the full stopbank or can it be in stages.

Mr Drummond hoped they could get a resource consent to cover the whole process. He said some things can't be decided on as we don't know what standard the stopbank will be built to.

Cr Inglis said we should be working on the area that will protect the town.

Mr Drummond said the piece from Woodman's Corner down to Blue Gum Corner is the top priority, but we may have some challenges on the other side of the river when we apply for resource consent. The work will have to be staged.

Cr King said if work was staged for one side of the river, you'll struggle to get funding from people on the other side.

Board Member Fry wanted some idea about funding. He said to date site investigations on the banks have not included local landowners and believes it is an oversight on the part of the consultants.

Mr Thomson said Council hasn't currently got a rating policy for rivers capital works and all options can be considered. We'll be seeking guidance and direction from

Council. Staff have no preconceived ideas, we only have a rating system for operations and maintenance for classified rivers.

Board Member Fry said the first thing any ratepayer is going to ask is how much is it going to cost. He asked when consultation with landowners is going to start.

Cr King said we will have to indicate that landowners, including township of Motueka, will be expected to fund a large share of the cost. We've already indicated that we expect these works to be funded from the area to a lesser or greater degree.

Cr Norriss said it is too early to say what the funding options will be, but we should give a clear steer on how Council has funded other works.

Board Member Fry said there needs to be adequate consultation with the people that count, eg Mr Warren Fry and Mr Jim Scott. The landowners will benefit. He questioned the exercise as to why and how it is driven and noted that the Motueka stopbanks were built on private land.

Cr O'Regan said a resource consent now lasts for five years, but you can ask for a longer period of time, so didn't foresee a problem with staging. He asked about constraints on Council actually forcing work on private land. Does Council have an automatic right to go onto the land and upgrade it.

Mr Drummond said we have located deeds of covenant that were created by the Nelson Catchment Board for all pieces of land that were private land. They are a legal agreement with the landowner who signed it at the time. He suggested we will need to go through whatever process is needed, but will need to be registered against the titles of the property.

Cr O'Regan suggested that the matter be discussed with the solicitor and property owners.

**Moved Crs King/Borlase
WK06/10/12**

**THAT the updated report on the Motueka River Stopbank Review be accepted.
CARRIED**

13 OLD MILL WALKWAY – COASTAL PROTECTION WORKS

Mr Thomson spoke to the report contained in the agenda which was to inform the Committee of progress with respect to the coastal protection of the Old Mill Walkway, Ruby Bay and seek approval to pursue a preferred protection option.

Chief Executive, Mr Dickinson, arrived at the meeting at 1.45 pm.

In the LTCCP adopted this year, \$938,000 has been budgeted for the construction of coastal erosion protection along an 800 metre section of the Old Mill Walkway Reserve in the 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 financial years. Funding for this work anticipates a cost-share between locally adjoining property owners, ratepayers in the

immediate Mapua/Ruby Bay area via a targeted rate and district ratepayers via the general rate.

In early September 2006, Council staff, Mayor Hurley, Crs Higgins and Norriss met with immediately adjoining landowners to discuss proposed short and medium term works and potential cost-sharing options.

It was hoped the resource consent application could be considered as a non notified application.

Mr Thomson said we need to complete consultation with the landowners and report back to the Committee. We have an indication of what the funding split should be.

Cr King said the first thing Council will be asked is what it will cost. We're starting to spend money, developing plans, consent lodging. We have a current formula that is not widely accepted as the best way of doing it, but we can't keep progressing work without the associated funding agreement.

Mr Thomson said we've got some cash funding from the \$10 rate but to get us to the point where we get consents, plans, and awarding of a tender that would use all that rate and would be needing the loan.

Cr Inglis said the problem is not going to go away. He said the land becomes very valuable after the sea is kept out. He said we need to find the money and do the work in total.

Mr Thomson said early next calendar year should see work commencing. He hoped that funding would be resolved within that timeframe also.

Cr Higgins said he brought a suggestion about using crushed quarry rock that hasn't even been looked at.

Mr Thomson said the consultants have said if we want to halt the erosion then you have to do it by a hard engineering solution. The balance of the reserve to the north may be able to use other options. Some softer solution, like crushed quarry rock, is something that may be looked at. He was happy to get the consultant to come and talk to the Committee about solutions for stages 1 and 2.

