

**KAIKOURA DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING FOLLOWING THE
FINANCE AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY 15 MARCH 2006, IN MEMORIAL HALL SUPPER
ROOM, ESPLANADE, KAIKOURA.**

AGENDA

1. *Apologies*

2. *Matters of Importance to be raised as Urgent Business*

3. **Minutes to be Confirmed:**

■ *Council 15/02/2006*

page 75

Reports to be Adopted:

■ *Works & Services Committee 15/02/2006*

page 84

■ *Environmental Services Committee 15/02/2006*

page 90

■ *Finance and Policy Committee 15/02/2006*

page 94

■ *Social Services Committee 08/02/2006*

page 96

■ *Tourism & Development Committee 08/02/2006*

page 101

Minutes to be received

■ *Hearings and Applications Committee 17/01/2006*

page 108

■ *Hearings and Applications Committee 07/02/2006*

page 118

■ *Formal Hearing 09/02/2006*

page 122

■ *Hearings and Applications Committee 24/01/2006*

page 125

■ *Hearings and Applications Committee 28/02/2006*

page 133

4. *Matters arising from Confirmed minutes*

5. *Minutes Action List Update*

MEETING	ACTION REQUIRED	BY	DATE ACTIONED
	21 DECEMBER 2005		
Council	Review of South Bay Commercial Boat Park rental rates	Stuart	Item 7 Page 149
Council	Form a working party and investigate an alcohol ban in the district	Councillors Pablecheque, McChesney, and Macphail.	In Progress
	15 FEBRUARY 2006		
Council	Publish photographs and the various roles	Linda	Published

	of Councillors in and around Council and contact details in local newspaper		Kaikoura Star 1 March 2006
Council	Map of Kaikoura district with camping/litter problem areas identified in order of priority	Nicole	In Progress
Council	Develop a Freedom camping policy	Nicole/Annie	In Progress

6. Sport Tasman Report

page 147

7. Review of South Bay Commercial Boat Park and Slipway Fees

page 149

8. Earthquake & Insanitary Buildings Policy

page 150

9. Committee Updates

10. Mayor's Report

page 170

Change of Date – April 2006 Council Meeting

The Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Chief Executive Officer have requested leave of absence from the 19 April 2006 meeting. It is therefore suggested this meeting be postponed to the following day being Thursday 20th April 2006.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the April Council meeting be held on Thursday 20th April 2006.

11. Urgent Business

12. Council Public Excluded Session

Moved, seconded that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely

- a. Confirmation of Minutes of Council Public Excluded meeting on 15/02/2006*
- b. Confirmation of Minutes of Environmental Services Public Excluded meeting on 15/02/2006*
- c. Receipt of Hearings & Applications Public Excluded meeting on 17/01/2006*

The general subject matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) and 7(2)(i) of the Local Government Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Grounds of the Act under which this resolution is made
Minutes of the Council Public Excluded meeting held 15	The exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is	Section 48(1)(a) and 7(2)(b)

February 2006.	necessary to enable the Local Authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation.	
Minutes of the Environmental Services Committee Public Excluded meeting held 15 February 2006.	The exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Local Authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation.	Section 48(1)(a) and 7(2)(b)
Receipt of Hearings & Applications Public Excluded meeting on 17 January 2006.	The exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Local Authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation.	Section 48(1)(a) and 7(2)(b)

Report to Council

Review of South Bay Commercial Boat Park and Slipway Fees

At the Council meeting in December 2005, Council requested that a review of the South Bay Commercial Boat Park rental rates be undertaken.

The existing slipway fees and parking fees of \$600.00 each was set for the year commencing 1997/98 and have not been altered since that date. The recreational boating slipway fee has also been held at the existing level for many years. The \$600.00 fee charged per annum also included GST so the net return to Council is some \$533.00 or \$10.25 per week.

If Council took the conservative approach and looked at increasing both the parking and slipway fee at a compounded rate of 5% per annum since the 1997/98 financial year the figures arrived at in today's dollars would be \$930.00 per annum.

