

Councillor Debate: Taylors Mistake 23 July 2010

Transcriber comments: 43:03. Low quality of recording. For any critical sections please refer back to the original recording for confirmation.

Bob Parker: Welcome back everybody. We now move to the item 26A on the agenda, Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay baches. In order to get things rolling I want to test the recommendation that's here, Councillor Wells, you've indicated that you are prepared to move the staff recommendation. I understand that you also want to incorporate in that technical need to rescind the Council resolution referred in point 4 on page 147, which needs to be tidied up.

Bob Parker: Ok, with regard to the recommendations up on the projector and the report referred to on page 152. Ok. So Councillor Wells, would you start the ball rolling.

Sue Wells: Thank you, Mayor. I know that it seems a lifetime since this first came to the table, and we have discussed this at some length, indeed taking part in number of things. This Council faces a really simple decision here. In our city plan we have adopted the provision that the Environment Court arrived at. Some of you might agree with and some of you might not agree with. That's actually not our place to start picking it apart in our City plan. Our job today is, as it was then, to give effect to the Environment Court decision. And here is the silliness of it.

Sue Wells: The first thing that has to happen is that the, not the Council, the Taylors Mistake Association are obliged to prepare a planting plan concept. Not the Council. So what the Court has done is give the first kick of the ball to a third party. Not to us, to a third party. That's what the Court has said. Using my psychic powers I foresee a fairly difficult process around this. I think we may yet struggle to get a planting plan prepared. Heres how I see this rolling out. We had to uphold our city plan because that's what we do. We have to request the bach owners to prepare a planting plan and my psychic powers tell me that by the time the plan is prepared, we will be in plan review mode. Because we are going to be doing that I predict next year. We'll have done that discussion next year and by the time this rolled out we will be reviewing a new plan. At the time we're reviewing the planning, it would be appropriate for us to be reconsidering this matter again. But at the moment according to the court decision this first thing that has to happen, is for the bach owners to prepare a planting plan concept to the satisfaction of the Council, and that's what we should be doing. We should be asking the baches to do that, we do not check in anyway that we need to get the licensing sorted out before that, that is just not on. That's like saying the strip owners shouldn't have to comply with anything else if they don't like the licence. Council land and we issue the licence separately. That then is the way that we get to plan review. We need to make a very straight forward decision, we have a plan there is stuff in it and our job is to uphold it. Whether or not we're thinking it's going to be some procedural hurdles is another matter. I think if you look at it and realise who's got to do what, nothing is going to happen to those baches for a very long time. And that's what the court has provided for, and is why we should support the staff recommendation. [5:00]

Bob Parker: We now move to Resolution B moved, second it, seconded, invite Councillor Corbett to address the table.

Barry Corbett: Thank you Mr Mayor. This is a very important one because everyone, well just about everybody in Christchurch has an artwork of Boulder Bay in their home. Just to remind you Jane Harbour, on the cover of the telephone book, is a lovely painting of Boulder Bay. Won a telecom award, and sits on front of Christchurch telephone book. So people in Christchurch now about this. They know about Taylors Mistake, they know about Boulder Bay. And I would suggest to you that the majority of them love it the way it is. I love it the way it is. I love that walk going from Taylors Mistake all the way down to Boulder Bay, and Godley Head. It's just a magical place. And I was talking to someone once about that walk and they said, 'you know, when you do a walk, you need to have a destination to go to' If we took those away, there goes the destination. The walk just wouldn't be the same, quite good, all of a sudden during this walk, along the good ones, and you're coming across these fantastic iconic baches. They're rather special. So I don't mind using the word baches, to me they should be called cribs, because I'm originally from Dunedin. Mr Thompson you would agree? There's times we should really change all the things in them baches to cribs, holiday homes, maybe. They are special, they are really great. If you look at the ones in Taylors Mistake, and those families who have kept that surf lifesaving club and everything going for years, they've provided all the facilities down there and they've done so well. When I first came on Council I said I wanted those baches to stay, and I haven't changed at all.

Barry Corbett: But I'm supporting this because I believe that this is one way of working through all the problems that we have. And I believe that this is the best possible way of working through the problems that we have. And it gives the people of Boulder Bay and people from Taylors Mistake, and the people from the nice ones up on the cliff who don't like the ones down there, the chance to still actually have their say. So I urge you to go with this one. If you like those baches, this is the one that's the best to go forward.

