

---

# Council

## OPEN MINUTES

---

Minutes of a meeting of Council held in the Council Chambers, 126-148 Oxford St, Levin, on Wednesday 3 February 2016 at 4.00 pm.

---

### PRESENT

<b>Mayor</b>	Mr B J Duffy
<b>Deputy Mayor</b>	Mr G G Good
<b>Councillors</b>	Mr W E R Bishop
	Mr R J Brannigan
	Mr R H Campbell
	Mr M Feyen
	Mrs V M Kaye-Simmons
	Mrs J Mason
	Mrs C B Mitchell
	Mr A D Rush
	Ms P Tukapua

### IN ATTENDANCE

Mr D M Clapperton	(Chief Executive)
Mr D Law	(Group Manager – Finance)
Mr G Saidy	(Group Manager – Infrastructure Services)
Mrs M Davidson	(Group Manager – Customer & Community Services)
Mr D McCorkindale	(Senior Manager – Strategic Planning)
Mr G Searle	(Water & Waste Services Manager)
Mr I Tate	(Team Leader, Land Information Management)
Mr I Winks	(GIS/Land Information Officer)
Mrs K J Corkill	(Meeting Secretary)
Ms S Bowling	(Meeting Secretary)

### ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Mr B Elliott	Designgroup Stapleton Elliott)
--------------	--------------------------------

### MEDIA IN ATTENDANCE

Mr N McBride	(“Manawatu Standard”)
Ms C Taylor	(“Chronicle”)

### PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE

There were 16 members of the public in attendance at the commencement of the meeting.

---

Mayor Duffy advised Crs Feyen and Campbell that unless they abided by the standard of dress expected for the Council Chamber (and removed the hard hats and fluro vests they were wearing), they would not get the opportunity to engage in the meeting.

## 1 Apologies

There were no apologies.

## 2 Public Speaking Rights

10.3 2016-2017 HDC Annual Plan  
Mrs Christina Paton  
GreyPower – Mr Mike Coupe/Mr Lew Rohloff

11,1 Aquatic Centre Redevelopment  
Mrs Jacqui Kerrins  
Mrs Carroll Cumming

For the record, the Chair advised that Mr Ten Have's request for speaking rights had been declined.

## 3 Late Items

Mr Clapperton publicly noted the addition of some amended Agenda pages (21, 22 & 23), which had been circulated prior to the meeting. He would also advise of another amendment when that particular report (16/6) was addressed.

## 4 Declaration of Interest

File No 15/774 Planning Services Matters Considered Under Delegated Authority  
Cr Bishop

## 5 Confirmation of Minutes – 2 December 2015

MOVED by Cr Kaye-Simmons, seconded Cr Brannigan:

*THAT the minutes of the meeting of Council held on Wednesday, 2 December 2015, be confirmed as a true and correct record.*

**CARRIED**

## 6 Matters Arising

Cr Campbell requested that his remarks on Shannon becoming a Motor Home Friendly Town which followed his comments on the Shannon Christmas lights, be recorded (page 8).

Whilst it was not in relation to the accuracy to the Minutes, Mr Clapperton advised that further information would be coming back to Council in relation to the Houses on Trickle Feed report.

## 7 Leave of absence

There were no leaves of absence requested.

## 8 Announcements

Following on from the recent announcement that Higgins, with whom Council had a significant roading contract, had been purchased by Fletchers, Mr Clapperton said assurances had been received that the change would have no impact as far as those contractual arrangements were concerned.

### Staff Introductions

New staff, Helen Hayes, Website Officer, and Anna Wood, Urban Designer, introduced themselves and gave an overview of themselves and their roles at Council.

### Foxton Community Board Update

Mayor Duffy upheld a point of order raised by Cr Feyen to comments made by Ms Smart on his attire as she commenced her Board update.

In her update, Ms Smart commented:

- it had been a brilliant couple of months for Foxton with a large number of people enjoying the recreational facilities which had had a positive economic benefit;
- the resident seal was back in the river;
- the Whitebait Creek upgrade and new culvert was going to plan and should be finished by the spawning season;
- the good weather was impacting positively on the whole region;
- a notable occasion - tomorrow was the Masonic Village's 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary;
- everyone was working hard to get action on not only the two big projects (Te Awahou and the Main Street upgrade) but the project that had been on the books the longest, which was opening the Loop to get a healthy flow. Hopefully that would progress this year.