Cr Higgins said if we don't sort out funding and nothing happens, time rolls on. At the meeting with residents there was nothing that gave him confidence that they would pay. Wider Mapua is reluctant to pay the 47% and many are advocating that they want Council to do the work but won't pay.

Cr Norriss agreed that there is a huge commitment in the community wanting the work done, but not the same commitment to putting up the dollars and that has forestalled this project up until now. The meeting with the directly affected landowners was a positive move forward.

Cr Currie asked if it would be more cost effective to complete the total work in one go.

Mr Thomson said there are issues with doing it all at once. We would probably have considerably longer investigation and design phase and we would be considering in a lot more detail a wider range of options to do the whole 700 metres of foreshore. Planning approvals required would be significantly more onerous. Given that time is of the essence our recommendation is to deal with stage one first and it can be done in a fairly straight forward and efficient way in terms of time and cost. He said the Old Mill Walkway along the esplanade reserve is still legally in existence. Further to south of that there are a number of private landowners who have title into the high tide mark, so when the tide is in people can't walk around the coast.

The funding formula is 47% targeted rating area, 20% from general rate and 33% from private landowners who derive benefit.

Cr O'Regan said in other areas of New Zealand property owners have paid a lot more money protecting their properties. The formula seems to be light on the affected landowners and high on the targeted rating area.

Mr Thomson said there will be significant ongoing maintenance costs with whatever works are done.

Cr Norriss said the revetment work being proposed is different to what was done on the previous parts.

Mr Thomson said the design for Broadsea Avenue was based on a proposal from the landowners, but the specific design for Old Mill Walkway Reserve would be slightly different. There are different parameters and erosion rates.

Mr Dickinson said contract prices are sensitive to the price of the rock which is an important component.

Cr King was concerned that the overriding purpose was to protect the walkway. He was not convinced that people are wanting to spend \$1m protecting the walkway. Council has to decide what its objective is and it may have some input into the funding formula.

Cr Norriss said there will be a huge range of views amongst the landowners who will be required to pay. Some people have said they don't care if the walkway goes, then another group of people are passionate about the walkway. He asked if the funding available to progress this is sufficient.

Cr Kempthorne said we need to get a conclusion on funding. The last thing we want to do is do a whole lot of work and not be able to agree on a satisfactory funding formula. This is a critical issue.

Cr Currie agreed that those whose properties will be protected should be paying the bulk of the costs.

Cr Norriss said the community is saying the Council should make a contribution because it owns the Old Mill Walkway.

**Moved Crs Kempthorne/King
WK06/10/13**

THAT Council staff be given approval in principle to:

- a) Adopt a rock revetment type structure, as shown in the report of Tonkin & Taylor report of 3 October 2006, as the preferred option for the protection of the southern 150m of the Old Mill Walkway.**
- b) Prepare and lodge Resource Consent Application(s) and tender documents for the construction of this option.**
- c) Continue to consult with adjacent landowners with respect to cost-sharing and preparation of the Consent Application(s).**
- d) Consult with other affected parties in preparation for lodging Consent Application(s).**
- e) Confirm funding options for the construction of both the proposed works and the remaining 550m of the Old Mill Reserve Walkway, prior to raising a loan to fund the project.**

CARRIED

Board Member Fry left the meeting at 2.35 pm.

14 UTILITIES MANAGEMENT REPORT

14.1 Water

Mr Cuthbertson advised the Dry Weather Task Force will be called together next week because of the dry weather.

14.2 Wastewater

Negotiations have been held with iwi at Takaka regarding the Takaka sewerage upgrading. An agreement has been adopted by iwi and it will be presented to the next Engineering Services Committee.

14.3 Stormwater

Cr Norriss tabled a letter received from R Schmuke concerning stormwater charges on his property at Tata Beach.

Mr Dickinson said we are getting complaints from Golden Bay people who have had stormwater UDA charges for the first time and also from people in the Mapua area. Unlike a charge for wastewater where you are either hooked up or not, there is no guarantee that the stormwater system goes past your front gate but we draw a UDA around a general area that will benefit. Because the ratepayer can't see a direct benefit, we tend to get the complaints about having to pay.