Bob Parker: Any other councillors wish to rise to speak on this? Councillor Broughton.

Helen Broughton: Point of clarification.

Bob Parker: Point of clarification.

Helen Broughton: If we could go with the proposal now, is there any possibility that the baches would be gone by next year through the whole village? And we haven't got bulldozers down there, but other companies would come in down there and the baches are gone?

Peter Mitchell: I think the short answer to your question in terms of baches being taken away: no, unless by agreement with the bach holder, or the owner of the structure. From a practical point of view. I think at the end of the day, no, I think the answer to that would be no in terms of the next 12 months from that point of view. Staff would not go to commence enforcement proceedings to take baches away without first coming back here to sort of let you know that was going on from that point of view. This issue is here around giving effect to the District Plan and also around the second part of the Resolutions D and E, from that point of view of the license.

Sally Buck: I do have an amendment of Councillor Williams

Bob Parker: April, just excuse me, Councillor Buck I know that you have a question and you will be referred to in an appropriate moment from, by the Chair. Councillor Broughton has point of clarification and has indicated she is going to speak to it.

Councillor Broughton: Thank you. I'll try and be brief. The Environment Court came up with a judgement in 2002 or about. There was an original Court decision in 1999, and some settlement you gave in mediation '96. And I was interested today when I asked the legal counsel from Wynn Williams, and I said can Council decide to move to a new Plan change, and he agrees with Council can. And what I am arguing is that it is so long ago that all that this should have settled that, there's been three councils since, and with different people, different values and in my view an increasing concern about heritage. And in my view, that heritage, all the baches would stay. And they are an important part of Christchurch's heritage. And our heritage planner at the time argued in front of the Court, that it was important to keep all the baches. So there are broader considerations like map drawing [?? 0:11:21.0]. But from a heritage perspective they're critical. The baches, the baches evolved over the last nine years, is an important part of achieving kiwiana. It's important to people now, it's used in fashion magazines and other magazines, it's something critical to the NZ identify and we have been fortunate to have all these quaint baches at Taylors Mistake. They're really accessible to the public and in future years I think they're going to become a tourism attractions. So I think the Council today weren't part of what may have happened in '99. [?? 0:12:01.9] to make that call. I believe we need to keep to our resolution of April, and I'm taking the words from the council report, and if you accept what I'm saying, to have a possible plan change. There may be impediments to that, but all we're asking staff to do is keep to the April decision and prepare a possible plan change consideration by Council. And staff organise a workshop on it. I mean I think that that's incredible that we're still here on this issue. Council staff started in 1936. And I'm not sure that any government local or central would like to stick to since 1936, social attitude to change, councillors at the table have different views. And I think really that these baches are critical. And the biggest building era of the baches was in 1920 to 1930, and at the start of World War Two there were 72 baches, commanded by the NZ Army. It's part of our world, it's our [?? 0:13:18.1]. So to quite a lot of heritage there and importantly we should retain it. And all I'm asking for is that we continue with a possible Plan change, it may be knocked out at the next hurdle if there's a difficulty, but I'd like to keep to that. Thank you.

Bob Parker: Thank you. Councillor Buck, do you have a point of clarification?

Sally Buck: I want to know - concern about the effluent and the storm water. And I want to know if any of the baches are pouring effluent into the ocean and if this is going to continue or not. Because it sounds like its going to go on.....

Bob Parker: Ok, that's a point of clarification.

Ian Thompson: I have to say that at the present time that may very well be happening, although no one knows for sure. The purpose of putting a license regime into place is to ensure that sewage is

properly dealt with. There is a pump at the bottom of Taylors Mistake Road that apparently baches owners can connect to. Storm water isn't seen as being too much of an issue. There is a water supply to the baches as well. But in terms of the waste water, yes, it is possible to do it better than what it is at the moment.

Sally Buck: From what I'm hearing from Councillor Wells, this licensing regime is actually going to have an awfully long time to get in place. And so we won't be able to check that in actual fact that these baches are connecting or not. There's a big concern to me that possible effluent is going into the ocean.

Ian Thompson: I agree, it is a concern. It might be Peter, can we do anything about that before licenses are in place?

Peter Mitchell: The council would have remedies under other legislation such as the Health Act, if there were public health concerns which could be, action could be taken quite independent of this whole issue about Plan changes, licenses and everything else. If there was information coming to Council to that effect.

