



NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE 36TH COUNCIL MEETING

I hereby give notice that the 36th Council meeting of the 7th Papakura District Council is to be held on:

DATE: Tuesday 23rd February 2010

TIME: 4.00 P.M.

VENUE: Council Chambers
35 Coles Crescent
PAPAKURA

T Stratton
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

MEMBERSHIP:

Chairperson	His Worship the Mayor (Calum Penrose)
Deputy Chairperson	Clr Goldsmith
	Clr Auva'a
	Clr Catchpole
	Clr Conroy
	Clr Jones
	Clr O'Connor
	Clr Piggott
	Clr Pringle

(Quorum 5 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.	Personal	3
3.	Confirmation of Minutes	3
4.	Approval of Recommendations	3
5.	Minutes – Te Roopu Kaitiaki O Papakura	3
6.	Deputations and Petitions	3
7.	Presentations.....	3
8.	Mayor’s Report	3
9.	Items for Decision	4-16
	(a) Papakura Golf Course Consultation	4-5
	(b) Hearings Committee for Draft Pukekiwiriki Paa Reserve Management Plan.....	6-7
	(c) Massey Park Development Update February 2010	8-13
	(d) Karaka Centre Ltd. – Rates Remission 2009/10 (Re-Zoned Rating Units in the Business Rating Group Pending Development).....	14-16
10.	Items for Information	16
11.	Notices of Motion	17
12.	Confidential.....	17-18
	(a) Approach to Resolution of Outstanding Appeals	17-18
	(b) Ardmore Aerodrome Appeal Process Update Report.....	17-18
	(c) The Future of Accent Point, the Library and Museum.	17-18
	(d) Karaka Centre Ltd and Karaka Lakes Ltd Developments – Rates Relief Requests	17-18

PAPAKURA DISTRICT COUNCIL

**AGENDA FOR THE 36TH MEETING OF THE PAPAKURA DISTRICT COUNCIL TO
BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 35 COLES CRESCENT, PAPAKURA
ON TUESDAY 23RD FEBRUARY 2010 COMMENCING AT 4.00 P. M.**

- 1. APOLOGIES**

- 2. PERSONAL**

- 3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**
 - (a) That the Minutes of the 35th Council Meeting held on Tuesday 26th January 2010 be confirmed.

- 4. APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5. MINUTES – TE ROOPU KAITIAKI O PAPAKURA**

- 6. DEPUTATIONS**

- 7. PRESENTATIONS**

- 8. MAYOR'S REPORT**

9. ITEMS FOR DECISION

**(a) PAPA KURA GOLF COURSE
CONSULTATION**

**REPORTING OFFICER: T. Stratton
Chief Executive**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report seeks Council approval to extend the public consultation period related to the partial lifting of the encumbrance on the Papakura Golf Course site.

BACKGROUND

Papakura Golf Course was owned by the Council until 1993. The Council of the day sold the Golf Course subject to an encumbrance on the title which preserved “the land as Public Golf Course from which the public cannot be reasonably excluded” and also subject to a condition that before any on-sale the Council was given the right to purchase the land back.

In October 2009 Council approved the signing of an agreement with Score Trustees Ltd to lift the encumbrance on part of the Golf Course subject to a number of conditions i.e.

- Payment to Council of \$1,050,000 for partial discharge of the encumbrance
- The encumbrance remaining on the balance of the land in the same format as currently
- The agreement being subject to Council consulting with the community on the partial discharge of the encumbrance
- The golf course being developed at the same time, or before, the retirement village
- STL using its best endeavours to ensure the “First Tee” programme is available at the Golf Course
- The retirement village being of a high quality (e.g. to the standard of the retirement village at Forrest Hill, Te Rapa)
- STL receiving all necessary consents.

The agreement was sent to the Auckland Transition Agency (ATA) for confirmation of Council’s decision and this was received in early December.

NARRATIVE

After receiving the ATA confirmation of Council’s decision in December Council was able to start consultation on lifting the encumbrance. As the Christmas period is not considered the optimum time to reach the community, staff planned to commence consultation in late January/early February. In mid January ARC Councillor, Joel Cayford, highlighted some details of the agreement in his blog which was then picked by local media. As a result Council was in the position of responding to the media ahead of the formal launch of the consultation process. This was unfortunate as public debate started without all of the information being available. However, advertising has been placed in the local paper by the Council, and the developer has organised two information sessions. The closing date for submissions was advertised as 24 February 2010, being the normal one month period that Council uses for such consultation.

