

**MINUTES OF WESTERN BAY OF PLENTY DISTRICT COUNCIL
PROJECTS AND MONITORING MEETING NO. PRC26-1
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1484 CAMERON ROAD, TAURANGA
ON TUESDAY, 21 APRIL 2026 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 – NGĀ MEMA KEI KONEI

Cr A Sole, Cr L Rae, Cr S Beech, Cr T Coxhead, Cr G Dally, Cr D Dinsdale, Mayor J Denyer, Cr G Elvin, Cr R Joyce and Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge

20 members of the public

3 IN ATTENDANCE – I TAE AKE

B Singh (General Manager Infrastructure Group), M Taris (Interim Chief Executive), A Henderson (Acting General Manager Corporate Services), A Lane (General Manager Strategy and Community), P Watson (Reserves and Facilities Manager), J Proverbs (Communications Specialist), S Parker (Cycleways Manager), C McLean (Director Transportation), R Leahy (Senior Governance Advisor), R Garrett (Governance Manager) and H Wi Repa (Governance Systems Advisor)

4 APOLOGIES – NGĀ WHAKAPAHĀ

APOLOGY

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.1

Moved: Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Cr L Rae

That the apologies for lateness from Mayor J Denyer and Cr R Joyce be accepted.

CARRIED

5 CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEMS – NGĀ TAKE TŌMURI

Nil

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST – NGĀ TUKITUKINGA

Nil

7 TRANSFER OF PUBLIC EXCLUDED ITEM – TE WHITINGA O TE AO MĀRAMA KI NGĀ TAKE MUNA

Nil

9.34am Mayor J Denyer entered the hui.

8 PUBLIC FORUM – WĀHANGA TŪMATANUI

8.1 BOP COAST ROWING CLUB – PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP A PAPER ROAD AT WAIROA RIVER

Charlie Burns and Nick Hanna were in attendance on behalf of the BOP Coast Rowing Club to present a proposal to develop a paper road to Wairoa River. They noted the below points:

- The Club was 34 years old and served a wide range of athletes from various ages.
- Since the Club had relocated to the riverside, they had expanded immensely and were looking to build an extension to the existing facility.
- As a result of the increase in activity in the area, pressure was being put on roading infrastructure.
- They requested that the width of the road be widened and sealed to the full width of the paper parcel. This would enable two lanes of traffic and car parking, if this could not be achieved they felt that widening it to two lanes would suffice.
- The current gravel road potholed very quickly and caused damage to users' equipment.

9.42am Cr Rodney Joyce entered the hui.

- The increased activity on the road was causing issues for the neighbours, a nearby kiwifruit grower had experienced an increase of dust on their crop and overflow carparking into the cul-de-sac was a safety hazard.

The presenters responded to pātai as below:

- The proposal had 105 car parks (approximately 50 on either side of the road). The concept plan was developed in line with Council's development code.
- The design and quantity survey had been undertaken for the shed expansion. The Club was now looking to start fundraising for it, noting that it could take a number

of years before the facility was built. The cost of the building was approximately \$3 million.

- There was provision for trailer parking on the site.
- The dimension of the car parks was 2.5m x 5.4m and the lane width was approximately 6m each.
- Ideally the proposed car park area and road would be chip sealed to help mitigate the issue of potholes.

Tabled Item 1 – BOP Coast Rowing Club Presentation

8.2 WAYNE LOWRY – ORMSBY LANE MAINTENANCE ISSUES

Wayne Lowry, Chairman of the Kaimai-Ōmanawa Rural Ratepayers Association, was in attendance to discuss maintenance issues with Ormsby Lane. He noted the below points:

- Mr Lowry requested that 200m of gravel road on Ormsby Lane be serviced by Council to a state where it was safe for residents to use.
- Ormsby Lane was part owned by Council and it was the public part of the road that was causing issues.
- Residents had observed that a smaller chip size was used when grading the road and believed that it was not adequate for the road.
- The issue had been brought to Mr Lowry's attention approximately six months ago.

Staff responded to pātai as below:

- A roading crew would be going to the site to evaluate the issue.
 - There was an unsealed maintenance contract for the road, which specified how the maintenance was to be completed, however recent weather events had affected the road.
 - There were challenges with getting the grade of material correct for unsealed roads. The road needed enough clay content to enable the material to bind and form a smooth and solid surface, however, too much clay could cause the road to become muddy.
 - It was noted that the maintenance contracts were monitored by staff to ensure the work was completed to contract specifications.
-

8.3 LINDA WILMAN – WORK ROAD MAINTENANCE ISSUES

Linda Wilman was in attendance to discuss maintenance issues with Work Road. She noted the below points:

- There were issues with potholes on the unsealed parts of Work Road, which was approximately 2km. The road was becoming close to impassable due to maintenance issues.
 - Residents were concerned that the road rehabilitation had been delayed.
-

- The recent weather events kept washing away the road and forming large potholes.
- There were concerns about the metal being used, which residents believed to be large quarry waste, noting that some residents had punctures in their tyres.
- It was noted that the road was a school bus route.

