EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING OF WESTLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE HOKITIKA WESTLAND RSA, 22 SEWELL STREET, HOKITIKA AND VIA ZOOM ON WEDNESDAY, 14 OCTOBER 2026 COMMENCING AT 1.00 PM

The Council Meeting was recorded and uploaded to the Westland District Council YouTube Channel.

1. KARAKIA TĪMATANGA
OPENING KARAKIA

The opening Karakia was led by Councillor Walker.

2. MEMBERS AND APOLOGIES

Chairperson:	Her Worship the Mayor
Deputy Mayor and Northern Ward:	Councillor Burden
Northern Ward Members:	Councillor Maitland, Councillor Mackenzie
Hokitika Ward Members:	Councillor Gillett, Councillor Martin, Councillor Walker
Southern Ward Members:	Councillor Manera, Councillor Munns
Iwi Representatives:	Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick, Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai

NGĀ WHAKAPAAHA
APOLOGIES

Apology received from Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick.

Moved Councillor Walker, seconded Councillor Martin and **Resolved** that the apology from Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick be received and accepted.

The following members were in attendance via audio-visual link:
Councillor Gillett
Councillor Munns

Also in Attendance:
T. Armstrong, Structural Engineer, Eliot Sinclair; S. Raturi, Structural Engineer, Eliot Sinclair.

Staff present
B. Phillips, Chief Executive; L. Webster, General Manager Regulatory and Compliance; S. Lewis, Chief Financial Officer; E. Bencich, General Manager District Assets; D. Maitland, Quality Assurance Manager; J. Visser, Facilities and Properties Manager; R. Parekh, Principal Communications Advisor; C. Dodds, Executive Assistant; S. Hewett, Governance Administrator.

3. WHAKAPUAKITANGA WHAIPĀNGA
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No members declared a conflict of interest for the items on today's agenda.

4. COUNCIL HEADQUARTERS BUILDING AND PAKIWAITARA BUILDING - 36 and 41 Weld Street, Hokitika

The Chief Executive provided Council with the background to the report. T. Armstrong and S. Raturi attended the meeting via audio-visual link to answer technical questions for the elected members.

Background Information

A previous assessment was completed but did not provide a percentage of New Building Standards (NBS) on it however it was presented by previous management that it resulted in 34% NBS and this has been used as the basis for building use up until now. Remedial work was suggested but never undertaken.

Council Headquarters – 36 Weld Street

A new report was conducted on the Council Headquarters at 36 Weld Street which assessed the building to be at 25% NBS resulting in the Chief Executive closing the building until a more detailed engineering assessment could be completed. Along with the results of the report other factors, such as the Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment's (MBIE) guidelines around building occupancy of earthquake-prone buildings and the recent Davison report findings on the Mt. Maunganui Beachside Holiday Park landslide were considered when deciding on whether the building should be closed or not.

Council Building – 41 Weld Street

An assessment was then done on the Council Building at 41 Weld Street (Pakiwaitara Building)) which also received a 25% NBS rating and thus has also been closed.

Discussions have also been had with tenants in the property, who have since vacated the premises.

The Council report on the agenda contains the information to date but costings are based on old assessments and any consideration of the future of the premises will need to address the needs of Council in its ability to fulfil its services to the community.

The engineering reports on both buildings will be circulated to Elected Members and posted on the Council website for full transparency.

Engineers Assessment Report Summary

Mr. Armstrong summarised the engineering assessment highlighting the following:

- 36 Weld Street has sturdy foundations for the time period that it was built however the built on extensions pose the greatest risk to life.
- 41 Weld Street also has strong foundations but there are structural issues.
- A 34% NBS rating is the level at which government considers a building as earthquake prone.
- When strengthening an existing building 67% NBS is generally considered the minimum to strive for however this is usually driven by commercial factors (e.g. sale or tenancy conditions. The industry standard is to aim for as near 100% NBS as feasible with a minimum of 67% NBS.

Councillors Q&A with Engineers

Which of the two sites has the better earth foundations if Council were to rebuild on one of them?

- Both sites are piled however 36 Weld Street's are compacted into the ground, however the current quality of them is unknown.

Does a 67% NBS rating determine whether the building would withstand an earthquake or just provide more time for evacuation?