Sally Buck: I'd really like to add something onto the recommendation that this has happened, whether or not they come back with a plan change or whatever, that we actually want that effluent issue put in place.

Bob Parker: So just in clarification, talking to the motion, should that become the substantive, you will be adding that to the recommendation.

Sally Buck: Yes, I'd really like to do that....*(interruption near recorder)*...

Bob Parker: At this stage we are still dealing with the amendment. Councillor Johanson you are next, then Councillor Wells and Councillor Williams.

Yani Johanson: Thank you. I just have two questions. One is what would this proposed amendment do with regards to the legal letter that we have received, and the submission we've heard this morning around enforcement action. Point of clarification as to if we agree to this amendment it raises with me, you know, what business.

Peter Mitchell: I think Mr Mayor, I must have made two comments. The amendment is essentially the same as the resolution the Council passed back in April, and for which the report is on the agenda today. So it seems to be just a reiteration of the same issue from that point of view. I would expect in terms of the letter you received from Wynn Williams, if the Council was to pass this today we could expect by Friday week an application or enforcement order as was indicated to you, and we will then be back in the Environment Court on this particular matter.

Yani Johanson: The second question was in regards to the request to enforce by the 30th September. Does staff have to comment on that? I just don't quite understand where we're at in

terms of the agreement, not with the members of the other one, the staff recommendation that as when would enforcement action will take place.

Peter Mitchell: I think if the Council today was to agree to the staff recommendation in front of you, there is, the risk of Save the Bay going to the Environment Court is lower from that point of view. Because what the staff recommendation's essentially trying to do is give effect to the Environment Court's 2003 decision. And if Save the Bay were to go to the Environment Court then the Council, assuming they'd passed the resolution, the recommendation today, would say to the Court: look, the Council, yes, it has taken much longer than what the Court expected back in 2003, from the Council's point of view, I suppose everybody else's point of view I suppose the time has gone by. But it is now accepted that, it needs to give effect to that 2003 decision and is working actively with the parties to do so, and would ask the Court to adjourn any such application pending the outcome of those discussions.

Peter Mitchell: So, from that perspective I think it would be quite a different approach before the Environment Court. Because the other one in terms of, sorry, just to go back to – if the Council did not pass the recommendation today and the action was to be taken to the Environment Court, effectively the Council as a public body, standing up in the Environment Court and having to answer the question: why haven't you simply given effect to a Court decision in which this organisation took an active role along with all the other parties? And that's a very difficult question to answer in a realistic sense.

Bob Parker: Thank you, Councillor Wells?

Sue Wells: Firstly to Councillor Broughton. Is this intended to replace the other motion?

Helen Broughton: [?? 0:20:05.8] resolution and it's probably, [?? 0:20:09.4].

Sue Wells: So it's to replace?

Helen Broughton: Yes, it will replace it.

Sue Wells: Oh right oh. And, oh, no, that's fine. And [?? 0:20:19.4]

?: [?? 0:20:21.5 - 0:20:30.1]. I'm not arguing [?? 0:20:31.3] but, you know, but keep [?? 0:20:34.5 - 0:20:39.0 *other people talking during this stage as well*]

Chrissie Williams: I'm thinking of the amendment, what is the intention of it in nice and simple terms, but is to continue with the process at the start of outline of Paragraph 9 of the report. And you'll notice that, you know, the first thing if we did want to go to a Plan change we'd need a Resolution to secure that as a Plan change. But that's the intent of the amendment. Two points. I disagree with Councillor Corbett that says if we want to keep the baches we should vote for the staff recommendation. That's, I believe, the opposite of the case. If we do vote for the original staff recommendation as moved by Wells and Corbett, the fourteen baches will get, that have been

identified, will go. And that's what that, the Environment Court decision and the City Plan anticipate and that's what that resolution will be confirming.

Chrissie Williams My understanding is that the Environment Court process, the Court body weren't deciding whether baches should stay or go necessarily, but whether the baches could be scheduled in the City Plan, and whether the TMB zone was appropriate. So those are the considerations for the Court. I'm not sure when the discussions were held about where the 14 baches should go. My understanding, that would have been in the 1990s somewhere.