The Chairperson advised that design work for sealing a section of the road was underway, however, the works would not begin until 2027.

8.4 JILL AND GEOFF DELL - FLOODING AT TWO MILE CREEK

Jill and Geoff Dell were in attendance to discuss issues with flooding at Two Mile Creek. She noted the below points:

- Their property flooded on 22 January 2026, the flooding happened during heavy rain.
- Even in Cyclone Gabrielle the water did not reach the level of flooding that it did on 22 January 2026.
- They believe that the bank was higher prior to the rock wall along Two Mile Creek being built, and that either their land was lowered adjacent to the top of the wall or that the creek bed was raised to facilitate the flow down stream.
- They observed that the creek was more prone to flooding since the wall had been built.
- In the latest flood on 22 January 2026, the water reached a sewage man hole cover at a neighbouring property.
- Building and development upstream had caused more water to come down stream.
- Some properties across the creek had been raised to prevent flooding, they were aware that their property could not be raised to that height, however, requested that their property was raised to some extent.
- They were concerned that if there was no dam then the water could rush down Two Mile Creek and worsen the flooding in that area.
- They had attempted to enhance the flood prone area by planting native trees, however, this was ruined by the flooding.

The General Manager Infrastructure advised that staff would undertake an investigation into the matter and report back to Council and the Public Forum speakers by the end of May.

Tabled Item 2 – Jill and Geoff Dell Speaking Notes

8.5 FRIENDS OF PRECIOUS FAMILY RESERVE – PRECIOUS FAMILY RESERVE TOILET

Bruce McCabe, Roger Goodman, John Duffy, Graham McKinstry and Judy Sampson were in attendance to discuss the toilet at Precious Family Reserve. They noted the below points:

- Mr McCabe felt that the petition brought to the Projects and Monitoring Committee meeting in May 2025 showed that the residents and reserve users did not want the toilet at the location.
- Mr McCabe felt that the petition discussion was skewed at the Projects and Monitoring Committee meeting in June 2025 and that the petition carried little weight in the Committee's decision-making, which ignored the views of those residents on the matter.
- Mr McCabe felt that the Ōmokoroa Community Board's position on the matter was misrepresented during the debate at the 10 June 2025 Committee meeting and believed that this misrepresentation was a factor in the decisions made by a number of Councillors.
- They requested that the Committee treat the petition as the primary document of community expression when making a decision on the 'Precious Family Reserve – Reconsideration of Toilet Options' report.
- Mr Duffy felt that the planning and consent processes for installing the toilet did not follow good practice.
- Mr Duffy was of the view that when the toilet was installed there was no adopted management plan for Precious Family Reserve and that the 2018 concept plan was not formally adopted into the Kaimai Reserve Management Plan until the Plan was finalised in 2025.
- Mr Duffy noted that the 2018 concept plan included a toilet at or near to the pump station, however, this was some distance away from where the toilet was installed.
- Engagement with adjacent property owners was undertaken during the 2018 concept plan, however, the affected property owners did not have any input when the toilet location changed.
- Council was granted a non-notified resource consent and building exemption for the toilet, noting that Council was the applicant and the consent authority, and Mr Duffy believed that arrangement should have carried more procedural openness.
- They felt that the screen plantings surrounding the toilet were inadequate.
- Mrs Sampson raised concerns about the safety of the toilet after she was trapped in the facility in February 2026, she noted that she did not sign the petition and was neutral in regard to the debate on its location.
- The toilet lost power which had resulted in her becoming trapped in the facility on a very hot day. Mrs Sampson was concerned that no one from Council had contacted her regarding the incident.
- Mr McKinstry was concerned that the decision report did not provide detailed costings on removing the toilet and felt there should have been an option that, if removed, the toilet could be sold to offset the removal costs.

- Mr McKinstry discussed Council's engagement policy in relation to further consultation on this issue.

Presenters responded to pātai as below:

- Mr Goodman did not want a toilet at its current location as he felt it was in the wrong location and was an 'eyesore'. He clarified that if the toilet had been installed at the original location he would not have had an issue with it.
- Mrs Sampson did not have an issue with the toilet being at the reserve site.
- Mr Duffy clarified that Council had consulted with him regarding the Kaimai Reserve Management Plan and concept plan for Precious Family Reserve.

