

Minutes of an ordinary meeting of the Gore District Council, held in the Council Chambers, 29 Bowler Avenue, Gore, on Tuesday 25 June 2019, at 5.35pm

Present His Worship the Mayor (Mr Tracy Hicks JP), Crs Bolger, Beale (from 5.46pm), Davis, Dickson, Gardyne, D Grant, P Grant, Phillips (via teleconference), Reid and Sharp.

In attendance The Chief Executive (Mr Stephen Parry), General Manager Regulatory and Community Services (Mr Ian Davidson-Watts), General Manager Infrastructure (Mr Ramesh Sharma), Chief Financial Officer (Mr Luke Blackbeard), HR/Administration Manager (Susan Jones), Communications-Marketing Manager (Sonia Gerken), Transport Manager (Mr Peter Standring) and two members of the public in the gallery.

Apology Cr Highsted apologised for absence.

His Worship asked for any conflicts of interest. None were declared.

1. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr P Grant, seconded by Cr Gardyne, **THAT** the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Gore District Council, held on Tuesday 14 May 2019, as presented, be confirmed and signed by the Mayor as a true and complete record.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Reid, seconded by Cr D Grant, **THAT** the report of the ordinary meeting of the Community Services Committee, held on Tuesday 4 June 2019, as presented, be confirmed and signed by the Mayor as a true and complete record.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Davis, seconded by Cr Dickson, **THAT** the recommendations contained within the report of the meeting of the Community Services Committee, held on Tuesday 4 June 2019, as presented, be ratified.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Bolger, seconded by Cr D Grant, **THAT** the report of the meeting of the Regulatory and Planning Committee, held on Tuesday 4 June 2019, as presented, be confirmed and signed by the Mayor as a true and complete record.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Bolger, seconded by Cr Dickson, THAT the recommendations contained within the report of the meeting of the Regulatory and Planning Committee, held on Tuesday 4 June 2019, as presented, be ratified.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Davis, seconded by Cr Reid, THAT the report of the meeting of the Operations Committee, held on Tuesday 4 June 2019, as presented, be confirmed and signed by the Mayor as a true and complete record.

The Council *noted* that Cr Davis had in fact chaired the meeting, not Cr Beale.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Davis, seconded by Cr Dickson, THAT the recommendations contained within the report of the meeting of the Operations Committee, held on Tuesday 4 June 2019, as presented, be ratified.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Bolger, seconded by Cr Gardyne, THAT the report of the meeting of the Finance and Policy Committee, held on Tuesday 4 June 2019, as presented, be confirmed and signed by the Mayor as a true and complete record.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr D Grant, seconded by Cr Bolger, THAT the recommendations contained within the report of the meeting of the Finance and Policy Committee, held on Tuesday 4 June 2019, as presented, be ratified.

2. YOUTH COUNCIL

Youth Councillors Saffie Hare and Eryn Phillipson were in attendance and gave an update on Youth Council activities. These included activities held as part of Youth Week including events at the MLT Event Centre, activities at Camp Columba, a gaming afternoon, the Youth Awards and a combined church service. The timing of the Youth Awards had changed this year and 54 nominations had still been received which was very pleasing. A total of 380 people attended the awards evening and Liam Malone had been an inspiring and entertaining speaker.

Cr Beale attended the meeting from 5.46pm

The Youth Councillors departed at 5.49pm

3. CREATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

A copy of a report from the Creative Communities Assessment Committee meeting held on Wednesday 15 May had been circulated with the agenda.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Davis, seconded by Cr Reid, THAT the information be received.

2019/52

4. GORE DISTRICT COUNCIL (OTAMA RURAL WATER SUPPLY) BILL (SC1747)

A memo had been received from the Chief Executive advising that the Gore District Council (Otama Rural Water Supply) Bill had been passed into law on 27 May 2019. Under section 5(1A) of the new statute, a new referendum of consumers had to be conducted no later than five years after the commencement of the Act. The date for the referendum completion was 28 May 2024. The steps that the Council needed to be comply with prior to the referendum were detailed, together with the obligations of the company.