**Moved Crs King/Henry
WK06/10/14**

**THAT the Utilities Management Report dated 2 October 2006 be received.
CARRIED**

**15 REFUSE AND RECYCLING TARGETED RATE – RATING OF
VACANT PROPERTIES**

Mr Cuthbertson spoke to the report in the agenda that outlined alternative funding options available to Council for kerbside rubbish and recyclable collections, particularly with respect to vacant sections.

Cr Henry opposed the recommendation as it concentrates solely on rural areas. The idea is that you are either receiving the service or not receiving the service. Until we can identify on a per-dwelling basis, some other people will have to pick up the difference.

Cr Norriss said the urban area is already designated sections, but in the rural areas they are separate titles as part of a farm.

Mr Thomson said ideally we would be applying this targeted rate on a per-dwelling basis. We also have a lot of properties that have multiple dwellings and we have no ability to charge them more than one charge. Most complaint has come from rural property owners who will never, while they own the property, build a house and they feel aggrieved in paying this charge. The ideal would be to have a per-dwelling charge.

Mr Dickinson understood Mr Thomson's comments, but doesn't believe it is consistent. If you have a bare land title in a rural area you can build a house on it as of right so why should there be an exemption to the refuse charge.

Mr Cuthbertson said when a subdivision is done and a 224 certificate is issued they are charged the water daily charge and automatically charged a pan charge regardless of whether there is a house on it.

Cr O'Regan said the rate we levy is a tax not a service charge. If it is a service charge we wouldn't need to strike a rate. We've established a tax on the same basis as the water charge.

Cr King said if it becomes apparent there is room in the budget to adjust the way it is collected, without adjusting the rate, there may be an opportunity to look at it again.

Cr Kempthorne doesn't support the recommendation. He is sympathetic to rural landowners who have several properties but this only addresses part of the problem.

Cr Borlase doesn't agree that recycling rate is a tax, it is for a service but considers there are a number of people, especially in Golden Bay, who farm land away from their house and he would like to have a facility where they can apply to have that rate remitted on the bare land. Criteria could be set for this remission.

Cr Riley has received a number of comments about this issue. It's not just the rural areas. He supports the recommendation.

**Moved Crs Kempthorne/O'Regan
WK06/10/15**

**THAT the recycling report be received.
CARRIED**

Cr Riley voted against the motion.

16 SOLID WASTE – QUANTITIES AND BUDGET UPDATE

Mr Cuthbertson presented the report contained in the agenda that informed the Committee of solid waste quantities and income for the current financial year.

**Moved Crs Higgins/Henry
WK06/10/16**

**THAT the Solid Waste – Quantities and Budget Update Report be received.
CARRIED**

17 AWAROA INLET ASSOCIATION – REQUEST FOR WATER TANK

Council received a letter dated 26 January 2006 from the Awaroa Inlet Association requesting funding for a 5,000 litre water storage tank.

**Moved Crs King/Inglis
WK06/10/17**

THAT:

- a) the Engineering Services Committee agree in principle to the provision of funding of up to \$1,500 to meet the cost of purchase and installation of a 5,000 litre water storage tank to be located at Awaroa Inlet, to increase existing storage capacity to 25,000 litres;
- b) the Corporate Services Manager be requested to source money from an appropriate fund.

CARRIED

18 RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

**Moved Crs Henry/Currie
WK06/10/18**

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

- **Jeffries Creek Upgrading**

The general subject of the matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to the 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:

Item No.	General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
7	Jeffries Creek Upgrading	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or 7 of the Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

Item No	Reason to withhold information under section 7	
7	Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	Section 7(2)(a)

(Refer to Confidential Minute Book, resolutions numbered WK06/10/19 to WK06/10/20)

**Moved Crs Henry/Kempthorne
WK06/10/21**

**THAT open meeting be resumed and the business transacted while the public was excluded be confirmed in open meeting.
CARRIED**

**Moved Crs O'Regan/Borlase
WK06/10/19**

THAT:

- a) the existing Jeffries Creek through the Bashford property be cleaned out and evenly graded for its full length.
- b) Engineering staff further investigate option 8 contained in the report and include it in a future budget for the cost to undertake the land acquisition and creek widening works.

CARRIED

**Moved Crs Henry/King
WK06/10/20**

THAT the Chairperson, Cr Borlase and Utilities Manager be authorised to negotiate with Mr Bashford over the flood protection at Lord Rutherford Road South.

CARRIED

Cr Currie did not vote.

The meeting concluded at 4.30 pm.

Chair:

Date: