



NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE OPERATIONS & MONITORING COMMITTEE

I hereby give notice that the Operations & Monitoring Committee meeting of the Papakura District Council is to be held on:

DATE: Tuesday 28 September 2010

TIME: 12.30 P.M.

VENUE: Council Chambers
35 Coles Crescent
PAPAKURA

T Stratton
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

MEMBERSHIP:

Chairperson	Clr O'Connor
Deputy Chairperson	Clr Auva'a
	HWM Penrose
	Clr Catchpole
	Clr Conroy
	Clr Goldsmith
	Clr Jones
	Clr Piggott
	Clr Pringle

(Quorum 4 members)

(The reports and recommendations contained in this Order Paper are not necessarily Council Policy and should not be taken as Council Policy, or opinion)

**PAPAKURA DISTRICT COUNCIL
CONTENTS**

NO.	ITEM	PAGE
1.	Apologies	3
2.	Confirmation of Minutes	3
3.	Deputation and Petitions	3
4.	Presentations	3
5.	Finance and Corporate	4-17
	(a) End of Year Performance Measure Update.....	4-5
	(b) Postponement of Rates on Farmland 2010/11	6-9
	(c) Financial Results for the Year Ended 30 June 2010	10-17
6.	Business and Promotion	17
7.	Community Services	18-23
	(a) Safer Papakura Trust – Lease of Premises.....	18-20
	(b) Parks and Recreation Quarterly Report June 2010 to August 2010.....	21-23
8.	Roading and Transport	24-26
	(a) Wood Street / East Street Safety Improvements	24-26
9.	Water Issues	27-29
	(a) Integrated Catchment Management Plan Update	27-29
10.	Waste Management	30-31
	(a) Waste Management and Minimisation Quarterly Report June 2010 to August 2010.....	30-31
11.	Other Operational Matters	31
12.	Notices of Motion	32
13.	Confidential	33
	(a) Land Purchases for Roothing Upgrade – 255 Porchester Road, Takanini.....	33
	(b) Airfield Road Stormwater Drainage Improvement Contract PDC/10/25.....	33

PAPAKURA DISTRICT COUNCIL

**AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF THE OPERATIONS & MONITORING COMMITTEE
TO BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 35 COLES CRESCENT, PAPAKURA
ON TUESDAY 28TH SEPTEMBER 2010 COMMENCING AT 12.30 P.M.**

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

- (a) That the Minutes of the Operations and Monitoring Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 31 August 2010 be confirmed.

3. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

4. PRESENTATIONS

5. FINANCE AND CORPORATE

(a) END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE MEASURE UPDATE

REPORTING OFFICER: Micah Savage
Business & Performance Analyst

ATTACHMENT: Performance Measures 2009-2010
(Attachment No. 1)

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present the results for Activity Performance Measures for the period 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010.

BACKGROUND

Council adopted a set of performance measures as part of the LTCCP 2009-19 to monitor progress and inform decision making for its various activities. Attached are the performance measures results for the year ended 30 June 2010.

Many of the results included in the attachment will form part of the Papakura District Council's final Annual Report.

NARRATIVE

Key and Interpretation

The attachment shows a summary of the performance measure results for the year ended 30 June 2010. The target for the financial year is shown followed by the result for the year.

Measure Targets – “Baseline to be set”

9 of the 121 measures are listed with targets 'Baseline to be set'. These are all new measures that were adopted as part of the LTCCP 2009-19 and, as a result, historical data is not available.

Other Information

Residents Survey Statistics

Measures that rely on residents survey statistics will be reported at a later date.

Monitoring of Water and Wastewater – Wastewater

Measures WW5 and WW6 should only apply to Water Supply and not Wastewater services.

Waste Management and Minimisation

Although measure W2 shows a percentage decrease in household recycling waste diverted from landfill, this can be in part attributed to a downward trend in refuse tonnes to landfill overall.

The October 2009 Recycling Participation survey found that recycling participation has risen considerably.

CONCLUSION

Activity Performance Measure results are presented for the year ended 30 June 2010.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.

5. FINANCE AND CORPORATE

(b) POSTPONEMENT OF RATES ON FARMLAND 2010/11

**REPORTING OFFICER: D McIntosh
Management Accountant**

**ATTACHMENT: Schedule of Applications
(Attachment No. 2)**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report presents for consideration by the Committee applications received under the Postponement of Rates on Farmland Policy.

BACKGROUND

Council in the 2009-2019 LTCCP has maintained a policy for Postponement of Rates on Farmland. This policy was adopted under the provisions of section 102(5)(b) and section 110 of the Local Government Act 2002. The full text of the policy is outlined in volume two of the LTCCP on page 57.

The objective of the policy is:

To encourage owners of farmland to continue productive farming businesses rather than subdividing or otherwise using their land for residential purposes.

NARRATIVE

The attached schedule lists details of applications received under the policy, including information to assist the Committee in evaluating them, along with the value of rates which would be postponed if approved.

Statutory Provisions

Section 87 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 states:

(1) A local authority must postpone the requirement to pay all or part of the rates on a rating unit (including penalties for unpaid rates) if –

(a) the local authority has adopted a rates postponement policy under section 110 of the Local Government Act 2002; and

(b) the ratepayer has applied in writing for a postponement; and

(c) the local authority is satisfied that the conditions and criteria in the policy are met.

The key element of this provision is that rates **must** be postponed if the application meets the policy criteria.

Policy Criteria

Following are the criteria from the policy to be used in considering the applications

1. *The rating unit must be rated within the Rural differential rating group; and*
2. *The ratepayer must be the current owner of the rating unit and the property must have been used for farming purposes for not less than two years.*
3. *The rating unit must be used principally for the purposes of a farming business. Council considers that a farming business may include, but is not limited to, livestock farming, bloodstock, horticulture and viticulture. It will be up to the applicant to show that their enterprise is being conducted as a business venture rather than simply defraying the costs of their lifestyle. It will then be a decision of Council as to whether the applicant is, in its view, conducting a productive farming business or not. Council may request any information it needs from the applicant in support of their application.*
4. *The policy will not apply to rural land that is being used as a lifestyle block*
5. *The ratepayer must make application annually to the Council on the prescribed form prior to the due date for payment of rates instalment 1 for the year concerned.*

Assessment Against Conditions & Criteria

Information received from applicants along with data held on Council records has been used to evaluate applications. No site visits or other independent verification has been carried out.