The increase in those two rates (slipway and boat parking) would net Council an additional \$7,000 per annum which would cover the cost of the proposed public jetty. If Council considered raising the slipway for recreational boaties at the same compound rate then the fee would move from \$5.00 per use to \$7.75 per use or if Council decided to round it out to the nearest dollar then \$8.00 would be an appropriate fee for the new, much easier to use facility.

Similarly, the monthly and/or annual charge could equally be increased by approximately 55%. The current monthly fee is \$35.00 and this could increase to \$55.00 while the annual fee of \$75.00 would increase to approximately \$115.00. While these appear to be substantial increases, they are modest increases if they had been undertaken on an annual basis and in light of the improved facilities that would be available to the recreational and commercial users, the charges are not unreasonable if in fact still on the light side.

If Council decided to increase the commercial and recreational boat charges it could include those proposed charges in the draft Long Term Council Community Plan. It could also advise the commercial boat operators and seek feedback from them outside of the Long Term Council Community Plan process. In terms of the license to occupy agreements signed by the commercial boat operators, Council has the ability to review the charges and that agreement suggests that Council only has to provide the operators with one month's notice prior to the fees going up. If Council was to increase the fees it is suggested that they increase from 1 July 2006.

Recommendation

It is therefore recommended that the following fees and charges be included in the budgets for the 2006/07 year and to take effect from 1 July 2006:

<i>Commercial Parking Fee</i>	<i>\$930.00 per annum</i>
<i>Commercial Slipway Fee</i>	<i>\$930.00 per annum</i>
<i>Daily Recreational Launch Fee</i>	<i>\$ 8.00</i>
<i>Monthly Recreational Launch Fee</i>	<i>\$55.00</i>
<i>Annual Recreational Launch Fee</i>	<i>\$115.00</i>

Kaikoura District Council

Building Act 2004

Proposal Statement

And Draft To Formulate

Earthquake – Prone and Insanitary Buildings

Policy 2006

March 2006

Draft #01 - 17th February 2006

Introduction

The Building Act 2004 (“the Act”) requires Council to adopt an earthquake-prone and insanitary buildings policy to ensure that all earthquake prone buildings are identified, assessed and strengthened to at least the minimum prescribed standard to reduce the potential of injury, loss of life and damage to other property in the event of a moderate earthquake. This consideration could in some cases result in the demolition of a building.

It is a mandatory requirement of the Act S. 131 that Council implements specific Policy and S. 132 sets out the procedures in terms of the introduction and formulation of the Policy.

The policy is required to state:

1. the approach that Kaikoura District Council will take in performing its functions under the Building Act 2004
2. Kaikoura District Councils priorities in performing those functions
3. how the policy will apply to heritage buildings

In developing and adopting this policy Kaikoura District Council will have followed the consultative procedure as defined by section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

The Building Act 2004 requires this Policy to be in place before 31st May 2006

This policy is required to be reviewed at least every five years thereafter.

Local Seismic Indicators

Kaikoura District is directly involved with seismic futures having numerous faults and thrusts within its boundaries. The formation of the seaward and inland ranges and valleys stand testament to this fact.

A pictorial demonstration of the multiple seismic influences can be seen in the A3 map attached to the Woodward – Clyde Seismic Hazard Evaluation Report prepared for Kaikoura District Council and dated September 1995.

Clearly defined strike-slip and thrust faults have been identified to the extent that our Kaikoura District is the most seismically active area of New Zealand.

The Woodward – Clyde evaluation of seismic hazard in the Kaikoura district has recommendations that should be considered in terms of the Long Term Council Community (LTCCP) Plan and the future direction of building activity. This consideration could assist to minimize damage to buildings and associated risk to the occupants by recognizing key indicators such as a buildings location and design.

Using the Modified Mercalli (MM) Scale, demonstrated in the Woodward – Clyde report, and the likely earthquake event intensity expectation of the New Zealand Society of Earthquake Engineers any development in the region should be influenced and designed accordingly.

