

**MINUTES OF WESTERN BAY OF PLENTY DISTRICT COUNCIL
COUNCIL MEETING NO. CL24-1
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1484 CAMERON ROAD, TAURANGA
ON THURSDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2024 AT 9.30AM**

1 KARAKIA

Whakatau mai te wairua	Settle the spirit
Whakawātea mai te hinengaro	Clear the mind
Whakarite mai te tinana	Prepare the body
Kia ea ai ngā mahi	To achieve what needs to be achieved.
Āe	Yes

2 PRESENT

Mayor J Denyer, Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour, Cr T Coxhead, Cr R Crawford, Cr G Dally, Cr A Henry, Cr R Joyce, Cr M Murray-Benge, Cr A Sole, Cr D Thwaites and Cr A Wichers.

3 IN ATTENDANCE

J Holyoake (Chief Executive Officer), R Davie (Deputy CEO/General Manager Strategy and Community), A Henderson (General Manager Corporate Services), A Curtis (General Manager Regulatory Services), C Crowe (General Manager Infrastructure Services), E Watton (Strategic Policy and Planning Programme Director), G Golding (Governance Manager), P Watson (Reserves and Facilities Manager), J Rickard (Community and Strategic Relationships Manager), N Rutland (Environmental Planning Manager), T Clow (Principle Policy Lead: Environmental Planning), R Leahy (Governance Advisor), H Wi Repa (Governance Systems Advisor) and P Osborne (Senior Governance Advisor).

VIA ZOOM

M Va'ai Matatia (Senior Environmental Planner), A Mark (Senior Environmental Planner), C Nepia (Graduate Kaupapa Māori Specialist – Kaiārahi Mahere), C Thyne (Research and Monitoring Analyst), E Webb (Environmental Planner), K Lawton (Infrastructure Planner), T Miller (Strategic Advisor Resource Management), G Dean (Senior Environmental Planner: Urban Design), J Paterson (Transportation Manager), B Urbanc (Kaupapa Māori Specialist – Kaiārahi Hōnonga), F Crotty (Environmental Planner), A King (Strategic Advisor: Legislative Reform and Special Projects).

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

A Evans – Media (SunLive)

O Nathan – General Manager (Tourism Bay of Plenty)

D Pfefferle – Waihi Beach Lifeguard Services

G McDonald – Pio Shore's Sports and Community Association

R Coles – Director/Planner Momentum Planning and Design

4 APOLOGIES

APOLOGY

RESOLUTION CL24-1.1

Moved: Cr M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Cr R Joyce

That the apology absence from Cr Grainger be accepted.

CARRIED

5 CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEMS

Nil

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil

7 PUBLIC EXCLUDED ITEMS

Nil

8 PUBLIC FORUM

Richard Coles – Submission on behalf of KiwiGreen New Zealand on Plan Change 92

Mr Coles was in attendance on behalf of KiwiGreen NZ to highlight the below key points laid out in their submission on Plan Change 92. He noted the below points:

- The submission was in relation to 21 Francis Road in support of the industrial zoning.
- The Director of KiwiGreen NZ requested that it be confirmed that the KiwiGreen Land Owner was also supportive of the Industrial Zone, recognising the additional submissions which held a differing view.
- The Future Urban Growth option was not supported by KiwiGreen.
- Mr Coles tabled a letter (Tabled Item 1) outlining the above view points.

Mr Coles responded to pātai as below:

- The Commissioners recommendations recommended Future Urban Zoning for 21 Francis Road, noting that Plan Change 92 was suggesting Industrial Zoning, and this was supported by KiwiGreen.

- KiwiGreen had purchased the site (21 Francis Road) with the hope and understanding that it would be re-zoned as industrial, due to how they intended to use the land in the future, noting the size of the land was appropriate for this use as well.
- KiwiGreen had purchased the property several years ago.

9 COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR RECEIPT

9.1 MINUTES OF THE MAKETU COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING HELD ON 28 NOVEMBER 2023

RESOLUTION CL24-1.2

Moved: Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour

Seconded: Cr A Henry

That the Minutes of the Maketu Community Board Meeting held on 28 November 2023 be received.

CARRIED

10 COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR CONFIRMATION

10.1 MINUTES OF THE STRATEGY AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 9 NOVEMBER 2023

RESOLUTION CL24-1.3

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour

That the Minutes of the Strategy and Policy Committee Meeting held on 9 November 2023 be confirmed as a true and correct record and the recommendations therein be adopted.

CARRIED

10.2 MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 14 DECEMBER 2023

Council considered a track changed version of the Council meeting minutes held 14 December 2023 ([Tabled Item 2](#)) due to the amendments required. The final version without tracked changes was tabled ([Tabled Item 3](#)) for Council to confirm as a true and correct record.

RESOLUTION CL24-1.4

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour

1. That Council note the track changed version of the Council meeting minutes held 14 December 2023 (Tabled Item 2) and confirm the final version (Tabled Item 3) as a true and correct record, and the recommendations therein be adopted.
2. That the Chairperson's electronic signature be inserted into the confirmed minutes.

CARRIED

11 COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR RECEIPT**11.1 MINUTES OF THE TE IHU O TE WAKA O TE ARAWA MEETING HELD ON 10 NOVEMBER 2023**

RESOLUTION CL24-1.5

Moved: Cr R Crawford

Seconded: Cr G Dally

That the Minutes of the Te Ihu o te Waka o Te Arawa Meeting held on 10 November 2023 be received.

CARRIED

12 REPORTS**12.1 TOURISM BAY OF PLENTY DRAFT STATEMENT OF INTENT 2024-25 TO 2026-27**

Council considered a report dated 22 February 2024 from the Community and Strategic Relationships Manager, who provided a brief overview of the report including the recommendations for consideration.

The Community and Strategic Relationships Manager introduced Oscar Nathan from Tourism Bay of Plenty (TBOP), who provided an outline of the planned work for the next year.

- Cruise ship visitation numbers had created a busy summer period.
 - Work undertaken to spread visitation numbers across the bay had been a focus, noting that this was spearheaded by former Director of TBOP, Graeme Crossman.
 - A study was being undertaken with Cruise regarding looking at future opportunities for the entire district, due to the port being one of the biggest businesses in the country, it was important to understand how cruise fit in.
-

- Councillors were provided with a pamphlet for the 'Flavours of Plenty' event, noting that this was the third year this event had run. The intention was to undertake a three-year progress report, to ensure that the event was fulfilling its intended purpose.
- The cycle trail brochures available and the updating mechanism had been working well.
- TBOP had an interactive dashboard on their website that provided total data and insight around tourism. It was noted that there were difficulties with the unknowns that surrounded the incoming government.
- The datasets that the industry relied on heavily were not being updated as regularly as they once were, which also caused difficulty.

Staff and Mr Nathan responded to pātai as follows:

- The feedback received from Tauranga City Council (TCC) provided general feedback on multiple areas including:
 - They were happy to see TBOP continue with the exploration of a sub-regional brand;
 - They were keen to understand how TBOP intended to progress with 'Flavours of Plenty'; and
 - They requested TBOP to explore transparency opportunities regarding the reporting that they did.
- It was understood that, due to COVID-19, 'Tarnished Frocks and Divas' had gone into hiatus, however TBOP was working with the events team at TCC to establish a clearer strategy, that incorporated discussions on the iconic event.
- The datasets that TBOP had created would be shared with Councillors following the meeting, to enable them to determine the impact on the stakeholder communities.
- 'Flavours of Plenty' was mostly known for the festival itself, however it was noted that TBOP looked at it from the platform of the horticultural provinance across the region. Outside the programme for 'Flavours of Plenty', TBOP assisted workshops with successful event creators, to help strengthen the eco-system.
- In relation to the LTP, the Community and Strategic Relationships Manager noted that Council had undertaken the initial discussions regarding the economic development activity. Through those discussions Elected Members expressed a desire for opportunities to develop local tourism, as well as the TECT Park Strategic Plan review. As these desires were above the current business as usual (BAU) for TBOP, funding was factored in to allow for the implementation of local tourism opportunities, noting that it was project specific.
- Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC) was coming to the end of their investment in 'The Green Room' programme, noting that this had been highly successful.
- Conversations were taking place in relation to an opportunity to assist and work alongside Whakatane Regional Council and Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Awa, noting that this could also create funding opportunities.

- TBOP would undertake a budget forecast to form a better understanding of where they might be required to “tighten their belt” whilst remaining pragmatic in their approach of it. Council would be kept up to date on how they progressed with those discussions.

The following tākupu were made by Councillors:

- Mr Nathan was congratulated on the work that he had undertaken since becoming a part of TBOP.

RESOLUTION CL24-1.6

Moved: Cr A Henry

Seconded: Cr G Dally

1. That the Community and Strategic Relationships Manager’s report dated 22 February 2024 titled ‘Tourism Bay of Plenty Draft Statement of Intent 2024-2025 to 2026-2027’ be received.
2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of low significance in terms of Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
3. That Council receives the draft Tourism Bay of Plenty Statement of Intent 2024-2025 to 2026-2027, included as **Attachment 1** (of this report).
4. That Council confirms the draft Tourism Bay of Plenty Statement of Intent 2024-2025 to 2026-2027 is in alignment with the Letter of Expectation provided by Western Bay of Plenty District Council to Tourism Bay of Plenty.
5. That Council notes as joint shareholder Tauranga City Council has provided feedback on the draft Statement of Intent at their 12 February 2024 Council meeting.

CARRIED

12.2 PROPOSAL TO LEASE - WAIHĪ BEACH LIFEGUARD SERVICES INCORPORATED - BOWENTOWN SEAFORTH ROAD SOUTH RESERVE - REVISED COMMUNITY OPTION

Council considered a report dated 22 February 2024 from the Reserves and Facilities Manager, who took the report as read and summarised the main points.

Donna Pfefferle was in attendance, on behalf of Waihī Beach Lifeguard Services, to respond to any pātai.

Staff and Ms Pfefferle responded to pātai as below:

- The exercise undertaken to peg out the different options, was useful and Waihī Beach Lifeguard Services was happy with the outcome.
-

- An important part of the process was ensuring that those involved understood the different touch points of the process and when/how they could provide feedback.
- Ms Pfefferle noted that the guidance from the Reserves and Facilities Manager had been exceptional in the process, noting that it would be beneficial to have a template of the process for applicants, including being encouraged to receive initial feedback from stakeholders prior to going to Council.
- The concerns raised by the Waihi Beach Coastguard was in relation to the potential traffic congestion that could occur, as well as the number of meetings that took place in relation to the application process.
- Ms Pfefferle noted that due to the nature of the role that Waihi Beach Coastguard and Waihi Beach Lifeguard Services held, they would not be generating traffic into the area.
- Pio Shore's Sports and Community Association had provided written support on Site 2-V3 as the preferred location.
- Waihi Beach Coastguard were entitled to manage their carpark, due to the form of property rights they held under their lease.
- The BMX track had been allowed for in Waihi Beach Lifeguard Services' initial business plan. This took into consideration costings to ensure that the BMX Track was realigned at the same stage as the earthworks.
- The new proposed building site location was further away from the cricket pitch, and therefore eliminated the initial concerns expressed by the Pio Shore's Sport and Community Association.
- Ms Pfefferle noted that there had been confusion within the community regarding both the relationship and role that the Waihi Beach Lifeguard Services and Waihi Beach Coastguard had.
- Staff were satisfied that the compliance officers available during peak periods would ensure that the emergency services would be able to access their vehicles, and not be obstructed by the parking of members of the public.