The applications have been assessed against the conditions and criteria as follows:

- a) All applications presented were received by the cutoff date of 1 September 2010. There were no new applications this year.
- b) All applications were for land classified as rural therefore meeting criteria 1.
- c) Ratepayers have been confirmed as the owner (as opposed to lessees) of the rating unit at the time rates assessments were issued, meeting part criteria 2.
- d) Applicants were requested to advise the length of time the property had been used for farming purposes. All exceeded the two year minimum based on the ratepayer's assertion, therefore meeting part criteria 2.
- e) Criteria 3 considers whether the rating unit is being used for a farming business, particularly:
 - i. Must be used **principally** for the purpose of a farming business.
 - ii. Enterprise conducted as a business venture not just defraying costs of lifestyle.

There is also a general point following the criteria noting that:

The policy will not apply to rural land being used as a lifestyle block.

Information collected to assist in assessing the application in terms of criteria 3 includes:

- i. Area devoted to farming activity.
- ii. Nature of activity.
- iii. Size of farming business.
- iv. Is the ratepayer the operator of farming business?
- v. Is the operator GST registered?
- vi. Gross revenue from farming activity.

The schedule of applications shows a significant variation in the scale and range of activities which may qualify as farming businesses in terms of the policy.

In previous years various issues have been considered by the Committee in relation to criteria 3 and 4, including:

1. Is there a minimum turnover to qualify, noting that different types of farming generate varying revenue yields per hectare (eg. grazing vs glasshouses)?
2. Is there a minimum property size to qualify, differing types of farming require more or less land (eg. again grazing vs glasshouses)?
3. Is it of concern if the owner is leasing the property out? Also distinction between leasing land and providing grazing for other farmers?
4. When does the farming activity outweigh the residential component in determining principal use?
5. When does defraying lifestyle costs stop and business venture start?

No specific determinations have been made in previous years by the Committee in terms of these issues.

The attached report distinguishes applications previously approved (ie. considered to meet criteria in prior years) and new applications.

Postponement Levels

The policy provides for postponement of up to 20% of rates excluding uniform charges.

While postponement is not discretionary for applications where the criteria are met, the policy does provide for a variable postponement level of up to 20%. Previous practice of Council has been to approve postponements of the maximum 20%.

CONCLUSION

Applications have been received for postponement of rates on farmland and are listed in the attached schedule for consideration by the Committee and approval as appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.
2. That the Committee approve the applications as listed in the schedule as meeting the criteria of the postponement policy.
3. That the Committee approve the postponement of 20% of rates levied excluding UAGCs for those rating units meeting the policy criteria, with the postponement amount totaling \$48,341.70.

5. FINANCE AND CORPORATE

(c) FINANCIAL RESULTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2010

REPORTING OFFICER: Victoria Villaraza
Director Finance and Corporate Services

ATTACHMENT: Report on Compliance with Treasury Policies

(Attachment No. 3)

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present the interim financial results (pre-audit) for the year ended 30 June 2010 for the committee's information.

BACKGROUND

This report presents the key financial results in four parts as follows:

Operating Result reports on the financial impacts of the day to day operating activities of Council for the year. It contains the following information:

a. **Actual to 30 June 2010**

This column presents the net rate impact of the activities which is total operating costs less total revenue, excluding rates, from 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010 i.e. 12 months of activity.

b. **Approved Budget to 30 June 2010**

This column shows the approved rate levels for the activities which is made up of the adopted Annual Plan plus any approved Carry Forward amounts and represents projected 12 months of activity.

c. **Variance (Budget vs. Actual)**

This column shows the difference between the actual results and budget. Amounts in brackets mean the rates required for the activity is lower than the budget. Amounts not in brackets mean the rates required for the activity is higher than the budget.

d. **Proposed Carry Forward**

This column shows the proposed carry forward amount into the 2010 to 2011 financial year.

Capital Works Result reports on the progress to complete the capital works programme for the year. It contains the following information:

a. **Actual to 30 June 2010**

This column presents 12 months of capital expenditure.

b. **Approved Budget to 30 June 2010**

This column represents the budget for the full year plus any carry forwards from the previous year.

c. Variance (Budget vs. Actual)

This column shows the difference between the actual results and budget. Amounts in brackets mean the actual spend is lower than the budget. Amounts without brackets mean the actual spend is higher than the budget.

d. Proposed Carry Forward

This column shows the proposed carry forward amount into the 2010 to 2011 financial year.

Treasury Profile Result covers reporting against Council's Liability Management and Investment Policies. The report covers the year to 30 June 2010.

Development / Financial Contributions Result shows information on the levels of contributions for the financial year. The report covers the year to 30 June 2010.

Reporting Parameters

As a general rule, the operating, capital, treasury profile and development/financial contributions results are reported against the following financial reporting exception parameters currently used to report significant variations in Council's published Annual Reports:

- report on reasons why the actual / forecast is at least \$50,000 and 10% or more above budget;
- report on reasons why the treasury profile is outside the limits of Council's current policies.

NARRATIVE

Operating Result

Table 1	30 Jun 10 Actual	Approved Budget	Variance Budget vs. Actual	Proposed Carry Forward
	\$000	\$000	\$000	\$000
Rates Requirement by Activity (Direct Rate Requirement)				
Business and Promotion	663	674	(11)	
District Administration	2,584	2,507	77	
Democracy and the Community	1,053	984	69	
Civil Defence and Emergency Management	243	238	5	
Information Services	798	820	(22)	
Regulatory Administration	360	380	(20)	
Building Control	(538)	(346)	(192)	