I support the retention of the baches. The presentations we had back in April I think it was, from the Taylors Mistake Association, gave, to me gave some very good evidence about the heritage value. You'll remember the document that they presented to us about the history of these baches. They're comparing them with baches or cribs in other parts of New Zealand. I don't believe that they're impeding access. And by having a Plan change to consider, yes, we would be reviewing that decision, but I think it would be timely to do this now. I believe that people interested heritage has moved on from the 1990s. So I'm supporting this amendment so that we can retain these baches. I believe that if you, if we pass the other motion we'll have the baches gone before lunchtime.

Bob Parker: I'm just going to ask, I think, I want some clarification on behalf of the table around the discussion. We're hearing a couple of conflicting things Mr Mitchell and might be able to help. One, that the intention of the recommendation that Councillor Wells and Councillor Corbett who seconded it, is, as I understand from it, from listening to the discussions around the table much the same, that the difference is that Councillor Wells has moved and if you go with that process, which I understand you're saying makes it less likely that we can be placed in the invidious position of defending ourselves in the Environment Court around an enforcement order something you read people do, for the parties who have not done. If we go with the amendments here we could find ourselves in that position. And contrary what Councillor Williams has just said, it seems to be, that if that is the case, then there is potentially as little or even less certainty for those baches given that we may be asked to place and carry out an enforcement order I think. Whereas if we go with the Wells recommendation, we actually put into place the Environment Court decision. And then begin a process which will be, by her definition, be overtaken by a broader plan change which would allow current thinking to better align with the Plan. Am I getting clear somewhere? Is this what has been outlined?

Peter Mitchell: I think that that's a very fair summation Mr Mayor. And I would also make the point that what you refer to as the Wells / Corbett support staff recommendation, that is based around Environment Court decision which in turn was based around community input, a very public process and with people having been subject to cross-examination, on oath, in terms of the evidence they were given. And also a lot of investment by the community, this council, and the other groups involved. My concern in terms of the amendment, and going down the alternative Plan change road is you simply put the same people, and perhaps new players, back into a much more adversarial approach to this. Rather than simply giving effect – because the Council, with the Wells / Corbett one, it is based around the Environment Court decision already in place. And is simply giving effect to it from that point of view.

Bob Parker: I wonder if I can ask, given what I think is the majority of sentiment around this table, which is to retain the baches on the basis of a number of grounds and changing sentiments etc. I'm just taking a punt here. but if that was the feeling of the majority of the table, which pathway offers the fairest and least liable to be overturned by [?? 0:26:37.1]? Which is going to give us the best process to get to that position, if that was the majority view of the day?

Peter Mitchell: My advice to the Council would be for the Wells / Corbett motion from that perspective. At the end of the day it is the fairest in the sense that the Council is a public body itself, it has given any effect to a Court decision in which it has taken part, and I think that is the most appropriate action, in my view, for the Council to take.

Bob Parker: Is there anyone else who wishes to address point in clarification? Yes, Councillor Williams.

Chrissie Williams : What you are suggesting hat we go with the the Wells / Corbett resolution. Is there some risk assessment need to that? So Councillor Wells was saying, 'well, this may not happen, so we move to Plan review.' I don't know what the probability of that is to happen. So, what I need to hear very clearly from you the that we don't have this as amendment, we go with the original staff recommendation, what is the risk of those 14 baches being removed, and I'd like you to put a time frame around it, maybe in the next couple of years. What's the probability?

Peter Mitchell: Well the Environment Court decision has what is referred to as 'unscheduled baches'. It clearly contemplates that a number of baches will go. But that was always part of that Environment Court process, and the Bach Owners Association was involved in that, they clearly understand that, that was the outcome of the Court decision. So it's that expectation, in my mind, it's an expectation that in terms of the Wells / Corbett motion that you work through those steps. And within that, then they occur at a time that maybe the licenses could be resolved in three months, it might be six months, it might be nine months, but there is a point in time when those unscheduled baches will be removed. There has to be to give effect to the Court decision.

Chrissie Williams: The Mayors question was saying if the majority view was that they should be retained, which recommendation should we go with and you say the Wells/Corbett one.

Peter Mitchell: Sorry, that's a fair point because the Environment Court decision, and the advice has always been clear, there are unscheduled baches which there is an expectation they will be removed. Yeah.

Bob Parker: Mr Mitchell, a question from Councillor Wells.

Sue Wells: Mr Mitchell, would you agree that the Court has made it for the bach owner to take the first step in that process?

Peter Mitchell: Yes.

Sue Wells: And the court has not put a timeframe around that process? So the bach owners could procrastinate cheerfully for some considerable period of time, and still give effect to what is in the City Plan. Would you agree with that?