A copy of a letter from the Medical Officer of Health had been circulated with the agenda. The Medical Officer strongly recommended that further work on implementing the Act not be undertaken until there had been careful consideration of the DIA, MfE and MoH review of the three waters work which was expected to be released in June. The review would be an important guide for the future shape of drinking water, wastewater and stormwater systems.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Davis, seconded by Cr Gardyne, THAT the report and letter from the Medical Officer of Health be received.

2019/53

5. GRANTS SUBCOMMITTEE (SC2424)

A memo had been received from the Chief Financial Officer following the first round of meetings held by the Grants Subcommittee on 1 April, 9 May and 30 May. Copies of the reports from the subcommittee meetings had been circulated with the agenda.

A significant new application had been received from the SBS St James Theatre Trust seeking a one-off grant of \$60,000 towards seismic strengthening and the installation of a lift. The grant had been recommended for approval by the subcommittee and would need to be financed by a short term loan which would be repaid over six years using rates funding. A copy of the covering letter from the Trust along with its financial statements had been circulated with the agenda.

If the grant was ratified, an amendment to the Annual Plan 2019/20 would need to be noted before the Council adopted the Annual Plan later in the meeting.

Cr D Grant said the subcommittee was unanimous in its support of the funding application from the St James Theatre Trust. A lift was becoming a necessity in the theatre with the District's population getting older.

He added the Trust's Lotteries grant would expire on 17 July and if the Trust could raise one third of the cost for the lift then Lotteries had indicated it would fund the remaining two thirds of the cost.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr D Grant, seconded by Cr Sharp, THAT the report be received,

THAT the reports of the meetings of the Grants Subcommittee held on 1 April, 9 May and 30 May 2019, be received,

AND THAT the Council adopt the recommendations contained in the reports of the Grant Subcommittee meetings.

2019/54

6. ADOPTION OF 2019/20 ANNUAL PLAN (SC2169)

A memo had been received from the Chief Financial Officer together with a copy of the 2019-20 Annual Plan. There were some differences to year 2 of the 10 Year Plan, but the majority of the plan remained unchanged and there had been no changes to the non-financial performance measures. The budgets had been updated to reflect the timing of large capital projects and allowances had been made for circumstances that had changed over the last 12 months. The 2019/20 Annual Plan rate increase was 4.95%.

The main differences to the 10 Year Plan had been detailed along with the three most significant capital projects scheduled for 2019/20.

Cr Sharp did not support the upgrade of the civic administration building. It was a luxury the Council could not afford. There were plenty of other projects to be sorted out and with those, would mean the Council debt would be around \$35-40 million.

His Worship disagreed that it was a luxury. The current design of the building reflected 40-50 years ago and the upgrade had been delayed for a long time. He thought the upgrade would reflect the way the Council needed to do business in the future.

Cr P Grant moved THAT the draft Annual Plan for 2019/20 be adopted, noting a grant of \$60,000 to the St James Theatre Trust will be added to the grants schedule.

The motion was seconded by Cr Bolger.

In response to Cr Sharp asking about the relocation cost for the administration building upgrade, the Chief Executive said the staff disruption cost was budgeted at \$100,000. Cr D Grant advised there had been a workshop the previous week which Cr Sharp had not attended. Cr Sharp asked where the staff would go. The Chief Executive was happy to advise Cr Sharp at the briefing following the meeting. There were some issues of confidentiality that still needed to be observed.

The motion was put and it was carried.

Cr Sharp voted against the motion noting his opposition to the civic administration building upgrade.