Agenda
Operations & Monitoring Committee Meeting
28 September 2010

Table 1	30 Jun 10 Actual	Approved Budget	Variance Budget vs. Actual	Proposed Carry Forward
	\$000	\$000	\$000	\$000
Environmental Health	105	161	(56)	
Animal Control	124	(3)	127	
Parking Control	(92)	(69)	(23)	
Resource Consents	93	7	86	
Planning Policy	1,450	1,178	272	
Strategic Projects	109	90	19	
Works Administration	328	317	11	
Roading and Transportation	6,857	6,814	43	64
Water Supply and Wastewater	107	105	2	
Stormwater and Environmental Infrastructure	3,142	3,108	34	
Waste Management and Minimisation	1,110	1,255	(145)	
Development Engineering	20	(4)	24	
Operations Engineering	215	201	14	
Community Services Administration	1,085	1,013	72	
Community Halls	91	75	16	
Reserves	3,072	3,222	(150)	131
Aquatic and Leisure Centre	1,238	1,311	(73)	
Conveniences	134	147	(13)	
Library	1,039	1,001	38	
Cemetery	60	44	16	
Older Persons Housing	(70)	(105)	35	
Citizens Advice Bureau	70	69	1	
Community Development and Safer Communities Administration	478	534	(56)	8

Agenda
Operations & Monitoring Committee Meeting
28 September 2010

Table 1	30 Jun 10 Actual	Approved Budget	Variance Budget vs. Actual	Proposed Carry Forward
	\$000	\$000	\$000	\$000
Arts and Culture	449	357	92	3
Housing	(8)	(37)	29	
General Property	584	736	(152)	
Accent Point	510	561	(51)	
Administration Building	481	549	(68)	
Grants	111	102	9	2
General Revenue – Contribution to Rates	(457)	(190)	(267)	
Total Council Rates Requirement	27,598	27,806	(208)	208
Add: Museum and MOTAT Levies	1,187	1,191	(4)	
Total Rates (Available) / Required to fund operations	28,785	28,997	(212)	208
Rate Surplus – June 2010	212		212	
Less: Rate Impact of Proposed Carry Forwards to 2010/11	208			
Unallocated Rate Surplus – June 2010	4			

This year's operating result is a rate surplus of \$0.2 million. This is a satisfactory result considering the economic environment over the last year and in particular the major change in cash funding for capital projects and its resulting impact on loan servicing costs.

Of the rate surplus, \$208K is proposed to be allocated to expenses that will be carried forward into the 2010/11 financial year, leaving \$4K to be allocated for any future requirements. The proposed carry forward programme is included in the Council's agenda for approval.

The overall rate requirement of \$28.8 million is within a 1% variance of the overall approved rate budget of \$29.0 million.

The key exceptions against budget at activity level are as follows:

Agenda
Operations & Monitoring Committee Meeting
28 September 2010

Activity	Underspend / Overspend	Amount
		\$000
<p>Building Control</p> <p>Actual fees and charges being higher than the budget is the main reason for the results in the regulatory services areas.</p>	Underspend	192
<p>Environmental Health</p> <p>Reduced expenditure primarily in Consultants charges (\$6k), Liquor Licensing Authority costs (\$6k), legal costs (\$10k), Environmental Health Audit costs (\$13k) other expenditure (\$14k) resulted in savings of \$56k.</p>	Underspend	56
<p>Animal Control</p> <p>Actual fees and charges being lower than the budget is the main reason for the results in the regulatory services areas.</p>	Overspend	127
<p>Resource Consents</p> <p>Actual fees and charges were higher than budget. However, this increase in revenue is offset by increases in the cost of processing, in particular, consultants' charges, of which \$66K was not recoverable.</p>	Overspend	86
<p>Planning Policy</p> <p>Takanini Structure Plan (1A) and District Plan Changes (Ardmore Airport) were well above proposed expenditure levels in the LTCCP 2009-19.</p>	Overspend	272
<p>Waste Management and Minimisation</p> <p>Reduced costs of collection services such as inorganic collection \$55K lower than budget and recyclable collections \$99K lower than budget are the key reasons for the underspend.</p>	Underspend	145
<p>Community Development and Safer Communities Administration</p> <p>Savings in project delivery costs (Youth Crime Prevention, Youth Services project and Safer Communities projects) and higher than projected revenue are primarily responsible for the underspend in this area.</p>	Underspend	56
<p>Arts and Culture</p> <p>Lower than projected revenue from the Hawkins Theatre is the primary contributor to the overspend.</p>	Overspend	92
<p>General Property</p> <p>Reduced loan servicing charges as well as lower operating costs are the reason for the underspend.</p>	Underspend	152
<p>Administration Building</p> <p>Reduced interest expenses is the key factor in the underspend of \$68k in this area.</p>	Underspend	68

Capital Works Result.

The following table summarises the capital works results by activity:

Table 2	30 Jun 10 Actual \$000	Approved Budget \$000	Variance Budget vs Actual \$000	Carry Forward \$000
Capital Works Result				
Business and Promotion	45	32	13	
Civil Defence and Emergency Management	0	5	(5)	
Roading and Transportation	14,072	26,333	(12,261)	10,662
Stormwater and Environmental Infrastructure	2,522	11,392	(8,870)	8,196
Waste Management and Minimisation	9	34	(25)	
Community Halls	29	81	(52)	49
Reserves	1,942	13,994	(12,052)	11,910
Aquatic Centre	232	496	(264)	265
Conveniences	167	213	(46)	
Library	2,040	1,475	565	2,937
Cemetery	34	242	(208)	207
Older Persons Housing	28	654	(626)	635
Community Development	136	762	(626)	541
Arts and Culture	1,101	1,520	(419)	492
Housing, Property and Other	1,897	2,571	(674)	68
District Administration	0	35	(35)	
Information Services	41	124	(83)	
Total Capital Works Expenses	24,250	59,963	(35,713)	35,962

The approved budget of \$60 million is made up of the adopted 2009/10 Annual Plan of \$46 million, \$14 million carried forward from the 2008/09 Financial year.

Capital expenditure to June 2010 is \$24 million which is 40% of the total programme based on the approved budget to June 2010.

In addition, a total of \$36 million is included in the proposed carry forward programme for 2010/11.

