



Cover image: Lake Matheson - BareKiwi

Council Meeting Agenda

14 October 2026

Extraordinary Council Meeting

WESTLAND
District Council | Te Kahui o Poutini





AGENDA

RĀRANGI TAKE

NOTICE OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF

COUNCIL

to be held on **Wednesday, 14 October 2026**, commencing at **1 pm** at the Hokitika Westland
RSA,

22 Sewell Street, Hokitika and via Zoom

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



In accordance with clause 25A of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, members may attend the meeting by audio or audio-visual link.

Council Vision

*By investing in our people, caring for the environment, respecting the Mana Whenua
Cultural heritage, and enabling investment, growth, and development
we will enrich our district and the people that reside here.*

Purpose

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as prescribed by section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is:

- (a) To enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and
- (b) To promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future.

Council seeks to meet its obligations under the Local Government Act 2002 and the achievement of the District Vision adopted by the Council in June 2025, which are set out in the Long Term Plan 2025–2034.

1. KARAKIA TĪMATANGA OPENING KARAKIA

<i>Kia hora te marino Kia whakapapa pounamu te moana Hei hurahai mā tātou I te rangi nei Aroha atu, aroha mai Tātou i a tātou katoa Hui e! Tāiki e!</i>	<i>May peace be widespread May the sea be like greenstone A pathway for us all this day Give love, received love Let us show respect for each other Bind us all together!</i>
---	---

2. NGĀ WHAKAPAAHA APOLOGIES

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

4. KA MATATAPU TE WHAKATAUNGA I TE TŪMATANUI RESOLUTION TO GO INTO PUBLIC EXCLUDED (to consider and adopt confidential items)

Resolutions to exclude the public: Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987. 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) would disclose a trade secret; and	
	(ii) 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))

**DATE OF NEXT ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
ON 29 OCTOBER 2026 AT 1.00 PM
LOCATION TO BE CONFIRMED, AND VIA ZOOM**

Report to Council



DATE: 14 October 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Chief Executive

36 and 41 Weld Street – Seismic Risk and Future Accommodation

1. Summary

Recent engineering reports have identified concerns regarding the seismic performance of Council-owned buildings at 36 and 41 Weld Street, Hokitika, highlighting the need to address identified risks and determine the future of these properties.

Both buildings have an assessed seismic rating of 25% of New Building Standard (%NBS). Previous assessments and management decisions have not resulted in the necessary strengthening works being undertaken.

Strengthening estimates prepared in November 2024 for 36 Weld Street and April 2025 for 41 Weld Street indicate a combined cost of approximately \$7.34 million excluding GST to achieve 67%NBS, with additional costs and potential escalation yet to be determined.

This report outlines the current situation, associated risks, legislative considerations and available options, seeking Council's direction on the immediate management and long-term future of both properties.

Council seeks to meet its obligations under the Local Government Act 2002 and the achievement of the District Vision adopted by the Council in June 2025, which are set out in the Long Term Plan 2025–2034.

2. Background

36 and 41 Weld Street have been identified as requiring seismic strengthening for several years, with previous engineering assessments and Council decisions acknowledging the structural deficiencies of both buildings.

36 Weld Street

An earlier engineering assessment identified the need for seismic strengthening; however, the assessment did not follow the required methodology to establish the building's %NBS rating. In 2021, previous management reported that the building was at 34%NBS and that Council was committed to strengthening it to a minimum of 67%NBS. The proposed works, which would have required the building to be vacated for approximately eight months, were not undertaken.

41 Weld Street

A 2019 engineering assessment identified the building as achieving 25%NBS. The report was formally received by the Building Consent Authority in 2020, resulting in the building being classified as earthquake-prone. Despite this assessment, the building continued to be occupied, with consideration given to accommodating additional Council services.