This policy does not enter into tsunami events being as a result of seismic activity.

Background

The previous Building Act 1991 specifically targeted “un-reinforced masonry” structures. This ring fenced seismic concerns to that type of building without addressing the wider issues of potentially unsafe structures, rather using other sections of the 1991 act such as “Dangerous or Insanitary Buildings” jointly with the enforcement sections to achieve safer buildings in our community. Whereas the Building Act 2004 is focused in purpose by section 3:

- a. People who use buildings can do so safely and without endangering their health.

And connectively:

- b. People who use a building can escape from the building if it is on fire,

More specifically section 4 of the Act sets out an extensive list of matters that Council must have regard for in the performance of its functions and discharge of its duties.

Pertinent provisions include:

- a. the need to ensure that any harmful effect on human health resulting from the use of particular building methods or products or of a particular building design, or from building work, is prevented or minimized:
- b. the importance of ensuring that each building is durable for its intended use:

and others.

Previous efforts throughout New Zealand to strengthen earthquake prone buildings initiated strong debate in terms of social and economic effects within the community with an emphasis on long term safer buildings versus affordability. This is reflected and somewhat appeased in the duration for remediation works on buildings confirmed as being earthquake prone as demonstrated in the policy.

Meaning of an Earthquake-prone Building

s. 122 of the Act:-

- (1) A building is earthquake prone for the purposes of the Act if, having regard to its condition and to the ground on which it is built, and because of its construction, the building –
 - a. will have its ultimate capacity exceeded in a moderate earthquake (as defined in the regulations,); and
 - b. would be likely to collapse causing –
 - (iii) injury or death to persons in the building or to persons on any other property; or
 - (iv) damage to any other property
- (2) Subsection (1) does not apply to a building that is used wholly or mainly for residential purposes unless the building –

- a. comprises 2 or more stories: and
- b. contains 3 or more household units

Moderate earthquake has the same meaning as section 7 in the Building Regulations 2005 where – “– moderate earthquake means, in relation to a building, an earthquake that would generate shaking at the site of the building that is of the same duration as, but that is one third as strong as the earthquake shaking (determined by normal measures of acceleration, velocity and displacement) that would be used to design a new building at that site.”

Liquefaction

Much of Kaikoura has a foreshore with a pea shingle subsurface that may attract liquefaction status. Liquefaction occurs where the subsurface soils react to seismic movement by behaving in a similar manner to liquid in terms of its ability to support a building with subsequent structural damage or catastrophic collapse as a possibility.

Liquefaction is normally a greater risk when shallow ground water is present and is in conjunction with the aforementioned pea shingle. Whilst there have been a number of reports relating to seismic activity in the district liquefaction has not been extensively investigated. The Institute of Geological and Nuclear Science in Wellington have no specific detail on this subject for Kaikoura. Similarly Environment Canterbury have little to offer on the subject within Kaikoura.

Earthquake Prone and Insanitary Buildings - Identification

Kaikoura has few buildings over two floors in height that do not have a proven record of service but that alone does not mean assessment is not necessary for even minor buildings.

The New Zealand Building Code clause B1 ‘Structure’ demands a performance:

Buildings, building elements and site work shall have a low probability of rupturing, becoming unstable, losing equilibrium, or collapsing during construction or alteration and throughout their lives.

Clause B1 specifies a number of factors for consideration including earthquake, differential movement, earth pressure and adverse effects due to insufficient separation from other buildings.

There are numerous considerations and structural engineering principles to apply both in terms of seismic loadings and other natural hazards. It would be safe to say that the required expertise for an overall assessment of buildings could be sourced from consultants in conjunction with Councils in house engineers.

It would be prudent to note at this point that whilst NZS4203 is current (March 2006) at this date for the purposes of determining whether a building is earthquake prone or not the Department of Building and Housing is considering its replacement. The latter, possibly during 2006, standard AS/NZ 1170 part 5: 2004 calls for an increase in the threshold value.