The community reaction from immediate neighbours of the Golf Course and other interested parties has been strongly against any development of the golf course.

At recent meetings the community have criticised the short timeframes available to respond to the proposal. During the community discussion with the Developers it became apparent that it would also be useful for the Developers to open a dialogue with the community around options for the Golf Course land and they have indicated that they would like to do this. They have also indicated that they would appreciate Council's consultation deadline being extended to accommodate this process. It is suggested that an additional 3 months be allowed for this to happen to allow sufficient time for the options to be explored.

CONCLUSION

The Council's consultation process on the lifting of the encumbrance for the Papakura Golf Course land has not had an ideal start due to partial information being provided ahead of the Council starting consultation. Community opposition is significant and includes criticism of the restricted timeframe for consultation. The Developer is also keen to open a dialogue with the community and has asked if the Council would be willing to extend its consultation timeframe to allow this to happen.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.
2. That Council extend the consultation period related to the partial lifting of the encumbrance on the Papakura Golf Course by a further three months to the end of May 2010.

9. ITEMS FOR DECISION

(b) **HEARINGS COMMITTEE FOR DRAFT
PUKEKIWIRIKI PAA RESERVE
MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**REPORTING OFFICER: Allan Christensen
Community Services Planner**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to recommend formation of a four member special hearings panel to hear and make decisions upon submissions received on the Draft Pukekiwiriki Paa Reserve Management Plan.

BACKGROUND

Section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977 requires the preparation Reserve Management Plans for certain reserves. A draft management plan for Pukekiwiriki Paa has been prepared and was publicly notified for submissions on 9 December 2009. Submissions close on 19 February 2010.

At the District Development Committee meeting on 8 December, a resolution was passed concerning the hearing of submissions on the draft management plan:

That the Committee recommends to Council that the hearing of submissions on the Draft Pukekiwiriki Paa Reserve Management Plan under s.41(d) of the Reserves Act 1977 be delegated to a hearings committee comprising 2 Mana whenua representatives and 2 elected member representatives.

NARRATIVE

In order to form the hearings committee, it is suggested that two of the elected members who have been involved in the drafting of the plan and who sit on Te Roopu Kaitiaki o Papakura, be the elected member representatives. The Kaitiaki collective have nominated Ted Ngataki and Lucy Tukua as the Mana Whenua representatives to sit on this committee.

The duties of the hearings committee members are to hear from submitters, to deliberate on the submissions received and to make recommendations to the Council on any changes to the draft plan before it is sent to the Minister of Conservation for approval.

CONCLUSION

The District Development committee has recommended to Council that submissions to the draft Pukekiwiriki Paa Reserve Management Plan are to be heard by a special committee composed of Manawhenua and elected members. Council is asked to appoint Ted Ngataki and Lucy Tukua plus two elected members to this hearings committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.
2. That Council resolves to form a four (4) member special hearings committee comprising 2 Manawhenua representatives being Lucy Tukua and Ted Ngataki and 2 elected member representatives being X with delegated authority to hear submissions on the draft Pukekiwiriki Paa Reserve Management Plan and to make recommendations to the Council on any changes, alterations or deletions to the draft plan.

9. ITEMS FOR DECISION

**(c) MASSEY PARK DEVELOPMENT UPDATE
FEBRUARY 2010**

**REPORTING OFFICER: Nicola Terry
Manager Community Assets**

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of the report is to report on overall progress on the project and to present a revised project budget for Council approval.

BACKGROUND

Massey Park is being upgraded to turn it into one of the District's premier sports parks. The upgrade includes a new sand carpet playing surface, overall landscaping, improved security, added parking and a refurbishment of the existing grandstand.

The professional services contract to design and specify the re-development was awarded to AECOM (formerly Maunsell Ltd) in April 2009. That contract scope assumed that the redevelopment concept prepared by Council in 2008 would form the basis of the design. The fee proposal incorporated in the contract was for \$475,227.

During the preliminary review of that concept (including a detailed site survey, geotechnical checks and more stakeholder consultation) in May and June 2009, it was recognised that it was not achievable. The review found the concept to be limited with respect to space for providing a new building for the sports clubs using the Park and unable to be built for the available budget. The space limitation was not able to be resolved because the Papakura Rugby Club was unwilling to allow demolition of their building ahead of the expiry of the lease to occupy in 2019. A change in concept for the project was prepared.