The key variances relate to the following:

- \$2.3 million was spent on land purchases against a total budget of \$14.0 million. The remaining budget will be carried forward into 2010/11. These include: \$3.4 million for the Hingaia Sportsfields; \$2.5 million for the Manuroa Rail Overbridge; \$2.3 million for the Takanini North Catchment Treatment Pond; and \$0.6 million for the Porchester Road High Street Intersection.
- \$6.0 million of the roading capital programme (excluding land purchases of \$4.7 million included above) is proposed to be carried forward to 2010/11. The key items include: \$2.0 million for Papakura's share of the Interchange construction; \$0.8 million for the Clevedon/Marne/Willis Intersection; and \$0.5 million for the Takanini School Road/Airfield and Taka Road Realignment.
- \$6.0 million of the stormwater capital programme (excluding land purchases of \$2.0 million) is proposed to be carried forward to 2010/11. The key items include: \$1.6 million for the East Street Stormwater Upgrade; \$0.5 million for Drury Industrial Improvements; \$0.6 million for Slippery Creek Improvements; \$0.9 million for the Takanini South Catchment; \$0.5 million for Croskery Catchment Improvements; and \$0.4 million for the Chichester Drive Upgrade.
- \$7.1 million of the capital programme for Reserves relate to the following key projects that are proposed to be carried forward to 2010/11: \$0.3 million for the Pahurehure Management Plan Implementation; \$3.9 million for Bruce Pulman Park Projects; and \$1.9 million for the McLennan Park Extension;

Treasury Profile Result

Liability Management and Treasury Policies

The full policy is outlined in Council's Annual Plan 2009/10 (including the amendment to Treasury limits). The attachments provide a summary of the results against the limits contained in the policy.

The committee will note that for the July 2009 to June 2010, full compliance was achieved against the policies. The following table summarises the debt maturity profile:

Table 3 Debt Maturity Profile	Policy Minimum	Policy Maximum	Actual
First \$30million (covered by bank facility and less than one year)	\$0	\$30.0m	\$14.5m
Less than 1 Year (15% to 100%)	\$5.5m	\$37.0m	
1 to 3 Years (15% to 70%)	\$5.5m	\$25.9m	\$23.0m
3 to 5 Years (15% to 50%)	\$5.5m	\$18.5m	\$14.0m
5 to 10 Years (0% to 50%)	\$0	\$18.5m	\$0
Totals			\$51.5m

Table 3 shows that debt maturity is in line with the policy guidelines. During the July 2009 to June 2010 period, total debt levels increased and decreased from time to time depending on cashflow requirements. The actual debt level at 30 June 2010 was \$51.5 million against a budgeted debt level of \$49 million. This result is within reasonable limits considering the low level of development contributions received for the year.

Development / Financial Contributions Result

The following table summarises the development / financial contributions revenue (excluding Water and Wastewater) from 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010:

Table 4	30 Jun 10 Actual \$000	Approved Budget \$000
Roading	76	4,599
Public Transport	1	
Stormwater	57	5,766
Community Facilities	80	8,131
Reserves	449	
Works Contributions via Development Agreements	31	
Total	694	18,496

Development contributions revenue of \$0.7 million is 3.8% of the budget target of \$18.5 million. The gap between actual and budget is mainly due to the timing of development. Development has slowed down considerably in the last year which results in revenue from development contributions below budget expectations. However, because Council's capital works programme has a large component of growth-related projects, actual capital spend against budget is also well below budget.

CONCLUSION

The summary interim financial results show Council's position for the year ended 30 June 2010. Although at an activity by activity level, there are some major differences between approved annual budget and actual expenditure, the Council's overall projected net financial result from operations were met from the available funding from rates and are well within acceptable budget limits.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.

6. BUSINESS AND PROMOTION

7. COMMUNITY SERVICES

(a) SAFER PAPA KURA TRUST – LEASE OF PREMISES

REPORTING OFFICER: Leora Hirsh
Manager Community Development

ATTACHMENT: Letter from Safer Papakura Trust
(Attachment No. 4)

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report seeks Council direction on a request from Safer Papakura Trust to remain in their current premises for the medium term.

BACKGROUND

The Safer Papakura Trust was formed in September 2008 as a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) to deliver graffiti services (previously delivered by the Proudly Papakura Trust), the Town Centre Ambassador programme and Town Centre security services (previously delivered by the Town Centre Association).

Since inception the Trust has been operating from a Council owned location at 78A Great South Road. These premises are a commercial property that was purchased by Council to facilitate construction of a stormwater tunnel that was required to service new development areas in Takanini. The tunnel was expected to run through this location on its way to the stormwater pond at Gills Ave. Owning these premises gave Council the opportunity to both access the area where the tunnel would be constructed and also act as a base for construction activity, including a tunnelling head to enable construction under Great South Road and the railway line. This particular project is in abeyance due to cost and negotiations related to the cost with the key developers. It is unclear when the project may be initiated.

In the intervening period the Trust has been given rent-free use of the property.

In July 2010 a report was put before this Committee advising that this situation was not sustainable in the long term and that consideration should be given to finding alternative suitable premises to accommodate the Trust. For a variety of reasons, discussed in that report, level 2 Accent Point was proposed as the best alternative option.

Subsequently Council passed the following resolution:

THAT, SUBJECT TO ATA APPROVAL, THE COUNCIL OFFER SAFER PAPA KURA TRUST A LEASE OF LEVEL 2 OF ACCENT POINT (INCLUDING USE OF THE GARAGE ON LEVEL 1) AT PEPPERCORN RENTAL. THE LEASE TERM IS TO BE FROM A COMMENCEMENT DATE TO BE AGREED WITH THE TRUST UNTIL 30 SEPTEMBER 2020.

NARRATIVE

During initial discussions with the Trust, level 2 Accent Point appeared to be a suitable alternative, particularly given:

- The office space is larger than the current location
- It is well located in the centre of town
- There is a large double garage and storage space available on level 1 which would allow the Trust to lock away their trucks and supplies.

However, in drafting a lease new issues have been identified that are of concern to the Trust. These include:

- The Trust will need to share access to the garage as it also provides the goods lift access for courier deliveries for all tenants, including the cafe and the library. This would compromise the security of the Trust's materials.
- A sump will need to be installed to ensure toxic substances are disposed of properly. The cost of this is unknown but is possibly in excess of \$20,000.
- The need to provide water and waste water in the garage. The cost of installing this would be approximately \$5,000.

It is noted that the Trust's current site is very well provided for in regards to the latter two points above.

The Trust is also concerned that the public access to the Accent Point office is difficult, in comparison to their current high profile site. They currently receive a significant number of visitors.