Previous investment considerations

In November 2024, strengthening estimates were prepared for 36 Weld street and April 2025 for 41 Weld Street properties, identifying costs of approximately \$4.53 million for 36 Weld Street and \$2.81 million for 41 Weld Street to achieve approximately 67%NBS. These estimates excluded a number of associated works and potential cost escalation.

Recent engineering assessments have now established both buildings at 25%NBS, bringing renewed attention to their seismic performance, the management of identified risks and the need for a clear decision on their future.

3. Current Situation

Recent engineering assessments have confirmed that both 36 and 41 Weld Street have a seismic rating of 25%NBS, placing them within Grade D (high risk), with an estimated relative life-safety risk 10–25 times greater than a comparable new building.

In response to these findings, the Chief Executive has taken a precautionary approach, temporarily vacating both buildings to manage the identified seismic risks and prioritise the safety of staff, tenants and members of the public. Interim arrangements are being established to manage building access, maintain essential services and ensure business continuity while Council considers the longer-term future of both properties.

The legislative environment is also changing, with amendments to the earthquake-prone building framework taking effect from 1 July 2027. While these changes may alter the regulatory classification and strengthening requirements for the buildings, they do not change the underlying seismic risk.

Council must now consider the immediate management of both properties alongside their long-term future. Strengthening to 34%NBS would reduce the assessed seismic risk but would not eliminate it, while strengthening to 67%NBS would require significant capital investment. Neither approach necessarily addresses the longer-term suitability of the buildings for Council operations and community services.

The current situation requires Council to balance life safety, legislative obligations, service continuity and financial prudence, while establishing a clear pathway for determining the future use and investment in these properties.

4. Options

Council must consider the future of 36 and 41 Weld Street separately, recognising the different functions, investment requirements and potential future uses of each property. The options also need to be considered within Council's wider accommodation and civic facility requirements, including the future of Pakiwaitara.

4.1. Option 1 - 36 Weld Street: Seismic Strengthening

Undertake seismic strengthening of 36 Weld Street to achieve a minimum of 67%NBS, addressing the identified structural deficiencies and improving the building's seismic performance.

The November 2024 estimate identified strengthening costs of approximately \$4.53 million excluding GST. This estimate is now almost two years old, was subject to significant qualifications and exclusions, and should be regarded as a minimum indicative cost rather than a reliable current project budget. Further investigations, detailed design and cost escalation are likely to increase the investment required.

Importantly, the estimate relates primarily to structural strengthening and does not include the full scope of works required to bring the building up to a fit-for-purpose standard. Significant additional investment would be required to address building services, internal configuration, accessibility, functionality and future operational requirements.

The total cost of retaining and upgrading the building has not been established and would be materially higher than the original estimate. This option would improve the building's seismic performance but would not, in itself, deliver a fit-for-purpose Council administration facility.

4.2. Option 2 – 41 Weld Street: Seismic Strengthening to 67%NBS

The April 2025 estimate identified strengthening costs of approximately \$2.81 million excluding GST. This estimate is now almost 18 months old, was subject to significant qualifications and exclusions, and should be regarded as a minimum indicative cost rather than a reliable current project budget. Further investigations, detailed design and cost escalation are likely to increase the investment required.

Importantly, the estimate relates primarily to structural strengthening and does not include the full scope of works required to bring the building up to a fit-for-purpose standard. Significant additional investment would be required to address building services, internal configuration, accessibility, functionality and future operational requirements.

The total cost of retaining and upgrading the building has not been established and would be materially higher than the original estimate. This option would improve the building's seismic performance but would not, in itself, deliver a fit-for-purpose facility for Council and community services.

4.3. Option 3 – Disposal of 36 and/or 41 Weld Street

Consider the disposal of one or both properties, subject to independent market valuations and an assessment of their future strategic value.

This option would avoid significant capital investment in buildings that may no longer meet Council's operational requirements, while potentially releasing capital for investment in alternative accommodation or community facilities.