This was reported to Council in July 2009 and a new scope adopted, thereby significantly changing the design services required. The professional services contract was put on hold while the new re-development scope was clarified through the preliminary design phases.

In October and December 2009, Council's Operations and Monitoring Committee considered the preliminary design findings that defined the scope of the development and confirmed an approved scope to identify the developed and detailed design effort needed.

The approved scope has now been further developed with respect to the estimated construction costs, and the remaining design input to developed and detail design (including specification and resource and building consent work) has been re-estimated. This information has been consolidated into a revised project budget.

NARRATIVE

Redevelopment Project: Progress Update:

The sand carpet installation, comprising new drainage and irrigation systems, as well as the sand layer playing surface, was brought forward as a separate contract to ensure it was ready ahead of the expected grandstand completion in the third quarter of 2011 and also possible Rugby World Cup activity in September 2011. This contract is underway. The contractor is putting in the new irrigation system first so that water is available to control any dust nuisance. The drains and initial sand carpet will be complete by March 2010 followed by sowing of the new grass, which will consolidate over the winter. Final sand application and nurturing of the grass will be done over summer 2010/11.

The grandstand was damaged by fire on the weekend of 27/28th September 2009. Temporary works were done to make it safe and to clear out fire damaged material from the lower level of the stand. The insurance settlement is progressing and has been managed to ensure that the settlement makes due allowance for the planned refurbishment of the stand.

Through the preliminary design preparation, a number of consultation sessions have been held with the affected sports clubs to bring them up to date on what is being planned and to get their feedback. In particular, the requirements for storage of sports equipment and changing facilities have been extensively canvassed.

As backgrounded above, the preliminary design for the overall landscape improvements, the grandstand refurbishment and the reconfiguration of the athletics club building to achieve the necessary equipment storage, is complete. The landscape scope allows for improvements to the area in front of the Aquatic Centre, to be funded from the budget for the Aquatic centre upgrade.

The re-design of the concept and the additional work to incorporate the re-furbished grandstand into the development has affected the original development programme. The designers are able to allocate additional resources to the developed and detailed design phases to complete these in a shorter time and thereby maintain, or advance, the original target dates for tendering the work.

Consideration is being given to the physical works tendering process to establish if it too can be accelerated. Some information on the construction industry situation suggests that contractors' workloads are picking up and that prices may start to rise in the third quarter of this year. Tendering the Park project ahead of that time may obtain keener pricing.

Budget Background

The original budget included in the LTCCP was adopted in parallel with the concept prepared in 2008. As noted above, this concept was reviewed as the first step in the design of the re-development, and has been amended significantly. The prime change was the abandonment of a new multi-sports building along with the retention of the Rugby Club building, and inclusion of extensive refurbishment of the existing grandstand. This change was adopted by Council in July 2009.

The concept review also highlighted that the original concept did not fully explore a number of ancillary aspects of the overall project such as protected trees, security implications and the overall parking pressures around the Park. These matters were not specifically considered when the LTCCP budget was prepared.

The question of maintaining facilities for the key users of Massey Park during the redevelopment was not addressed in the concept plan which focussed on a high level statement of the aspiration of the project. To free up the Massey Park field and athletics track for construction activities, (the sand carpet installation being the first), the adjacent space at Mansell Field has been set up for athletics activity over the summer and will be brought up to better standard for rugby games prior to winter. This work has incurred costs to establish a grass running track, ground renovation and temporary facilities and equipment storage. It will involve further cost.

Throughout the preliminary design, there has been robust attention paid to keeping the scope within the LTCCP budget for the project. The approved scope is closely aligned with the budget, but the additional professional services to redefine the concept, and investigating the grandstand, have been at an additional cost.

A review of the construction costs in early January 2010 by the quantity surveying consultant for the project, based on the preliminary design, has shown that further reductions in cost can only be achieved by making sacrifices to either the quality of the work or to some features, which would reduce functionality and compromise the basic principles of the development.

Physical Works Costs

The estimated construction costs for the project – based on the preliminary design of the approved scope and with no fee allowances - are \$5.3M (including contingency sums). This scope includes landscaping and carparking in front of the Aquatics Centre.

The budget for the Aquatics Centre upgrade has included these costs – estimated at \$575,000 – so they have been excluded from the Massey Park budget. The athletics track resurfacing at \$60,000, is also funded from outside of this project.