On balance, the Trust has decided that their current location at 78A Great South Road is a far preferable site. They have written to Council asking that consideration be given to providing the Trust with a lease for the 78A Great South Road premises. This letter is attached for Council's consideration.

Given that the stormwater tunnel project is in abeyance and Council has no immediate plans for the property, the site at 78A is available to lease. However, Council does need to consider both the real and the opportunity costs in entering into a community lease (at peppercorn rental) for this commercial property.

The current actual cost to Council of owning this property is in the order of \$80,000 per annum. This is made up of the annual general rate (\$10,536 in the 2010/11 financial year) and interest on the loan raised to purchase the property. Effectively Council is therefore subsidising the Trust, but in a way that is non-transparent.

The opportunity cost is difficult to ascertain in the current economic climate. Rent-free occupancy of this site is not sustainable in the long term, and the new Auckland Council Property CCO may desire a commercial return for the property. Although, given the current economic outlook and the number of vacant commercial yards in Papakura a good return could be difficult to realise.

Further to this, as any vacant site is susceptible to vandalism (as evidenced by the empty Blockbuster video site at 78 Great South Road) it would not be desirable to leave this site unoccupied. As this site is particularly high profile, an option for Council would be to enter into a two year lease with Safer Papakura Trust, with a three year right of renewal. This would allow for a review of the arrangement in 2012.

If Council is of a mind to provide such a lease to the Trust, it may wish to build some amount of cost-recovery into the lease. There are a number of options open to Council regarding this:

- Full cost recovery from the Trust. Although this would be very difficult for a not-for-profit organisation to achieve.
- Recover the rates cost, again this would put financial pressure on the Trust.
- Set the rent at a level that provides a contribution towards costs (such as 50% of rates).

- Set a peppercorn rental as with other community leases. However it is noted that usually community leases do not cost Council in this way as reserve land is non-rateable.

Council direction is sought with regards to an appropriate and acceptable rental charge.

CONCLUSION

Safer Papakura Trust is currently occupying a Council owned commercial property that was purchased to enable future stormwater works. An alternative site at Accent Point has been proposed to the Trust; however they have subsequently requested a lease on their current premises at 78A Great South Road. It is recommended that Council offer a two year lease with a three year right of renewal to the Trust. Council direction is sought regarding setting the rental for this property.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.
2. That Council rescind the July 27 2010 resolution:

THAT, SUBJECT TO ATA APPROVAL, THE COUNCIL OFFER SAFER PAPA KURA TRUST A LEASE OF LEVEL 2 OF ACCENT POINT (INCLUDING USE OF THE GARAGE ON LEVEL 1) AT PEPPERCORN RENTAL. THE LEASE TERM IS TO BE FROM A COMMENCEMENT DATE TO BE AGREED WITH THE TRUST UNTIL 30 SEPTEMBER 2020.
3. That Council offer a two year lease Safer Papakura Trust with a three year right of renewal to occupy 78A Great South Road.
4. That the annual rent be set at a level to be determined by Council.

7. COMMUNITY SERVICES

**(b) PARKS AND RECREATION QUARTERLY
REPORT JUNE 2010 TO AUGUST 2010**

REPORTING OFFICER: Nicola Terry
Manager Community Assets
Rakesh Gupta
Works Operations Manager

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to update the Operations and Monitoring Committee on the progress in the Parks and Reserves activity from June 2010 to August 2010.

BACKGROUND

This report covers three aspects of parks and reserves: asset planning, capital projects and maintenance. Progress on these three areas of work is reported to Council on a quarterly basis.

NARRATIVE

Asset Planning

Pukekiwiriki Paa

Te Roopu Kaitiaki o Papakura has been working on the joint management agreement for Pukekiwiriki Pa. A separate report has been prepared for Council on this matter.

Marybeth Reserve

The Marybeth Reserve Management Plan has been adopted subject to changes in the final design and further consultation with the Rosehill residents group. Progress has been made with the purchase of the final house required for the extended reserve with a sale and purchase agreement drawn up with the expectation that the vendors seek legal advice.

Taka Reserve

The draft Taka Reserve Management Plan was adopted for consultation on 10 August 2010. A consultation drop in session was held on 22 September 2010 at Takanini School. Consultation will close on 11 October 2010.

McLennan Park

The draft McLennan Park Reserve Management Plan and Masterplan was adopted for consultation. Consultation closed on 21 September 2010. Hearings will be held as soon as practicable by the new Papakura Local Board.

Leases and Licences:

The community leases presented to Council in June 2010 were approved by the ATA on 6 September 2010. Letters and draft leases have been sent to groups for their consideration and sign off.

Capital and Renewal Projects

Playground Renewals

Playground renewals have been completed at the Children's Forest (Game Place entrance), Elsie Morton Reserve and Clarice Reserve.

Renewals and Upgrades in Parks and Reserves

A number of renewals and upgrades have been undertaken in parks and reserves including:

- Watch House reinstatement
- Boardwalk and path – Inlet Road
- Ray Small Park footpath renewals – reinstatement of the path edges will be completed once the ground conditions are dry enough for machinery to drive on the site
- Papakura South Cemetery – new section, 2 new beams, paths, seats and pedestrian gates
- Conifer Grove street tree planting programme

Renewals and Upgrades of Property

Hawkins Theatre – The Hawkins Theatre upgrade is finished and was completed to budget. There were some time delays with more extensive reconstruction and replacement of timbers than was anticipated. The interior was completed on time which allowed the theatre to continue to operate.

Waimana Older Person's Housing Refurbishment – The refurbishment is well underway with 7 units complete and a further 6 approximately 50% complete at the writing of this report.

Recreation Centre – Renewals are now complete including repainting, kitchen re-fit and new carpet in the foyer area.

Community Halls – Renewals are complete at the Elizabeth Campbell Hall including repairs to the flooring after flooding and a new ceiling in the foyer area.

Mangrove Removals in Pahurehure Inlet no. 2

At the writing of this report draft reports have been prepared to submit to the ARC. They include the final baseline monitoring reports and the monitoring programme and works management plan for stage 2.

Massey Park Development Plan

The construction contract has been let for the Massey Park upgrade. It is anticipated that work will start on site towards the end of September 2010 and be complete in May 2011.