The giving of information through land information memoranda and any requisition of Council should consider AS/NZ 1170 as “the means of assessment” to avoid any potential of upgrading recent required

building works on an earthquake – prone structure being carried out under the outgoing lesser standard NZS4203.

The result of this of course may require a second upgrade for the structure to comply as NZS1170 is some 20% higher than its expected predecessor the current NZS4203.

Key Sections of the Policy

The Building Act 2004 and the Building regulations 2005 define the meaning of an “earthquake prone building”. As a general guidance, an earthquake prone building will have a strength that is 33% or less of the current loadings code. The current loadings code is NZS4203:1992 “Code of Practice for General Structural Design Loadings for Buildings”. That document is to be replaced by NZS1170.5:2004 “Structural design Actions”. That latter standard has been published and is expected to be cited in the Compliance Documents for the New Zealand Building Code in 2006 but not before the mandatory adoption of this policy.

It should be noted that the test for whether a structure is earthquake prone or not is in terms of the current loadings code (presently NZS4203).

Once a building has been classified as earthquake prone it will need to be strengthened, or if appropriate demolished. There is no specific provision that Council can rely on to insist that a particular capacity be attained, the legislation has not addressed the upgrading process in a definitive way, rather that Council should encourage the owner to strengthen the structure to the greatest extent possible.

Timeframes for Remediation

Five and ten years seems to be a widely accepted remediation timeframe for other than demolition, insanitary and or “Dangerous Buildings” in terms of the Building Act 2004. Buildings assessed as having a more urgent remediation program because of pending structural failure during an earthquake event or insanitary conditions may need a stated lesser time span. In this case each earthquake prone or insanitary building not attracting the five or ten year category should be taken on merit after consultation with the appropriately qualified engineer, the Director General of Health and where applicable New Zealand Historic Places Trust.

For the purposes of this policy each building deemed to be earthquake prone by Council engineers shall be remedied by the application of section 1.7 “Priorities” of this policy or a shorter time span as qualified by Council engineers.

Council engineers shall consider:

- the condition of the subject building
- the use of the building
- occupant density
- location of the building
- heritage buildings / sites
- NZ Fire Service recommendations

in addition to widely accepted engineering principles and the New Zealand National Society for Earthquake Engineering, 1985; *Recommendations and Guidelines for Classifying , Interim Securing and Strengthening*.

Any recommendation involving building work as defined in the Building Act 2004 will attract the need for a building consent in terms of section 40 of the Act notwithstanding emergency procedures to remove a hazardous situation. Emergency procedures will include consultation with not only the building owner but other stakeholders including but not limited to NZHPT and Te Runanga o Kaikoura.

Heritage Buildings

Nothing in this policy will negate Councils recognition of the importance of the regions cultural, historical and heritage values and the need for specialist input to protect against invasive actions by any party who signals an interest in any building, structure or site.

Kaikoura District Council is committed to offering heritage buildings within its boundaries a good chance of surviving a major earthquake. However Council does not wish to see the intrinsic heritage values of these buildings adversely affected by structural improvement measures.

Heritage buildings will be assessed in the same way as other potentially earthquake prone buildings and discussions held with owners and the Historic Places trust to identify a way forward. Focused efforts will be made to meet heritage objectives.

Following this consultation period notices will be served requiring improvements or demolition within a stated (preferably agreed) timeframe. In some cases Council may deem it necessary to consult with the general public.

1. Overall Approach

Kaikoura district Council will:

1. review its whole building stock to identify buildings that fall within the scope of potential earthquake prone or insanitary buildings under the Building Act 2004
2. assess broadly the performance of those buildings in relation to the new building standard and, in particular, to the standard defined for earthquake prone buildings. This broad assessment will be carried out at Councils cost.
3. determine from this assessment a list of buildings that are earthquake prone in terms of the Building Act 2004.
4. advise owners of the affected buildings of Councils findings and invite them, within a stated timeframe, to meet with and or obtain further detail from Council on future requirements.
5. serve notice to all owners of earth quake prone buildings once the stated timeframe for meeting with Council has passed and, subject to the results of discussions, to carry out work to reduce or remove the danger or demolish the building within a specified timeframe.
6. allow owners a right of appeal as defined by the Building Act 2004 which can include an application for a determination in terms of section 177 of the Act.