Peter Mitchell: I would agree with that.

Sue Wells: So when you say three months or six months, is it in fact correct that they could take two or three years to develop there landscape plan?

Peter Mitchell: Yes, that is true. But I'm speaking from the point of view that all parties took part in Environment Court process acting in good faith. The Court reached an outcome which was again involving all parties, and on the basis that the Bach Owners Association is acting in good faith, they will work through this process. Part of that process which they are well aware of and which they have effectively, through the Court process, agreed to is that a number of those unscheduled baches, because that was the whole rationale for the Court's decision, will be removed in a point of time by being relocated into the zone, bach zone.

Bob Parker: Ok. So what we've just heard there is probably not going to help some people unwind the complexity of the situation, Mr Marriott as chief executive, do you want to summarise as well.

(People next to recorder whispering)

Peter Marriott: ...[?? 0:31:02.8] Environment Court decision. If you pass that recommendation, we as staff will be endeavouring to give effect to the Environment Court decision. So we will be endeavouring, using all our powers, to get a landscape plan and to work through all the steps and the final outcome is some baches will be removed. Now that's, lets not muddy the waters that it might take years, it might need a Plan change. Let's be clear that we as staff, if you pass that recommendation, we will be endeavouring to enforce the Environment Court decision. So if you disagree with the Environment Court decision and the enforcement of the Environment Court decision [vote for the amendment].

Sue Wells: So my question before you do that, if you want to buy an amount of time you perhaps, the bach owners might have a change of view, would that amendment give anyone a longer time, or would that amendment take us straight to the Environment Court.

Peter Marriot: The window of time as you define it, is best with the staff recommendation. Because staff recommendation currently has two parts to it. One part is to deal with those baches that Environment Court said could remain. Thats where Mr Mitchell is talking about the licences. So that would mean to go away, and to straight away, you sort those out. And then there's a process that we go through second set of actions which is outlined in this report.

Bob Parker: Councillor Corbett.

Barry Corbett: Just to check, Chief Executive or Mr Mitchell, what is the wording that would ensure the status quo? Is there no wording that can do that?

Bob Parker: I think the answers come fairly clear is really why I asked the questions that I started asking. Because if you look at the staff recommendation, and what Councillor Wells is saying is that you can use this as a tool to retain all of the baches. It is a good tool to use because on the one hand you are enacting something which you've been part of creating with the Environment Court, you've got a decision, you should put that in place. But then there would be so many delays potentially to that you get to a point of [?? 0:33:50.4]. I think, something that is inherently wrong with that and in simple terms what you're outlining is a process by which people agree to do something, and agree not to do something. And I think that in simple terms seems like less of a transparent approach to solve the problem no matter how straightforward from someone whose well versed in the processes of planning it might appear, to the rest of the world it might appear to be giving with one hand and essentially taking with the other. How many events could intrude between this time and your interpretation of the horizon of the baches being retained that might interfere with that process? This, what is being asked for here, although it immediately entails a whole lot of more work, it does, I think, you quite rightly outlined to us, have greater risk to bach owners in that the enforcement of Environment Court and the [?? 0:34:56.3] to take that out. So I think, from my perspective this gives greater clarity, but the concern is that if it is the will of the councillors to keep the baches, there is also a risk. And I'd like to know a little bit more about the enforcement process. Mr Mitchell, I would like to know, given that was the course that was taken, if it went to the Environment Court, what could happen to Council, what sort of time frame could we be forced into, before we got to this plan review that we're talking about, the overall review which apparently is going to be the saviour of this situation. So in that, that's the interesting thing to me.

Peter Marriott: You've still got to remember one key point that I think is missing. A Plan change isn't the saviour of anyone because you have to assume that a Plan change, whether it's by that Resolution or whether it's through our whole District Plan Review, would be the effect, and you will get another decision made by the Environment Court in Christchurch. That there in my opinion leads to another Environment Court decision.

Bob Parker: Councillor Wells.

Sue Wells: If the Bach Owners Association while developing the plan came up with a Private Plan change which touched on heritage from the time it was notified as I understand it would have effect {and take precedence over the city plan - BJJ}, and the way that [?? 0:36:34.3] heritage matter. Yeah? Mr Mitchell, can I check that?

Peter Mitchell: Yeah.