The following tākupu were made by Councillors:

- Acknowledgements were made to the Waihi Beach Community Board, Rose Fox, Ms Pfefferle and all those involved in helping to find a way forward.
- The outcome reached was positive and a great outcome for all.

RESOLUTION CL24-1.7

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr R Joyce

1. That the Reserves and Facilities Manager's report dated 22 February 2024 titled 'Proposal to Lease - Waihi Beach Lifeguard Services Incorporated - Bowentown Seaforth Road South Reserve - Revised Community Option' be received.
-

2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of **low** significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
3. That Council exercise its powers conferred on it as the administering body of the reserve by delegation from the Minister of Conservation under the Reserves Act 1977 and grant Waihi Beach Lifeguard Services Incorporated the right to lease for up to 35 years for 600m² of land, more or less, being part of Lot 1 DPS 75873 to allow for a surf club facility situated on:
 - A) Bowentown Seaforth Road South Reserve at site option 2 -V3 (included as **Attachment 1** of this report).
4. That Council notes that any granting of a lease must not be taken by the applicant, as a guarantee that all other consents required by any policy, by- law, regulation, or statute, will be forthcoming. The applicant is responsible for obtaining all required consents at its own cost.

CARRIED

12.3 RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL FOR PLAN CHANGE 92 AND THE NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT FOR ŌMOKOROA ACTIVE RESERVE

Council considered a report dated 22 February 2024 from the Environmental Planning Manager, who provided a brief overview of the report, including the recommendations for Councils consideration. The below points were noted:

- The process for Plan Change 92 had required a significant investment in time of work.
- The planning processes were a result of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (RMA Amendment Act), which saw the introduction of Medium Density Residential Standards across the two urban areas for Ōmokoroa and Te Puke.
- While work was already being undertaken in Ōmokoroa in relation to Stage 3, this put an emphasis on including Te Puke. Plan Change 92 provided for the urban stage 3 of Ōmokoroa, and greenfield area in Te Puke. It was noted that associated to this was the infrastructure projects in Ōmokoroa, specifically roading and the Ōmokoroa roundabout.
- Staff acknowledged the signal changes from Central Government, however no change had been received in relation to this particular piece of legislation, and therefore Council was still required to make decisions by 1 March 2024.
- The panels recommendations had taken into consideration Councils position, as well as those of submitters, and they had worked through matters during the hearings process. The recommendations were, for the most part, consistent with the recommendations that staff had determined.
- The key points of difference between the recommendations from the panel and those determined by staff were:

- The industrial zoning in Ōmokoroa (which was raised in public forum);
 - Changes to the setback provisions in relation to vibrations, with the introduction of rules that staff had otherwise not anticipated; and
 - Activity status changes in relation to roundabouts in Ōmokoroa.
- This decision making process is similar to the normal Schedule 1 Plan Change process, with the difference of having no appeal process. If Council was to accept the recommendations from the panel, they could progress and make the Plan Change operative.
 - Where a recommendation from the Hearings Panel was rejected, a reason must be provided. The rejected recommendations, including any alternative recommendations would then be decided on by the Minister for the Environment.
 - As the Notice of Requirement ran alongside the planning matters being considered on Ōmokoroa, the Independent Hearings Panel considered it, and confirmed it appropriate, subject to some modified conditions set out in the report.

Staff responded to pātai as follows:

- The Independent Hearings Panel only addressed the individual submissions and recommendations they were required to make.
- Where Council made alternative recommendations, there were provisions within the legislation that required Council to ensure these were based off the same information made available to the hearings panel.
- To give affect to a Spatial Plan from a zoning, rule or activity perspective, Council would be required to undertake a subsequent District Plan change, depending on the legislation at the time. The Te Puke Spatial Plan would not change what was outlined in the District Plan, as it was a conceptual process that fed into alternative processes, such as the District Plan and the Long Term Plan, from a funding/budget perspective.
- Although the Plan Change contained objectives and policies in relation to public transport, it did not detail any solutions.
- Subject matter expert staff considered the Fire and Emergency submission in great detail, and determined that on balance the District Plan and Development Code provided provisions in previous years, which they felt were still sufficient. Staff also considered the fact that this was a Medium Density Plan Change, which provided requirements to allow a number of dwellings per site (medium density per hectare). If roads and access points were widened too much you would struggle to meet those targets.
- Although there were concerns raised in relation to traffic/transport and parking, this was not something that Council had control over at present, and therefore this Plan Change had no affect on it.
- Under the operative District Plan, 21 Francis Road was zoned future urban, with the anticipation that it would be zoned industrial. Council proposed that the land to the east and west of Francis Road be zoned industrial, however it was noted that the panels recommendations for the west of the Francis Road intersection was to

remain future urban. This was due to concerns that Council had not undertaken sufficient consultation with adjacent land owners in the medium density area, as well as the definition of 'industry' allowing for any industry work to take place in that area.

- The provision of public transport was a Regional Land Transport matter, noting that this Plan Change would provide a good advocacy point for Council into that process, in relation to the expected growth.
- The number of proposed future dwellings in Ōmokoroa that may be affected by the recommended vibration provisions, was around 110. In Te Puke it would be around 30.
- The proposed vibration requirements would apply to dwellings, accomadation, education, worship, marae and medical facilities, noting that buildings would need to be single story. The cost required to mitigate the vibration issues was significantly high.
- It was normal for the cost to mitigate the impacts on dwellings, to fall on those affected.
- Under LGOIMA, a LIM report was not required to specify anything that was apparent within the District Plan.
- The way that the proposed vibration rule was drafted, it would apply to any new building or additions to buildings.
- The community meetings held in relation to the Plan Change were well attended, with an estimated 50-100 people. It was acknowledged that due to the timeframe in which Council had to prepare a Plan Change, following the implementation of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS), there had been fewer opportunities for public meetings.
- The reference to Clearwater in the recommendation was in relation to case law, as it sought to make clear from the beginning what could and could not be considered as part of the Plan Change.
- The panel raised concerns regarding 'heavy industry' and felt they did not have the scope to resolve through the Plan Change. There were rules within the District Plan regarding 'light industrial', which applied to an area of land on the eastern side of Ōmokoroa Road.

RESOLUTION CL24-1.8

Moved: Cr R Crawford

Seconded: Cr A Sole

That the Environmental Planning Manager's report dated 22 February 2024 titled 'Recommendations by the Independent Hearings Panel for Plan Change 92 and the Notice of Requirement for Ōmokoroa Active Reserve' be received.

CARRIED

MOTION

Moved: Cr Henry

Seconded: Mayor Denyer

That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of low significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr Thwaites

Seconded: Cr Murray-Benge

That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of high significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

The Deputy CEO/General Manager Strategy and Community highlighted the assessment of the Significance and Engagement Policy that was outlined within the report, and the fundamental rationale for why the decisions were deemed of low significance. The reasons included the fact that there had been a substantive process undertaken already, under the Resource Management Act, which had been completely transparent and had enabled a very robust and rigorous hearings process.

Acknowledgement was made on the consequential implications; however it did not fall under the remit of the decision Council was being asked to consider. The decision sought was a regulatory decision, and the consequential implications, particularly regarding Financial Contributions, would be more appropriately raised through the Long Term Plan (LTP) process.

As this was a legislatively prescribed process, if Council determined that this should be of high significance, the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) legislation did not allow for a further round of consultation on the recommendations, and in fact expressly precluded the ability to do so.

Council was advised that if the rationale for raising the level of significance against the Significance and Engagement Policy was in relation to Financial Contributions, this should be debated through the LTP discussions.

Cr Thwaites and Cr Murray-Benge withdrew the amendment.

RESOLUTION CL24-1.9

Moved: Cr A Henry

Seconded: Mayor J Denyer

2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of low significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

The motion was voted on as follows:

For: 5

Against: 5

Abstained: 1

The Mayor exercised his casting vote and voted for the motion. The motion was put and carried.