- 34% NBS is considered a risk at a moderate level of shaking, at 67% NBS there is a slightly bigger buffer, however even at 100% NBS a building can be written off depending on the strength of the earthquake, but you wouldn't expect a total collapse compared to a lower rating.
- Many new builds now aim for a standard of surviving anything up to a 1 in 500 year earthquake.
- The current 25% NBS rating is a D grade; this equates to a 10 - 25 times greater risk to life in the event of an earthquake compared to a 100% NBS rating.

Would the proximity to the Hokitika Swimming Pool complicate any new build on the 41 Weld St site?

- As the current building is piled any new build would also be piled and the site has a good level of access so would not expect any extra difficulty building on that site.

Could the current condition of the foundations affect saleability or the ability to rebuild on either site?

- Working with existing foundations can create constraints on how you can develop a building.
- In the event of a sale, not necessarily a need to remove the existing piles but recommends that they are fully mapped out.
- Cited examples following the Christchurch earthquake where there were difficulties rebuilding on sites where foundations and basements had been buried.

Has any analysis been done on the liquefaction risk of the area?

- Hokitika is on sand and the water table rises during high tide and in areas this occurs you will find liquefaction risk.
- Both 36 and 41 Weld St are situated on denser sand which is less prone to liquefaction and whether the foundation would need to go deeper on a new building would be subject to the design.

Could, for example a pole shed type construction be utilised to build on top of the existing foundations to compact it for a single level construction?

- For a single level construction, you could look at a shallow foundation option.
- Possibly not a canter lever pole structure due to how it relies on the lateral strength of the ground to prevent the building falling over.
- Examples in town of new buildings using a portal frame structure which are resilient to earthquakes due to their flexibility and built on a shallow foundation, with some of the sand underneath dug out and filled with a gravel raft.
- If you start to go multistorey then you're likely to need a deeper foundation.
- Noted that other natural hazards should be taken into consideration such as accessibility during a flood and whether Civil Defence requirements need to be considered.

Is the ground near the Hokitika Airport better or worse than in town, and if you were going to build a new building where would you choose?

- The ground at the airport is good ground with the iron pan underneath and is well above the high tide mark and doesn't have a liquefaction risk.
- If the area near the airport is a consideration it would be considered a better place to build a building.

Mr. Raturi reiterated that the NBS rating is based on life safety not building safety so risk to life is the number one consideration when assessing the rating.

Mr. Raturi and Mr. Armstrong left the meeting at 1:37pm and did not return.

Deliberations
The Chief Executive advised that while this did not happen overnight, but it is important that Council focus on the best decision for the community going forward and noted that a comprehensive report will need to be done on any options considered before going ahead and these would come back for approval through Council. Any option taken will require a special consultative process due to the significance of Council assets and will be going through this year's Long Term Plan process; it will not be pushed out to future years.

The options being discussed were as follows:
Option 1 - 36 Weld Street: Seismic Strengthening
Option 2 - 41 Weld Street: Seismic Strengthening to 67%NBS
Option 3 - Disposal of 36 and/or 41 Weld Street
Option 4 - Demolition and redevelopment of one site and dispose of the other

After hearing from Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Raturi Her Worship the Mayor then asked Councillors for their input as follows:

Councillor Gillett: Advised he was leaning towards option 3 of the report which is to dispose of both buildings and look at other options and sites. Noting that if customer service needs to be in town Council could look at options for leasing a small space in town however it might not be necessary and just require a transition for the community to get used to a new location. Cr Gillett advised he is also still considering option 4, which is to demolish and rebuild on one of the existing sites.

Councillor Walker: Advised he does not see value in option 1, which is strengthening the existing buildings. Cr Walker advised he is also leaning towards option 3 and asked whether community facing services could be collocated in the library; if this is not possible Council can discuss other options further in the process. Taking other factors such as the Water Treatment Plant and potential amalgamation, believes that it is most prudent to investigate the value of the existing buildings, while also investigating costs associated with option 4, and then rebuilding based on Council requirements while being cost effective. Cr Walker agreed that it is important to have community facing services located in town and advised he is supportive of option 3, with rudimentary costings investigated on option 4. Cr Walker would like all options to go out for community feedback.

Councillor Munns: Advised she is comfortable with looking at selling the current buildings but believes that Council offices and services should be centrally located in town for community access. Cr. Munns supports building a simple community building next to the Hokitika Swimming Pool so that everything is together and central.