2019/55

7. RATES RESOLUTION (SC2177)

The Chief Financial Officer had recommended the Council set the following rates under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

Cr Bolger moved **THAT** under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, the Council set the following rates on rating units in the district for the financial year commencing 1 July 2019 and ending on 30 June 2020:

a. Uniform Annual General Charge

A uniform annual general charge set under section 15 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for all rateable land in the district of \$731.51 (GST inclusive) per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit.

b. General rate

A general rate set under section 13 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for all rateable land in the district of an amount of \$0.000453 (GST inclusive) in the dollar of capital value of the land.

c. Southland Regional Heritage Trust rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 in relation to all rateable land in the district, to fund the Council's contribution to the Southland Regional Heritage Trust, of an amount of \$36.22 (GST inclusive) per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit.

d. Targeted rate for various specified activities

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 to fund the following activities: roading; civil defence; aquatic facilities; district libraries; property; MLT Event Centre and public toilets. The rate is set based on the capital value of the land and at different rates in the dollar for different categories of land as follows:

Categories of rateable land	Per \$ of Capital value (GST inclusive)
Gore, Residential	0.001953
Gore, Commercial	0.004817
Mataura, Residential	0.000867
Mataura, Commercial	0.004886
Rural	0.000769
Heavy Industry 1	0.067760
Heavy Industry 2	0.012910
Heavy industry 3	0.011304
Utilities	0.000862

e. Parks & Reserves Residential rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for parks and reserves on all rateable land defined as residential, and at different amounts for different categories of such land as follows:

Categories of rateable land	Factor(s) for calculating liability	Rate (GST inclusive)
Gore, Residential	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$329.80
Mataura, Residential	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$258.36

f. Parks & Reserves Rural rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for parks and reserves on all rateable land defined as rural, and at different fixed amounts for different categories of such land, as follows:

Categories of rateable land	Factor(s) for calculating liability	Rate (GST inclusive)
Rural, Capital value \$0 - \$149,000	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$219.60
Rural, Capital value 149,001 and above	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$361.80

g. Parks & Reserves Commercial rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for parks and reserves on all rateable land defined as commercial, and at different amounts or rates in the dollar for different categories of such land, as follows:

Categories of rateable land	Factor(s) for calculating liability	Rate (GST inclusive)
Commercial, capital value \$0 – 85,000	Per rating unit	\$450.00
Commercial, capital value \$85,001 - \$840,000	Capital value	\$0.005281
Commercial, capital value \$840,001 and above	Per rating unit	\$4,450.00

h. Water rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for water supply, at different amounts for different categories of land as follows:

Categories of rateable land	Factor(s) for calculating liability	Rate (GST inclusive)
Gore or Mataura water scheme – connected	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$361.85
Gore or Mataura water scheme – serviceable	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$180.93

i. Additional water rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for water supply, on all non-residential land which is connected to the Gore or Mataura water schemes, of an amount of \$361.85 (GST inclusive) per connection after the first connection.

j. Wastewater and stormwater rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for wastewater and stormwater at different amounts for different categories of land, as follows:

Categories of rateable land	Factor(s) for calculating liability	Rate (GST inclusive)
Gore or Mataura scheme, connected	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$440.36
Gore or Mataura scheme, serviceable	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$220.18
Waikaka scheme, connected	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$135.44
Waikaka scheme, serviceable	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$67.72
Pukerau scheme, connected	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$101.58

Additional wastewater and stormwater rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for wastewater and stormwater on all non-residential land connected to the Gore, Mataura or Waikaka wastewater and stormwater schemes, at different amounts for different categories of land, as follows:

Categories of rateable land	Factor(s) for calculating liability	Rate (GST inclusive)
Connected to Gore or Mataura scheme, short term accommodation	per water closet or urinal after the first	\$220.18
Connected to Gore or Mataura scheme, educational institutions	per water closets or urinals after the first. The number of water closets or urinals will be assessed on the basis of 6.25% of the total number of staff and pupils at each establishment.	\$440.36
Connected to Gore or Mataura scheme, all other non-residential rating units (excluding educational institutions).	per water closet or urinal after the first.	\$440.36
Connected to Waikaka scheme, all non-residential (excluding educational institutions).	per water closet or urinal after the first.	\$135.44

k. Otama water unit allocation rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for the Otama water scheme on all land connected to the scheme, of an amount of \$200 (GST inclusive) per water unit allocation i.e. on the extent of the provision of the service.