CARRIED

Cr Thwaites requested that his vote against the motion be recorded.

MOTION

Moved: Deputy Mayor Scrimgeour

Seconded: Cr Crawford

That Council accepts the recommendations of the Independent Hearings Panel for Plan Change 92 and the public be notified of the decision in accordance with clause 102 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 by 1 March 2024.

The Deputy CEO/General Manager Strategy and Community reminded Councillors that the Ōmokoroa Peninsula, including Ōmokoroa Stage 3, was signalled as a growth area well before the gestation of SmartGrowth. Council had made investment decisions in relation to waste water reticulation, on the assumption that Ōmokoroa would at least grow to a population of 12,000 at some point in the future.

There was concern that the MDRS legislation was clouding consideration of the fact that planning for Stage 3 of Ōmokoroa had been in progress since at least 2017. During this time there had been several iterations of community engagement, which included very detailed conceptual planning with the existing Ōmokoroa community. Acknowledge was made on the fact that the MDRS had altered those plans, however staff were well advanced in bringing Council a Plan Change to open up for development – Ōmokoroa Stage 3. It was noted that many local developers had made investment decisions and purchased land in anticipation of Ōmokoroa Stage 3 being re-zoned and open for development imminently.

Council was reminded that they had received funding for an interim roundabout, of which the fundamental basis of that decision by the Crown, was to enable for Stage 3 to be opened up for housing.

This was an important decision for Council, not just for the Ōmokoroa community, but also in terms of its commitment to the Urban Growth Partnership, of which the Crown was a member, to open up land for housing, noting that there was a significant housing crisis across the sub-region.

Staff suggested allowing this item to lie on the table, in order to seek further advice on the implications of Council potentially rejecting the recommendations in their entirety.

The legislation prescribed for an alternative to be provided in the event of rejecting all of the recommendations from the panel. Staff had not contemplated what the procedural element was for that decision making process, which included the commercial risk that a lot of developers had entered into, as well as the contractual risk of Council following the funding they had received from Kāinga Ora.

Deputy Mayor Scrimgeour and Cr Crawford withdrew their motion.

RESOLUTION CL24-1.10

Moved: Cr G Dally

Seconded: Cr A Henry

That recommendation 3 lie on the table.

A division was called, and the voting was as follows:

For: Cr Henry, Cr Dally, Cr Crawford, Cr Coxhead, Mayor Denyer, Cr Wichers, Deputy Mayor Scrimgeour, Cr Joyce.

Against: Cr Thwaites, Cr Sole, Cr Murray-Benge

CARRIED

11.37am The meeting adjourned.

11.55am The meeting reconvened.

The Deputy CEO/General Manager Strategy and Community and staff recommended that this item also lie on the table, as it was complimentary in nature to Plan Change 92.

RESOLUTION CL24-1.11

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr R Joyce

That recommendation 4 lie on the table.

CARRIED

12.4 MAYOR'S REPORT TO COUNCIL

Council considered a report dated 22 February 2024 from the Executive Assistant – Mayor/CEO. The report was taken as read.

RESOLUTION CL24-1.12

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr A Sole

That the Executive Assistant – Mayor/CEO’s report dated 22 February 2024 titled ‘Mayor’s Report to Council’ be received.

CARRIED

13 INFORMATION FOR RECEIPT

Nil

14 RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

RESOLUTION CL24-1.13

Moved: Cr R Crawford
 Seconded: Cr M Murray-Benge

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
<p>14.1 – Confidential Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 14 December 2023</p>	<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)(f)(ii) – the withholding of the information is necessary to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Council members, officers, employees, and persons from improper pressure or harassment</p> <p>s7(2)(i) – the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or</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>

	disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)	
CARRIED		

The Meeting closed at 11.59am.

Confirmed as a true and correct record at the Council meeting held 4 April 2024.



.....

Mayor J Denyer

CHAIRPERSON / MAYOR