1.1 Identification of Earthquake - prone or Insanitary Buildings

Kaikoura District Council will:

1. undertake an initial desktop review of Council files in an effort to locate potential EQP buildings
2. follow up with site inspection where deemed necessary
3. carry out initial evaluation of performance in earthquake based on information obtained by using the NZSEE Initial Evaluation Method process
4. require identified EQP building owners to carry out detailed assessment on their buildings unless otherwise agreed
5. maintain a list of EQP buildings according to the results of assessment
6. categorize the EQP buildings according to the following:
 - a. Buildings with special post disaster functions as defined in AS/NZ 1170.0:2002. Importance Level 4.
 - b. Buildings that contain people in crowds or contents of high value to the community as defined in AS/NZ1170.0 : 2002, Importance level 3.
 - c. Buildings with a heritage classification of A or B under Councils register.
 - d. Buildings with an Importance Level less than 3 as defined in AS/NZ 1170.0: 2002

1.2 Assessment Criteria

For practical purposes, Kaikoura District Council will define EPB's as those that, when subjected to a moderate earthquake, do not meet nor exceed the criteria for ultimate limit state as defined in the loadings and materials Standards for new buildings.

Council will use the NZSEE recommendations as its preferred basis for defining technical requirements and criteria. These recommendations are designed to be used in conjunction with AS/NZ1170 Loadings Standard, NZS 3404 Steel Structures Standard and other materials standards.

1.3 Taking Action on Earthquake –prone Buildings

Kaikoura District Council will:

1. advise and liaise with owners of buildings identified as being earthquake prone
2. encourage owners to carry out an independent assessment of the structural Performance of those buildings

3. serve formal notices on owners of earthquake prone buildings in accordance with the Building Act 2004 s.124 requiring them to remove the danger.
4. allow owners to appeal against the classification within 12 months of the receipt of notice

1.4 Interface between the Building Act 2004 and EPB

1.4.1 The Building Act 2004 section 112 Alterations to an existing building.

Whenever a building consent application is received for significant upgrading or alteration of a building that is or could be earthquake prone, then, irrespective of the general priorities set by Council for dealing with EQP buildings, Council will not issue a building consent unless it is satisfied that the building is not earthquake prone and that the building work will not detrimentally affect the buildings compliance with the building code.

If the building is shown to be earthquake prone, then the council will require that the building be strengthened to comply as nearly as is reasonably practicable with the provisions of the building code.

1.4.2 Section 115 : Change of Use

Whenever a building consent is received for a change of use of a building that is or could be earthquake prone, then, irrespective of the general priorities set by Council for dealing with EQP buildings, it will be a requirement of the building consent that the owner initiates a detailed assessment of the earthquake performance of the building to determine whether or not it is an EQP building in its existing condition.

If the building is shown to be earthquake prone then the Council will require that the building be strengthened to comply as nearly as is practicable with every provision of the building code that relates to structural performance as is required by the Building Act 2004 section 115(b) (i) (A) (In this instance the requirement for EQP buildings would be the same as that for non-earthquake buildings.)

1.5 Dealing With Building Owners

The steps in the process are outlined in 1.3 above.

1.5.1 Before exercising its powers under the Building Act 2004 section 124, Council will seek, within a defined time-frame, to discuss options for action with owners with a view to obtaining from the owner a mutually acceptable approach for dealing with the danger, leading to receipt of a formal proposal from owners for strengthening or demolition.

1.5.2 In the event that discussions do not yield a mutually acceptable solution Council will serve a formal notice on the owner to strengthen or demolish the building.

1.6 Recording a Buildings EQP Status

A register of all EQP and insanitary buildings shall be kept by Council noting the status, any requirements for improvements or the results of improvements as applicable.