Tabled Item 3 – Friends of Precious Family Reserve Case for Removal Brief

Tabled Item 4 – Friends of Precious Family Reserve Rebuttal

Tabled Item 5 – Graham McKinstry Speaking Notes

11:27am The hui adjourned for morning tea.

11:49am The hui reconvened.

9 PRESENTATIONS - NGĀ WHAKATAIRANGA

Nil

10 REPORTS - NGĀ PŪRONGO

10.1 PRECIOUS FAMILY RESERVE - RECONSIDERATION OF TOILET OPTIONS

The Committee considered a report from the Reserves and Facilities Manager who provided an overview of the report and responded to some matters raised in Public Forum as below:

- It was clarified that the costs provided in the report related to the scope of the relocation or removal of the toilet.
 - Removing the toilet would result in a reduced level of service for Precious Family Reserve as it would not be following what was adopted in the concept plan.
 - The concept plan was not an engineering assessment plan, which meant that the toilet location changed once the detailed site plans had been done and onsite constraints were better understood. It was noted in the original concept plan that the site may be subject to underground services, which subsequently affected the decision to change the toilet location.
 - The toilet was a permitted activity under the zoning and all necessary consents were obtained for the facility. The allegations that the toilet did not meet the Code of Compliance had been investigated.
 - Council installed screen plantings between the adjoining residents' property and the toilet facility. In keeping with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
-

(CPTED) principles, screen planting was not planned immediately around the toilet itself.

- It was noted that Mr McKinstry's interpretation of Council's engagement policy indicated the threshold for consultation was not triggered. If this was the case, this would apply to any consultation relating to the moving of the toilet facility within the concept plan parameters.

Staff responded to pātai as below:

- There was the potential that the costings to remove the toilet and install it elsewhere in the District would be more than relocating it to another site in the reserve.
- There were sites in the District where the toilet could be relocated that would have less consenting requirements compared to Precious Family Reserve, which would reduce the relocation cost.
- It was clarified that the toilet could not be relocated to the site that was in the original concept plan.
- Through the renewal programme, the toilet facility at Island View Reserve was upgraded to a twin unit and the existing unit was refurbished and relocated to Precious Family Reserve.
- The toilet electronics were not upgraded as part of the refurbishment, however, since the incident when Mrs Sampson was trapped, the electronics had been upgraded to the latest technology.
- The consent application was lodged on 20 March 2024 and approved on 23 May 2024.
- The toilet facility was considered a low risk building when undertaking an assessment to exempt it from the Building Code and Building Act.
- There had been one other incident that staff were aware of where the electronic technology had failed in a toilet. This incident occurred at Midway Park in Pukehina and the people trapped were a staff member and the contractor.
- The lifespan for the toilet building was approximately 50 years, however, if the toilet remained it would become part of council's renewal schedule where it would eventually be replaced with a brand new toilet.
- If funding was available, it would take approximately 6-8 weeks to decommission and remove the toilet from its location.
- A family representative of the original owner of Precious Family Reserve had presented their views on the reserve to Council through the Reserve Management Plan process and other consultation mechanisms.
- No work had been undertaken to obtain detailed costing for relocating the toilet to an alternative location elsewhere in the District. The costing of \$145,000 for relocation was specific to the reserve as there were limitations with the site, including the need to go through the consent process again.
- \$40,000-\$45,000 was a realistic estimate to undertake an independent review of the process.

1:43pm The hui adjourned for lunch.

2:00pm The hui reconvened.

- It was clarified that recommendation 3b and 4 allowed for consultation on the option only to remove or relocate the toilet and not to retain it in its current location. Recommendation 4 would need to be amended to allow for consultation on retaining the toilet in its current location.
 - It was noted that an internal “lessons learnt” process would be undertaken and reported back to the Audit, Risk and Finance Committee.
-

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.2

Moved: Cr L Rae

Seconded: Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge

1. That the Reserves and Facilities Manager’s report dated 21 April 2026 titled ‘Precious Family Reserve – Reconsideration of Toilet Options’ be received.
2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of **medium** significance in terms of Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

CARRIED

MOTION

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr G Dally

3. That the Projects and Monitoring Committee:
 - a. Approves that the status quo remains - the toilet facility remains in place as per the original Committee decision and that staff undertake a “lessons learnt” process to enhance future infrastructure delivery projects.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr G Elvin

Seconded: Cr D Dinsdale

3. That the Projects and Monitoring Committee:
 - a. Approves that the status quo remains - the toilet facility remains in place as per the original Committee decision - and directs staff to commission an external independent review of the full process relating to the proposed toilet facility at the Precious Family Reserve, including recommendations as to any improvements in process, community engagement protocols and communications so as to enhance quality of service delivery to the community; such report to be at an estimated cost of between \$40,000-\$45,000.