With the meeting's indulgence, the Chief Executive's Report presentation was brought forward on the Agenda..

## **10.2 Chief Executive's Report to 3 February 2016**

### **Purpose**

For the Chief Executive to update Councillors, or seek endorsement on, a number of matters being dealt with.

MOVED by Cr Rush, seconded Cr Mitchell:

*THAT Report 16/5 Chief Executive's Report to 3 February 2016 be received.*

*THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.*

**CARRIED**

Ian Tate, Council's Team Leader, Land & Information Manager, and Ian Winks, GIS/Land Information Officer, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the positive changes that had taken place and the efficiencies achieved in the processing and production of Land Information Memoranda (LIMS) and responded to Councillors' questions.

Cr Bishop said it was absolutely fantastic, for those who were familiar with the property market, to be able to receive a LIM in a day. It was hugely significant for an environment that Council wanted to grow.

Mayor Duffy extended the offer for interested Councillors to observe the LIM process, commenting that since this new regime had been introduced he had had more positive public feedback on this than on any other external service that Council provided.

## 9 Proceedings of Committees

### 9.1 Proceedings of the Community Wellbeing Executive 15 December 2015

#### Purpose

To present to the Council the minutes of the Community Wellbeing Executive meeting held on 15 December 2015.

MOVED by Cr Good, seconded Cr Campbell:

*THAT Report 16/7 Proceedings of the Community Wellbeing Executive 15 December 2015 be received.*

*THAT the Council receive the minutes of the Community Wellbeing Executive meeting held on 15 December 2015.*

**CARRIED**

### 9.2 Proceedings of the Finance, Audit & Risk Subcommittee 27 January 2016

#### Purpose

To present to the Council the minutes of the Finance, Audit & Risk Subcommittee meeting held on 27 January 2015 and the Financial Report to 31 December 2015..

MOVED by Cr Bishop, seconded Cr Mason:

*THAT Report 16/6 Proceedings of the Finance, Audit & Risk Subcommittee 27 January 2016 be received.*

*THAT the Council receive the minutes of the Finance, Audit & Risk Subcommittee meeting held on 27 January 2016 and the Financial Report to 31 December 2015.*

**CARRIED**

The Chair of the Finance, Audit & Risk Subcommittee, Cr Bishop, whilst commenting on the good work that had been done in the debt recovery space and also the positive impact of the continuing downward pressure on interest rates, reminded the table that balancing the budget was the collective responsibility of those around the table and there was a need to be vigilant.

As well as the amended pages already advised, Mr Clapperton noted changes on page 18:

“The Forecast budget for 30 June 2016 is forecasting a deficit of \$(503,000) at 30 June 2015 2016 ...”

“Activity expenditure: expected to be above budget by ~~\$1,557~~ \$773k.

Responses were then provided to Councillors’ questions.

## 10 Executive

## 10.1 Monitoring Report to 3 February 2016

### Purpose

To present to Council the updated monitoring report covering requested actions from previous meetings of Council.

MOVED by Cr Good, seconded Cr Mitchell:

*THAT Report 16/2 Monitoring Report to 3 February 2016 be received.*

*THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.*

**CARRIED**

### Page 72 12/347 - Okarito Avenue Stormwater

Mr Clapperton noted that Okarito Stormwater was raised in the Annual Plan Report and would also be considered by Council at the March 2016 Council meeting.

### Page 77 14/940 – Te Awahou Nieuwe Stroom

A procurement report would be presented to the March 2016 Council meeting, rather than the recorded February meeting.

### Page 79 Levin Mall Carpark

In response to a query from Cr Campbell, Mayor Duffy advised that this was progressing and would be reported to the March 2016 Council meeting.

## 10.2 Chief Executive's Report to 3 February 2016

### Purpose

For the Chief Executive to update Councillors, or seek endorsement on, a number of matters being dealt with.

Whilst having nothing further to add to his report, Mr Clapperton observed that the opportunity for Council to deliver better outcomes to its customers by the use of good technology was largely as a result of an investment that Council made about five years ago (approximately \$1.2m) to upgrade its IT platform. If that had not happened there was absolutely no way that such a good outcome could have been achieved. The decision at that time was a good one and the benefits were now coming to the fore.