The nett construction cost estimate for the Massey Park project is \$4,667,000. Included in this estimate is the contract amount for the sand carpet installation which was awarded in November 2009 for the sum of \$383,000. Overall, the construction work is estimated to be within the budget.

Additional funds have been spent on work needed to make the Mansell Field playing area suitable for athletics and for the Rugby Club, while the Massey Park playing field is unavailable. This has incurred costs of \$23,000 and a further \$25,000 is estimated for work ahead of the rugby season and next summer's athletics.

Professional and Consent Fees

The original fee proposal included in AECOM's contract was based on the original concept for the Park. This showed a new building with implied flexibility in its layout to incorporate all the features expected by the resident sports clubs. Limited landscaping work was depicted in front of the Aquatic Centre.

The adopted concept for the redevelopment has introduced additional work to the preliminary design phase of the project, which is directly reflected in the professional fee component. Refurbishing the grandstand necessitated considerable extra work to establish basic information about the size of the building and the useable spaces within it, the condition of building components and its structural arrangements for earthquake resistance. There were no existing drawings for the grandstand to use as a basis for the re-design.

As the overall concept was being reviewed, more investigation was needed to address some of the ancillary aspects left unanswered in the earlier work – such as protected trees, security risks and parking.

Advancing the sand carpet contract separately has also incurred some additional costs compared to it being included in an overall redevelopment contract. Advancing this contract was necessary to make sure that the new playing surface was ready for use by the time the rest of the upgrade was complete.

The overall fee situation therefore is that, while some of the original fee proposal has been applicable to the revised concept (mostly the landscape elements), much of the concept and preliminary work has involved additional and different work. The costs involved in these areas of additional work are:-

- Work to obtain additional inputs to the originally scoped design (parking, trees, security) \$28,800
- Quantity surveying inputs for cost control and value workshops (original and revised concept) \$44,800
- Additional work to establish basic parameters for designing refurbishment of grandstand (seismic strength, condition review, overall measurement survey) \$60,900
- General design input to additional preliminary design (space allocation, layout drawings, finishes selection, equipment storage options, carparking options, consultation, etc) for revised concept \$87,000.
- Additional work to advance sand carpet installation \$18,300

The design consultant has put forward a revised proposal for the professional services work needed to complete the project design to the revised scope. They have also submitted estimates for the professional inputs into the construction phase – using the designer in this role is preferred because of their knowledge of the project and because of their accountability for ensuring their design is constructed appropriately.

The estimated fees to complete the developed and detailed design are \$375,000.

The estimated construction phase fees are \$220,000 for the grandstand and general landscaping and \$40,000 for sand carpet installation.

Other fees involved in the project are building and resource consent charges from Council. Estimating these is difficult ahead of the actual consenting process, but an allowance of \$25,000 can be made.

The total professional and consenting fees for the re-development are therefore estimated at \$1,076,500. This figure includes all the additional work initiated by the revisions to the original concept, which amount to \$173,900.

Typical total fees have been calculated by the cost control consultant at \$848,000 for a building project of this value. This is comparable to the estimated overall fees – excluding the \$173,900 of costs associated with the revision to the concept – at \$902,600.

The additional design input to date has either been done under the original contract with AECOM, or has been managed as small fixed fee assignments. However, the additional expenditure to complete the project requires a new contract for the professional providers (AECOM) and this requires Council approval.

Budget Revision

Careful cost control has refined the scope of the project to keep the estimated construction cost to a point where additional reductions in scope will compromise the outcomes for the redevelopment. The construction cost is in line with the amounts allowed for in the LTCCP. However, the fees associated with the project have had to be increased to provide sound information upon which to base the design work and to take account of the significant change in concept part way through the design.

Additional unbudgeted costs have also been incurred to provide temporary facilities for the Clubs displaced from Massey Park during construction activity.

The overall budget impact is that the overall redevelopment budget is now estimated at \$5,694,500. The LTTCP budget is \$5.4M.

This increase can be offset by the expected insurance payment for the fire damage. At this stage the cost related to making good the damage is still under negotiation with the insurance company, but a conservative estimate is for \$100,000 to be available.

The nett increase required for the Park redevelopment budget is therefore \$199,500.