In addition, the following information will be placed on the Land Information Memoranda produced by Council under the Building Act 2004:

- i. an address and legal description of land and building
- ii. a statement that the building is on the council register of EQP buildings
- iii. the date by which strengthening or demolition is required if known
- iv. a statement that further details are available from the Council for those who can demonstrate a genuine interest in the property.

In granting access to information concerning earthquake-prone and insanitary buildings the Council will conform to the requirements of relevant legislation.

1.7 Priorities

Kaikoura District Council has prioritized both the identification and the requirement to strengthen or demolish buildings as follows.

Figures in brackets indicate the latest date for identification and notification and the maximum times for strengthening or demolition respectively. Times required for strengthening or demolition commence on the date of issue of formal notice. Specific times will be assigned for action according to the assessment of structural performance and the nature of the concerns.

The order will be as follows:

1. Buildings with special post-disaster functions as defined in AS/NZ 1170.0: 2002, Importance Level 4 (December 2008) **15 years**
2. Buildings that contain people in crowds or contents of high value to the community as defined in AS/NZS 1170.0: 2002, Importance Level 3 (December 2009) **20 years**
3. Buildings with a heritage classification of A or B under the Councils register (December 2010) **25 years**
4. Buildings with an Importance Level of less than 3 as defined in AS/NZ 1170.0: 2002 (December 2011) **30 years**

2.0 Heritage Buildings

Heritage buildings will be assessed and categorized as with other buildings in terms of EQP procedure however Council and the owners or owner's agents must have regard to the heritage status of a subject building.

The Building Act 2004 section 4 (2) (1) recognizes the – “ need to facilitate the preservation of buildings of significant cultural, historical or heritage value”

Kaikoura District Council is mindful that any building work or ground disturbance must recognize the heritage fabric of the site and minimize any intrusion thereon.

Council accepts that should any heritage building (as defined by both the Kaikoura District Plan and the NZ Historical Places Trust) requiring strengthening, alteration or demolition following the assessment

processes of this policy, all stake holders will be invited to take part in the consultation process. In normal circumstances resource consent from Kaikoura District Council would be required to significantly alter, strengthen or demolish a heritage building. An archaeological authority may also be required from Environment Canterbury and New Zealand Historic Places Trust in the event of earthworks associated with a pending demolition of an EQP building

Consultation where an heritage building is deemed to be earthquake prone may include representatives from but not limited to:

- New Zealand Historical Places Trust
- Te Runanga o Kaikoura
- The building owners
- Kaikoura District Council
- Department of Conservation
- Interested community groups

Consideration to waiving resource consent fees for heritage building enhancement may be available through the Kaikoura District Council by application.

KAIKOURA DISTRICT COUNCIL

Draft - Earthquake-prone and Insanitary Buildings Policy

The Building Act 2004 requires Kaikoura District Council to adopt policy on how to deal with earthquake prone, dangerous and insanitary buildings.

The draft has been prepared and is now presented for public comment in accordance with the special consultative procedures described in section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Council is required to adopt the policy prior to 31st May 2006.

The policy must state –

- The approach that the territorial authority will take in performing its functions under this Part; and
- The territorial authority's priorities in performing those functions; and
- How the policy will apply to heritage buildings.

The draft schedules those persons and organizations who may have an interest in the earthquake – prone buildings and how they may be affected by such a policy.

Council invites all interested persons, organizations and community groups to have input into the policy.

Further details are available from:

Kaikoura District Council Offices
34 Esplanade Kaikoura

15th March 2006

Proposal for: Earthquake – Prone and Insanitary Buildings Policy

Background

Council is required to adopt an Earthquake – Prone and Insanitary Buildings Policy in accordance with the Building Act 2004 s.131.

This section of the Act requires the policy to be in place before 31st May 2006.

The proposed policy is subject to the consultative procedures in the Local Government Act s.83 and will thereafter be concluded with a copy of the adopted policy being sent to the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Building and Housing.