## 10.3 2016-2017 Horowhenua District Council Annual Plan

### Purpose

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider whether to consult on the 2016-2017 Annual Plan.

MOVED by Cr Tukapua, seconded Cr Bishop:

*THAT Report 16/1 2016-2017 Horowhenua District Council Annual Plan be received.*

**CARRIED**

Mrs Paton joined the table to speak to this item. She maintained that it was imperative that Council consulted with residents and ratepayers on the Annual Plan and if Council did not consult it would be breaching its own performance measures. In response to a query, Mrs Paton said her biggest concern was that central government, by the amendment to the LGA, was looking for a takeover of local government by shutting down the ability to consult when consultation provided the opportunity for people to

impart their views to their elected representatives.

A copy of Mrs Paton's submission is **attached** to the official minutes.

Mr Coupe and Mr Rohloff, on behalf of GreyPower, sought clarity on whether Council had used the indicative rates schedule system to arrive at the 5.43% rate increase noted in 6.1.1 of the Report, seeking to make a point that where the report purported that the decision was not significant, it actually was.

Mayor Duffy, for clarity, said whilst the amount involved was significant, in terms of the Act the matter was not deemed significant and he requested that GreyPower move on with its presentation.

Mr Rohloff spoke further against the proposed departure from what he termed 'best practice normality' and appealed to Councillors not to agree to recommendations 3.2 and 3.3 of the Report, intimating that it could cause a change in the current collaborative relationship between GreyPower and Council.

A copy of GreyPower's written submission is **attached** to the official minutes.

Mr Clapperton responded to the submitters' comments and Councillors queries/ remarks as well as speaking to the report::

- the performance measures noted by Mrs Paton in terms of consultation did not specifically apply to the Long Term/Annual Plan but related to anything that Council might require input on from the community. Council was not therefore breaching its performance measures.
- it was not suggested that consultation would not take place, but it would not occur in relation to this one element. Council would still consult on any other activity on which it wanted feedback from the community.
- this particular component had been consulted on this time last year, being year 2 of the LTP. Every opportunity had been provided to the community to have its say on what was wanted in the LTP for the next year.
- Council would consult should new business be proposed.
- with regard to the Northeast Stormwater Project that had been highlighted this evening, that was not new business because it was already included in year 2 of the LTP and it was consulted on last year; the issue was the scale in terms of dollars.
- with regard to getting feedback from the community, a lot of work had gone in over the last two years with ratepayers groups and the Foxton Community Board in terms of what was important to them and that opportunity was there on an on-going basis to get input into what Council was doing.
- Council did have to internally produce an Annual Plan document and that would be considered by Council in its final form in June and the rates requirement for each activity would drop out of that once the Annual Plan was adopted by Council by way of a rates resolution. What had been done was to indicate what rates requirements could be and it might be helpful to sit down with GreyPower to show just what the impact might be on individual properties.
- he could give an assurance to Councillors and members of the public that Council had sought advice on the matter.
- it was important to focus on 4.1 of the report which covered the legislation changes that enabled Council to not consult.
- timing was very important. Any delay would be problematic to allow sufficient time should consultation be required.
- today's decision related to this year (2016/17) only and did not create a precedent. The same process would be required for future years if a similar situation arose.

Mr Clapperton gave more in depth information on the differences proposed to Year 2 of the 2015-2025 LTP as noted in 4.10 of the report and the reasons behind those differences, highlighting a correction under "Wastewater – Shannon Disposal System which should read -\$393,000 (not -\$93,000).

Following a comment from the Chair that the process was about being more efficient, more engaged and delivering better outcomes for Horowhenua and noting the challenges with regard to communication, he apologised to those who were in attendance for the Aquatics Report for the delay in that item being considered.

Mr Clapperton noted that Rangitikei and Tararua District Councils were undertaking a similar process. He then responded to Councillors' questions about consultation costs and the relative cost of just producing an Annual Plan, the interpretation of the legislation in different circumstances; duplication of Annual Plans from previous years; the scope of consultation; and broad historical concerns with regard to Okarito Ave.

Cr Feyen proposed and spoke to the following outlining the reasoning behind his stance:

Moved: Feyen                      Seconded: Campbell

That this item lay on the table until a full Council briefing has taken place.