Consideration would need to be given to the marketability of the properties in their current condition, existing tenancy arrangements, potential redevelopment opportunities and any statutory disposal requirements.

This option would allow Council to redirect capital towards assets that better support its long-term service delivery requirements.

4.4. Option 4 – Demolition and redevelopment of one site and dispose of the other

Investigate the demolition and redevelopment of one property for future Council and community use, alongside the disposal of the other property.

This option would enable Council to retain one strategically located site (preferred 41 Weld St) while consolidating its property holdings and avoiding significant investment in strengthening and refurbishing two ageing buildings.

Assessment would be required of the respective market values, site suitability, demolition and redevelopment costs, potential disposal proceeds and the capacity of each site to accommodate a modern, fit-for-purpose facility.

This option would provide an opportunity to rationalise Council's property portfolio, reduce long-term maintenance and renewal liabilities, and focus future capital investment on a single facility that meets Council's operational and community requirements.

5. Assessment of Options

5.1. Option 1 - 36 Weld Street: Seismic Strengthening

5.1.1. Pros

- Addresses identified structural deficiencies and improves the building's seismic performance to a minimum of 67%NBS.
- Retains Council ownership and use of an existing centrally located administrative asset.
- Avoids the need to acquire land or develop an entirely new administration building.
- Provides greater certainty regarding the building's structural performance and potential continued use.

5.1.2. Cons

- Significant capital investment would be required without delivering a fully fit-for-purpose administration facility.
- The building's existing layout, services and configuration may continue to constrain operational efficiency and future service delivery.
- Additional structural deficiencies or compliance requirements may be identified during detailed design and construction.
- Investment in the existing building may limit Council's ability to pursue more efficient, integrated or flexible accommodation solutions.

5.1.3. Financial Implications

- The November 2024 estimate identified a strengthening cost of approximately \$4.53 million excluding GST.
- This estimate excludes significant expenditure associated with internal alterations, building services, functional improvements and temporary relocation. Further investigations, detailed design and updated cost estimates would be required to establish the full project cost.
- The financial assessment would also need to consider the building's current market value, anticipated remaining useful life, ongoing maintenance and renewal costs, and the extent to which the proposed investment would increase its value or functionality.
- Temporary accommodation would be required during the strengthening period, creating operational disruption and additional costs.
- There is a risk that substantial capital expenditure would be committed to structural strengthening without delivering a corresponding improvement in operational efficiency or long-term asset value.

5.1.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- The proposed investment is substantial and would need to be assessed against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, existing Long Term Plan provisions and available funding.
- Depending on the final project scope, funding requirements and significance assessment, public consultation or an amendment to the Long Term Plan may be required.
- Given the level of investment and implications for Council's future accommodation, community engagement should be considered before a final commitment to strengthening is made.

5.2. Option 2 – 41 Weld Street: Seismic Strengthening to 67%NBS

5.2.1. Pros

- Addresses identified structural deficiencies and improves the building's seismic performance to a minimum of 67%NBS.
- Retains Council ownership of an existing centrally located asset that accommodates Council and community services.
- Provides a higher level of seismic performance than the minimum required to address the building's current earthquake-prone classification.
- Avoids the need to acquire land or develop an entirely new facility.
- Provides greater certainty regarding the building's structural performance and potential continued use.

5.2.2. Cons

- Significant capital investment would be required without delivering a fully fit-for-purpose facility.
- The building's existing layout, services and configuration may continue to constrain functionality, accessibility and future service delivery.
- Additional structural deficiencies or compliance requirements may be identified during detailed design and construction.
- Investment in the existing building may limit Council's ability to pursue more integrated or flexible accommodation solutions.

- Proposed legislative changes may alter the building's earthquake-prone classification and statutory strengthening requirements, potentially changing the justification for immediate investment.