Massey Park Aquatic Centre

The Aquatic Centre upgrade project has progressed through the preliminary phase and is now in the design phase. A key element of that work as originally scoped has been to confirm that this remains within budget. Careful refinement and selection of alternative material and design approaches has retained the agreed overall upgrade scope and kept the expected cost aligned with the budget. Existing equipment has been inspected and where required, replacement has been allowed for.

However, the equipment and building assessments have shown up some unexpected maintenance issues. The clear finishes on the timber roof beams is starting to deteriorate. The beams are made of treated timber, so their structural capability is not in question. But, the aged appearance of the beams will be at odds

with the refurbished pools if they are not refinished at the same time as the upgrade work is done. The budget available cannot fund the estimated \$100,000 added cost of the beam re-finishing.

Another area that has been inspected, and revealed to have deteriorated significantly, is the interior roof space between the ceiling and the outer roofing iron. The vapour barrier that keeps moisture laden air from the pools out of the space is in poor condition and there is evidence of water damage to the insulation in the space. Structural components are not at risk at this time. The vapour barrier system should be replaced to ensure the long term serviceability of the roof. A very preliminary estimate of costs involved suggests that up to \$900,000 could be needed to repair the roof.

An approach to addressing these two unanticipated maintenance issues is being prepared for the incoming Auckland Council and the local board. The overall programme for the upgrade works is phased with seasonal use of the facility and the first area planned to be upgraded is the outdoor area during winter next year so it will be ready for summer 2011/12. This programming means that there is time to carefully consider the best approach to these issues.

Energy Management

The councils in the Auckland Region have worked together to negotiate a joint articulated gas supply contract. This includes Massey Park Aquatic Centre and is anticipated to save this facility around \$4000 per annum. Council on-charges gas to CLM, so no changes are made to Council budgets as a result of the new contract.

Maintenance

Parks Maintenance Contract

This contract covers the routine maintenance of parks and reserves for Council by its contractors HEB Smithbridge Limited.

Routine maintenance work of parks and reserves is being carried out in line with the contract requirements. Parks and street tree pruning maintenance work is currently being carried out in accordance with the available budget and the prioritisation of service requests. Audit outcomes for the June to August 2010 period meet contract requirements.

Sports Fields Renovations

The scope of spring renovations for the sports fields has been finalised. These will commence from early September 2010 and will be finished by early October 2010.

Pest Plant Removal

Native re-plantings work following pest-plant removal at Tanah Merah is completed.

CONCLUSION

The report outlines progress of the extensive work programme related to asset planning, capital projects, and maintenance aspects of the parks and reserves activity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.

8. ROADING AND TRANSPORT

(a) WOOD STREET / EAST STREET SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

REPORTING OFFICER: Clem Reeve
Transportation & Roading Assets Manager

ATTACHMENT: Plan of Improvements
(Attachment No. 5)

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present to Council the final design for improvements at the intersection of Wood Street and East Street and to seek a Council resolution to implement 'no stopping at all times' (NSAAT) parking restrictions that are an integral part of these improvements.

BACKGROUND

At the 23 March 2010 meeting of the Operations and Monitoring Committee a report was presented outlining the proposed allocation of the Minor Improvement budget for the 2010/11 financial year. At this meeting it was resolved:

THAT \$230,000 OF THE MINOR IMPROVEMENTS BUDGET FOR THE 2010/11 FINANCIAL YEAR BE ALLOCATED TO UNDERTAKE CRASH BLACK SPOT SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AT THE INTERSECTIONS OF WOOD STREET AND EAST STREET AND WALTERS ROAD AND COSGRAVE ROAD AND THAT THE OPTIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENTS BE REPORTED BACK TO THE COUNCIL FOR FINAL DECISION.

In May 2010, a workshop on a range of improvement options at the Wood and East intersection was undertaken. This workshop resulted in a preferred approach to safety improvements being signalled by the attending elected members. These concepts were then progressed into the design phase. The detailed design and safety audit for the improvements at the intersection of Wood Street and East Street has now been completed and hence final approval of the scheme is now sought.

(It is noted that the design for improvements at the intersection of Walters Road and Cosgrave Road are still in progress and are not covered in this report).

NARRATIVE

Dodd Civil Consultants were commissioned to carry out detailed design for improvements at the intersection of Wood Street and East Street. Dodd Civil Consultants were advised of the package of improvement works proposed for the intersection, (as discussed at the Council workshop), including:

- installing raised central islands with additional "STOP" signs on both Wood Street approaches to the intersection;
- installing speed tables on both Wood Street approaches to the intersection;
- constructing a kerb build-out on the north-eastern corner of the intersection;
- cutting back the kerb on the south-eastern and south-western corners of the intersection;

- reshaping of the berm on the northern-western corner of the intersection to improve visibility; and
- removing on-street car-parking spaces to improve visibility and ensure appropriate vehicle tracking is maintained.

A safety audit of the design prepared by Dodd Civil Consultants has been carried out by Traffic Design Group. The (post) design safety audit is a further step taken to ensure that the design will deliver on all outcomes and improvements. It is effectively a peer review of the design to ensure compliance with all relevant standards and that the design meets the performance improvements intended. During the design and safety audit process a change to the design previously presented to Council was made. This involves constructing kerb extensions on both sides of the pedestrian crossing on East Street. This change was made for the following reasons:

- it reduces the number of on-street parking spaces that need to be removed;
- it reduces the crossing distance for pedestrians, thereby increasing the safety of pedestrians using the crossing; and
- it narrows the road width, which may encourage lower vehicle speeds for some drivers.

The amended design, (with kerb extensions at the pedestrian crossing) results in the loss of 27 on-street parking spaces, (compared with 35 on-street parking spaces being lost as presented in the workshop concept). Of the parking spaces being lost, 13 have a sixty minute time restriction (P60) and 14 are unrestricted parking spaces. The locations where the parking spaces are proposed to be removed are:

- six spaces (P60) on East Street, north of the Wood Street intersection;
- nine spaces (unrestricted) on East Street, south of the Wood Street intersection;
- five spaces (unrestricted) on Wood Street west of the East Street intersection; and
- seven spaces (P60) on Wood Street, east of the East Street intersection.