l. Otama water connection rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for the Otama water scheme on all land connected to the scheme, of an amount of \$215 (GST inclusive) per water connection.

m. Solid waste rate

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for solid waste at different amounts for different categories of land as follows:

Categories of rateable land	Factor(s) for calculating liability	Rate (GST inclusive)
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------

Gore and Mataura, vacant land (unserviced)	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$74.20
Gore and Mataura, small wheelie bin service (80 ltr)	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$255.29
Gore and Mataura, (standard wheelie bin service (240 ltr)	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$301.34

n. **Community hall rate**

A targeted rate set under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 for rural halls as follows:

Categories of rateable land	Factor(s) for calculating liability	Rate (GST inclusive)
Brydone hall area	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$24.22
Mandeville hall area	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$46.00
Otama hall area	Per rating unit	\$80.50
Pukerau hall area	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$36.00
Tuturau hall area	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$34.86
Waikaka hall area	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$49.00
Knapdale hall area	Per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit	\$57.50

2. That all rates will be payable in four instalments with the due dates for payment being:

Instalment no	Period covered	Due date for payment
1	1 July to 30 September	30 August 2019
2	1 October to 31 December	29 November 2019
3	1 January to 31 March	28 February 2020
4	1 April to 30 June	29 May 2020

3. Penalties

That a 10% penalty will be added to each instalment, or any portion of the instalment, of rates assessed in the 2019/2020 rating year that remain unpaid on the day after the due date for payment of that instalment.

That additional 10% penalties will be added to any rates assessed in previous financial years that remain unpaid on 5 July 2019; and then again on 6 January 2020.

Only payments actually received at the Council offices named below will be accepted as paid on that date.

4. Method of payment

Rates can be paid at the main Council office in Bowler Avenue, Gore or at the Mataura Service Centre in Bridge Street Mataura.

Payments may be made in cash or by cheque or EFTPOS. Credit card payments may be made online via the Council's eservices website. A 2.88% surcharge will be added to any credit card payment.

Electronic payments by direct debit or online banking can be arranged by contacting a customer services representative on 209-0330.

The motion was seconded by Cr Davis

Cr Sharp asked about the UACG at \$731 and what percentage that equated to?

The Chief Financial Officer advised the UAGC and SRHC rate were the same across all ratepayers but together accounted for 25% of the rate take. Cr Sharp asked if it was intended to reduce the UAGC level. The Officer said it was an issue for debate at the next Long Term Plan. Cr Sharp said it meant that the rural ratepayers paid more for the urban problems. When it had been levied at 30% it had been to pay for recycling. Now it was at 25%. Cr Bolger said traditionally the Council had made a lot of use of the UAGC up to its maximum cap of 30%. However, over time a UAGC of that significant dollar value was penalising those ratepayers with a lesser valued property. The Council had determined to fixed the UAGC at a dollar value and be retained at 25% of its potential maximum. As the quantum of rates had increased, the UAGC was at 25% and the decision of the Council was that it remain at that level. It also had nothing to do with recycling.

His Worship said the time to have the debate about the UAGC was the next Long Term Plan in 2021. The UAGC had been debated two LTPs ago and Cr Sharp had been part of that discussion.

Cr Bolger said the overall rate increase was 4.59% and the rural increase was about 3.86%.

Cr Beale said the UAGC had been raised in 2002 to largely appease the farmers of the day. It had been subsequently lowered. The urban ratepayers did not have the luxury of claiming the GST back on rates which most rural ratepayers did.

Cr Gardyne said percentages did not mean much and the rate increase was fairly even.

His Worship said it was implicitly untrue that the UAGC targeted farmers. The shift in the UAGC to what it was now was to spread the burden from higher valued properties to lower valued properties, be they either urban or rural.