5.2.3. Financial Implications

- The April 2025 estimate identified a strengthening cost of approximately \$2.81 million excluding GST.
- This estimate excludes significant expenditure associated with internal alterations, building services, functional improvements, relocation of occupants and potential upgrades to existing commercial tenancies. Further investigations, detailed design and updated cost estimates would be required to establish the full project cost.
- The financial assessment would also need to consider the building's current market value, anticipated remaining useful life, ongoing maintenance and renewal costs, and the extent to which the proposed investment would increase its value or functionality.
- Temporary accommodation would be required during the transition and strengthening period, creating operational disruption and additional costs.
- There is a risk that substantial capital expenditure would be committed to structural strengthening without delivering a corresponding improvement in service delivery, operational efficiency or long-term asset value.

5.2.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- The proposed investment would need to be assessed against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, existing Long Term Plan provisions and available funding.
- Depending on the final project scope, funding requirements and significance assessment, public consultation or an amendment to the Long Term Plan may be required.
- Given the building's community and commercial uses, engagement with affected tenants, service providers and the wider community would be important before a final investment decision is made.

5.3. Option 3 – Disposal of 36 and/or 41 Weld Street

5.3.1. Pros

- Avoids significant capital investment in strengthening and upgrading buildings that may no longer meet Council's operational and community requirements.
- Potentially releases capital for reinvestment in alternative accommodation or future civic and community facilities.
- Reduces Council's long-term exposure to seismic risk, ongoing maintenance and asset renewal costs.
- Provides an opportunity to rationalise Council's property portfolio and align investment with future service delivery requirements.
- Enables the private sector to consider alternative uses or redevelopment opportunities for the properties.

5.3.2. Cons

- Council would relinquish ownership of centrally located properties that may have future strategic value.
- The existing seismic ratings and condition of the buildings may limit market interest and achievable sale prices.
- Alternative accommodation would need to be secured for affected Council services and potentially resulting in additional costs and disruption.
- Disposal may reduce Council's flexibility to accommodate future operational or community requirements.
- The timing and proceeds of any sale would be uncertain.

5.3.3. Financial Implications

- Independent market valuations would be required for both properties to establish their current market value, taking into account the identified structural deficiencies, existing tenancies and potential redevelopment opportunities.
- Disposal could avoid the combined November 2024 and April 2025 strengthening estimates of approximately \$7.34 million excluding GST, together with additional refurbishment and ongoing asset renewal expenditure.
- However, these avoided costs would need to be considered against potential sale proceeds, disposal costs and the capital or operating expenditure required to secure alternative accommodation.
- Temporary accommodation would be required during the transition period, creating operational disruption and additional costs.
- A comparative financial assessment would be necessary to determine whether disposal provides better long-term value than retaining and investing in either property.

5.3.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- The disposal of one or both properties would require assessment against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, the Long Term Plan and any applicable statutory requirements relating to the disposal of Council-owned assets.
- Consideration would need to be given to the strategic importance of the properties, their current use and the potential impact on Council and community services.
- Depending on the significance of the proposed disposal and its implications for future service delivery, public consultation may be required.
- Engagement with affected tenants, staff and community service providers would also be necessary to manage potential relocation and service continuity implications.

5.4. Option 4 – Demolition and redevelopment of one site and dispose of the other

5.4.1. Pros

- Removes the identified seismic vulnerabilities associated with the existing buildings from Council's property portfolio.
- Retains Council ownership of one strategically located site for future civic and community use.
- Provides an opportunity to develop a modern, fit-for-purpose facility designed around Council's future operational and community requirements.
- Enables consolidation of services, shared facilities, improved accessibility and more efficient use of Council accommodation.
- Reduces Council's property holdings and associated long-term maintenance, renewal and asset management liabilities.
- Provides an opportunity to release capital through the disposal of the property not retained for redevelopment.
- Provides greater flexibility to respond to future changes in Council operations and community requirements.