Bob Parker: [?? 0:36:42.6]

Peter Marriott: I think your point is, staff recommendation through that process could end up with a plan change, this is what the Councillor Wells is saying. Key word COULD. But it could be a Plan change that Council doesn't have involvement with. That might be something that worked out between parties. In my opinion least risk going through council recommendation.

Bob Parker: So, I think that clarifies it a little bit. [Laughter] What we have here, it seems to me, an extraordinary situation. The machinery of Plans and Environment Courts and planning processes grinding inextricably towards an outcome of some kind, even though this Council, for a period approaching 40 years, has struggled with this decision. Today the Council, I suspect is of the view, the majority anyway, that these buildings should all be retained. But what I'm actually hearing is there is no longer a secure process to get to that point anyway. There is however a democratic process that can potentially bring us to that point. And the most measured way of doing it is, I think on balance, through the staff recommendations was the one which Councillor Wells started with. I'm summing it up, Mr Mitchell, how are we doing?

Peter Mitchell: Clearly, as the General Manager responsible for the recommendation, I think that's doing very well, Mr Mayor. [Laughter] And also too, but from my perspective, it is not a comfortable position that I think for the Council to be in where it's got an Environment Court decision, you've got obligations under the RMA to give effect to your own Plan, and there's always been this inconsistency in terms of the Council's position on this matter, I'll put it that way. So actually Mr Mayor, I could just finish up, there's an issue that Councillor Buck raised about wastewater. And I've had a Dr Gilpin in the audience who's a member of the Bach Owners Association advises me that there's no effluent issue because there are electric composting and chemical toilets at all the baches at Taylors Mistake and Boulder Bay. Just to give a measure of comfort.

Bob Parker: I thank you for that. I'm sure Councillor Buck is somewhat reassured to hear that. I think we've actually now, through a fairly tortuous process, got a better grip on it. At least that's my feeling. So, I think we do now move to some sort of conclusion. We're going to have to test the amendment, unless the mover and seconder have for any reason decided they would want to withdraw it having heard, otherwise we'll test it by way of a vote. If there are any other points, clarifications that are in your mind, if you want to have them clear, make the decision that you understand that I opportunities around Councillor minds.

Sally Buck: On that point that Mr Mitchell said, does that mean then that all the long drops are the ones who've been disconnected?

Bob Parker: Some of them have been retained purely for historic reasons. [Laughter]. I'm sure.

Brent Gilpin: All of the baches had to have electric toilets as part of the 1987, and since then some, technology's moved on and some have replaced them with composting toilets. And certainly if there was any sewage issue, I think Taylors Mistake has the best water quality of Canterbury, and if there's any sewage issues, I mean my children swim in that water and we wouldn't be waiting for the Council to sort out any bach holders who were doing that.

Bob Parker: Well I think that's a very blunt and to the point. Thank you. Ok. So, look, let's get to work guys, we have done a lot thing thinking about this and now we are at the point of testing the amendment. There's no withdrawal of the amendment so I'm now going to ask if anyone wishes to rise to speak to it, in which case I now put that amendment. All those in favour to say aye.

[From Council minutes¹]:

That the Council officers prepare advice to the Council on a possible Plan Change to retain all the baches at Taylors Mistake.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Williams and on being put to the meeting was declared lost on Division No. 3 by 3 votes to 10, the voting being as follows:

For (3): *Councillors Broughton, Wall and Williams.*

Against (10): *Councillors Buck, Button, Cox, Corbett, Johanson, Reid, Sheriff, Wells, Withers and the Mayor.*

Bob Parker: Narrowly defeated. Now let's move back to the substantives and we were part way through the discussion around that. I now have a record of those people who followed Councillor Broughton. So is there anyone who wants point of clarification, now being moved to the debate for anyone who wishes to rise to speak to this. I put the recommendation, all those in favour say aye (various: aye'), all those opposed say no (various: no). Division is called for.

[From Council minutes]

The original motion was then put to the meeting and declared carried on Division No. 4 by 11 votes to 2, the voting being as follows:

For (11): *Councillors Buck, Button, Cox, Corbett, Johanson, Reid, Sheriff, Wall, Wells, Withers and the Mayor.*

Against (2): *Councillors Broughton and Williams.*

0:42:56.2: *move to other business.*

Brent Gilpin

31 July 2010.

¹ <http://www1.ccc.govt.nz/council/proceedings/2010/august/cnclcover26th/council23july2010minutes.pdf>