The motion was put and it was carried.

2019/57

8. PROPOSED FEES AND CHARGES FOR 2019/20 (SC2169)

A memo had been received from the Chief Financial Officer together with the schedule of proposed fees and charges for the year commencing 1 July 2019. There were very few amendments from the current year. Those areas changing were solid waste, Visitor Centre, water, parking and financial contributions.

Cr D Grant asked if the reason for removing the parking per 15m² charge was due to potential earthquake strengthening work on some buildings.

The Chief Financial Officer said it had never been charged and because of that it was recommended to be removed.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Davis, seconded by Cr Dickson, THAT the proposed fees and charges for the year commencing 1 July 2019, be adopted.

2019/58

9. FUTURE CHANGES FOR DOG REGISTRATION FEES (SC2217)

A memo had been received from the Chief Financial Officer with a proposal to amend dog registration fees in one year's time for the 2020/21 financial year. Registration fees for the next 12 months were unaffected.

As part of the fees and charges workshop for the Annual Plan, the Council examined its dog registration fees. The dog control action plan previously adopted by the Council aimed to reduce wandering dogs and reduce dog attacks. One of the tools available to do that was by increasing the incentive for owners to de-sex their dog. Statistically, desexed dogs were less prone to wandering and therefore less likely to cause a nuisance. A significant number of dog owners would be affected by the changes and it was recommended that the changes be implemented from 1 July 2020

to give those affected 12 months to prepare for them and arrange for their dog to be desexed if they did not wish to incur a higher fee.

When investigating the changes that could be made to the fee structure, it was discovered that the current structure did not comply with the Dog Control Act 1996. The Act permitted different fees to be set for working and non-working dogs. A full definition of “working dog” and “stock” had been circulated. A list of the dog breeds deemed more likely to be working dogs had also been circulated along with a list of dog breeds deemed more likely to be working dogs and a list of dog breeds in the rural area considered to be non-working dogs.

Cr Beale knew of a couple who had relocated to the country and who bred dogs and the changes would capture them from a registration perspective. The General Manager said there had been a number of working dogs in town that had been charged full rate in the past when they could have had a discounted rate. He added the value of the discount for dogs that were desexed would be increasing.

In response to Cr Davis, the General Manager said there were about 11 dog owners in the rural area who would be more impacted than others by the changes and staff would be contacting them once the changes were approved by the Council. Customers would receive information about the upcoming change with their registration notice for the coming year and information would also be included on the Council’s website together with an FAQ page. Rural customers with five or more non-working dogs would be individually contacted about the change.

Cr Reid asked if dogs were impounded was there any onus on the owner to have them desexed before they were returned. The General Manager replied only if the dog was rehomed. The Council could not desex a dog without the permission of the owner.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr P Grant, seconded by Cr Davis, THAT the report be received,

THAT the Council adopt the proposed fee structure, differentiating registration fees based on whether or not a dog is a working or non-working dog from 1 July 2020,

THAT the Council adopt the proposed discounts to apply to the non-working dog category as set out in 4.2 of this report from 1 July 2020,

AND THAT dogs kept by the Eastern Southland Hunt Club, solely and principally for the club’s activities are deemed to be working dogs for the purposes of the Dog Control Act 1996.

2019/59

10. HEALTH AND SAFETY REPORT (SC1299)

The Council perused a health and safety report from the Human Resources Manager that covered Gore District Council staff training, details of the number of incidents

reported for the period 21 February to 11 June and an update on the fatality at the Gore oxidation ponds on 29 January.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr D Grant, seconded by Cr Bolger, THAT the report be received.

2019/60

11. BUILDING CONSENT STATISTICS

A copy of the building consent statistics for May 2019 had been circulated with the agenda.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Reid, seconded by Cr Bolger, THAT the information be received.