5.4.2. Cons

- Requires significant capital investment, with the full cost of demolition, site preparation and redevelopment yet to be established.
- Demolition would result in the permanent loss of the existing building on the retained site and any remaining asset value.
- Council would relinquish ownership of one centrally located property that may have future strategic value.
- The existing seismic rating and condition of the property selected for disposal may affect market interest and the achievable sale price.
- Redevelopment would require detailed planning, design, consenting and procurement, potentially resulting in an extended delivery timeframe.

- Temporary accommodation would be required during the transition and redevelopment period, creating operational disruption and additional costs.
- Site constraints, ground conditions and infrastructure requirements may affect redevelopment feasibility and costs.

5.4.3. Financial Implications

- The total financial implications of demolition, redevelopment and disposal have not yet been established.
- A detailed feasibility assessment would be required to determine demolition and site preparation costs, potential land remediation requirements, construction costs and associated infrastructure investment.
- Independent market valuations would be required for both properties to establish their current value, taking into account the identified seismic deficiencies, existing tenancies and redevelopment potential.
- The assessment would need to consider potential proceeds from the disposal of one property and the extent to which these could offset the capital investment required for redevelopment.
- Consideration would also need to be given to temporary accommodation costs, funding requirements and the whole-of-life operating, maintenance and renewal costs of the proposed facility.
- While redevelopment may require a higher initial capital investment than seismic strengthening, it could provide greater long-term value through improved functionality, operational efficiencies and reduced future maintenance liabilities.
- A comparative financial assessment against the November 2024 strengthening estimates of approximately \$7.34 million excluding GST would be required. These estimates are almost two years old, contain significant qualifications and exclusions, and do not represent the full cost of delivering fit-for-purpose facilities.

5.4.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- Demolition and redevelopment of one or both properties would require assessment against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, Long Term Plan provisions and applicable statutory requirements.
- Given the potential scale of investment and the strategic importance of the sites, public consultation may be required, particularly where redevelopment would result in changes to Council or community facilities.
- Engagement with affected staff, tenants, community service providers and other stakeholders would be necessary to inform future accommodation requirements and manage service continuity.
- Any decision to proceed with redevelopment should be supported by a comprehensive business case, including consideration of alternative sites, funding arrangements and the long-term strategic value of retaining the properties.

6. Risk Assessment

The proposed options for 36 and 41 Weld Street present differing levels of financial, operational, legislative and strategic risk. The immediate seismic risks must be managed independently of Council's longer-term decisions regarding strengthening, disposal or redevelopment.

The following assessment considers the principal risks associated with each option, their potential consequences and the measures available to Council to manage them.

Option	Key Risk	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk Rating
Option 1 – Strengthen 36 Weld Street	Significant capital investment without achieving a fit-for-purpose administration facility.	Likely	Major	High

	Additional structural or compliance requirements increase project costs.	Possible	Major	High
	Construction and relocation disrupt Council operations.	Likely	Moderate	High
Option 2 – Strengthen 41 Weld Street	Significant investment without addressing the building's long-term functional requirements.	Likely	Major	High
	Changes to earthquake-prone building legislation alter the regulatory justification for strengthening.	Possible	Moderate	Moderate
	Unforeseen construction costs and disruption to existing occupants.	Likely	Moderate	High
Option 3 – Disposal	Properties achieve lower sale prices due to seismic ratings and building condition.	Possible	Moderate	Moderate
	Loss of strategically located Council-owned assets.	Possible	Major	High
Option 4 – Demolition and redevelopment of one site and dispose of the other	Redevelopment costs exceed available funding or initial estimates.	Possible	Major	High
	Extended delivery timeframes and disruption to Council and community services.	Possible	Moderate	Moderate
	Redevelopment does not deliver anticipated long-term operational or financial benefits.	Possible	Major	High

Risk Mitigation

The principal risks can be managed through independent engineering assessments, updated cost estimates, property valuations and a comprehensive assessment of Council's future accommodation requirements.