The budget impact of the changes to the project has not been able to be highlighted previously, because until the preliminary design work was substantially completed (in December 2009) and a rigorous costing exercise done (January 2010), the extent to which scope changes could offset these additional design costs was not known. Now that the construction costs have been carefully reviewed, it is clear that there is no room to reduce the scope further without compromising the project outcomes, and the budget needs to be increased.

The alternative to allocating additional funds to the project is to reduce the scope. As previously noted, the scope has been rigorously examined and deductions made of items that are not essential to achieving the project outcomes. Should Council wish to complete the project within the current budget, the level of further savings achievable by deleting any of the following components of the project is:-

Southern car park (near Bowling Club)	\$100,000
Feature fence between pool and park	\$60,000 nett assuming a standard low fence put in
Mural along grandstand wall (facing Ron Keat)	\$50,000
Feature lighting at entrances etc	\$50,000 (deduction from \$75,000 allowance to leave only essential security related lighting)

While each of these items is capable of being removed, it is considered that deleting any of these items would compromise the quality of the completed project.

CONCLUSION

The design work for the Massey Park redevelopment has been increased by the change in concept to concentrate the building elements of the redevelopment in the existing grandstand. The primary impact on the project has been financial with additional professional services fees for the extra design work associated with the requested changes.

Robust cost reviews have been done on the approved scope of the project and the estimated construction cost cannot be reduced to accommodate the added design costs without compromising the project outcomes.

The Massey Park work has made the playing field unavailable to athletics and rugby for up to two seasons and temporary work has been done on Mansell Field to make it suitable for these two primary users of Massey Park. Additional costs have been incurred for this.

In total, additional funds of \$199,500 are required over the LTCCP amount of \$5.4M for the Massey Park redevelopment.

The existing professional services contract is based on the previous concept and work scope. It needs to be replaced by a new contract for the remaining professional services to complete the project. This contract will have a value of \$595,000 and Council approval to let this contract is sought.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.
2. That Council approve additional funding of \$199,500 for the Massey Park Development.
3. That Council delegate to the CEO authority to award a professional services contract to supply professional services to complete the project to AECOM Ltd in the sum of \$595,000 to replace the existing contract.

9. ITEMS FOR DECISION

(d) **KARAKA CENTRE LTD. – RATES REMISSION 2009/10 (RE-ZONED RATING UNITS IN THE BUSINESS RATING GROUP PENDING DEVELOPMENT)**

REPORTING OFFICER: D McIntosh
Management Accountant

ATTACHMENT: Remission Application Letter
Property Site Plan
Rates Remission Policy

(Attachment No. 1)

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report presents an application from Karaka Centre Ltd in relation to two properties for rates remission where the sites are re-zoned rating units in the business rating group pending development.

BACKGROUND

Council has a rates remission policy adopted in the 2009-2019 LTCCP (volume 2, page 60, copy attached) which provides as its objective:

“... the opportunity for rates relief on rating units which have been re-zoned and now fall within the business rating group. The policy recognises that development of business land may take some time following re-zoning and that the application of the business differential in initial years prior to development may be inequitable.”

Karaka Centre Ltd. has applied for rates remission under this policy for sites located at 43 Hingaia Road (6.3ha) and 47 Harbourside Drive (7.6ha) (valuation references. 37401-00618 & 37401-00619). A plan of the site locations is attached.

NARRATIVE

Remission Criteria

Consideration of the rates remission application requires assessment against the conditions and criteria established in the policy. Following are the criteria and an evaluation of whether these have been met.

	Criteria Details	Evaluation
1	The rating unit must be rated within the business differential rating group.	✓ - rated in business group
2	Remission will be available in rating years following the year in which the land on which the rating unit is located is re-zoned	✓ - land covered by these sites was first rated as business in the 2006/07 year following re-zoning in the prior year.
3	Remission will normally only be available for 5 years following re-zoning, however the time-frame may be extended or reduced at the sole discretion of council. The time period over which remissions may be granted will depend on	✓ - the standard 5 year period would extend to 2010/11

	specific circumstances in each case, particularly the extent to which the development of business sites is dependent on the development of surrounding areas	
4	Remission will cease to be available for any years following that in which a building consent is issued for the rating unit for the first building.	✓ - no building consents issued for sites (note building consents issued on these sites for advertising signs have been considered not relevant)
5	The ratepayer must make application annually to the council on the prescribed form at any time during the rating year for which remission is sought.	✓ - application made within rating year

The table shows that all the core criteria have been met.