2019/61

12. POTENTIAL PURCHASE OF MATAURA RAILWAY STATION BUILDING (37.13.1)

A memo had been received from the Chief Executive following a recommendation at the last Council meeting from the Mataura Community Board relating to the purchase of the former Mataura railway station building. Councillors had been hesitant about proceeding with the purchase of the building given they had not viewed the offer provided by KiwiRail to the Community Board. A copy of an offer from KiwiRail dated April 2018 had been circulated. It was also noted the property was deteriorating very quickly.

The Chief Executive added that KiwiRail had written to His Worship the previous day referring to the offer of April 2018, and wanting a quick resolution or some finality in respect of the offer and specifically mentioned the Railway Trust at Mandeville as being the next “cab off the rank” if the offer to the Community Board was not going to be accepted. The Community Board had a view that it could relocate the building. There was a lot of work required for resource and building consent for relocation. Any relocation into say a residential area would need to have a commitment replete with requisite funding.

His Worship said the building had been a topic of discussion for a long time and he was aware that the Community Board was keen to secure it. The Chairman of the Community Board, Mr Alan Taylor was in attendance. Mr Taylor confirmed option C (acceptance of the offer of KiwiRail) was the preference of the Board. The railway station represented an important part of the history of the district and the Board was asking that it have a say in its future and preserve its heritage value. He and Cr Phillips had been liaising with the District Arts and Heritage Curator who felt it was a project that could be pursued. Mr Taylor would like the opportunity to try and retain the building and needed the Council’s support. The Board was conscious of not imposing any cost on the Council. There was a proposal to set up a local working group to get the project moving.

Cr Phillips said the Board would have an action plan in place to ensure the building could be retained in its district and if not, to have the ability to move it on to another area where it could be showcased. The Mataura Development Trust was willing to purchase the building from the Council. He asked the Council to accept the offer so that the Trust could secure the building and return it to its former glory.

His Worship said he would love to see the station remain in Mataura and on site but that did not appear possible. There was a clear timeline from KiwiRail for a decision to be made. Mr Taylor confirmed if the Council purchased the building and on-sold it to the Development Trust and the Trust found it was unable to proceed with the project, then it was happy for the building to go elsewhere.

Cr Davis asked if the Development Trust was able to relocate the building within the timeframe imposed by KiwiRail, given the consents that would be required. Mr Taylor advised the building could be shifted in a few weeks but it would take some time to get consents.

Cr P Grant noted the building was a heritage listed building and asked why KiwiRail could not tidy it up. The Chief Executive said the building was recognised as being the best example of its type in the country. He did not think KiwiRail would be interested in retaining the structure and it would probably end up being demolished.

In response to Cr Dickson, His Worship expected that the Trust would not come back to the Council for funding. Mr Taylor said that was not the Trust's intention. The Board had some funds available to it to start the process. In response to Cr Beale who asked about the Coster Fund, His Worship said any contribution from the fund would be up to its trustees to decide.

Cr Reid asked who would pay for the site to be in a satisfactory condition once the building had been removed. Mr Taylor said the Board had been contacted by a fuel company who was very keen to put a fuel stop on the site.

Cr Bolger said the station was an iconic structure and he thought it entirely appropriate that the Community Board be entrusted with its future.

Cr Bolger moved THAT the Council consider the KiwiRail offer, the recommendation of the Mataura Community Board and the suggested additional conditions of any purchase contained in this report and confirm its agreement to purchase the former Mataura Railway Station building for the sum of \$1.

The motion was seconded by Cr Reid.

Cr Sharp asked if there were any costs known for refurbishing the building. Mr Taylor said he had a cost for shifting the building, but not for refurbishing it. Mr Taylor added it had a Heritage New Zealand category 2 listing.

Cr Sharp asked where the building may be relocated to. Cr Phillips said the Board had not raised the project with the community yet. The Board did have a location in mind but did not want to divulge it at this stage.

The motion was put and it was carried.

2019/62

The meeting concluded at 6.55pm