As the seconder of the motion, Cr Campbell expressed his view that ratepayers should be able to exercise their democratic right to be involved in the process.

After further discussion the resolution was put, with a division called for.

**For:**

Councillors: Ross Campbell  
Michael Feyen

**Against:**

Councillors: Wayne Bishop  
Ross Brannigan  
Garry Good  
Victoria Kaye-Simmons  
Joanna Mason  
Christine Mitchell  
Tony Rush  
Piri-Hira Tukapua

The division was declared LOST by 2 votes to 8.

The meeting broke for a meal at 6.11 pm with the Mayor advising those in the public gallery who were in attendance for the Aquatics Report, that that item would be addressed at 7.15 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 6.42 pm.

Consideration of the 2016/2017 Horowhenua District Council Annual Plan Report resumed:

MOVED by Cr Bishop, seconded Cr Good:

*THAT this decision is recognised as not significant in terms of S76 of the Local Government Act.*

*THAT the Horowhenua District Council does not consult on the 2016-2017 Annual Plan as it deems that there are no significant or material differences from the content of Year 2 of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.*

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

**For:**

Councillors: Wayne Bishop  
Ross Brannigan  
Garry Good  
Victoria Kaye-Simmons  
Joanna Mason  
Christine Mitchell  
Tony Rush

**Against:**

Councillors: Ross Campbell  
Michael Feyen  
Piri-Hira Tukapua

The division was declared CARRIED by 7 votes to 3.

#### 10.4 Documents Executed and Electronic Transactions Authorities Signed

##### **Purpose**

To present to Council the documents that have been executed, Electronic Transactions Authorities and Contracts that have been signed by two elected Councillors, which now need ratification.

MOVED by Cr Bishop, seconded Cr Brannigan:

*THAT Report 15/773 Documents Executed and Electronic Transactions Authorities Signed be received.*

*THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.*

*THAT the Horowhenua District Council hereby ratifies the signing of documents and Electronic Transaction Authorities as scheduled:*

- (a) *Electronic Transaction Authority relating to sale of 25 Story Street, Foxton Beach to Chris Sayer Builder Limited, contained in Certificate of Title 399474.*
- (b) *Electronic Transaction Authority relating to the sale of 82 Oxford Street, Levin to Timothy Benedict Williams, contained in Certificate of Title WN559/89.*

**CARRIED**

#### 11 Customer and Community Services

##### 11.2 Liquor Licensing Matters from 1 October 2015 to 31 December 2015

##### **Purpose**

To report, for information purposes, on matters relating to liquor licensing for the period 1 October 2015 to 31 December 2015.

MOVED by Cr Campbell, seconded Cr Rush:

*THAT Report 15/462 Liquor Licensing Matters from 1 October 2015 to 31 December 2015 be received.*

*THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.*

**CARRIED**

In response to a query, Cr Campbell was advised that new licence applications were publicly notified and then went to a District Licensing Committee hearing should any objections be received.

Having declared an interest in the following item, Cr Bishop withdrew from the table.



### 11.3 Planning Services Matters Considered Under Delegated Authority

#### Purpose

To present details of decisions made under delegated authority in respect of Planning Services Matters.

MOVED by Cr Brannigan, seconded Cr Tukapua:

*THAT Report 15/774 Planning Services Matters Considered Under Delegated Authority be received.*

*THAT this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of s76 of the Local Government Act 2002.*

*THAT the matters decided under delegated authority (s104 of the Resource Management Act) as listed, be received:*

#### **All Subdivision Resource Consents Granted Under Delegated Authority 21/11/15 to 20/01/16**

<b>Granted Date</b>	<b>File Ref</b>	<b>Subdivider</b>	<b>Address</b>
01 Dec 15	502/2015/3677	Wayne Bishop Investments Ltd	44-70 Kimberley Road, Levin Rural
07 Dec 15	502/2015/3693	Nigel Lyall Dacre	55 Williams Road, Tokomaru Rural
08 Dec 15	502/2015/3682	R N & S D Hudson	36 Fairfield Road, Levin, Rural
09 Dec 15	502/2015/3687	Horowhenua District Council	Roe Street, Levin
09 Dec 15	502/2015/3694	Ratahiwi Farm Limited	155 Williams Road, Tokomaru Rural
18 Dec 15	502/2015/3701	Juffermans Surveyors Limited	9 Hillary Street, Foxton