Criteria 3 does however include a discretionary element in that Council may reduce or extend the default 5 year time-frame for remission availability depending on the specific circumstances in each case. The applicant has submitted that the development of business land has been delayed by a slower “take-up of the surrounding residential environment” than originally forecast. On this basis it is proposed that there is no reason to consider a reduction in the 5 year remission availability time-frame.

It should also be noted that the application of rates remission policies are governed by section 114 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002. This provides that council may remit rates where the conditions and criteria of an adopted remission policy are met. Importantly this implies there is no compulsion to do so, however it is not considered that there are any reasons associated with this application for the Council not to approve the remission.

Remission Amount

The remission policy specifies that the rates remission for any approved applications will be

“up to an amount equal to the difference between actual rates levied for the year and the amount that would have been levied if the rating unit was rated within the residential rating group”

The maximum available remissions are:

Site	2009/10 Rates on Business basis (as levied)	2009/10 Rates on Residential basis	Maximum Remission
43 Hingaia Rd	\$ 69,240.00	\$16,759.80	\$ 52,480.20
47 Harbourside Dr	\$ 76,810.70	\$18,522.00	\$ 58,288.70
Total	\$146,050.70	\$35,281.80	\$110,768.90

(Note: The amount calculated in the Karaka Lakes Ltd. application letter as an expected remission is incorrect as it does not apply the residential step differential rate applying to rating unit land values exceeding \$320,000. This overstates rates that would be charged on a residential basis and understates the maximum remission.)

As this is the first rating year for which this remission policy applies and no other applications have been presented to date, no precedent is available in terms of determining the amount of remission that should be approved, noting that the policy only specifies a maximum. Council may wish to consider whether the maximum or an alternative lesser amount is an appropriate remission to provide as rates relief.

CONCLUSION

The application for rates remission received from Karaka Lakes Ltd. meets the core criteria of the remission policy concerned. It is therefore proposed that the remission application be approved.

It is further recommended that Council consider and determine whether to apply the maximum remission available or alternatively a lesser amount which would provide an appropriate measure of rates relief.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the information be received.
2. That the application by Karaka Lakes Ltd. for remission of rates for re-zoned rating units in the business rating group pending redevelopment, in relation to properties at 43 Hingaia Road and 47 Harbourside Drive, be approved.
3. That the amount of remission for the 2009/10 rating year be set at \$xxx.xx for 43 Hingaia Road and \$xxx.xx for 47 Harbourside Drive.

10. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

11. NOTICES OF MOTION

- (a) **NOTICE OF MOTION FOR THE COUNCIL MEETING 23 FEBRUARY 2010**
- (Attachment No. 2)**
-

12. CONFIDENTIAL

- (a) **APPROACH TO RESOLUTION OF OUTSTANDING APPEALS**
- (b) **ARDMORE AERODROME APPEAL PROCESS UPDATE REPORT**
- (c) **THE FUTURE OF ACCENT POINT, THE LIBRARY AND MUSEUM**
- (d) **KARAKA CENTRE LTD AND KARAKA LAKES LTD DEVELOPMENTS – RATES RELIEF REQUESTS**
-

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council move into public excluded session. The general subject matter to be considered, the reasons for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under S 7(2) i and S 48 (2) a (i) and S 7 (2) g of Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 are:

Item	Reason	Grounds
12(a) Approach to Resolution of Outstanding Appeals	To enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage negotiations (including commercial or industrial negotiations).	S 7 (2) i
	To enable the local authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings before a local authority where a right of appeal lies to any Court or Tribunal against the final decision of the local authority in those proceedings.	S 48(2)a (i)
12(b) Ardmore Aerodrome	To enable Council to maintain legal	S 7 (2) g

Agenda
 36th Council Meeting
 23 February 2010

<p>Appeal Process Update Report</p>	<p>professional privilege.</p>	<p>S 48(2)a (i)</p>
<p>12(c) The Future of Accent Point, the Library And Museum</p>	<p>To enable the local authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings before a local authority where a right of appeal lies to any Court or Tribunal against the final decision of the local authority in those proceedings.</p>	<p>S 7 (2) i</p>
<p>12(d) Karaka Centre Ltd and Karaka Lakes Ltd Developments – Rates Relief Requests</p>	<p>To enable Council to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage negotiations (including commercial or industrial negotiations).</p>	<p>S 7 (2) i</p>