With the agreement from the mover and seconder the amendment was **withdrawn** and the original motion was voted on.

MOTION

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr G Dally

3. That the Projects and Monitoring Committee:
 - a. Approves that the status quo remains – the toilet facility remains in place as per the original Committee decision and that staff undertake a “lessons learnt” process to enhance future infrastructure delivery projects.

The motion was voted on and a division was called and recorded as follows:

For: Mayor J Denyer and Cr G Dally

Against: Cr S Beech, Cr T Coxhead, Cr D Dinsdale, Cr L Rae, Cr A Sole, Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge, Cr Elvin and Cr R Joyce

LOST 2/8**MOTION**

Moved: Cr L Rae

Seconded: Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge

3. That the Projects and Monitoring Committee:
 - b. Approves that the toilet facility be relocated to a new position on Precious Family Reserve (to be determined and subject to consent requirements), and recommends that a budget of \$145,000 to relocate the toilet facility be funded from rates in the 2026/27 Financial Year.

The motion was voted on and a division was called and recorded as follows:

For: Cr L Rae, Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge, Cr S Beech, Cr D Dinsdale and Cr G Elvin

Against: Mayor J Denyer, Cr T Coxhead, Cr G Dally, Cr R Joyce and Cr A Sole

LOST 5/5

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.3

Moved: Cr R Joyce

Seconded: Cr G Dally

1. That Council carries out a new round of consultation in Ōmokoroa to determine the community’s view on the presence and placement of a toilet in the Precious Family Reserve, including the current location, other options and the associate costs.

A division was called and recorded as follows:

For: Cr A Sole, Cr L Rae, Cr S Beech, Cr T Coxhead, Cr G Dally, Mayor J Denyer and Cr R Joyce

Against: Cr D Dinsdale, Cr G Elvin and Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge

CARRIED 7/3

10.2 BICYCLE LOCK UP FACILITY – PROLE ROAD

The Committee considered a report from the Infrastructure Growth and Delivery Manager dated 21 April 2026. An overview of the report was provided.

Staff responded to pātai as below:

- It was noted that the proposed facility was a high level concept plan and there was opportunity for other options at the location.
 - It was clarified that a location for the facility was not yet confirmed but it was likely to be on Prole Road near the bus stop.
 - The original scope of the project did not include a bicycle lock-up facility, if the project went ahead it would be funded by an underspend of the Ōmokoroa Stage 1 Urbanisation project.
-

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.4

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr G Dally

1. That the Infrastructure Growth and Delivery Manager's report dated 21 April 2026 titled "Bicycle Lock-Up Facility – Prole Road" 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.
-

CARRIED

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.5

Moved: Cr T Coxhead

Seconded: Cr D Dinsdale

4. That the Projects and Monitoring Committee approves **Option B (Recommended)**:
 - a. To not progress the proposed bike lock-up facility as a scope increase to the current project; and
 - b. To retain the savings of \$85,000 from the Ōmokoroa Stage 1 Urbanisation project and prevent incurring an additional \$3,000 per year of ongoing operational maintenance costs.
-

CARRIED

10.3 MAKETŪ GRINDER PUMP PROJECT

The Committee considered a report from the Infrastructure Engineer dated 21 April 2026. An overview of the report was provided.

Staff responded to pātai as below:

- The existing pumps relied on a pressure sensor, if the sensor was blocked then the pump did not get a signal to say that the wastewater tank was empty. This resulted in many of the pumps continuing to run and eventually burning out.
- A number of options were considered, however, only two were suitable for Maketū – the first involved retrofitting the existing system similar to the float system in Te Puna West, and the second was to build a contemporary gravity-fed system. Both would have required extensive work to the existing wastewater system which was deemed to be too expensive.
- The business case found that it would cost approximately \$7 million to retrofit the wastewater system to the float system that Te Puna West had.
- The proposed telemetry system was less invasive compared to the other systems considered and would involve minimal physical work at individual properties.
- The failure rate of the grinder pumps was lower at Te Puna West compared to Maketū, noting that only two pumps had been replaced this year in Te Puna West compared to 60 in Maketū.
- The overall system including the pipe network and tanks had a expected asset lifespan of 100 years, the grinder pumps had asset lifespans of 10 years.
- Council currently did not have sufficient data to know which grinder pumps were nearing the end of the lifespan or had recently been rebuilt or replaced. Part of the project would be to undertake a stock take of the existing pumps and start a tracking system which could inform their approach to rebuilding or replacing the pumps.
- The main reasons why the pumps failed were because the pumps were being run while the tank was empty, improper use such as flushing disposable items into the system, and solidified wastewater from lack of use.
- A communications strategy would be rolled out to help educate residents about what could be flushed into the wastewater system.
- It was clarified that the same grinder pumps were used in Te Puna West and in Maketū.
- It was expected that the \$80,000 annual operating budget would be covered in the current maintenance budget. This would cover the cost of the sim card and notification system required for the system and was in line with what the technology cost elsewhere in the district.