It is not considered that any of these parking spaces can be retained without compromising the safety or operation of the intersection and/or the adjacent pedestrian crossing.

Notification of the proposed works has not yet been undertaken with property owners or occupiers adjacent to the intersection. However, it is noted that tenants of several properties adjacent to the intersection have contacted Council in recent years with concerns about the safety of the intersection. Before any works commence, directly affected property owners and occupiers will be notified of the proposed improvements.

CONCLUSION

Dodd Civil Consultants have been commissioned to carry out detailed design for improvements at the intersection of Wood Street and East Street (including the adjacent zebra crossing on East Street). A safety audit of the design has been carried out by Traffic Design Group. The design includes the following proposed improvements to address vehicle and pedestrian safety concerns at the intersection:

- installing raised central islands with additional “STOP” signs on both Wood Street approaches to the intersection;
- installing speed tables on both Wood Street approaches to the intersection;
- constructing a kerb build-out on the north-eastern corner of the intersection;
- cutting back the kerb on the south-eastern and south-western corners of the intersection;
- reshaping of the berm on the northern-western corner of the intersection to improve visibility;
- removing 27 on-street car-parking spaces to improve visibility and ensure appropriate vehicle tracking is maintained; and
- installing kerb extensions on both sides of the zebra crossing on East Street.

Adjacent property owners and occupiers have not yet been notified of the proposed works, and this will be carried out prior to the improvements being implemented.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.
2. That Council endorses the proposed improvements at the intersection of Wood Street and East Street, as shown on the attached plan.
3. That pursuant to section 77 of the Transport Act 1962 and Regulations, clause 6 of the Road User Rule 2004 and clause 7.1 of the Operative Papakura District Council Parking and Traffic Bylaw (2009), Council resolves that on-street parking be prohibited on the sections of East Street indicated by no stopping lines on the attached plan and that appropriate road markings be installed to advise motorists of this prohibition.
4. That pursuant to section 77 of the Transport Act 1962 and Regulations, clause 6 of the Road User Rule 2004 and clause 7.1 of the Operative Papakura District Council Parking and Traffic Bylaw (2009), Council resolves that on-street parking be prohibited on the sections of Wood Street indicated by no stopping lines on the attached plan and that appropriate road markings be installed to advise motorists of this prohibition.

9. WATER ISSUES

(a) INTEGRATED CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

REPORTING OFFICER: **Kieren Daji**
Stormwater Assets Manager

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to summarise for information, the completed Integrated Catchment Management Planning undertaken by Council.

BACKGROUND

The Proposed Auckland Regional Plan Air, Land and Water (PARP: ALW) established an expectation for all territorial local authorities in the Auckland Region to prepare Integrated Catchment Management Plans in support of their Network Discharge Consent applications to the Auckland Regional Council (ARC).

The Integrated Catchment Management Plans (ICMP) are prepared by adopting a multi-disciplinary approach involving engineers, modellers, district planners, asset managers, ecologists, stream specialists, iwi, local residents and other interested parties. Once completed, each ICMP provides a blue print for managing stormwater in relation to land use, growth development, flood hazard, water quality, stream quality, receiving environment quality and stormwater networks on a stormwater catchment basis.

Five ICMP areas were identified for the Papakura District, including Pahurehure Inlet North, Central Papakura, Hingaia South, Slippery Creek and Hingaia Stream. All five ICMP area reports have been completed.

Outcomes of the ICMP include:

- a systematic understanding of the performances of stormwater drainage systems under various growth scenarios in the District;
- improved understanding of flooding hazards in the District;
- improved understanding of the current status and water quality issues concerning our freshwater and marine water environments;
- a planning and assessment toolset for managing the stormwater drainage system in the District; drainage system models, options assessment matrix;
- best practical option; an implementation programme for structural (physical works) and non-structural management options (regulatory, education, etc);
- adequate information for application of a Network Discharge Consent from ARC.

The first PDC ICMP completed (which also was the first ICMP completed in the Auckland region) was peer reviewed by external experts. The quality and structure of the report was such that the ARC considered that this work should be a model that all other ICMP's generated within the Auckland region could be based on.

NARRATIVE

Five ICMP area reports were completed including Pahurehure Inlet North, Central Papakura, Hingaia South, Slippery Creek and Hingaia Stream. A summary of each report is as follows, noting that the findings were presented to elected members in a workshop on 16 February 2010 where the ICMP work undertaken was endorsed by the elected members present.

Central Papakura

This ICMP covers the traditional stormwater catchment areas known as Old Wairoa Road, Elliot, Pahurehure and Prince Edward. The key issues in this catchment include extensive historic flooding of residential properties and houses and commercial properties, poor drainage in the central business area, future urban expansion into Takanini Structure Plan (TSP) areas 2A and 2B and development intensification around central business area, groundwater management in peat soil aquifer and poor water quality at Pahurehure Inlet. Major works have been planned to deal with these issues, such as a major conveyance system and a tunnel to facilitate future development, extensive drainage upgrade works to alleviate flooding and water quality treatment devices at Elliot and Prince Edward catchments. A suite of non-structural management measures is also recommended to supplement the structural works. Many of the recommended works are in the implementation process, and the CBD drainage improvement has been completed.

Slippery Creek

The Slippery Creek ICMP area encompasses major streams such as Croskery Road Drain, Hays Creek, Symonds Stream, Waihoihoi Stream and the main Slippery Creek. Mostly existing urban development areas in the Croskery Road Drain catchment, which has major flooding issues in the past and considerable efforts have been made in the past to mitigate the flooding problem. Rural Plan changes have implications on other streams in terms of increased flooding and stream erosion. Key issues identified include: flooding of houses and industrial/commercial properties, poor level of drainage services in urban areas due to the lack of drainage infrastructure, infrastructure provision for future development in the TSP area 2C and in the Red Hill area, stream water quality impacted by urban runoff, stream ecological value management and stream channel erosion. Major structural works and non-structural measures have been recommended to combat the key issues identified. Capital works include major drainage improvement in existing urban area, new drainage infrastructure for future development, upstream flood detention areas, water quality treatment facilities at various locations and stream channel erosion protection. Many of the recommended works are currently being designed.