#### **All Land Use Resource Consents Granted Under Delegated Authority 21/11/15 to 20/01/16**

<b>Granted Date</b>	<b>File Ref</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Address</b>
01 Dec 15	501/2015/3697	Horowhenua District Council	133 Tane Road, Tokomaru Rural
04 Dec 15	501/2015/3695	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	487 Waitarere Beach Road, Levin Rural
09 Dec 15	501/2015/3705	LEP Limited	46 Weraroa Road, Levin
09 Dec 15	501/2015/3638*	Horizons Regional Council	Hokio Beach Road, Levin Rural
09 Nov 15	501/2015/3639*	Horowhenua District Council	Hokio Beach Road, Levin Rural
14 Dec 15	501/2015/3698	L A & C Watson	146 Strathnaver Drive, Levin Rural
15 Dec 15	501/2015/3690	Tony Thomas Consulting Ltd	1 Heatherlea East Road, Levin Rural
18 Dec 15	501/2015/3692	Hope Centre Trust Board	7 Kent Street, Levin
22 Dec 15	501/2015/3709	Land Information New Zealand	19 Stanley Street, Levin
23 Dec 15	501/2015/3673	L S & C M Allen	232 Kuku Beach Road, Levin Rural
23 Dec 15	501/2015/3700	K J & R A Jackson	35A Marine Parade, Foxton Beach
13 Jan 16	501/2015/3708	Bradley Mark Dawson	Pretoria Road, Tokomaru Rural
14 Jan 16	501/2015/3712	Debbie Louise Munro	124 Kawiu Road, Levin
14 Jan 16	501/2015/3635*	HUHA – Helping You Help Animals, Trust	1155 State Highway 1, Levin Rural
15 Jan 16	501/2015/3704	Horowhenua District Council	55-57 Hartley Street, Foxton Beach

\* Independent Commissioners

**CARRIED**

Cr Bishop rejoined the table.

## 12 Procedural motion to exclude the public

MOVED by Cr Kaye-Simmons, seconded Cr Brannigan:

That the public be excluded from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

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

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 section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

### C1 Community Housing - Consultation

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.	<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)(c)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely to damage the public interest.</p>	<p>s48(1)(a)</p> <p>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</p>

The text of these resolutions is made available to the public who are present at the meeting and form part of the minutes of the meeting.

**CARRIED**

Resolutions in relation to the confidential items are recorded in the confidential section of these minutes and are not publicly available.

6.50 pm The public were excluded.

7.05 pm The meeting resumed in open session.

The Chair called an adjournment until 7.15 pm to allow members of the public to return to the Chambers.

## 11.1 Aquatics Centre Redevelopment

### Purpose

To seek Council's approval to proceed with the Aquatic Centre Redevelopment project as identified in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.

MOVED by Cr Good, seconded Cr Brannigan:

*THAT Report 16/10 Aquatics Centre Redevelopment be received.*

*THAT this decision is recognised as not significant in terms of S76 of the Local Government Act.*

**CARRIED**

Mrs Carroll Cumming, a long-time proponent for the provision of a hydrotherapy pool in the Horowhenua following the closure of the hospital pool, spoke in support of the proposed Aquatics Centre Redevelopment. A hydrotherapy pool was included in the redevelopment and whilst it was not what had originally been envisaged, it was a huge advance on what had been available over the past few years.

In speaking to this report, Mrs Jacqui Kerrins introduced herself saying she was a ratepayer, a high user of the Aquatic Centre facilities, her children were swimmers and in her work as a physiotherapist she used the pool for clients. She expressed some concerns about lack of information with regard to what was proposed and suggested that more stakeholder consultation would be of benefit. This was an opportunity to provide some decent improvements and she wanted to ensure that the allocated money was well spent. Whilst she did not want to stall any upgrade she did think it would be possible to do better than what was proposed.

Following Councillors receiving further clarification from submitters to some of their comments, Mrs Davidson joined the table to speak to the report. She introduced Mr Brian Elliott, the architect who had been working on the project over the past few months. She also acknowledged the 'enthusiastic and passionate' Aquatic Centre staff who were also in attendance for consideration of this item.