Purpose of This Report

The purpose of this report is to seek Councils approval and adoption of the subject Policy following the consultation procedures of the Local Government Act s.83.

The Objective

The objective is to ensure that Council complies with the requirements of the Building Act 2004 in addition to a safer community.

The Options

1. To adopt the Policy
2. Not adopt the report
3. To recommend variation to the proposal prior to the consultation process.

The Cost

The building owners will be affected by building upgrades where their building has been identified as being earthquake prone or insanitary. In all but severe cases the owners will have a number of years to comply with notices served by Council.

The community at large may be affected should a significant number of buildings be identified as being EQP although with a small number of building stock Kaikoura's community generally would see little change in terms of cost.

Council's cost would be involved with the following resources:

- A desk top review of potential EQP building files
- Contact with EQP building owners and follow-ups
- Enforcement potential

The Result

Council will have complied with the Building Act 2004 requirement.
The community can be assured of a safer environment.

Recommendation

That Council adopts the policy

Mayor's Report – March 2006

- An invitation to attend the “Balance Farm environment awards’ sponsored by E-Can has arrived for anyone to take up.
- The invitation to submit remits for consideration at the *Local Government New Zealand* AGM by 22 May – *is there any interest in forming a remit to submit?*

- Speaking of LGANZ AGM..... Last year Stuart and I attended and re iterated that all or part of the conference could well be of interest to all or some elected members. The preliminary notice of the AGM has been distributed to you and once an agenda etc is formulated we shall distribute that to you all. At that stage we can finalise KDC attendance.
- A reply from Nandor Tanczos MP – re our support for the continued use of recyclable milk containers
- Stuart and I attended the Zone 5 Local Govt. Meeting in Ashburton 20th Feb. The unconfirmed minutes of which are attached
- 27 & 28 feb, I attended the new mayors refresher course in Wellington as (as I see it) part of my roles professional development.

Attendance was almost complete from around the country and the course was a requested follow-up by mayors from the post election course.(which I unfortunately did not attend).

However.....this course re iterated to me that we are not alone in the world and other districts face the same challenges we do, its only the depth that varies!

Much of the discussion centred on personal “mayoral” experiences – successes and failures – and relationships with councils and staff.

Rating issues and the effect of roading costs for rural districts dominates some annual plan workshops around the country.

The new Minister for Local Govt, Mark Purdon, spoke to us and confirmed his awareness of how hard we all work – then left - and the Auditor General also spoke and attempted to justify the LTCCP audit costs – in my opinion, unsuccessfully. He was also aware of the large number of grievance cases currently being investigated.

Which brings me to “Code of Conduct”” which, when tried, has proved to be a wet ticket slapping exercise. This is being addressed by both LGANZ & Audit dept. as we speak

- Transits draft 2006/7-2015/16 10 year state Highway Forecast has been received. It seems that our truck waste stop has been dropped off the 3 year plan altogetherBUT.... a mention is made of the
Hapuku passing lane as 115th priority with a medium urgency and
Limestone creek passing lane @ 38th priority and a high urgency.
 A strategic study entitled *Kaikoura Transport Study* is scheduled for 2006/07.
Conway Bluffs re-alignment @ 166th priority and medium urgency
Improvement to shingle Fans @ 202nd priority & high urgency
Okarahia North re alignment @ 95th priority and medium urgency
We do not feature on the Committed Large Activities list

The Document as a whole is available from the “in Box” in my office.

Noting that the document is a draft and in a consultation phase complete with submission form. – closing 24 march

Also in the “BOX “are other tabled publications you may, or not, find of interest.

- MOYD newsletter
- Statistics NZ info kit
- MOTIVATE – NZ’s transport newsletter
- MWH Jan/Feb newsletter
- On Track – annual report
- Managing Flood Risk – Draft NZ Protocol
- LTNZ – Feb Newsletter
- The Navy Today – Feb.
- The social report – Regional indicators – MOSD
- NZ Tourism News – Feb
- Maori and Council Engagement under the RMA