Councillor Maitland: advised that he is in agreement with Councillor Walker but does not think that the process of a new build should be rushed and Council should first assess what is needed and where it could be situated and would like the Hokitika Airport area to be considered.

Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai: advised that he supports either options 3 or 4, stressing that this issue has been delayed for too long and action needs to be taken. Queried whether an option of sharing space with Department of Conservation could be considered.

Deputy Mayor Burden: advised that he supports options 3 or 4 and likes the idea of a community hub on 41 Weld Street inclusive of the library and other community services and is hesitant to share a site with another organisation as it might lead to issues in the future. Agreed that the airport should be

considered and doesn't believe that the argument for accessibility is as important as is being discussed as the airport is only 2km from the CBD and for many residents would be closer than going into town. The Deputy Mayor agreed with Councillor Walker about sourcing community feedback on all options.

Her Worship the Mayor: advised that even if amalgamation progresses there will still need to be a Council presence in Hokitika and advised she is hesitant about moving to the airport and would prefer Council be located in town to allow community members to visit the council when running other errands such as shopping.

Councillor Mackenzie: advised that he considers the process to be more sequential rather than choosing a sole option and thinks that Council should start with option 3 to get an idea of the value of the buildings and if there is not interest or value in them then consider option 4, moving to option 1 or 2 to strengthen one of the existing buildings. Councillor Mackenzie preferred option 3 but would also like the airport location investigated suggesting that if access was an issue Council could investigate an electric bus option from town.

Councillor Martin: Advised that she had no preferred option at this stage but stressed the outcome needs to be fit for purpose and focus on long term functionality and be kept simple. Noted that selling both sites would offer some funding towards a future facility. Cr Martin questioned what cost is involved for the consultative process would be to which the Chief Executive responded that it would be more of a time cost on staff than a financial one and would have to happen regardless of whether Council progress with a new building or a change to an existing one.

The Chief Executive followed up by informing Council that services will be fragmented in the short term as no site in Hokitika is large enough to house all staff together however the Chief Executive is aiming to have a mid-term solution ready by the February 2027. The Chief Executive also highlighted that the future of 41 Weld Street was always planned to go into this year's Long Term Plan for consideration.

Councillor Manera: Advised that both prime sites in town so should have value. If Council did proceed with the airport location he would like to upgrade the infrastructure in the area with an aim to develop the area as an industrial zone.

The Chief Executive noted that conversations have been had with the other West Coast councils about what level of shared services might be possible but only at a high level at this stage and regardless of the result of local government reforms there is a strong view within every district that there needs to be a strong local voice and presence in each district.

Staff resource limits the number of detailed options that Council can go to the public for consultation on, but Council will also need focussed feedback from the community on clear options. Frequently Asked Questions will be published to the website.

Moved Councillor Mackenzie, seconded Councillor Manera and **Resolved** that:

1. The report be received.
2. Council directs staff to investigate the market value of both properties, 36 and 41 Weld Street, Hokitika.
3. Council directs staff to investigate options for building new council premises on council owned land
    a. at the Hokitika Airport and
    b. in the Hokitika Central Business District.
4. Associated costs and timelines for the above options be reported back to council.
5. Council requests that the Chief Executive report back to Council on the special consultative process required for the above options.

The Motion was put to vote and carried unanimously.

Her Worship the Mayor concluded the meeting with an acknowledgement of the work the Chief Executive and council staff have undertaken and also acknowledged members of the community for their support.

5. RESOLUTION TO GO INTO PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Moved Councillor Walker, seconded Councillor Maitland and **Resolved** that Council confirm that the public were excluded from the meeting in accordance with Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 at 2.32 pm.

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

Item No.	General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
1.	Hokitika Wastewater Treatment Plant	Good reason to withhold exist under Section 7	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists. Section 48(1)(a)

This resolution is made in reliance on sections 48(1)(a) and (d) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interests or interests protected by section 7 of that Act, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

Item No.	Interest		Section
1	Protect information where the making available of the information:		(S.7(2)(b))
	(i) (ii)	would disclose a trade secret; and would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information	
1	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.		(S.7(2)(h))
1	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations);		(S.7(2)(i))

MEETING CLOSED AT 2:58 PM

Next Ordinary Council Meeting – 29 October 2026 at 1.00 pm
Beachfront Hotel, 111 Revell Street, Hokitika and via Zoom

Confirmed by:

Her Worship the Mayor **Date: 29 October 2026**
Chair