Mrs Davidson gave an overview of the history behind the proposed upgrade, previous Council resolutions, the budget allocated, and scope of what had initially been identified, the extensive needs and opportunities analysis that had been undertaken, as well as the earthquake assessment and mechanical and energy audit that had been part of shaping what had been presented. She stressed that the project was at the concept design rather than a detailed design phase as the aim had been to keep costs as low as possible before getting mandate from Council to proceed with detailed designs.

Mrs Davidson said it was critical to remember that stakeholder engagement was at the core of getting the detailed design right and what was being shown on the screen (which was slightly different from what was included in the report) was not the final design. What was shown, however, did capture the nine identified priorities.

Working through the concept designs on the screen, Mr Elliott spoke in more detail about the work done by Nicki Moen and then himself which had fed into concept designs which were based on the 9 identified priorities. He had endeavoured to utilise the agreed pool of money in the most efficient and innovative way, getting the priorities in the best order, starting with the hydrotherapy pool..

Mrs Davidson referred to the operational efficiencies that would result from the redevelopment and the revenue opportunities that would arise which did have a direct correlation to the public private financial performance targets which had been set for the Aquatics activity. In terms of operational impact, the pool would close for up to four

months when resources and service delivery would be transferred to the Foxton Pool. Following receipt of a petition from Foxton to extend the hours of the Foxton Pool, the redevelopment would provide an opportunity, at no cost to the ratepayer, to do a robust evaluation so Council could make an informed decision on the future use of the Foxton Pool. There would be a marketing campaign to let people know that the Foxton Pool would be staying open.

In response to a query about funding for the project, it was noted that maintenance would be funded from depreciation reserves and the hydrotherapy pool and upgrade would be loan funded.

For clarity, Cr Feyen queried if the project would come back to Council before it proceeded or would it just go to the Projects Committee?

Mr Clapperton commented on the unique situation that pertained to this project. It was not usual for Council to become so involved in the detail of a project and he urged caution in terms of creating a precedent for other projects.

Cr Bishop commented on the amount of time that the Projects Committee had committed to this project and the concerns that had been raised which had resulted in a meeting with the architect on site. He proposed an amendment to recommendation 2.3 to include a budgeted figure lower than what was proposed in the LTP, explaining the rationale behind his proposed change.

Cr Mitchell expressed her support for Cr Bishop's stance. .

Moved: Bishop            Seconder: Tukapua

THAT the Aquatic Centre redevelopment project be endorsed and proceed within a budget of \$982,800.00.

In speaking to this amendment, Cr Bishop gave a history of the project as he knew it, particularly in terms of how the budget was arrived at and the inclusion of other components over and above the hydrotherapy pool, which had been the catalyst/focus for the initial upgrade proposal. He suggested that the budgeted figure of nearly \$1.7m had become a target. Whilst he was absolutely behind the project he thought that Council staff, who had in the past managed to deliver solutions well under budget, may be able to do the same in this instance. Cr Bishop then substantiated his stance in more detail with his comments being supported by Cr Mitchell.

Deputy Mayor Good articulated his concern that if savings were going to be made he wanted the hydrotherapy pool to be the priority and he did not want to see that skimmed on. He also agreed that it was not normal for Council to focus on the finer points of such projects.

Cr Brannigan signalled, despite understanding the stance taken by Crs Bishop and Mitchell, that he had a different view and would not be supporting the amended resolution. He believed that Council had the opportunity, within the budget in the LTP, to enhance the user experience at the pool

Whilst saying he thought it was a great project overall, Cr Feyen expressed his support for the amended recommendation.

Cr Kaye-Simmons said she agreed with Cr Brannigan. She had heard from many pool users and a lot of people were really excited that the pool was getting an upgrade.

Cr Rush commented on the concern that had been expressed by the Projects

Committee that the figures were very broad brush without a lot of rigor or science behind them. Whilst he believed savings may be able to be made, he did not believe that the project could be delivered for \$980,000. The only reason the Projects Committee would be involved in the final sign off on the design and budget was because of the lack of certainty around the figures. There also did not appear to be any contingency in the figure suggested by Cr Bishop which was a concern.

Cr Campbell directed the meeting the Statement of Income and Expenditure and other funding that may be available in the budget for the project.