Hingaia South

This ICMP includes the southern portion of Hingaia Peninsular which is the largest remaining rural area to be urbanised after 2020. The upper catchment which covers existing urban area to the east of the Southern Motorway, has historic flooding problems especially in the area immediately adjacent to the motorway on the upstream side. Key issues include: stormwater drainage/quality treatment infrastructure provision to facilitate future urban expansion, stream management, coastal margin management and existing flooding problems to the east of the Southern Motorway. A master plan for managing stormwater drainage/quality treatment in the future urban area has been drafted by identifying the key components of the system and their locations. The stream corridors and existing wetland areas will be preserved by imposing riparian margins. A coastal regression line has been identified and is to be contained in the coastal margin reserve. Extreme tidal inundation areas taking into account climate changes have been mapped. The Culvert crossings under the southern motorway will be upgraded to alleviate flooding problem upstream.

Pahurehure Inlet North

The Pahurehure Inlet North ICMP is comprised of stormwater catchment areas known as Takanini South, Conifer Grove, Longford Park and Youngs Road. Takanini South Catchment has the greatest future growth potential with the TSP areas 1A and 1B located in the upper catchment to the east of the North Island Main Trunk (NIMT) railway embankment. The remaining catchment areas are all nearly fully developed with Conifer Grove and Longford Park being the newest and having better existing stormwater drainage infrastructure; Youngs Road Catchment is one of the oldest suburbs in the District and the drainage provision is poor. Key issues identified include: existing flooding of properties and houses, water quality at Pahurehure Inlet due to urban runoff, provision of drainage infrastructure for future urban area and groundwater management in peat soil aquifer. Recommendations on both structural measures (capital works) and non-structural measures have been made to deal with the issues identified.

Hingaia Stream

The Hingaia Stream catchment straddles the boundary between the Franklin District and Papakura District. This ICMP was carried out through a joint effort between PDC and FDC. The Hingaia Stream originates from the northern slopes of Bombay Hills and flows through Drury Town before discharging into the Drury Creek. Extensive flooding damage to residential and commercial/industrial buildings occurred in 1989 and PDC has since undertaken major works at Drury to alleviate flooding problems. The rural plan changes will potentially allow more rural subdivision development in the future both in the Papakura and Franklin District areas. A possible 360 hectare industrial development contemplated by Stevenson adjacent to their existing quarry activity will potentially have significant impact in the catchment if not properly managed. Key issues identified include: flooding, stream management, water quality and infrastructure provision for potential Stevenson's development known as the Drury South Business Project (DSBP). Major works have been recommended to mitigate flooding at Drury Town including a new culvert structure under SH1 to divert some flow into Ngakoroa Stream prior to the confluence with Slippery Creek. Extensive stormwater management works have been proposed at the DSBP to mitigate flooding problems downstream, improve water quality and enhance the riparian areas along the existing streams.

CONCLUSION

Five comprehensive ICMP reports have been completed to provide a better understanding of stormwater management issues and a recommended strategy for long term stormwater management.

The findings have been presented to Council previously in workshops and are recognised as the most up to date and comprehensive strategy for the management of stormwater in the District.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.

10. WASTE MANAGEMENT

**(a) WASTE MANAGEMENT AND
MINIMISATION QUARTERLY REPORT
JUNE 2010 TO AUGUST 2010**

**REPORTING OFFICER: Rakesh Gupta
Works Operations Manager**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to inform the Committee on waste management operations for the period June 2010 to August 2010.

BACKGROUND

The waste management and minimisation services of Council are responsible for the performance of waste services contracts and waste minimisation projects.

NARRATIVE

Waste Services

The table below outlines the key tonnages of different types of refuse for the June 2010 to August 2010 period and average comparative previous periods.

	Tonnage/month			
	2008/09 monthly Average	June 2010	July 2010	Aug 2010
Loose Litter	8*	20	23	20
Illegally Dumped	41*	7	25	38
Kerbside Recycling	327	281	293	288
Litter From Bins	23	21	18	19
Refuse Bag Collection	516	491	471	485
Total	915	820	830	850

*2008/09 misapportionment between loose litter and illegally dumped rubbish.

The above table sources tonnages from the following contracts:

Refuse and Litter Services Contract (Waste Management Limited) and Recycling Contract (Streetsmart Ltd.)

The Refuse and Litter Services Contract and the Recycling Contract are both operating efficiently and have met or exceeded the contracted performance indicators for the period.

The figures above indicate that both refuse and recycling tonnages for the year to date have reduced compared to the previous year's averages.

The Contractor provides weekly reports certifying that when bins are emptied, loose litter is also cleared within a five meter area around the bins. However, this is dependent on free access and is not possible if parked vehicles impede access. Weekly audits are being undertaken by the Council Representative to ensure the loose litter and overall contract outcomes are being achieved.

Inorganic Refuse Collection 2010

The 2010 inorganic collections commenced on 26 July 2010 and was completed on 28 August 2010.

The comparison with previous years is tabled as below:

Year	2008	2009	2010
Tonnage	1394	1091	1262

The tonnage for 2010 was the approximate average of 2008 and 2009 tonnages (low compared to 2008 but high compared to 2009) and was completed within the allocated budget.

Refuse Bag Manufacture and Distribution Contract

Bag manufacturing and distribution continue to meet quantity and quality specifications.

The logo on Council refuse bags will be changed to 'Auckland Council' logo from 1st November 2010. Bags with the Papakura logo will be accepted until these stocks are all consumed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.

11. OTHER OPERATIONAL MATTERS

13. CONFIDENTIAL

- (a) **LAND PURCHASES FOR ROADING UPGRADE – 255 PORCHESTER ROAD, TAKANINI**
- (b) **AIRFIELD ROAD STORMWATER DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT CONTRACT PDC/10/25**
-

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council move into public excluded session. The general subject matter to be considered, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under s. 7 (2) i of Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 are:

Item	Reason	Grounds
(a) Land Purchases for Roothing Upgrade – 255 Porchester Road, Takanini	Enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial or industrial negotiations).	s. 7 (2) i
(b) Airfield Road Stormwater Drainage Improvement Contract PDC/10/25	Enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial or industrial negotiations).	s. 7 (2) i