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.6

Moved: Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Cr R Joyce

1. That the Infrastructure Engineer (Stormwater/Wastewater) report dated 21 April 2026 titled “Maketū Grinder Pump Project” 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 the Projects and Monitoring Committee approves the procurement of contractor/s for the supply and install of telemetry across all grinder pumps in Maketū via closed invited tender.
4. That the Projects and Monitoring Committee delegates the award of contract works up to the value of \$2.2 million to the Chief Executive.
5. That the Projects and Monitoring Committee approves the allocation of \$80,000 annually for the ongoing telemetry operational requirements.

CARRIED

MEETING DURATION

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.7

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr L Rae

That in accordance with Standing Order 4.2, the Projects and Monitoring Committee resolves to continue with the remaining business of the meeting, noting that the meeting duration is longer than six hours.

CARRIED

4:05pm The hui adjourned for afternoon tea.

4:21pm The hui reconvened.

10.4 DEVELOPMENT TRENDS REPORT 2025 OVERVIEW

The Committee considered a report from the Research and Monitoring Analyst dated 21 April 2026. The report was taken as read.

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.8

Moved: Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Cr G Elvin

1. That the Research and Monitoring Analyst's report dated 21 April 2026 titled 'Development Trends Report 2025 Overview' 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 the Projects and Monitoring Committee receives the Summary Report as set out in **Attachment 1** and receives the Development Trends Report 2025 as set out in **Attachment 2** of the agenda report.

CARRIED

11 INFORMATION FOR RECEIPT – KŌRERO TE WHIWHIA

11.1 INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES PROJECT UPDATES

The Committee considered a report from the Executive Assistant Infrastructure Group dated 21 April 2026. The report was taken as read.

Staff responded to pātai as below:

- The engagement undertaken through the Spatial Plan process showed where the community would like to see the swimming pool built in Te Puke. Investigation work on the swimming pool would look at the suitability of the different sites.

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.9

Moved: Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Cr T Coxhead

1. That the Executive Assistant Infrastructure Group's report dated 21 April 2026 titled "Infrastructure Services Project Updates" be received.

CARRIED

11.2 2025-2026 FREEDOM CAMPING REPORT – DISTRICT WIDE

The Committee considered a report from the Compliance and Monitoring Manager dated 21 April 2026. The report was taken as read.

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.3

Moved: Mayor J Denyer

Seconded: Cr S Beech

1. That the Compliance and Monitoring Manager's report dated 21 April 2026 titled 2025-2026 Freedom Camping Report – District Wide be received.

CARRIED

11.3 REGULATORY OPERATIONS REPORT- MARCH 2026

The Committee considered a report from the Compliance and Monitoring Manager dated 21 April 2026. The report was taken as read.

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.4

Moved: Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Cr D Dinsdale

That the Compliance and Monitoring Manager's report dated 21 April 2026, titled 'Regulatory Operations Report – March 2026' be received.

CARRIED

11.4 HOUSING ACTION PLAN 2024 PROGRESS UPDATE

The Committee considered a report from the Community and Strategic Relationships Manager's report. The report was taken as read.

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.5

Moved: Cr D Dinsdale

Seconded: Deputy Mayor M Murray-Benge

That the Community and Strategic Relationships Manager's report dated 21 April 2026, titled 'Housing Action Plan 2024 Progress Update', be received.

CARRIED

12 RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC – WHAKATAU KI TE PORO I TE MAREA

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

RESOLUTION PRC26-1.6

Moved: Cr T Coxhead

Seconded: Cr R Joyce

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 |
|--|---|---|
| 12.1 - Waihi Beach Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade | 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 | 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 |

| | | |
|----------------|---|---|
| | <p>the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information</p> <p>s7(2)(h) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - the withholding of the information is necessary to enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations)</p> | <p>exist under section 6 or section 7</p> |
| CARRIED | | |

The Meeting closed at 5.30pm.

Confirmed as a true and correct record by the Project and Monitoring Committee on 9 June 2026.

.....

Cr A Sole
CHAIRPERSON