Expressing her support for the amendment to the recommendation, Cr Tukapua reiterated previous points made, particularly in terms of savings made on other Council projects. It did seem to her as if \$1.7m was a target and looking at pool usage and the number of people through the facility in a year, perhaps consultation could have been more extensive.

In terms of \$1.7m being described as a target, Mayor Duffy said it was. It was not normal to set a budget and then not expect to have it spent. Within that \$1.7m he was confident all the elements identified in the project could be met, but that would not happen if the budget was reduced as proposed. There had been four years spent on looking at the various pool components, some of which were outdated and there was technology that needed upgrading. His expectation was that the \$1.7m would provide 15 years of use before a further upgrade was needed and if it was not done now, how many more years would the community have to wait.

Cr Bishop in his right of reply and responding to the previous speakers, said his reason for going into detail now was it was the only time that pressure could be realistically put on the budget and he wanted to do the best for ratepayers.

It was clarified that it was intended the \$982,800 would cover the whole project, including resource consents and design costs.

A division on Cr Bishop's amended recommendation was called for, voting on which was as follows:

**For:**

Councillors: Wayne Bishop  
Michael Feyen  
Joanna Mason  
Christine Mitchell  
Piri-Hira Tukapua

**Against:**

Councillors: Ross Brannigan  
Ross Campbell  
Brendan Duffy  
Garry Good  
Victoria Kaye-Simmons  
Tony Rush

The division was declared LOST by 5 votes to 6.

In terms of recommendation 2.3 and to provide the ability for further discussion and debate in relation to the components going into the upgrade and the budget allocation, Mr Clapperton suggested removal of the words ".. and proceeds within the budget allocated in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan".

Cr Rush, whilst saying he did not agree with the previous amendment, did agree with the sentiment around ensuring the very best resolution for the least expenditure. Whilst the further involvement of the Projects Committee was outside the norm, he was comfortable with that as the Committee felt it needed to have an ongoing role to ensure that the wish list was backed up by rigorous costs and prunings under the leadership of a vigilant Chair.

Cr Feyen said he struggled that it would not come back to full Council.

Cr Brannigan said for him the issue with regard to the redevelopment was simple. It was an opportunity, within budget, to enhance the Aquatic Centre experience, not only for swimmers but for everyone who used the facility. It was also about future proofing the pool. If money was not spent now, it would be back on the table in the near future and would cost more. The Aquatic Centre had been built 26 years ago and had only been upgraded with the addition of a hydro slide and Learn to Swim pool. Pools such as the Makino in Feilding and the Lido in Palmerston North were upgrading and would attract potential users from Levin if the Aquatic Centre could not compete. He was all for savings but did not believe this was the appropriate area. The Aquatic Centre was a fundamental part of this community, was extremely well used and deserved an upgrade.

With regard to the budget and debt levels, Cr Tukapua reminded the table that the majority of the project would be loan funded. If it came in under budget that would be wonderful.

Cr Campbell said he agreed that the facility needed upgrading, but suggested, looking at debt levels, waiting a little longer and doing it right.

Cr Bishop said he did not believe, with the amount of money to be spent, that it would stop people going to other pools in the district.

Cr Mitchell said for her the catalyst had been the hydrotherapy pool. A minimal amount was now being spent on this and she was also not confident in the Projects Committee's stance on the project. She could not support the recommendation although she would like the hydrotherapy pool to go ahead.

In his right of reply, Cr Rush said he thought common sense was being displayed and the upgrade would make a difference in attracting people here. Not only would the pool experience be enhanced but there would be operational savings which said this was the right thing to do.

MOVED by Cr Rush, seconded Cr Good:

*THAT the Aquatic Centre redevelopment project be endorsed.*

*THAT the Projects Committee give approval to final design and budget within the budget allocated in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan.*

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

**For:**

Councillors: Ross Brannigan  
Brendan Duffy  
Garry Good  
Victoria Kaye-Simmons  
Joanna Mason  
Tony Rush

**Against:**

Councillors: Wayne Bishop  
Ross Campbell  
Michael Feyen  
Christine Mitchell  
Piri-Hira Tukapua

The division was declared CARRIED by 6 votes to 5.

9.20 pm

There being no further business, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD  
AT A MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON

DATE:.....

CHAIRPERSON:.....