Irrespective of the preferred option, Council will need to maintain appropriate interim risk management arrangements for both buildings, including access and occupancy controls, Trigger Action Response Plans (TARPs) and business continuity arrangements.

A staged decision-making process would reduce the risk of committing significant capital expenditure before the full financial and strategic implications are understood. This should include consideration of the buildings' current market values, whole-of-life costs, potential legislative changes and the opportunity cost of retaining the existing properties.

The overarching risk is that Council commits substantial public funds to addressing the structural deficiencies of the existing buildings without resolving their long-term suitability, or alternatively defers investment decisions without a clear and accountable pathway for managing the identified risks.

The preferred approach should therefore balance immediate life-safety considerations with long-term financial sustainability, service delivery requirements and responsible stewardship of Council assets.

7. Preferred Option(s) and Reasons

Option 4 – Demolition and redevelopment of one site and dispose of the other

Option 4 is the preferred option as it provides Council with an opportunity to address the identified seismic risks while taking a strategic, long-term approach to its property and accommodation requirements.

The November 2024 and April 2025 estimates indicate that strengthening both buildings to 67%NBS would require approximately \$7.34 million excluding GST. This investment would address structural deficiencies but would not deliver fit-for-purpose facilities, with significant additional expenditure required to meet future operational requirements.

The preferred approach is to retain one strategically located site for redevelopment and dispose of the other, rather than continuing to invest in two ageing buildings. This would enable Council to consolidate its property holdings, reduce ongoing maintenance and renewal liabilities, and focus future capital investment on a single, fit-for-purpose civic and administration facility.

Determining which site should be retained would require consideration of their respective market values, location, site suitability, redevelopment potential and ability to accommodate Council's future operational and community requirements.

This approach would provide an opportunity to consider the integration of Council and community services, ensuring that future investment supports efficient service delivery, financial sustainability and the district's long-term needs.

It is recommended that Council endorse Option 4 as the preferred strategic direction, with the intention of retaining one site for redevelopment and disposing of the other, subject to a comprehensive feasibility and financial assessment.

This would enable Council to make an informed decision on which property provides the greatest long-term strategic value before committing to demolition, disposal or redevelopment.

8. Recommendation(s)

- 8.1. That the report be received.
- 8.2. **Notes** that recent engineering assessments have identified both 36 and 41 Weld Street as having a seismic rating of 25%NBS, and acknowledges the need to address the identified risks and determine the long-term future of these properties.
- 8.3. **Notes** that the November 2024 and April 2025 estimates identify a combined cost of approximately \$7.34 million excluding GST to strengthen both buildings to 67%NBS, excluding additional refurbishment, functional improvements and potential cost escalation.
- 8.4. **Endorses** Option 4 – Demolition and redevelopment of one site and dispose of the other as the preferred strategic direction, with the intention of retaining one site (preferred 41 Weld St) for future Council and community use and disposing of the other.
- 8.5. **Directs** the Chief Executive to undertake a feasibility and financial assessment of the retained site to determine which site provides the greatest long-term strategic and financial value, including consideration of:
 - a. Independent market valuations of both properties.
 - b. Demolition, site preparation and redevelopment costs.
 - c. Site suitability and capacity to accommodate future Council and community services.
 - d. Whole-of-life costs, funding requirements and implications for Council's capital investment programme.
 - e. Disposal options and potential sale proceeds for the property not retained.
- 8.6. **Directs** the Chief Executive to maintain appropriate interim risk management and business continuity arrangements for both properties pending a final decision on their future.

- 8.7. Requests** that a further report be presented to Council outlining the findings of the feasibility assessment, a recommended site for retention, proposed disposal arrangements and an implementation and funding pathway, including any requirements for public consultation or amendment to the Long Term Plan.
- 8.8. Notes** that no final decision to demolish, redevelop or dispose of either property will be made until Council has considered the further assessment and any applicable statutory requirements.

Barbara Phillips
Chief Executive